

1 **Molecular aspects in pathogen-fruit interactions: Virulence and Resistance**

2

3

4

5

6 S. Tian<sup>1\*</sup>, R. Torres<sup>2</sup>, A-R. Ballester<sup>3</sup>, B. Li<sup>1</sup>, L. Vilanova<sup>2</sup>, L. González-Candelas<sup>3\*</sup>

7

8

9 <sup>1</sup>Key Laboratory of Plant Resources, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences,  
10 Beijing 100093, China. <sup>2</sup>IRTA, XaRTA-Postharvest, Edifici Fruitcentre, Parc Científic i  
11 Tecnològic Agroalimentari de Lleida, Parc de Gardeny, E-25003 Lleida, Catalonia,  
12 Spain. <sup>3</sup>Instituto de Agroquímica y Tecnología de Alimentos (IATA). Consejo Superior  
13 de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC). Catedrático Agustín Escardino 7, Paterna 46980-  
14 Valencia, Spain

15

16 \*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

17 E-mail addresses: tsp@ibcas.ac.cn (S. Tian) and lgonzalez@iata.csic.es (L. González-  
18 Candelas)

19

20 **Keywords:** *Botrytis*, Host defenses, Pathogenicity, *Penicillium*, Postharvest, Virulence  
21 Factors

22

1 ABSTRACT

2 Fruit losses during postharvest storage and handling due to pathogen infections are one  
3 of the major problems in the global food chain supply. The application of chemical  
4 fungicides to control diseases is currently limited by legislation in some countries and  
5 also raises concerns about food and environmental safety. Exploring molecular aspects  
6 of pathogen-fruit interactions therefore has biological and economic significance as a  
7 means to help develop rational alternatives for disease control. In this review we present  
8 the current knowledge of molecular aspects in pathogen-fruit interactions, addressing the  
9 following topics: the application of new “omics” technologies for studying these  
10 interactions; the molecular mechanisms of fungal pathogen attack; the regulation of  
11 virulence by exogenous factors; and, finally, fruit defense mechanisms.

12

13 **Contents**

- 14 1. Introduction.  
15 2. New technologies for studying host-pathogen interactions in postharvest fruit  
16 systems.  
17 3. Molecular mechanisms of fungal pathogens.  
18 3.1. Extracellular enzyme determinants.  
19 3.2. Reactive oxygen species and NADPH oxidase complexes.  
20 3.3. Effectors.  
21 4. Regulation of virulence by exogenous factors.  
22 4.1. Ambient pH.  
23 4.2. Light.  
24 4.3. Exogenous substances.  
25 5. Unraveling fruit defense mechanisms.  
26 6. Concluding remarks and future perspectives.

27

28 1. **Introduction**

29 Postharvest diseases caused by fungal pathogens lead to huge economic losses worldwide  
30 every year. Currently, the use of synthetic fungicides constitutes the main means to  
31 control these diseases. However, the development of resistance in fungal pathogens to  
32 fungicides and the growing public concern over the health and environmental risks

1 associated with high levels of pesticides in fruits have resulted in significant interest in  
2 developing alternative non-chemical methods of disease control (Mari et al., 2014).  
3 Furthermore, despite the application of fungicides and the increased use of new  
4 alternative strategies, fruits continue to be exposed to high infection pressure during  
5 production and commercial processing. In order to increase the arsenal of tools available  
6 to fight fruit decay we need to develop new approaches. In this context, the study of fruit-  
7 host interactions has gained increasing interest.

8 In the present review we have followed the nomenclature adopted by the American  
9 Phytopathological Society to define the terms pathogenicity and virulence (Sacristán and  
10 García-Arenal, 2008). Pathogenicity denotes the ability of a pathogen to cause disease on  
11 a particular host (a qualitative trait), whereas virulence is the degree of damage caused to  
12 the host (a quantitative trait). Virulence factors may be defined as those pathogen  
13 components that are non-essential for *in vitro* growth in a culture medium but contribute  
14 to disease. When one of these factors is required for pathogenicity it can be considered a  
15 pathogenicity factor. As virulence factors are important for infection, preventing  
16 pathogens from producing them constitutes an interesting alternative strategy for disease  
17 control. This strategy has been termed “antivirulence therapy” (Cegelski et al., 2008). As  
18 this therapy aims to disarm the pathogen rather than kill it or halt its growth, it is presumed  
19 that antivirulence compounds will generate much less selection pressure than traditional  
20 antibiotics in the pathogen to regain resistance, a problem faced with commonly used  
21 fungicides. However, before any antivirulence therapy can be developed there is a need  
22 to identify the virulence factors. In a broad sense, these factors can be as diverse as plant  
23 cell wall degrading enzymes (CWDEs), effectors (molecules that modify the physiology  
24 of the host in order to allow pathogen infection), or mechanisms that permit the rapid

1 adaptation of the pathogen to the host environment. The regulatory systems that govern  
2 all these processes can also be considered as virulence factors. Most of the research on  
3 antivirulence factors has been conducted with human pathogenic bacteria, although  
4 research on preventing fungal infections by *Candida albicans* and *Aspergillus fumigatus*  
5 has already been actively explored (Cui et al., 2015).

6 It is well documented that in many instances the differences in the outcome of a host-  
7 pathogen interaction (whether it is a compatible interaction, i.e., where disease occurs, or  
8 an incompatible/non-host interaction, i.e., where disease does not occur) depend on a  
9 rapid and efficient deployment of defense responses (Ferreira et al., 2006). These defenses  
10 are complex and constitute a multilevel series of structural and biochemical barriers that  
11 are either constitutive, preformed, and/or inducible. A first line of defense is common  
12 against all potential pathogens and is triggered by pathogen-associated molecular patterns  
13 (PAMPs). When a successful pathogen is able to escape this defense, then a second  
14 defense line is deployed by the host, the so called effector-triggered immunity. Plants  
15 respond to pathogen attack even in compatible interactions, although this response is  
16 insufficient to avoid infection progress. One of the earliest responses detected in many  
17 incompatible interactions (i.e., where the plant is resistant to the pathogen) is the  
18 activation of an oxidative burst characterized by an increase in the levels of reactive  
19 oxygen species (ROS) (Pitzschke et al., 2006). The oxidative burst precedes the synthesis  
20 of antimicrobial compounds like phytoalexins. This burst leads up to alterations in the  
21 synthesis of cell-wall structural proteins and the transcriptional activation of specific  
22 genes leading to the synthesis of pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins such as chitinases,  $\beta$ -  
23 1,3-glucanases and peroxidases (POD). Although these defense factors in host tissues

1 have been extensively studied, the mechanisms that regulate these responses have not  
2 been elucidated.

3 The application of molecular genetics techniques has significantly changed the study of  
4 plant-pathogen interactions, enhancing scientists' ability to test hypotheses and thus  
5 provide new information on the biochemical mechanisms underlying these interactions,  
6 i.e., pathogen virulence and host resistance (An et al., 2016a; Frías et al., 2011; Schouten  
7 et al., 2008). Cloning and the characterization of crucial genes in several fungal pathogens  
8 that are related to virulence/pathogenicity are likely to lead to a deeper understanding of  
9 the molecular mechanisms underlying fruit disease susceptibility/resistance. The above  
10 mentioned facts justify the need to increase our knowledge of the mechanisms of  
11 pathogen virulence and host fruit defense. This knowledge may lead to the rational design  
12 of new and safer control strategies.

13

## 14 2. **New technologies for studying host-pathogen interactions in postharvest fruit** 15 **systems**

16 During the last ten years we have witnessed an “omics” revolution that has involved all  
17 fields of biological sciences. This change is reflected in the way researchers now go about  
18 the study of biological processes, from a single gene/enzyme level to a holistic approach  
19 through which the researchers try to examine problems from a global point of view.  
20 Sequencing technology and its applications have expanded from the sequencing of  
21 individual genes to the assembly of complete genomes, from the analysis of the  
22 expression of a few genes to global transcriptomic analyses, and so on. However, the  
23 implementation of these new technologies in the field of postharvest pathology is lagging  
24 behind their uses in other closely related fields. “Omics” technologies are being used to

1 investigate many fruit crops from other points of view, and the information gathered from  
2 those studies can be used in postharvest pathology. Fruit crop genomes that have been  
3 sequenced include grape (Jaillon et al., 2007); apple (Velasco et al., 2010); banana  
4 (D'Hont et al., 2012); citrus (Xu et al., 2013); peach (Verde et al., 2013); and pear  
5 (Chagné et al., 2014). The genomes of many fungal plant pathogens have also been  
6 sequenced in recent years. The fungal sequencing genome projects contained in  
7 MycoCosm (Grigoriev et al., 2013) ([http://genome.jgi.doe.gov/pages/fungi-1000-](http://genome.jgi.doe.gov/pages/fungi-1000-projects.jsf)  
8 [projects.jsf](http://genome.jgi.doe.gov/pages/fungi-1000-projects.jsf)) provide a picture of the rapid progress being made in this field. The genomes  
9 of several postharvest pathogens are now available, including *Botrytis cinerea* (Amselem  
10 et al., 2011) and several different species of *Alternaria* (Dang et al., 2015) and  
11 *Colletotrichum* (Gan et al., 2013). The genomes of the following specific postharvest fruit  
12 pathogens from the genus *Penicillium* have also been recently sequenced: *P. digitatum*  
13 (Marcet-Houben et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2011); *P. griseofulvum* (Banani et al., 2016); and  
14 *P. expansum* and *P. italicum* (Ballester et al., 2015; Li et al., 2015). There are also ongoing  
15 genome sequencing projects for other relevant postharvest fungi, such as *Monilinia*  
16 *fructicola* and *M. laxa*.

17 The genetic information gathered in these projects provides a foundation for an in-depth  
18 analysis of the virulence factors of these important postharvest pathogens. Data are  
19 available on the whole set of putative genes present in these pathogens and on how many  
20 of these genes are secreted, which ones are candidate effectors and the arsenal of  
21 carbohydrate-active enzymes (CAZymes). There is also data on the array of proteases  
22 that each fungus can produce. In order to decipher which genes are relevant to  
23 pathogenesis and virulence, however, more studies are needed. Genes involved in  
24 pathogenicity and virulence are actively expressed during the colonization of the host. A

1 transcriptomic analysis of the pathogen-fruit interaction will thus reveal these genes, as  
2 well as other genes that are necessary for the normal growth of the fungus and are not  
3 necessarily related to pathogenicity/virulence. One advantage of directly analyzing the  
4 host/pathogen interaction is that information on host defense responses deployed in  
5 response to the fungal attack can also be obtained. The first approach used to analyze the  
6 fruit-pathogen interactome at the transcription level was based on sequencing ESTs  
7 (expressed sequence tags) (González-Candelas et al., 2010a) and on the identification of  
8 differentially expressed genes (Sánchez-Torres and González-Candelas, 2003). Other  
9 approaches that allow us to identify genes from either the fruit or the pathogen that are  
10 overexpressed during their interaction are based on the analysis of cDNA libraries using  
11 suppression subtractive hybridization (SSH) (Casado-Díaz et al., 2006; González-  
12 Candelas et al., 2010b; López-Pérez et al., 2015) or microarray hybridization (Guidarelli  
13 et al., 2011; Vilanova et al., 2014b). One advantage of the SSH approach is that it does  
14 not require previous knowledge of either the host or the pathogen, whereas a microarray  
15 can only be prepared once a large set of cDNAs from either interacting partners has been  
16 isolated. Recent advances in high-throughput sequencing technologies and decreasing  
17 costs have enabled small labs to conduct complex transcriptomic analyses using a whole  
18 transcriptome shot-gun sequencing approach (RNA-Seq). RNA-Seq, with its capability  
19 of producing millions of sequences from complex RNA samples, is displacing microarray  
20 analysis as the preferred tool for conducting global transcriptomic studies. Researchers  
21 have only recently begun to apply RNA-Seq in fruit-pathogen studies. Blanco-Ulate et al.  
22 (2014) investigated the expression of CAZymes-encoding genes in *B. cinerea* during its  
23 interaction with lettuce leaves, tomato fruit and grape berries, highlighting host-specific  
24 commonalities and differences. The interaction between apple fruit and *P. expansum* has

