



HAL
open science

Interrelated responses of tomato plants and the leaf miner *Tuta absoluta* to nitrogen supply

Romain Larbat, Stephane Adamowicz, Christophe Robin, Peng Han, Nicolas Desneux, Jacques Le Bot

► **To cite this version:**

Romain Larbat, Stephane Adamowicz, Christophe Robin, Peng Han, Nicolas Desneux, et al.. Interrelated responses of tomato plants and the leaf miner *Tuta absoluta* to nitrogen supply. *Plant Biology*, 2016, 18 (3), pp.495-504. 10.1111/plb.12425 . hal-02640137

HAL Id: hal-02640137

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02640137>

Submitted on 23 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - ShareAlike 4.0 International License

1 Original research paper :

2 **Title : Interrelated responses of tomato and the leafminer *Tuta absoluta* to nitrogen**
3 **supply**

4

5 **Romain Larbat^{1,2}, Stéphane Adamowicz³, Christophe Robin^{1,2}, Peng Han⁴, Nicolas**
6 **Desneux⁴ and Jacques Le Bot^{3*}**

7 ¹ INRA, UMR 1121 “Agronomie & Environnement” Nancy-Colmar, TSA 40602, 54518
8 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy Cedex, France

9 ² Université de Lorraine, UMR 1121 “Agronomie & Environnement” Nancy-Colmar, TSA
10 40602, 54518 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy Cedex, France

11 ³ INRA, UR 1115 “Plantes et Systèmes de Culture Horticoles”, 84000 Avignon, France

12 ⁴ INRA, UMR 1355, 400 Route des Chappes, 06903 Sophia-Antipolis, France

13

14 Short title: **Interrelated responses of tomato and *Tuta absoluta* to nitrogen**

15 * Corresponding author : Jacques Le Bot, INRA, UR 1115 “Plantes et Systèmes de Culture
16 Horticoles”, 228 route de l'Aérodrome, CS 40509, Domaine St Paul - Site Agroparc, 84914
17 AVIGNON Cedex 9, FRANCE

18 e-mail : Jacques.Lebot@avignon.inra.fr

19 phone : +33 (0)4 32 72 24 63 fax : +33 (0)4 32 72 24 63

- 1 **Key words:** *Solanum lycopersicum* cv. Santa clara, *Tuta absoluta*, leaf miner, larva, nitrogen
- 2 limitation, cross responses, interactions, plant defence, polyphenol oxidase, phenolics,
- 3 tomatine, growth
- 4 **Abbreviations**
- 5 CHAx: isomer x of caffeoyl hexaric acid
- 6 CP: caffeoylputrescine
- 7 FLA: flavonoids
- 8 FQA: feruloyl quinic acid
- 9 Hx: Harvest x
- 10 HCAD: hydroxycinnamic acid derivatives
- 11 HN: high nitrogen
- 12 KR: kaemperol rutinoside
- 13 LN: low nitrogen
- 14 N: nitrogen
- 15 NFT: nutrient film technique
- 16 pCoQA: p-coumaroyl quinic acid
- 17 PHE: phenolamide
- 18 PPO: polyphenol oxidase
- 19 PVPP: polyvinylpyrrolidone
- 20 QAR: quercetin apiosyl-rutinoside
- 21 R: rutin
- 22 x-CGA: isomers of chlorogenic acid

1 ABSTRACT

2 Plant-insect interactions are strongly modified by environmental factors. This study evaluates,
3 for the first time, the means by which nitrogen fertilisation affects the interaction between
4 tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum* L. cv. Santa clara) and the leafminer *Tuta absoluta*
5 (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae).

6 Greenhouse grown tomato plants were fed hydroponically on a complete nutrient solution
7 containing either a low nitrogen concentration (LN) limiting plant growth or a high nitrogen
8 concentration (HN) sustaining maximum growth. Insect-free plants were compared with
9 plants infested by *T. absoluta*. Seven and 14 days after an artificial oviposition leading to
10 efficacious hatching and larvae development, we measured vegetative tissue composition in
11 primary insect resources (total carbon, nitrogen, protein) together with defensive compounds
12 (phenolics, glycoalkaloids, polyphenol oxidase activity) in HN vs. LN plants.

13 It was only in the HN treatment that *T. absoluta* infestation slightly impaired leaf growth and
14 induced polyphenol oxidase (PPO) activity in the foliage. The concentration of phenolic
15 compounds and proteins, together with the total N distribution within the plant, were not
16 affected by *T. absoluta* infestation. LN nutrition impaired the *T. absoluta*-induced PPO
17 activity. It decreased protein and total nitrogen plant organ concentrations and enhanced the
18 accumulation of constitutive phenolics and tomatine. Moreover LN nutrition impaired *T.*
19 *absoluta* development by notably decreasing pupal weight and increasing the development
20 time from egg to adult. Nitrogen nutrition may thus be a means of altering the life cycle of *T.*
21 *absoluta*.