1 also been recently studied using RNA-Seq to analyze fungal genes expressed during  
2 colonization at 24, 48 and 72 h post-inoculation (hpi) (Ballester et al., 2015). Several  
3 genes classically related to virulence were induced, such as proteases, CWDEs and  
4 oxidoreductases. These types of enzymes are typically encoded by genes that are part of  
5 large gene families. By sequencing the global RNA population, one can determine which  
6 genes are actually induced. It was thus found that an aspergillopepsin-encoding gene  
7 showed the highest expression level at just 24 hpi, and that different pectinase-encoding  
8 genes exhibited different patterns of regulation during the course of infection. RNA-Seq  
9 also made it possible to discover genes that may represent putative  
10 virulence/pathogenicity factors. Previous studies had shown that *P. expansum* produces  
11 two glucose oxidases (GOX1 and GOX2), but only one of them, GOX2, has been  
12 implicated in virulence (Barad et al., 2012). In the RNA-Seq study a new *GOX3*-encoding  
13 gene was found that exhibited an earlier and much higher induction level than *GOX2*.  
14 Although knowing which genes are expressed is highly useful, it is possible to directly  
15 analyze the proteins being synthesized during a fruit-pathogen interaction using a  
16 proteomic approach. This approach bypasses the potential of a post-transcriptional  
17 regulation level and provides direct information on the final players, the proteins.  
18 Several studies, mainly on *B. cinerea* and *P. expansum*, have analyzed proteins  
19 synthesized by fungal postharvest pathogens under conditions that could affect  
20 pathogenesis, such as during conidia germination or exposure of the fungus to different  
21 pH values (Li et al., 2010; 2012), and under conditions that simulate the presence of the  
22 host (for a recent review see González-Fernández et al., 2015). Similarly, some proteomic  
23 studies have also been conducted in fruits to analyze their response to elicitors of induced  
24 resistance (Chan et al., 2007; Chan et al., 2008); wounding (Buron-Moles et al., 2014);



1 or to *Penicillium* spp. (Buron-Moles et al., 2015b). There has been only one study,  
2 however, that has analyzed the interacting proteome of both the fruit and pathogen  
3 simultaneously. This study conducted by Shah et al. (2012) profiled the proteome of  
4 ripening tomato fruits during its interaction with *B. cinerea*.

5 Another approach for studying the interaction between fruits and pathogens is to analyze  
6 the physiological and biochemical changes that occur using metabolomics. Most of the  
7 metabolomics studies conducted so far in fruit- pathogen interactions have been focused  
8 on the defense mechanisms of the fruit, in particular on the analysis of phenolic  
9 compounds, because these compounds have been classically associated with increased  
10 resistance levels in fruits.

11 The metabolite profiling of citrus fruit inoculated with *P. digitatum* showed an induction  
12 of different flavanones, flavones, polymethoxylated flavones and scoparone (Ballester et  
13 al., 2013b). Some of these metabolites are also induced in fruits in which increased  
14 resistance to pathogens has been triggered by an elicitor (Ballester et al., 2013a), although  
15 other phenolics found in elicited fruit were not detected in response to *P. digitatum*  
16 infection. The role of polymethoxylated flavones in disease resistance has also been  
17 revealed in the metabolomic analysis of a spontaneous yellow citrus mutant that is more  
18 resistant to green mold infection (Luo et al., 2015). In a recent study involving 24 apple  
19 varieties, correlation analysis revealed that phenols like flavonols and procyanidins B2 in  
20 the peel fraction of the inoculated fruit have a significant impact on blue mold resistance  
21 (Ahmadi-Afzadi et al., 2015). The comparison of tomato fruits that accumulate different  
22 levels of flavonoids and show different ripening behavior has also shed light on the role  
23 that specific flavonoids with high superoxide scavenging activities play in the higher  
24 resistance of some tomato lines to *B. cinerea* infection (Zhang et al., 2015).

1 Whatever the source of information regarding the possible involvement of a gene/protein  
2 in a host-pathogen interaction, either as a virulence factor or as a resistance mechanism,  
3 there is a need to validate such involvement. This functional analysis is normally achieved  
4 by manipulating the expression level of the corresponding gene. Obtaining gene knockout  
5 mutants is considered the most direct way to confirm the involvement of a gene in a  
6 biological process. In some instances, when deletion of a gene is not feasible, the analysis  
7 of mutant lines where the gene has either been downregulated or overexpressed can give  
8 a solid clue as to its function. For some postharvest fungal pathogens, such as *B. cinerea*,  
9 there are numerous articles describing the characterization of gene knockout mutants.  
10 There are many cases in which the gene deletion mutant shows no difference in virulence,  
11 or just a small decrease, with respect to the wild strain. One possible reason is the  
12 existence of multigenic families, such as those of CWDEs or protease encoding genes.  
13 When a gene belonging to a multigenic family is deleted, another member of the family  
14 can compensate for the missing one. One extreme example is the proteinase gene family  
15 of *B. cinerea*, where single and double gene knockout mutants were not affected in  
16 virulence (ten Have et al., 2010). However, the loss of a single polygalacturonase-  
17 encoding gene in an *Alternaria alternata* isolate causing citrus black spot reduced the  
18 virulence towards citrus fruit, whereas the loss of the orthologous genes in another *A.*  
19 *alternata* isolate causing citrus brown spot had no effect on virulence (Isshiki et al., 2001).  
20 The Host-Pathogen interaction database (PHI-base; <http://www.phi-base.org>) (Urban et  
21 al., 2015) contains more detailed information on the genes from different fungal  
22 pathogens that have been analyzed in the context of host-pathogen interactions.  
23 The same functional analysis approach is useful for analyzing the putative role of plant  
24 genes in the defense against pathogens. Limonene is a terpene that accounts for up to 97%

1 of the volatile emission of sweet orange and is an inductor of spore germination in *P.*  
2 *digitatum*, but it does not induce germination in the non-pathogen *P. expansum* (Droby et  
3 al., 2008). Downregulation of the citrus limonene synthase by antisense RNA led to  
4 transgenic citrus fruit with reduced levels of limonene that were less susceptible to *P.*  
5 *digitatum* infection (Rodríguez et al., 2011).

6

### 7 3. Molecular mechanisms of fungal pathogenicity

8 **3.1. Extracellular enzyme determinants:** Phytopathogenic fungi invade and colonize  
9 their host cell to obtain nutrients. Necrotrophic fungi kill their host cell before and during  
10 tissue invasion without a specific invasion of cells. These latter fungi thrive on dead  
11 organic material that is no longer a cell. This complex process requires the help of a large  
12 number of extracellular hydrolytic enzymes. Previous studies demonstrated that fungal  
13 pathogens secrete a large set of proteins into the extracellular environment (Kim et al.,  
14 2008). A number of secreted proteins are crucial for the virulence of pathogens,  
15 particularly the necrotrophic ones. Growing evidence has demonstrated that the  
16 extracellular CWDEs of pathogens, including endopolygalacturonases (Kars et al., 2005;  
17 ten Have et al., 1998), pectin methylesterases (Valette-Collet et al., 2003), endo-1,4- $\beta$ -  
18 glucanases (Eshel et al., 2000) and xylanases (Brito et al., 2006), are necessary for  
19 successful establishment and proliferation (lesion extension) in plant tissues. There are at  
20 least six endopolygalacturonase genes in *Botrytis cinerea* (Wubben et al., 1999). The  
21 deletion of two endopolygalacturonase genes, separately, resulted in a pronounced  
22 reduction of virulence (Kars et al., 2005; ten Have et al., 1998). Furthermore,  
23 demethylation by pectin methylesterase presumably preceded and facilitated the action of  
24 endopolygalacturonases (Valette-Collet et al., 2003). Besides CWDEs, extracellular

1 proteins with other functions also contribute to the virulence of fungal pathogens. Rolke  
2 (2004) showed that the secreted superoxide dismutase played an important role during  
3 cuticle penetration by the appressorium of *B. cinerea*. The knockout of the superoxide  
4 dismutase encoding the gene *Bcsod1* in *B. cinerea* led to significantly reduced virulence.  
5 An oxidative burst has been observed during cuticle penetration, and BcSOD1 may be  
6 involved in this process. In addition, a few secreted proteins have the ability to induce a  
7 hypersensitive response in the host, including, among others, Nep1-like proteins (NLP)  
8 (Schouten et al., 2008); cerato-platanin family proteins (Frías et al., 2011); and xylanases  
9 (Noda et al., 2010). The NLPs were first described in *Fusarium oxysporum* and constitute  
10 a growing family of known secreted proteins produced by fungi, oomycetes and bacteria  
11 (Gijzen and Nürnberger, 2006).

12 Extracellular proteins have also been found to be involved in the molecular dialogue  
13 associated with host-pathogen interactions (Esquerré-Tugayé et al., 2000), suggesting that  
14 a precise regulation of these proteins may occur during pathogenesis. In fungal pathogens,  
15 RabGTPases act as a vital regulator of the secretion process of extracellular proteins.  
16 CLPT1, a putative SEC4 homologue in the filamentous fungus *Colletotrichum*  
17 *lindemuthianum*, was shown to be essential for the transport of the secretory vesicles and  
18 virulence (Dumas et al., 2001; Siriputthaiwan et al., 2005). The Rab gene *Bcsas1* of *B.*  
19 *cinerea*, which is the homologue of Rab8 in mammals, was found to be crucial for  
20 growth, development, protein secretion and virulence (Zhang et al., 2014b). The knockout  
21 of *Bcsas1* inhibited the secretion of virulence factors, such as polygalacturonase and  
22 xylanase, in the extracellular environment, and significantly decreased the virulence of *B.*  
23 *cinerea*. These findings suggest that extracellular proteins and the regulation of the  
24 secretion process are crucial for pathogenesis.

1

2 **3.2. Reactive oxygen species and NADPH oxidase complexes:** Many investigations  
3 during recent decades have suggested that ROS play a major role in plant-microbe  
4 interactions. ROS are normal by-products of many metabolic reactions and include  
5 superoxide ( $O_2^{\cdot-}$ ), hydrogen peroxide ( $H_2O_2$ ) and hydroxyl radical ( $OH^{\cdot}$ ). ROS can act as  
6 potent oxidants or signal molecules during host-pathogen interactions, thus playing a dual  
7 role. On the one hand, plants react to microbe infection with an oxidative burst, which is  
8 necessary for further defense reactions. On the other hand, it has been shown that some  
9 pathogenic fungi can also produce ROS, which play an important role in the  
10 differentiation process and virulence. During the infection process of *B. cinerea*,  $O_2^{\cdot-}$   
11 accumulates in the hyphal tips and  $H_2O_2$  is generated in and around the penetrated cell  
12 (Tenberge et al., 2002). Castoria et al. (2003) showed that the calibrated addition of  
13 exogenous superoxide dismutase and catalase in apple wounds strongly reduced both  $O_2^{\cdot-}$   
14 and  $H_2O_2$  generation and the level of infection by *B. cinerea*. However, the role of ROS  
15 in fruit-pathogen interactions seems to be complex and could be different depending on  
16 the pathogen. A higher induction of  $H_2O_2$  in less mature apples, for example, has been  
17 associated with less susceptibility to *P. expansum* infection (Torres et al., 2003). In fact,  
18 effective biocontrol yeasts not only induce ROS production (Macarisin et al., 2010) but  
19 are also more tolerant to ROS (Castoria et al., 2003). In eukaryotic organisms, ROS are  
20 generally produced in mitochondria or through specialized enzymes. Mitochondria are  
21 considered to be the main source and target of intracellular ROS (Tian et al., 2013). The  
22 most important enzymatic ROS-generating systems are the NADPH oxidase (Nox)  
23 complexes. The Nox complexes use NADPH as an electron donor and transport electrons  
24 through the membrane, either the plasmatic membrane or an internal vesicle membrane,

1 to reduce oxygen to superoxide (Lambeth, 2004). In fungi, the Nox complexes are  
2 associated with a wide range of functions, such as sexual differentiation and  
3 pathogenicity. In *B. cinerea*, two homologs of the human catalytical subunit Nox2 have  
4 been identified and designated as NoxA and NoxB, respectively. Both NoxA and NoxB  
5 are required for the formation of sclerotia (Segmüller et al., 2008). The functions of the  
6 Nox complexes in pathogenesis have been intensively studied in recent years. These  
7 complexes are associated with the differentiation of infection structures such as  
8 appressoria and penetration hyphae. Both NoxA and NoxB have a great impact on  
9 pathogenicity (Segmüller et al., 2008). NoxB mutants showed a retarded formation of  
10 primary lesions. NoxA mutants, on the other hand, were able to penetrate host tissue in  
11 the same way as the wild type but were much slower in colonizing the host tissues. The  
12 double knockout mutants of NoxA and NoxB showed an additive effect: they were almost  
13 nonpathogenic. Both proteins are regulated by the regulatory subunit NoxR, the homolog  
14 of the mammalian p67phox, and a small GTPase Rac (Segmüller et al., 2008; Takemoto  
15 et al., 2007). The small GTPase Rac is activated by the GDP/GTP exchange factor (GEF)  
16 and binds to NoxR. Homologs of Rac have been identified in several filamentous fungi,  
17 but have not yet been found in *B. cinerea* (Takemoto et al., 2007). An et al. (2015)  
18 reported that a small GTPase, Rho3, a potential subunit of Nox complexes, was involved  
19 in the accumulation of ROS in hyphae tips and affected the sporulation, appressorium  
20 formation and virulence of *B. cinerea*. Interactions between Rho3 and other subunits of  
21 the Nox complexes are unknown. Recently, another component of Nox complexes,  
22 NoxD, which has high homology to the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) protein Pro41 from  
23 *Sordaria macrospora*, has been identified (Siegmund et al., 2015). NoxD can interact  
24 with NoxA and shows similar functions to NoxA in differentiation and pathogenicity.

1 These data provide evidence that certain functions of the NoxA complexes of *B. cinerea*  
2 are linked to the ER (Siegmund et al., 2015).

3 As important second messengers, ROS mediate a signaling pathway in fungi (Heller and  
4 Tudzynski, 2011). The oxidative stress initiates the phosphorylation of the MAP kinase  
5 Sak, a key component of the signal transduction pathway. Sak is associated with  
6 vegetative growth, sporulation and pathogenic development (Segmüller et al., 2007). In  
7 addition, some transcription factors (TFs) also participate in the ROS signaling pathway,  
8 such as Arf1 and Bap1 (Williamson *et al.*, 2007; Temme *et al.*, 2012). How ROS are  
9 transported is an interesting question. Previous studies suggest that the transport of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>  
10 in plants and mammals is mediated by aquaporins (AQPs) (Bienert et al., 2007). AQPs  
11 are water-channel proteins that generally mediate the selective and rapid flux of water  
12 across biological membranes. Recently, An et al. (2016) identified eight *AQP* genes in  
13 the genome of *B. cinerea*. Among these genes, *AQP8* was involved in ROS production,  
14 distribution and transport across membranes. The deletion of *AQP8* completely inhibited  
15 the formation of conidia and infection structures and markedly reduced the virulence of  
16 *B. cinerea* in tomato leaves and fruit. In addition, the deletion of *AQP8* significantly  
17 reduced the expression of the *noxR* gene, suggesting that *AQP8* may affect the function  
18 of the Nox complexes by influencing the expression of the *noxR* gene at a transcriptional  
19 level. Moreover, the knockout of both *AQP8* and *noxR* changed the distribution of  
20 mitochondria. These results indicate that there is a complicated ROS regulatory network  
21 in fungi (Fig. 1).

22 **3.3. Effectors:** The fungal pathogens are usually distinguished as either biotrophic  
23 (acquiring nutrition directly from living plant cells); hemibiotrophic (with an early  
24 biotrophic phase followed by a switch to necrotrophy); or necrotrophic (killing plant cells

1 and feeding on the dead cells). The traditional theory holds that biotrophic pathogens have  
2 an intimate interaction with their hosts. Many of these pathogens can deliver effectors  
3 into host cells to suppress the host immune response. Kleemann et al. (2012) revealed  
4 that the hemibiotrophic pathogen *Colletorichum higginsianum* also contains a large  
5 inventory of candidate effectors, and most effector genes are host-induced and expressed  
6 in consecutive waves associated with the transition from biotrophic to necrotrophic  
7 growth. Most postharvest pathogens, such as *B. cinerea*, *P. expansum* and *A. alternata*,  
8 are classified as necrotrophic fungi. These fungi have long been considered to be  
9 unsophisticated pathogens that do not have effectors and kill host cells with the use of  
10 CWDEs or toxins. However, some recent studies have changed this simplistic perception.  
11 Zhang et al. (2014) found that during the infection process the endopolygalacturonases  
12 not only degraded the cell wall of host cells, but also could be recognized as microbe-  
13 associated molecular patterns by the *Arabidopsis* receptor-like protein RBPG1, thereby  
14 influencing the resistance of the host. Recent discoveries of fungal small RNAs, which  
15 can be delivered into host cells to suppress plant immunity, added small RNAs to the list  
16 of pathogen effectors. Weiberg et al. (2013) found that some *B. cinerea* small RNAs could  
17 be injected into the host cells and act as effectors. These small RNAs hijack the host RNA  
18 interference (RNAi) machinery by binding to *Arabidopsis* Argonaute 1 (AGO1) and  
19 selectively silencing host immunity genes. The finding of effectors in the so-called  
20 necrotrophic fungi provides new insights into the interaction between postharvest  
21 pathogens and hosts.

22

#### 23 4. Regulation of virulence by exogenous factors



1 Fungi, as multicellular microorganisms, are sensitive to exogenous factors. It is well  
2 known that environmental conditions like nutrient availability, temperature, and relative  
3 humidity have a significant effect on the growth, reproduction and pathogenicity of plant  
4 pathogens. Recently, the roles of other environmental conditions, including ambient pH  
5 and light, have attracted more and more researchers' attention. In addition, exogenous  
6 substances, which are applied to control postharvest diseases, have also been shown to  
7 have significant effects on pathogenicity.

8 **4.1. Ambient pH:** Ambient pH is an important environmental factor that has significant  
9 effects on the physiology and pathogenicity of fungi. Li et al. (2010) found that ambient  
10 pH might affect spore germination in *P. expansum* by changing intracellular pH and ATP  
11 levels and the synthesis and folding of proteins. Manteau et al. (2003) found that ambient  
12 pH could influence the activities of extracellular proteases, polygalacturonases and  
13 laccases in *B. cinerea*. Moreover, *Bcpg1-6*, genes encoding endopolygalacturonases,  
14 responded differentially to different ambient pH values, both *in vitro* and *in vivo* (ten  
15 Have et al., 2001; Wubben et al., 2000). These secreted proteins are considered as  
16 potential virulence factors during the infection process. Li et al. (2012) analyzed the  
17 changes in the whole secreted proteins (secretome) of *B. cinerea* under different pH  
18 values using 2-DE. The values pH 4 and 6 were selected to mimic the pH values of  
19 different host tissue: pH 4 represents the pH value of fruit, and pH 6 represents the pH  
20 value of stems, flowers and leaves. A total of 47 differential protein spots (corresponding  
21 to 21 unique proteins) were identified, and most of these proteins were CWDEs or  
22 proteases. Interestingly, these researchers found that more proteins related to proteolysis  
23 were induced at pH 4, whereas more CWDEs were induced at pH 6. These findings  
24 suggest that inducing the secretion of proteases, rather than CWDEs, is more important

1 when *B. cinerea* infects ripe fruits, which have lower tissue pH and weakened cell walls.  
2 In contrast, CWDEs are more urgently required during the infection of leaves and stems,  
3 which have higher tissue pH and stiffer cell walls. The smart switch of secretome  
4 responding to different ambient pH values may contribute to a broad range of hosts in *B.*  
5 *cinerea*.

6 Fungi possess a complex system to sense and respond to changes in ambient pH. This  
7 system has been well characterized in *Aspergillus nidulans*, in which the following seven  
8 genes have been identified: *pacC*, *palA*, *palB*, *palC*, *palF*, *palH* and *palI* (Peñalva et al.,  
9 2008). In the system, *pacC* encodes a pH-dependent global transcription factor and plays  
10 a critical role in regulating gene expression. The *pacC* gene has also been found in several  
11 other postharvest fungal pathogens and contributes to the full virulence of these  
12 pathogens, including *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* (Alkan et al., 2013); *P. expansum*  
13 (Barad et al., 2014); and *P. digitatum* (Zhang et al., 2013). In *P. expansum*, ambient pH  
14 and *pacC* are also involved in the secondary metabolism and have been shown to affect  
15 the production of the mycotoxin patulin (Barad et al., 2015; Zong et al., 2015). Although  
16 there are conflicting reports on the possible role of this mycotoxin in pathogenesis  
17 (Ballester et al., 2015; Barad et al., 2014; Li et al., 2015; Sanzani et al., 2012), a recent  
18 study by Snini et al. (2015) indicates that patulin acts as a cultivar-dependent  
19 aggressiveness factor for *P. expansum*. In *B. cinerea*, the level of gene expression of  
20 *BcpacC* was found to be markedly higher at pH 6 than that at pH 4, indicating that *pacC*  
21 is also involved in the response of *B. cinerea* to ambient pH (Li et al., 2012).

22 Fungal pathogens not only passively sense and adapt to ambient pH, but also can  
23 positively change it to facilitate their infection of hosts by secreting alkaline or acid  
24 substances. Prusky and Yakoby (2003) defined fungi that produce an alkaline

1 environment as ‘alkaline fungi’, and those that produce an acidic environment as ‘acidic  
2 fungi’. *C. gloeosporioides* and *A. alternata*, as typical alkaline fungi, can secrete  
3 ammonia to alkalinize the ambient pH of infection sites and induce the expression of  
4 genes encoding virulence factors (Eshel et al., 2002; Kramer-Haimovich et al., 2006). In  
5 contrast, gluconic acid and oxalic acid produced by acidic fungi like *P. expansum* and *B.*  
6 *cinerea* can acidify the ambient pH, which results in higher CWDE activity at the lower  
7 pH level (Manteau et al., 2003; Prusky et al., 2004).

8 **4.2. Light:** Like ambient pH, light is also an important environmental factor capable of  
9 affecting the development, reproduction and metabolism in filamentous fungi. In fungi,  
10 the light signaling pathway has been best studied in *Neurospora crassa*. A similar  
11 mechanism has also been described in *A. alternata* by Pruss et al. (2014). The pathway is  
12 mediated via the WHITE COLLAR transcription factors WC-1 and WC-2 that form a  
13 complex (WCC) in response to blue light, leading to the activation of gene expression  
14 (Chen et al., 2010). A similar system has also been identified in *B. cinerea*, although the  
15 light-associated machinery seems more complicated in *B. cinerea* than in *N. crassa*.  
16 Canessa et al. (2013) found that not all wild isolates of *B. cinerea* exhibited phenotypic  
17 responses to light because of a high level of genetic variation in the species. In strain  
18 B05.10, light was a key environmental signal influencing the mode of (asexual)  
19 reproduction, growth and pigment accumulation, and WCC (BcWCL1 and BcWCL2)  
20 was an integral part of the light-associated machinery by mediating transcriptional  
21 responses to white light. Furthermore, the WCC is required to respond to oxidative stress  
22 and to achieve full virulence. Besides *bcwcl1* and *bcwcl2*, *B. cinerea* possesses another  
23 key gene in the light-signaling pathway, *bcfrq1*, which encodes a protein with 31.3%  
24 identity to its *Neurospora* homolog (Hevia et al., 2015). In this study, the  $\Delta bcfrq1$  mutant

1 presented decreased macroconidiation, enhanced sclerotia formation and impaired  
2 virulence on leaves of *Arabidopsis thaliana* Col-0.

3 Recently, Schumacher et al. (2014) identified a novel light-induced GATA transcription  
4 factor BcLTF1 (*B. cinerea* light-responsive transcription factor 1) by a random  
5 mutagenesis approach. BcLTF1 regulated not only the light-dependent differentiation,  
6 but also the equilibrium between the production and scavenging of ROS. Compared with  
7 the wild type, the bean leaves of the *bcltf1* deletion mutant showed greater ROS  
8 accumulation and smaller lesion diameters 3 days after inoculation. Microarray analyses  
9 revealed that 293 light-responsive genes were modulated by BcLTF1. To date, however,  
10 the relationship between BcLTF1 and the WCC complex remains unknown.

11 **4.3. Exogenous substances:** As an alternative to fungicides, a number of exogenous  
12 substances, such as sodium bicarbonate, silicon, borates and essential oils, have been  
13 applied to control postharvest diseases with positive results (Calo et al., 2015; Fallanaj et  
14 al., 2016; Qin et al., 2007; Qin and Tian, 2005; Shi et al., 2012; Yao et al., 2004). On the  
15 one hand, these substances can activate the defense system and induce resistance against  
16 pathogens; on the other hand, they also show direct effects on the pathogens. Though  
17 most related studies have only reported the inhibitory effects of exogenous substances on  
18 pathogens, a few studies have carried out a deeper analysis of the antifungal mechanism  
19 of these substances. Qin et al. (2007) found that borates, essential plant micronutrients,  
20 show a significant inhibitory effect on the spore germination and germ tube elongation of  
21 *P. expansum*. Furthermore, 14 differentially expressed protein spots were identified under  
22 borate stress using 2-DE and ESI-Q-TOF-MS/MS. Among these proteins, catalase and  
23 glutathione S-transferase, the two antioxidant enzymes, were less abundant upon  
24 exposure to borate. This effect might contribute to enhanced levels of intracellular ROS

1 and protein carbonylation. Intracellular ROS accumulation under borate stress has also  
2 been observed in spores of *C. gloeosporioides*, and mitochondrial degradation might be  
3 involved in the mechanism of antifungal activity of borate (Shi et al., 2012).

#### 5 **5. Unravelling fruit defense mechanisms**

6 Plants in general, and fruit in particular, are in constant contact with a large amount of  
7 microorganisms in the environment. Most of these microorganisms, however, are not able  
8 to produce infection (Ferreira et al., 2006). Recent studies have shown that either under  
9 specific conditions (Louw and Korsten, 2015; Louw and Korsten, 2014) or depending on  
10 the maturity stages of fruit (Vilanova et al., 2014a; Vilanova et al., 2012b), even some  
11 non-host pathogens are able to overcome fruit defenses and produce infection. These  
12 recent works have indicated that fruit maturity plays a main role in the development of  
13 postharvest diseases. Maturity is thus another major component in fruit resistance that  
14 should be considered in fruit-pathogen interaction studies.

15 Several species of postharvest pathogens, such as *Colletotrichum*, *Alternaria*, *Botrytis*  
16 and *Monilinia*, have been reported to remain quiescent in their hosts until the fruit ripens.  
17 In a recent study focused on tomato fruit defense responses against the fungus *C.*  
18 *gloeosporioides*, researchers showed that the expression of several fruit genes was  
19 induced even before appressoria penetration. Such genes included PAMP receptors and  
20 genes related with fatty acid biosynthesis, elongation, and the synthesis of cutin and  
21 waxes (Alkan et al., 2015). Moreover, the host defense reaction was further intensified  
22 during the quiescent stage by the activation of lignification, glycoalkaloid and  
23 phenylalanine pathways.

1 To unravel fruit responses against pathogen attack, it should be considered that fruits  
2 induce cellular defenses that prevent further colonization of the fruit tissue once the  
3 structural barriers have been breached by the pathogen. The structural or physical barriers  
4 “that pathogens have to break” are known as the passive (or constitutive) defense  
5 mechanisms of fruits to avoid pathogen ingress and/or progress. It has been reported that  
6 Trincadeira berries infected with *B. cinerea* accumulate saturated long-chain fatty acids,  
7 which are major constituents of grape waxes, and that this accumulation is accompanied  
8 by the up-regulation of several acyl-CoA synthetases and wax synthases (Agudelo-  
9 Romero et al., 2015). These studies show that the formation of barriers that are commonly  
10 recognized as constitutive can be induced within the framework of a host’s active  
11 response to fungal attack. These findings warrant further attention and future research  
12 given the critical role host lipids and lipid metabolites play in the dynamics of fruit  
13 defense.

14 Other fruit defense mechanisms, described as active (or inducible) defense mechanisms,  
15 require host mechanisms to function. Knowledge of plant-fungal interaction indicates that  
16 a crucial role in host defense is played by a rapid and massive generation of ROS within  
17 the host cells, a process known as an oxidative burst (Torres et al., 2006). The oxidative  
18 burst is one of the earliest responses to pathogen attack and involves the production of  
19 ROS including the superoxide anion, the hydroxyl radical and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. In spite of the  
20 important role of ROS in plant defense, there are few reports on the role that they might  
21 play in fruits. To date, the accumulation of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in response to wounding and/or pathogen  
22 attack has been demonstrated in tomatoes (Borden and Higgins, 2002); lemons (Macarisin  
23 et al., 2007); avocados (Castro-Mercado et al., 2009); plums (El-kereamy et al., 2009);  
24 blueberries (Miles et al., 2011); oranges (Buron-Moles et al., 2015a; Torres et al., 2011);

1 and apples (Buron-Moles et al., 2015a; Castoria et al., 2003; Su et al., 2011; Torres et al.,  
2 2003). The study by Castoria et al. (2003) also showed  $O_2^-$  production as a consequence  
3 of wounding. ROS metabolism is controlled by respiratory burst oxidase homologs  
4 (Rbos) and an array of other enzymes including superoxide dismutase (SOD), catalase  
5 (CAT) and ascorbate peroxidase (APX) (De Gara et al., 2003). In the orange-*P. digitatum*  
6 interaction, Ballester et al. (2006) found that the antioxidant activities of SOD, CAT, APX  
7 and glutathione reductase (GR) decreased at different rates with the advance of the  
8 fungus. In the area of the flavedo completely colonized by the fungus, however, the CAT  
9 and soluble POD activities increased. Moreover, all the enzyme activities were higher in  
10 non-infected areas of the flavedo than in the albedo, a fact that may be related to the  
11 greater resistance of the flavedo to infection by the pathogen. In apple-*Penicillium*  
12 interactions, Vilanova et al. (2014b) observed that Rbo gene expression was induced in  
13 apples inoculated with *P. digitatum* but not in apples inoculated with *P. expansum*. These  
14 researchers also noted a greater increase in the expression of genes encoding ROS-  
15 detoxifying enzymes, such as SOD, APX and POD, in apples inoculated with *P.*  
16 *expansum*. Buron-Moles et al. (2015b) also observed higher APX transcript abundance in  
17 apple in response to *P. digitatum* than in response to *P. expansum*. Additional proteomic  
18 data indicated that tomato infected by *R. nigricans* repressed the accumulation of catalase  
19 but induced the translation of catalase isozyme 2 (Pan et al., 2013). Further studies of  
20 gene expression should be done in order to understand these responses in depth.

21 The production of  $H_2O_2$  in plants is also involved in lignification (Olson and Varner,  
22 1993), and  $H_2O_2$  is a signaling molecule mediating the induction of hypersensitive cell  
23 death and the expression of a wide array of defense-related genes in surrounding cells  
24 (Borden and Higgins, 2002; Grant and Loake, 2000). The lignification process may

1 contribute to fruit resistance in different ways: i) making the fruit more resistant to  
2 degradation by enzymes secreted by an invading pathogen; ii) constituting a barrier  
3 preventing free nutrient movement and therefore helping to starve the pathogen; and iii)  
4 slowing down the penetration process. Lignin deposition as a fruit response to abiotic  
5 stress (wound) or biotic stress (pathogen) has been demonstrated using histochemical  
6 analysis (Skene, 1981; Spotts et al., 1998; Vilanova et al., 2012a; Vilanova et al., 2012b)  
7 and by quantifying lignin (Su et al., 2011; Valentines et al., 2005; Vilanova et al., 2013;  
8 Vilanova et al., 2014a). The role of phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL), a key enzyme  
9 in the phenylpropanoid pathway, in regulating lignin accumulation (Lewis et al., 1999)  
10 and synthesizing phenols (González-Candelas et al., 2010a) has been described. A recent  
11 study on the orange-*P. digitatum* pathosystem detected the maximum expression of  
12 several phenylpropanoid-related genes at 48 h after inoculation (Ballester et al., 2013b).  
13 In addition, Vilanova et al. (2013) found that PAL1, caffeic acid O-methyl-transferase  
14 (COMT1) and POX1 gene expression were induced to a greater extent by *P. digitatum*  
15 than by *P. expansum*, although the maximum expression was observed at 24 h, which  
16 may be due to the inoculum concentration used. Similar results were obtained in apple  
17 responses at different maturity stages (Vilanova et al., 2014a), with the highest level of  
18 induction of several phenylpropanoid-related genes occurring at 48 h after *P. expansum*  
19 inoculation.

20 A further active defense mechanism is related to pathogenesis-related proteins (PR),  
21 which have diverse functions and most of which are induced by stress (biotic or abiotic)  
22 (van Loon et al., 2006b). In terms of the fruit defense response, diverse works have  
23 described both the enzyme activity and gene expression of PR-proteins. For example, an  
24 increase in chitinase and glucanase enzymatic activities was detected in tomato fruit as a



1 response to infection caused by *A. alternata* (Cota et al., 2007) and in grapes infected by  
2 *B. cinerea* (Salzman et al., 1998). In plums, researchers observed an increase in the  
3 transcript level of PR10 and in H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> production after *M. fructicola* infection (El-kereamy  
4 et al., 2009). Additionally, the gene expression of PR proteins [chitinase (CHI), PR10 and  
5 β-glucanase] was detected earlier in a susceptible variety after 24 h of *C. acutatum*  
6 inoculation (Miles et al., 2011). Furthermore, two PR genes (PR5 and PR10) were found  
7 to be over-expressed in *Fragaria chiloensis* and *Fragaria x ananassa* after *B. cinerea*  
8 infection and showed different expression profiles depending on the tissue analyzed  
9 (González et al., 2013). Vilanova et al. (2014b) showed that *P. expansum* inoculation in  
10 apples induced a greater number of PR proteins [two CHIs, endoglucanase (EGL),  
11 pathogenesis-related thaumatin (TAU), and the defensin-like protein (DEFL)], than  
12 inoculation with *P. digitatum*. Complementary proteomic analysis conducted in apple  
13 reported an increase in the abundance of the thaumatin-like protein 1-a (PR5), suggesting  
14 that it may be involved in the initial apple wound response (Buron-Moles et al., 2014).  
15 Additionally, three PR10 proteins were detected in proteomics studies on both wounded  
16 and inoculated apples with *P. expansum* and *P. digitatum* pathogens (Buron-Moles et al.,  
17 2015b).

18 Plant defenses are regulated by complex signaling pathways involving salicylic acid,  
19 jasmonic acid and ethylene. Specifically, ethylene has been implicated in biotic stress,  
20 both as a virulence factor of fungal and bacterial pathogens and as a signaling compound  
21 in disease resistance (van Loon et al., 2006a). However, the role of this hormone in the  
22 postharvest disease resistance of fruit is still unknown. In both ripe and unripe tomato  
23 fruit, *B. cinerea* and *C. gloeosporioides* infections induce the ethylene biosynthesis  
24 pathway; transcription factors like non-ripening (NOR), ripening-inhibitor (RIN) and

1 never-ripe (NR); and the ethylene-regulated defense genes (Alkan et al., 2015; Blanco-  
2 Ulate et al., 2013). In citrus fruit, ethylene production has been found to increase with *P.*  
3 *digitatum* infection, and this hormone is synthesized by both the fruit and the pathogen  
4 (Achilea et al., 1985a; Achilea et al., 1985b). Moreover, the fact that many genes induced  
5 in citrus fruit upon *P. digitatum* attack are also up-regulated by ethylene highlights the  
6 role this hormone plays in the defense response of citrus to this pathogen (González-  
7 Candelas et al., 2010a).

8 During recent years, a growing number of studies have sought to identify cultivars with  
9 a high level of resistance to pathogens. This increase can be attributed to the fact that  
10 more and more breeding programs are seeking out new tools for the early selection of  
11 seedlings with enhanced resistance to pathogens. Several studies have provided data on  
12 genetically determined levels of resistance to *B. cinerea* in strawberry (Bestfleisch et al.,  
13 2015) and to *P. expansum* in apple cultivars from Norway and Sweden (Ahmadi-Afzadi  
14 et al., 2015; Tahir et al., 2015); Mexico (Sandoval et al., 2014); and Kazakhstan (Jurick  
15 et al., 2011). Overall, all these studies should be used in breeding programs for selecting  
16 apple cultivars with a high level of resistance to fungal pathogens. In peach breeding  
17 programs, Pacheco et al. (2014) and Martínez-García et al. (2013) have identified QTLs  
18 in a few genomic regions underlying brown rot response traits and providing a starting  
19 point for the development of marker-assisted selection for increased resistance to this  
20 pathogen. Preliminary results from an apple breeding program have already made it  
21 possible to identify QTLs for blue mold resistance in *Malus sieversii* (Norelli et al., 2014).

## 22 6. Concluding remarks and future perspectives

23 Losses due to the postharvest decay of fruits still represent a major concern both from an  
24 economic and food safety point of view. Despite the great effort that has gone into

1 developing new and safer alternatives to chemical fungicides, these compounds continue  
2 to represent the main tool for controlling the major postharvest pathogens. Most of the  
3 alternative treatments developed so far have some limitations that impede their use as  
4 stand-alone treatments. Although the possibility of combining different treatments within  
5 an integrated pest management strategy seems to be the predominant trend, it is clear that  
6 we need further developments in this field. Moreover, these developments will probably  
7 arise from deeper knowledge of the fruit-pathogen-environment interactions at the  
8 physiological, biochemical and molecular level.

9 In this review we have focused on the topics currently being investigated in both major  
10 postharvest pathogens and main fruit crops. Among the major postharvest  
11 phytopathogenic fungi, *B. cinerea* is the best characterized from a molecular point of  
12 view, a fact that reflects the importance of this fungus as a general plant pathogen. In  
13 recent years, however, extensive research has also been conducted on other important  
14 postharvest pathogens, such as *P. expansum*, *P. digitatum*, *C. gloeosporioides* and *A.*  
15 *alternata*. Interestingly, most of these fungi are necrotrophs that kill the cell to obtain  
16 nutrients. For a long time, these fungi were thought to rely on CWDEs and other  
17 extracellular hydrolases, such as proteases, as the major virulence factors. However, the  
18 characterization of gene knockout mutants indicates that in most instances all these  
19 enzymes are just necessary for full virulence, but they are not essential for pathogenesis.  
20 A similar situation is being uncovered with pathogen enzymes involved in ROS  
21 production/detoxification. These results are probably not so surprising, however, because  
22 many of these enzymes belong to families with redundant enzymes, and the loss of one  
23 member of the family can be compensated for by another enzyme that carries out a similar  
24 biological function. Although the biological functions of the majority of the virulence

1 genes identified and characterized by molecular biology techniques are still not clear,  
2 there is increasing optimism supported by recent experimental evidence (An et al., 2016;  
3 Noda et al., 2010; Siegmund et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2014b).

4 One of the research topics that is probably gaining the most attention in many pathogenic  
5 fungi, and which we think is likely to gain traction in the near future in postharvest  
6 pathogens, is the study of effectors: pathogen molecules that modulate host defense  
7 responses favoring the development of the pathogen. Although most effectors  
8 characterized so far are small cysteine rich secreted proteins, there are new players  
9 entering the scene. Small RNAs are emerging as very important regulators of gene  
10 expression, and not only in the organism in which they are synthesized, since they can be  
11 translocated to the host cells where they manipulate defense signaling pathways favoring  
12 pathogen infection. The study of small RNAs will probably open new perspectives in the  
13 study of fruit-pathogen interactions.

14 In order to be able to infect, pathogens have to adapt to the environmental conditions  
15 found within the host. As we have seen, these factors, such as ambient pH, light or the  
16 presence of exogenously added substances, also play a fundamental role in the outcome  
17 of fruit-pathogen interactions. The manipulation of environmental conditions thus  
18 constitutes another tool that can be exploited for the control of postharvest diseases.  
19 Furthermore, other environmental factors deserve further research, like the manipulation  
20 of nutrient availability or increasing the concentration of compounds that either promote  
21 fruit resistance or that are toxic to the pathogen.

22 Some of these environmental factors are more related to the fruit than to the pathogen. In  
23 this context, we are just starting to answer some old questions, like why ripe and unripe  
24 fruits show differential susceptibility to pathogens. The studies described in this review

1 are providing new perspectives that warrant further research to elucidate, for example,  
2 the role of lipids in fruit defense or the interplay among different defense signaling  
3 pathways. These mechanisms are additional to other fruit defense mechanisms that have  
4 received more attention in the fruit-pathogen interaction, like the role of ROS, PR  
5 proteins, lignification or phenylpropanoids metabolism. Besides inducing resistance,  
6 there are clearly two major strategies for increasing the resistance of fruits to pathogens.  
7 One involves the genetic manipulation of the fruit crop following similar strategies  
8 already used to increase resistance in whole plants. The other involves breeding programs  
9 that aim to introgress resistance QTLs from wild varieties into commercial germplasms.  
10 Such programs are already underway in important crops like apple, peach and strawberry.  
11 Hopefully these long-term initiatives will provide new varieties with improved resistance  
12 against major postharvest pathogens.

13 Finally, we want to emphasize that the major challenge that we will probably face in the  
14 coming years in the molecular characterization of fruit-pathogen interactions is the full  
15 development of the new “omics” techniques to help us unravel both  
16 pathogenicity/virulence factors in the pathogen and resistance/susceptibility mechanisms  
17 in the fruit. The implementation of these technologies will offer an unprecedented level  
18 of knowledge on fruit-pathogen interactions that can establish new bases for the  
19 development of control strategies, which is our ultimate goal as postharvest pathologists.

20

## 21 **Acknowledgments**

22 Work in Tian’s lab has been funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China  
23 (31530057; 31371863). Work in the LGC lab has been funded by the Spanish Ministry  
24 of Economy and Competitiveness (AGL2011-30519-C03-01 and AGL2014-55802-R)

1 and the Generalitat Valenciana (PrometeoII/2014/027). Work in the IRTA lab has been  
2 funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness by three national  
3 projects AGL2008-04828-C01/AGR, AGL2011-30519-C03/AGR and AGL2014-55287-  
4 C02.

5

## 6 **References**

- 7 Achilea, O., Chalutz, E., Fuchs, Y., Rot, I., 1985a. Ethylene biosynthesis and related  
8 physiological-changes in *Penicillium digitatum*-infected grapefruit (*Citrus*  
9 *paradisi*). *Physiol. Plant Pathol.* 26, 125-134.
- 10 Achilea, O., Fuchs, Y., Chalutz, E., Rot, I., 1985b. The contribution of host and pathogen  
11 to ethylene biosynthesis in *Penicillium digitatum*-infected citrus fruit. *Physiol.*  
12 *Plant Pathol.* 27, 55-63.
- 13 Agudelo-Romero, P., Erban, A., Rego, C., Carbonell-Bejerano, P., Nascimento, T.,  
14 Sousa, L., Martínez-Zapater, J.M., Kopka, J., Fortes, A.M., 2015. Transcriptome  
15 and metabolome reprogramming in *Vitis vinifera* cv. Trincadeira berries upon  
16 infection with *Botrytis cinerea*. *J. Exp. Bot.* 66, 1769-1785.
- 17 Ahmadi-Afzadi, M., Nybom, H., Ekholm, A., Tahir, I., Rumpunen, K., 2015.  
18 Biochemical contents of apple peel and flesh affect level of partial resistance to blue  
19 mold. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 110, 173-182.
- 20 Alkan, N., Friedlander, G., Ment, D., Prusky, D., Fluhr, R., 2015. Simultaneous  
21 transcriptome analysis of *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* and tomato fruit  
22 pathosystem reveals novel fungal pathogenicity and fruit defense strategies. *New*  
23 *Phytol.* 205, 801-815.

1 Alkan, N., Meng, X., Friedlander, G., Reuveni, E., Sukno, S., Sherman, A., Thon, M.,  
2 Fluhr, R., Prusky, D., 2013. Global aspects of pacC regulation of pathogenicity  
3 genes in *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* as revealed by transcriptome analysis.  
4 Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact. 26, 1345-1358.

5 Amselem, J., Cuomo, C.A., van Kan, J.A.L., Viaud, M., Benito, E.P., Couloux, A.,  
6 Coutinho, P.M., de Vries, R.P., Dyer, P.S., Fillinger, S. 2011. Genomic analysis of  
7 the necrotrophic fungal pathogens *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* and *Botrytis cinerea*.  
8 PLoS Genetics 7, e1002230.

9 An, B., Li, B.Q., Li, H., Zhang, Z.Q., Qin, G.Z., Tian, S.P., 2016. Aquaporin8 regulates  
10 cellular development and reactive oxygen species production, a critical component  
11 of virulence in *Botrytis cinerea*. New Phytol. 209, 1668-1680.

12 An, B., Li, B.Q., Qin, G.Z., Tian, S.P., 2015. Function of small GTPase Rho3 in  
13 regulating growth, conidiation and virulence of *Botrytis cinerea*. Fungal Genet.  
14 Biol. 75, 45-55.

15 Ballester, A.R., Lafuente, M.T., De Vos, C.H.R., Bovy, A., González-Candelas, L.,  
16 2013a. Citrus phenylpropanoids and defense against pathogens. Part I: Metabolic  
17 profiling in elicited fruits. Food Chem. 136, 178-185.

18 Ballester, A.R., Lafuente, M.T., González-Candelas, L., 2006. Spatial study of  
19 antioxidant enzymes, peroxidase and phenylalanine ammonia-lyase in the citrus  
20 fruit-*Penicillium digitatum* interaction. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 39, 115-124.

21 Ballester, A.R., Lafuente, M.T., González-Candelas, L., 2013b. Citrus phenylpropanoids  
22 and defense against pathogens. Part II: Gene expression and metabolite  
23 accumulation in the response of fruits to *Penicillium digitatum* infection. Food  
24 Chem. 136, 285–291.

1 Ballester, A.R., Marcet-Houben, M., Levin, E., Sela, N., Selma, C., Carmona, L.,  
2 Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., González-Candelas, L., Gabaldón, T., 2015. Genome,  
3 transcriptome, and functional analyses of *Penicillium expansum* provide new  
4 insights into secondary metabolism and pathogenicity. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.*  
5 28, 232-248.

6 Banani, H., Marcet-Houben, M., Ballester, A.-R., Abbruscato, P., González-Candelas, L.,  
7 Gabaldón, T., Spadaro, D. 2016. Genome sequencing and secondary metabolism of  
8 the postharvest pathogen *Penicillium griseofulvum*. *BMC Genomics* 17, 1-14.

9 Barad, S., Espeso, E.A., Sherman, A., Prusky, D., 2015. Ammonia activates pacC and  
10 patulin accumulation in acidic environment during apple colonization by  
11 *Penicillium expansum*. *Molecular Plant Pathology*, doi: 10.1111/mpp.12327.

12 Barad, S., Horowitz, S.B., Kobilier, I., Sherman, A., Prusky, D., 2014. Accumulation of  
13 the mycotoxin patulin in the presence of gluconic acid contributes to pathogenicity  
14 of *Penicillium expansum*. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.* 27, 66-77.

15 Barad, S., Horowitz, S.B., Moskovitch, O., Lichter, A., Sherman, A., Prusky, D., 2012.  
16 A *Penicillium expansum* glucose oxidase–encoding gene, GOX2, is essential for  
17 gluconic acid production and acidification during colonization of deciduous fruit.  
18 *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.* 25, 779-788.

19 Bestfleisch, M., Luderer-Pflimpfl, M., Höfer, M., Schulte, E., Wünsche, J., Hanke, M.V.,  
20 Flachowsky, H., 2015. Evaluation of strawberry (*Fragaria* L.) genetic resources for  
21 resistance to *Botrytis cinerea*. *Plant Pathol.* 64, 396-405.

22 Bienert, G.P., Moller, A.L.B., Kristiansen, K.A., Schulz, A., Moller, I.M., Schjoerring,  
23 J.K., Jahn, T.P., 2007. Specific aquaporins facilitate the diffusion of hydrogen  
24 peroxide across membranes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 282, 1183–1192.



1 Blanco-Ulate, B., Morales-Cruz, A., Amrine, K.C.H., Labavitch, J.M., Powell, A., Cantu,  
2 D., 2014. Genome-wide transcriptional profiling of *Botrytis cinerea* genes targeting  
3 plant cell walls during infections of different hosts. *Front. Plant Sci.* 5, 435.

4 Blanco-Ulate, B., Vincenti, E., Powell, A.L.T., Cantu, D., 2013. Tomato transcriptome  
5 and mutant analyses suggest a role for plant stress hormones in the interaction  
6 between fruit and *Botrytis cinerea*. *Front. Plant Sci.* 4, 142.

7 Borden, S., Higgins, V.J., 2002. Hydrogen peroxide plays a critical role in the defence  
8 response of tomato to *Cladosporium fulvum*. *Physiol. Mol. Plant Pathol.* 61, 227-  
9 236.

10 Brito, N., Espino, J.J., González, C., 2006. The endo- $\beta$ -1,4-xylanase Xyn11A is required  
11 for virulence in *Botrytis cinerea*. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.* 19, 25-32.

12 Buron-Moles, G., Torres, R., Amoako-Andoh, F., Viñas, I., Teixidó, N., Usall, J.,  
13 Keulemans, W., Davey, M.W., 2014. Analysis of changes in protein abundance  
14 after wounding in ‘Golden Delicious’ apples. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 87, 51-60.

15 Buron-Moles, G., Torres, R., Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Vilanova, L., Viñas, I., 2015a.  
16 Characterisation of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> production to study compatible and non-host pathogen  
17 interactions in orange and apple fruit at different maturity stages. *Postharvest Biol.*  
18 *Technol.* 99, 27-36.

19 Buron-Moles, G., Wisniewski, M., Viñas, I., Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Droby, S., Torres, R.,  
20 2015b. Characterizing the proteome and oxi-proteome of apple in response to a host  
21 (*Penicillium expansum*) and a non-host (*Penicillium digitatum*) pathogen. *J.*  
22 *Proteomics* 114, 136-151.

23 Calo, J.R., Crandall, P.G., O'Bryan, C.A., Ricke, S.C., 2015. Essential oils as  
24 antimicrobials in food systems—A review. *Food Control* 54, 111-119.

- 1 Canessa, P., Schumacher, J., Hevia, M.A., Tudzynski, P., Larrondo, L.F., 2013. Assessing  
2 the effects of light on differentiation and virulence of the plant pathogen *Botrytis*  
3 *cinerea*: characterization of the white collar complex. PloS One 8, e84223.
- 4 Casado-Diaz, A., Encinas-Villarejo, S., Santos, B.d.l., Schiliro, E., Yubero-Serrano,  
5 E.M., Amil-Ruiz, F., Pocovi, M.I., Pliego-Alfaro, F., Dorado, G., Rey, M., Romero,  
6 F., Munoz-Blanco, J., Caballero, J.L., 2006. Analysis of strawberry genes  
7 differentially expressed in response to *Colletotrichum* infection. Physiol. Plant. 128,  
8 633-650.
- 9 Castoria, R., Caputo, L., De Curtis, F. 2003. Resistance of postharvest biocontrol yeasts  
10 to oxidative stress: a possible new mechanism of action. Phytopathology 93, 564-  
11 572.
- 12 Castro-Mercado, E., Martinez-Diaz, Y., Roman-Tehandon, N., Garcia-Pineda, E., 2009.  
13 Biochemical analysis of reactive oxygen species production and antioxidative  
14 responses in unripe avocado (*Persea americana* Mill var Hass) fruits in response to  
15 wounding. Protoplasma 235, 67-76.
- 16 Cegelski, L., Marshall, G.R., Eldridge, G.R., Hultgren, S.J., 2008. The biology and future  
17 prospects of antivirulence therapies. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 6, 17-27.
- 18 Chagné, D., Crowhurst, R.N., Pindo, M., Thrimawithana, A., Deng, C., Ireland, H., Fiers,  
19 M., Dzierzon, H., Cestaro, A., Fontana, P., 2014. The draft genome sequence of  
20 European pear (*Pyrus communis* L. 'Bartlett'). PloS One 9, e92644.
- 21 Chan, Z.L., Qin, G.Z., Xu, X.B., Li, B.Q., Tian, S.P., 2007. Proteome approach to  
22 characterize proteins induced by antagonist yeast and salicylic acid in peach fruit.  
23 J. Proteome Res. 6, 1677-1688.

- 1 Chan, Z., Wang, Q., Xu, X., Meng, X., Qin, G., Li, B., Tian, S., 2008. Functions of  
2 defense-related proteins and dehydrogenases in resistance response induced by  
3 salicylic acid in sweet cherry fruits at different maturity stages. *Proteomics* 8, 4791-  
4 4807.
- 5 Chen, C.H., Dunlap, J.C., Loros, J.J., 2010. *Neurospora* illuminates fungal  
6 photoreception. *Fungal Genet Biol.* 47, 922-929.
- 7 Cota, I.E., Troncoso-Rojas, R., Sotelo-Mundo, R., Sánchez-Estrada, A., Tiznado-  
8 Hernández, M.E., 2007. Chitinase and beta-1,3-glucanase enzymatic activities in  
9 response to infection by *Alternaria alternata* evaluated in two stages of  
10 development in different tomato fruit varieties. *Sci. Hortic.* 112, 42-50.
- 11 Cui, J., Ren, B., Tong, Y., Dai, H., Zhang, L., 2015. Synergistic combinations of  
12 antifungals and anti-virulence agents to fight against *Candida albicans*. *Virulence*  
13 6, 362-371.
- 14 D'Hont, A., Denoeud, F., Aury, J.-M., Baurens, F.-C., Carreel, F., Garsmeur, O., Noel,  
15 B., Bocs, S., Droc, G., Rouard, M., 2012. The banana (*Musa acuminata*) genome  
16 and the evolution of monocotyledonous plants. *Nature* 488, 213-217.
- 17 Dang, H.X., Pryor, B., Peever, T., Lawrence, C.B., 2015. The *Alternaria* genomes  
18 database: a comprehensive resource for a fungal genus comprised of saprophytes,  
19 plant pathogens, and allergenic species. *BMC Genomics* 16, 239.
- 20 De Gara, L., de Pinto, M.C., Tommasi, F., 2003. The antioxidant systems vis-a-vis  
21 reactive oxygen species during plant-pathogen interaction. *Plant Physiol. Biochem.*  
22 41, 863-870.
- 23 Droby, S., Eick, A., Macarasin, D., Cohen, L., Rafael, G., Stange, R., McColum, G.,  
24 Dudai, N., Nasser, A., Wisniewski, M., Shapira, R., 2008. Role of citrus volatiles

1 in host recognition, germination and growth of *Penicillium digitatum* and  
2 *Penicillium italicum*. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 49, 386-396.

3 Dumas, B., Borel, C., Herbert, C., Maury, J., Jacquet, C., Balsse, R., Esquerré-Tugayé,  
4 M.-T., 2001. Molecular characterization of CLPT1, a SEC4-like Rab/GTPase of the  
5 phytopathogenic fungus *Colletotrichum lindemuthianum* which is regulated by the  
6 carbon source. Gene 272, 219-225.

7 El-kereamy, A., Jayasankar, S., Taheri, A., Errampalli, D., Paliyath, G., 2009. Expression  
8 analysis of a plum pathogenesis related 10 (PR10) protein during brown rot  
9 infection. Plant Cell Reports 28, 95-102.

10 Eshel, D., Ben-Arie, R., Dinoor, A., Prusky, D., 2000. Resistance of gibberellin-treated  
11 persimmon fruit to *Alternaria alternata* arises from the reduced ability of the fungus  
12 to produce endo-1, 4- $\beta$ -glucanase. Phytopathology 90, 1256-1262.

13 Eshel, D., Miyara, I., Ailinng, T., Dinoor, A., Prusky D., 2002. pH regulates  
14 endoglucanase expression and virulence of *Alternaria alternata* in persimmon  
15 fruits. Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact. 15, 774-779.

16 Esquerré-Tugayé, M.T., Boudart, G., Dumas, B., 2000. Cell wall degrading enzymes,  
17 inhibitory proteins and oligosaccharides participate in the molecular dialogue  
18 between plant and pathogens. Plant Physiol. Biochem. 38, 157-163.

19 Fallanaj, F., Ippolito, A., Ligorio, A., Garganese, F., Zavanella, C., Sanzani, S.M. 2016.  
20 Electrolyzed sodium bicarbonate inhibits *Penicillium digitatum* and induces  
21 defence responses against green mould in citrus fruit. Postharvest Biol. Technol.  
22 115, 18-29.

1 Ferreira, R.B., Monteiro, S., Freitas, R., Santos, C.N., Chen, Z.J., Batista, L.M., Duarte,  
2 J., Borges, A., Teixeira, A.R., 2006. Fungal pathogens: The battle for plant  
3 infection. *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.* 25, 505-524.

4 Frías, M., González, C., Brito, N., 2011. BcSpl1, a cerato-platanin family protein,  
5 contributes to *Botrytis cinerea* virulence and elicits the hypersensitive response in  
6 the host. *New Phytol.* 192, 483-495.

7 Gan, P., Ikeda, K., Irieda, H., Narusaka, M., O'Connell, R.J., Narusaka, Y., Takano, Y.,  
8 Kubo, Y., Shirasu, K., 2013. Comparative genomic and transcriptomic analyses  
9 reveal the hemibiotrophic stage shift of *Colletotrichum* fungi. *New Phytol.* 197,  
10 1236–1249.

11 Gijzen, M., Nürnberger, T., 2006. Nep1-like proteins from plant pathogens: recruitment  
12 and diversification of the NPP1 domain across taxa. *Phytochemistry* 67, 1800-1807.

13 González, G., Fuentes, L., Moya-León, M.A., Sandoval, C., Herrera, R., 2013.  
14 Characterization of two PR genes from *Fragaria chiloensis* in response to *Botrytis*  
15 *cinerea* infection: A comparison with *Fragaria x ananassa*. *Physiol. Mol. Plant*  
16 *Pathol.* 82, 73-80.

17 González-Candelas, L., Alamar, S., Ballester, A.R., Sanchez-Torres, P., Forment, J.,  
18 Gadea, J., Lafuente, M.T., Zacarias, L., Marcos, J.F., 2010a. Global regulation of  
19 genes in citrus fruit in response to the postharvest pathogen *Penicillium digitatum*.  
20 In *Plant Pathology*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, Berlin, pp 57-67.

21 González-Candelas, L., Alamar, S., Sanchez-Torres, P., Zacarias, L., Marcos, J., 2010b.  
22 A transcriptomic approach highlights induction of secondary metabolism in citrus  
23 fruit in response to *Penicillium digitatum* infection. *BMC Plant Biol.* 10, 194.

1 González-Fernández, R., Valero-Galván, J., Gómez-Gálvez, F.J., Jorrín-Novo, J.V.,  
2 2015. Unraveling the in vitro secretome of the phytopathogen *Botrytis cinerea* to  
3 understand the interaction with its hosts. *Front. Plant Sci.* 6, 839

4 Grant, J.J., Loake, G.J., 2000. Role of reactive oxygen intermediates and cognate redox  
5 signaling in disease resistance. *Plant Physiol.* 124, 21-29.

6 Grigoriev, I.V., Nikitin, R., Haridas, S., Kuo, A., Ohm, R., Otilar, R., Riley, R., Salamov,  
7 A., Zhao, X., Korzeniewski, F., 2013. MycoCosm portal: gearing up for 1000  
8 fungal genomes. *Nucl. Acids Res.* gkt1183.

9 Guidarelli, M., Carbone, F., Mourgues, F., Perrotta, G., Rosati, C., Bertolini, P., Baraldi,  
10 E., 2011. *Colletotrichum acutatum* interactions with unripe and ripe strawberry  
11 fruits and differential responses at histological and transcriptional levels. *Plant*  
12 *Pathology* 60, 685-697.

13 Heller, J., Tudzynski, P., 2011. Reactive oxygen species in phytopathogenic fungi:  
14 signaling, development, and disease. *Annual review of phytopathology* 49, 369-  
15 390.

16 Hevia, M.A., Canessa, P., Müller-Esparza, H., Larrondo, L.F., 2015. A circadian  
17 oscillator in the fungus *Botrytis cinerea* regulates virulence when infecting  
18 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, 8744-  
19 8749.

20 Isshiki, A., Akimitsu, K., Yamamoto, M., Yamamoto, H., 2001. Endopolygalacturonase  
21 is essential for citrus black rot caused by *Alternaria citri* but not brown spot caused  
22 by *Alternaria alternata* *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.* 14, 749-757.

1 Jaillon, O., Aury, J.M., Noel, B., Policriti, A., Clepet, C., Casagrande, A., Choisne, N.,  
2 Aubourg, S., Vitulo, N., Jubin, C., 2007. The grapevine genome sequence suggests  
3 ancestral hexaploidization in major angiosperm phyla. *Nature* 449, 463-467.

4 Jurick, W.M., Janisiewicz, W.J., Saftner, R.A., Vico, I., Gaskins, V.L., Park, E., Forsline,  
5 P.L., Fazio, G., Conway, W.S., 2011. Identification of wild apple germplasm  
6 (*Malus* spp.) accessions with resistance to the postharvest decay pathogens  
7 *Penicillium expansum* and *Colletotrichum acutatum*. *Plant Breed.* 130, 481-486.

8 Kars, I., Krooshof, G., Wagemakers, C.A.M., Joosten, R., Benen, J.A.E. van Kan, J.A.L.,  
9 2005. Necrotising activity of five *Botrytis cinerea* endopolygalacturonases  
10 produced in *Pichia pastoris*. *Plant J.* 43, 213-225.

11 Kim, K.S., Min, J.Y., Dickman, M.B., 2008. Oxalic acid is an elicitor of plant  
12 programmed cell death during *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* disease development. *Mol.*  
13 *Plant-Microbe Interact.* 21, 605-612.

14 Kleemann, J., Rincon-Rivera, L.J., Takahara, H., Neumann, U., Van Themaat, E.V.L.,  
15 van der Does, H.C., Hacquard, S., Stüber, K., Will, I., Schmalenbach, W., 2012.  
16 Sequential delivery of host-induced virulence effectors by appressoria and  
17 intracellular hyphae of the phytopathogen *Colletotrichum higginsianum*. *PLoS*  
18 *Pathog* 8, e1002643.

19 Kramer-Haimovich, H., Servi, E., Katan, T., Rollins, J., Okon, Y., Prusky, D., 2006.  
20 Effect of ammonia production by *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* on pelB  
21 activation, pectatylase secretion, and fruit pathogenicity. *Appl. Environ.*  
22 *Microbiol.* 72, 1034-1039.

23 Lambeth, J.D., 2004. NOX enzymes and the biology of reactive oxygen. *Nat. Rev.*  
24 *Immunol.* 4, 181-89.

- 1 Lewis, N.G., Davin, L.B., Sarkanen, S., 1999. The nature and functions of lignins. In:  
2 Comprehensive natural products chemistry, vol. 1, Barton, D.H.R., Nakanishi, K.,  
3 Meth-Cohn, O., (Eds.). Elsevier Science, Oxford. 617-745.
- 4 Li, B., Lai, T., Qin, G., Tian, S., 2010. Ambient pH stress inhibits spore germination of  
5 *Penicillium expansum* by impairing protein synthesis and folding: A proteomic-  
6 based study. J. Proteome Res. 9, 298-307.
- 7 Li, B., Wang, W., Zong, Y., Qin, G., Tian, S., 2012. Exploring pathogenic mechanisms  
8 of *Botrytis cinerea* secretome under different ambient pH based on comparative  
9 proteomic analysis. J. Proteome Res. 11, 4249-4260.
- 10 Li, B., Zong, Y., Du, Z., Chen, Y., Zhang, Z., Qin, G., Zhao, W., Tian, S., 2015. Genomic  
11 characterization reveals insights into patulin biosynthesis and pathogenicity in  
12 *Penicillium* species. Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact. 28, 635-647.
- 13 López-Pérez, M., Ballester, A.-R., González-Candelas, L., 2015. Identification and  
14 functional analysis of *Penicillium digitatum* genes putatively involved in virulence  
15 towards citrus fruit. Mol. Plant Pathol. 16, 262-275.
- 16 Louw, J.P., Korsten, L., 2014. Pathogenic *Penicillium* spp. on apple and pear. Plant Dis.  
17 98, 590-598.
- 18 Louw, J., Korsten, L., 2015. Pathogenicity and host susceptibility of *Penicillium* spp. on  
19 Citrus. Plant Dis. 99, 21-30.
- 20 Luo, T., Xu, K., Luo, Y., Chen, J., Sheng, L., Wang, J., Han, J., Zeng, Y., Xu, J., Chen,  
21 J., 2015. Distinct carotenoid and flavonoid accumulation in a spontaneous mutant  
22 of Ponkan (*Citrus reticulata* Blanco) results in yellowish fruit and enhanced  
23 postharvest resistance. J. Agric. Food Chem. 63, 8601-8614.



1 Macarisin, D., Cohen, L., Eick, A., Rafael, G., Belausov, E., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S.,  
2 2007. *Penicillium digitatum* suppresses production of hydrogen peroxide in host  
3 tissue during infection of citrus fruit. *Phytopathology* 97, 1491-1500.

4 Macarisin, D., Droby, S., Bauchan, G., Wisniewski, M., 2010. Superoxide anion and  
5 hydrogen peroxide in the yeast antagonist-fruit interaction: a new role for reactive  
6 oxygen species in postharvest biocontrol? *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 58, 194–202.

7 Manteau, S., Abouna, S., Lambert, B., Legendre, L., 2003. Differential regulation by  
8 ambient pH of putative virulence factors secretion by the phytopathogenic fungus  
9 *Botrytis cinerea*. *FEMS Microbio. Ecol.* 43, 359-366.

10 Marcet-Houben, M., Ballester, A.-R., De la Fuente, B., Harries, E., Marcos, J.F.,  
11 González-Candelas, L., Gabaldón, T., 2012. Genome sequence of the necrotrophic  
12 fungus *Penicillium digitatum*, the main postharvest pathogen of citrus. *BMC*  
13 *Genomics* 13, 646.

14 Mari, M., Di Francesco, A., Bertolini, P., 2014. Control of fruit postharvest diseases: old  
15 issues and innovative approaches. *Stewart Postharvest Rev.* 10, 1-4.

16 Martínez-García, P.J., Parfitt, D.E., Bostock, R.M., Fresnedo-Ramírez, J., Vazquez-  
17 Lobo, A., Ogundiwin, E.A., Gradziel, T.M., Crisosto, C.H., 2013. Application of  
18 genomic and quantitative genetic tools to identify candidate resistance genes for  
19 brown rot resistance in peach. *PLoS ONE* 8, e78634.

20 Miles, T.D., Day, B., Schilder, A.C., 2011. Identification of differentially expressed genes  
21 in a resistant versus a susceptible blueberry cultivar after infection by  
22 *Colletotrichum acutatum*. *Mol. Plant Pathol.* 12, 463-477.

- 1 Noda, J., Brito, N., González, C., 2010. The *Botrytis cinerea* xylanase Xyn11A  
2 contributes to virulence with its necrotizing activity, not with its catalytic activity.  
3 BMC Plant Biol. 10, 38.
- 4 Norelli, J.L., Wisniewski, M., Droby, S., 2014. Identification of a QTL for postharvest  
5 disease resistance to *Penicillium expansum* in *Malus sieversii*. Acta Hort. 1053,  
6 199-203.
- 7 Olson, P., Varner, J., 1993. Hydrogen peroxide and lignification. Plant J. 4, 887-892.
- 8 Pacheco, I., Bassi, D., Eduardo, I., Ciacciulli, A., Pirona, R., Rossini, L., Vecchiotti, A.,  
9 2014. QTL mapping for brown rot (*Monilinia fructigena*) resistance in an  
10 intraspecific peach (*Prunus persica* L. Batsch) F1 progeny. Tree Genet. Genomes  
11 10, 1223-1242.
- 12 Pan, X., Zhu, B., Luo, Y., Fu, D., 2013. Unraveling the protein network of tomato fruit  
13 in response to necrotrophic phytopathogenic *Rhizopus nigricans*. PLoS ONE 8,  
14 e73034.
- 15 Peñalva, M.A., Tilburn, J., Bignell, E., Arst, H.J., 2008. Ambient pH gene regulation in  
16 fungi: making connections. Trends Microbiol. 16,291-300.
- 17 Pitzschke, A., Forzani, C., Hirt, H., 2006. Reactive oxygen species signaling in plants.  
18 Antioxid. Redox Sign. 8, 1757-1764.
- 19 Prusky, D., McEvoy, J.L., Saftner, R., Conway, W.S., Jones, R., 2004. Relationship  
20 between host acidification and virulence of *Penicillium* spp. on apple and citrus  
21 fruit. Phytopathology 94, 44-51.
- 22 Prusky, D., Yakoby, N., 2003. Pathogenic fungi: leading or led by ambient pH? Mol.  
23 Plant Pathol. 4, 509-516.

1 Pruss, S., Fetzner, R., Seither, K., Herr, A., Pfeiffer, E., Metzler, M., Lawrence, C.B.,  
2 Fischer, R., 2014. Role of the *Alternaria alternata* blue-light receptor LreA (white-  
3 collar 1) in spore formation and secondary metabolism. Appl. Environ. Microbiol.  
4 80, 2582-2591.

5 Qin, G.Z., Tian, S.P., 2005. Enhancement of biocontrol activity of *Cryptococcus laurentii*  
6 by silicon and the possible mechanisms involved. Phytopathology 95, 69-75.

7 Qin, G.Z., Tian, S.P., Chan, Z.L., Li, B.Q., 2007. Crucial role of antioxidant proteins and  
8 hydrolytic enzymes in pathogenicity of *Penicillium expansum*: Analysis based on  
9 proteomic approach. Mol. Cell. Proteomics 6, 425-438.

10 Rodríguez, A., San Andrés, V., Cervera, M., Redondo, A., Alquézar, B., Shimada, T.,  
11 Gadea, J., Rodrigo, M.J., Zacarías, L., Palou, L., López, M.M., Castañera, P., Peña,  
12 L., 2011. Terpene downregulation in orange reveals the role of fruit aromas in  
13 mediating interactions with insect herbivores and pathogens. Plant Physiol. 156,  
14 793-802.

15 Rolke, Y., Liu, S., Quidde, T., Williamson, B., Schouten, S., Weltring, Tenberge, K.B.,  
16 Tudzynski, B., Tudzynski, P. 2004. Functional analysis of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-generating systems  
17 in *Botrytis cinerea*: the major Cu-Zn-superoxide dismutase (BCSOD1) contributes  
18 to virulence on French bean, whereas a glucose oxidase (BCGOD1) is dispensable.  
19 Mol. Plant Pathol. 5, 17-27.

20 Sacristán, S., García-Arenal, F., 2008. The evolution of virulence and pathogenicity in  
21 plant pathogen populations. Mol. Plant Pathol. 9, 369-384.

22 Salzman, R.A., Tikhonova, I., Bordelon, B.P., Hasegawa, P.M., Bressan, R.A., 1998.  
23 Coordinate accumulation of antifungal proteins and hexoses constitutes a

1 developmentally controlled defense response during fruit ripening in grape. *Plant*  
2 *Physiol.* 117, 465-472.

3 Sánchez-Torres, P., González-Candelas, L., 2003. Isolation and characterization of genes  
4 differentially expressed during the interaction between apple fruit and *Penicillium*  
5 *expansum*. *Mol. Plant Pathol.* 4, 447-457.

6 Sandoval, R.A., Martinez, R.A., Arvizu, S., Soto, L., Chavaro, M.S., Teixidó, N., Torres,  
7 R., 2014. Effect of maturity stage, ripening time, harvest year and fruit  
8 characteristics on the susceptibility to *Penicillium expansum* link of apple  
9 genotypes from Querétaro, México. *Sci. Hortic.* 180, 86-93.

10 Sanzani, S.M., Reverberi, M., Punelli, M., Ippolito, A., Fanelli, C. 2012. Study on the  
11 role of patulin on pathogenicity and virulence of *Penicillium expansum*. *Int. J. Food*  
12 *Microbiol.* 153, 323-331.

13 Schouten, A., Van Baarlen, P., Van Kan, J.A., 2008. Phytotoxic Nep1-like proteins from  
14 the necrotrophic fungus *Botrytis cinerea* associate with membranes and the nucleus  
15 of plant cells. *New Phytol.* 177, 493-505.

16 Schumacher, J., Simon, A., Cohrs, K.C., Viaud, M., Tudzynski, P., 2014. The  
17 transcription factor BcLTF1 regulates virulence and light responses in the  
18 necrotrophic plant pathogen *Botrytis cinerea*. *PLoS Genet* 10, e1004040.

19 Segmüller, N., Ellendorf, U., Tudzynski, B., Tudzynski, P., 2007. BcSAK1, a stress-  
20 activated MAP kinase is involved in vegetative differentiation and pathogenicity in  
21 *Botrytis cinerea*. *Eukaryot. Cell.* 6, 211-221.

22 Segmüller, N., Kokkelink, L., Giesbert, S., Odinius, D., Van Kan J.A.L, Tudzynski P.,  
23 2008. NADPH oxidases are involved in differentiation and pathogenicity in *Botrytis*  
24 *cinerea*. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.* 21, 808-19.

1 Shah, P., Powell, A.L.T., Orlando, R., Bergmann, C., Gutierrez-Sanchez, G., 2012.  
2 Proteomic analysis of ripening tomato fruit infected by *Botrytis cinerea*. J. Prot Res.  
3 11, 2178-2192.

4 Shi, X.Q., Li, B.Q., Qin, G.Z., Tian, S.P., 2012. Mechanism of antifungal action of borate  
5 against *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* related to mitochondrial degradation in  
6 spores. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 67, 138-143.

7 Siegmund, U., Marschall, R. Tudzynski, P., 2015. BcNoxD, a putative ER protein, is a  
8 new component of the NADPH oxidase complex in *Botrytis cinerea*. Mol.  
9 Microbiol. 95, 988-1005.

10 Siriputthaiwan, P., Jauneau, A., Herbert, C., Garcin, D., Dumas, B., 2005. Functional  
11 analysis of CLPT1, a Rab/GTPase required for protein secretion and pathogenesis  
12 in the plant fungal pathogen *Colletotrichum lindemuthianum*. J. Cell Sci. 118, 323-  
13 329.

14 Skene, D., 1981. Wound healing in apple fruits: the anatomical response of Cox's Orange  
15 Pippin at different stages of development. J. Hort Sci. 56, 145-153.

16 Snini, S.P., Tannous, J., Heuillard, P., Bailly, S., Lippi, Y., Zehraoui, E., Barreau, C.,  
17 Oswald, I.P., Puel, O. 2015. The patulin is a cultivar dependent aggressiveness  
18 factor favoring the colonization of apples by *Penicillium expansum*. Mol. Plant  
19 Pathol. doi: 10.1111/mpp.12338.

20

21 Spotts, R.A., Sanderson, P.G., Lennox, C.L., Sugar, D., Cervantes, L.A., 1998.  
22 Wounding, wound healing and staining of mature pear fruit. Postharvest Biol.  
23 Technol. 13, 27-36.

1 Su, J., Tu, K., Cheng, L., Tu, S., Wang, M., Xu, H., Zhan, G., 2011. Wound-induced H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>  
2 and resistance to *Botrytis cinerea* decline with the ripening of apple fruit.  
3 Postharvest Biol. Technol. 62, 64-70.

4 Sun, X., Li, H., Yu, D., 2011. Complete mitochondrial genome sequence of the  
5 phytopathogenic fungus *Penicillium digitatum* and comparative analysis of closely  
6 related species. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 323, 29-34.

7 Takemoto, D., Tanaka, A., Scott, B., 2007. NADPH oxidases in fungi: diverse roles of  
8 reactive oxygen species in fungal cellular differentiation. Fungal Genet. Biol. 44, 1065-  
9 1076.

10 Tahir, I., Nybom, H., Ahmadi-Afzadi, M., Roen, K., Sehic, J., Roen, D., 2015.  
11 Susceptibility to blue mold caused by *Penicillium expansum* in apple cultivars  
12 adapted to a cool climate. Eur. J. Hortic. Sci. 80, 117-127.

13 Temme, N., Oeser, B., Massaroli, M., Heller, J., Simon, A., González Collado, I.,  
14 Viaud, M., Tudzynski, P. 2012. BcATF1, A global regulator controls various  
15 differentiation processes and phytotoxin production in *Botrytis cinerea*. Mol. Plant  
16 Pathol. 13, 704-718.

17 ten Have, A., Breuil, W.O., Wubben, J.P., Visser, J., van Kan, J.A., 2001. *Botrytis cinerea*  
18 endopolygalacturonase genes are differentially expressed in various plant tissues.  
19 Fungal Genet. Biol. 33, 97-105.

20 ten Have, A., Espino, J.J., Dekkers, E., Van Sluyter, S.C., Brito, N., Kay, J., González,  
21 C., van Kan, J.A.L., 2010. The *Botrytis cinerea* aspartic proteinase family. Fungal  
22 Genet. Biol. 47, 53-65.

1 ten Have, A., Mulder, W., Visser, J., van Kan, J.A.L., 1998. The endopolygalacturonase  
2 gene Bcpg1 is required for full virulence of *Botrytis cinerea*. Mol. Plant-Microbe  
3 Interact. 11, 1009-1016.

4 Tenberge, K.B., Beckedorf, M., Hoppe, B., Schouten, A., Solf, M., Von Den Driesch, M.,  
5 2002. In situ localization of AOS in host-pathogen interactions. Microscopy  
6 Microanal. 8, 250-251.

7 Tian, S., Qin, G., Li, B., 2013. Reactive oxygen species involved in regulating fruit  
8 senescence and fungal pathogenicity. Plant Mol Biol. 82, 593-602.

9 Torres, M.A., Jones, J.D.G., Dangl, J.L., 2006. Reactive oxygen species signaling in  
10 response to pathogens. Plant Physiol. 141, 373-378.

11 Torres, R., Teixidó, N., Usall, J., Abadias, M., Mir, N., Larrigaudiere, C., Viñas, I., 2011.  
12 Anti-oxidant activity of oranges after infection with the pathogen *Penicillium*  
13 *digitatum* or treatment with the biocontrol agent *Pantoea agglomerans* CPA-2.  
14 Biol. Control 57, 103-109.

15 Torres, R., Valentines, M.C., Usall, J., Viñas, I., Larrigaudiere, C., 2003. Possible  
16 involvement of hydrogen peroxide in the development of resistance mechanisms in  
17 'Golden Delicious' apple fruit. Postharvest Biology and Technology 27, 235-242.

18 Urban, M., Pant, R., Raghunath, A., Irvine, A.G., Pedro, H., Hammond-Kosack, K.E.,  
19 2015. The Pathogen-Host Interactions database (PHI-base): additions and future  
20 developments. Nucl. Acids Res. 43, D645-D655.

21 Valentines, M.C., Vilaplana, R., Torres, R., Usall, J., Larrigaudiere, C., 2005. Specific  
22 roles of enzymatic browning and lignification in apple disease resistance.  
23 Postharvest Biol. Technol. 36, 227-234.

- 1 Valette-Collet, O., Cimerman, A., Reignault, P., Levis, C., Boccara, M., 2003. Disruption  
2 of *Botrytis cinerea* pectin methylesterase gene *Bcpme1* reduces virulence on several  
3 host plants. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.* 16, 360-367.
- 4 van Loon, L.C., Geraats, B.P.J., Linthorst, H.J.M., 2006a. Ethylene as a modulator of  
5 disease resistance in plants. *Trends Plant Sci.* 11, 184-191.
- 6 van Loon, L.C., Rep, M., Pieterse, C.M.J., 2006b. Significance of inducible defense-  
7 related proteins in infected plants. *Annu. Rev. Phytopathol.* 44, 135-162.
- 8 Velasco, R., Zharkikh, A., Affourtit, J., Dhingra, A., Cestaro, A., Kalyanaraman, A.,  
9 Fontana, P., Bhatnagar, S.K., Troggio, M., Pruss, D. 2010. The genome of the  
10 domesticated apple (*Malus × domestica* Borkh.). *Nat. Genet.* 42, 833-839.
- 11 Verde, I., Abbott, A.G., Scalabrin, S., Jung, S., Shu, S., Marroni, F., Zhebentyayeva, T.,  
12 Dettori, M.T., Grimwood, J., Cattonaro, F. 2013. The high-quality draft genome of  
13 peach (*Prunus persica*) identifies unique patterns of genetic diversity,  
14 domestication and genome evolution. *Nat. Genet.* 45, 487-494.
- 15 Vilanova, L., Teixidó, N., Torres, R., Usall, J., Viñas, I., 2012a. The infection capacity of  
16 *P. expansum* and *P. digitatum* on apples and histochemical analysis of host  
17 response. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 157, 360-367.
- 18 Vilanova, L., Torres, R., Viñas, I., González-Candelas, L., Usall, J., Fiori, S., Solsona,  
19 C., Teixidó, N., 2013. Wound response in orange as a resistance mechanism against  
20 *Penicillium digitatum* (pathogen) and *P. expansum* (non-host pathogen).  
21 *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 78, 113-122.
- 22 Vilanova, L., Viñas, I., Torres, R., Usall, J., Buron-Moles, G., Teixidó, N., 2014a.  
23 Increasing maturity reduces wound response and lignification processes against



1 *Penicillium expansum* (pathogen) and *Penicillium digitatum* (non-host pathogen)  
2 infection in apples. Postharvest Biol. Technol. 88, 54-60.

3 Vilanova, L., Viñas, I., Torres, R., Usall, J., Jauset, A.M., Teixidó, N., 2012b. Infection  
4 capacities in the orange-pathogen relationship: Compatible (*Penicillium digitatum*)  
5 and incompatible (*Penicillium expansum*) interactions. Food Microbiol. 29, 56-66.

6 Vilanova, L., Wisniewski, M., Norelli, J., Viñas, I., Torres, R., Usall, J., Phillips, J.,  
7 Droby, S., Teixidó, N., 2014b. Transcriptomic profiling of apple in response to  
8 inoculation with a pathogen (*Penicillium expansum*) and a non-pathogen  
9 (*Penicillium digitatum*). Plant Mol. Biol. Report. 32, 566-583.

10 Weiberg, A., Wang, M., Lin, F.M., Zhao, H., Zhang, Z., Kaloshian, et al., 2013. Fungal  
11 small RNAs suppress plant immunity by hijacking host RNA interference  
12 pathways. Science, 342, 118-123.

13 Williamson, B., Tudzynski, B., Tudzynski, P., van Kan, J.A.L. 2007. *Botrytis*  
14 *cinerea*: The cause of grey mould disease. Mol. Plant Pathol. 8, 561-580.

15 Wubben, J.P., Mulder, W., ten Have, A., van Kan, J.A.L. Visser, J., 1999. Cloning and  
16 partial characterisation of endopolygalacturonase genes from *Botrytis cinerea*.  
17 Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 65, 1596-1602.

18 Wubben, J.P., ten Have, A., van Kan, J., Visser, J., 2000. Regulation of  
19 endopolygalacturonase gene expression in *Botrytis cinerea* by galacturonic acid,  
20 ambient pH and carbon catabolite repression. Curr. Gen. 37, 152-157.

21 Xu, Q., Chen, L.-L., Ruan, X., Chen, D., Zhu, A., Chen, C., Bertrand, D., Jiao, W.-B.,  
22 Hao, B.-H., Lyon, M.P. 2013. The draft genome of sweet orange (*Citrus sinensis*).  
23 Nat. Genet. 45, 59-66.

- 1 Yao, H.J., Tian, S.P., Wang, Y.S., 2004. Sodium bicarbonate enhances biocontrol  
2 efficacy of yeasts on fungal spoilage of pears. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 93, 297-304.
- 3 Zhang, L.S., Kars, I., Essenstam, B., Liebrand, T.W.H., Wanemakers, L., Elberse, et al.,  
4 2014. Fungal endopolygalacturonases are recognized as microbe-associated  
5 molecular patterns by the *Arabidopsis* receptor-like protein responsiveness to  
6 *Botrytis* polygalacturonases. *Plant Physiol.* 164, 352-364.
- 7 Zhang, T., Sun, X., Xu, Q., Candelas, L.G, Li, H., 2013. The pH signaling transcription  
8 factor PacC is required for full virulence in *Penicillium digitatum*. *Appl. Microbiol.*  
9 *Biotechnol.* 97, 9087-9098.
- 10 Zhang, Y., De Stefano, R., Robine, M., Butelli, E., Bulling, K., Hill, L., Rejzek, M.,  
11 Martin, C., Schoonbeek, H.-J., 2015. Different reactive oxygen species scavenging  
12 properties of flavonoids determine their abilities to extend the shelf life of tomato.  
13 *Plant Physiol.* 169, 1568-1583.
- 14 Zhang, Z.Q., Qin, G.Z., Li, B.Q., Tian S.P., 2014. Knocking out *Bcsa1* in *Botrytis*  
15 *cinerea* impacts growth, development, and secretion of extracellular proteins,  
16 which decreases virulence. *Mol. Plant-Microbe Interact.* 27, 590-600.
- 17 Zong, Y., Li, B., Tian, S., 2015. Effects of carbon, nitrogen and ambient pH on patulin  
18 production and related gene expression in *Penicillium expansum*. *Int. J. Food*  
19 *Microbiol.* 206, 102-108.

20

## 21 **Figure legends**

22 Figure1. Model for ROS in the regulation of differentiation and virulence in fungi. The  
23 NADPH oxidase (Nox) complexes, which are composed of several subunits (NoxA/B,  
24 NoxR, NoxD, Rac), are the most important enzymatic ROS generating system. The

1 Nox complexes use NADPH as an electron donor and transport electrons through the  
2 plasma membrane (PM) to reduce oxygen to superoxide. The superoxide outside of  
3 cells can be converted into H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and transported into cells by certain channels, such  
4 as aquaporins. Mitochondrion is one of the action targets of intracellular ROS.  
5 Moreover, ROS, as signaling molecules, can regulate the function of Nox complexes,  
6 phosphorylation of the MAP kinase Sak, and the expression of oxidative stress  
7 response genes through transcription factors (TFs). Finally, the mycelial growth,  
8 sporulation and appressorium formation were regulated by the complicated ROS  
9 regulatory network.

10