22 These results confirm for tomato, the existence of several cross-responses of plant
23 composition and *T. absoluta* development to nitrogen nutrition.

24

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Plants respond to herbivorous insect feeding by means of a set of resistance mechanisms.
3 These mechanisms involve localised and systemic synthesis/emission of secondary
4 metabolites (Zangerl *et al.* 2002), induction of defensive enzymes (Stout *et al.* 1994) and
5 tolerance mechanisms such as resource and metabolite remobilisation within plant organs
6 (Tiffin 2000). It is now established that plant responses are highly specific to the insect
7 feeding guild, this specificity being driven by the complex interaction of, at least, three major
8 phytohormone signalling pathways *i.e.* jasmonic acid, ethylene and salicylic acid (Erb *et al.*
9 2012, Pieterse *et al.* 2009). Indeed, plants submitted to either phloem-feeding or chewing
10 insects have been shown to exhibit differences in defensive enzyme induction (Felton *et al.*
11 1994), phenolic compound accumulation (Olson & Roseland 1991), regulation of primary
12 metabolism (Schmidt *et al.* 2009) and transcriptomic responses (Kempema *et al.* 2007). By
13 contrast, plant responses to leaf miners have received less interest (Stout *et al.*, 1994, Cardoso
14 *et al.* 2014, Zhang *et al.* 2012). Leaf mining results from the ability of insect larvae to feed
15 and develop within plant tissues, mostly leaves and stems. From an ecological viewpoint, this
16 feeding strategy confers protection against natural enemies and allows larvae to avoid the
17 defence barriers (trichomes, spines...) on the leaf surface (Connor & Taverner 1997).
18 Furthermore, it is acknowledged that leaf miners provide a valuable model to study plant
19 responses to insect damage due to the intimate interactions created by larvae developing
20 within plant tissues (Han *et al.* 2014, Inbar *et al.* 2001).

21 Plant-herbivorous insect interactions are highly dependent on environmental factors. Of these,
22 plant nutrition and particularly nitrogen (N) fertilisation, has been widely studied (Bentz *et al.*
23 1995, Cates *et al.* 1987, Chen *et al.* 2010, Fischer & Fiedler 2000, Mattson 1980, Han *et al.*,
24 2014). N is an important macronutrient for both plants and herbivores. Plants require a great
25 deal of N to attain maximum growth and N concentration in the insect body tissues is more

1 concentrated than in their foodstuff (Schoonhoven *et al.* 2005). N deficiency (or limitation) at
2 the root level reduces tomato plant growth and N tissue concentration (Adamowicz & Le Bot
3 2008) whereas the concentrations of constitutive secondary compounds such as phenolic acids
4 and flavonoids are increased (Fritz *et al.* 2006, Larbat *et al.* 2012a, Larbat *et al.* 2012b, Larbat
5 *et al.* 2014, Le Bot *et al.* 2009) and also glycoalkaloids (Royer *et al.* 2013) in Solanaceae.
6 From the viewpoint of the plant, N fertilisation affects the inducible defence in a complex
7 way that depends on the pathway considered. Indeed, N limitation reduces the induction of
8 trypsin inhibitor and the accumulation of nicotine in infected tobacco, whereas it has no effect
9 on the induction of volatile terpenes (Lou & Baldwin 2004). From the insect viewpoint, plant
10 N fertilisation influences the development of various herbivores, especially lepidopterans,
11 through either (i) the plant nutritional value linked to tissue N concentration (Cates *et al.*
12 1987, Estiarte *et al.* 1994, Grundel *et al.* 1998, Han *et al.* 2014, Hunter & McNeil 1997, Inbar
13 *et al.* 2001, Schoonhoven *et al.* 2005), or (ii) the content of constitutive or induced chemical
14 compounds and mechanical plant defence (Gutbrodt *et al.* 2011, Koricheva 2002). The
15 relative importance of both effects on herbivore performance, however, is difficult to assess
16 and is likely pathosystem-specific.

17 The objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of N fertilisation on the ability of
18 tomato to resist to the leafminer *Tuta absoluta* (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). This
19 pest originating, from South America (Guillemaud *et al.* 2015), is now well established in
20 Europe, Africa and the middle East since its first appearance in Spain in 2006 (Desneux *et al.*
21 2011, Desneux *et al.* 2010). *Tuta absoluta* larvae feed exclusively on Solanaceae, tomato
22 plants being the major host. Leaf miners bring about serious leaf injuries, leading notably to
23 hydraulic damage and reduction in C acquisition (Aldea *et al.* 2005, Tang *et al.* 2006), which
24 eventually result in plant death. In tomato, *T. absoluta* is considered as a serious pest causing
25 large production losses. Because it is an emergent pest in Europe, data in the literature remain

1 insufficient to fully characterise the response patterns of tomato to *T. absoluta*, although these
2 are necessary to develop pest control strategies, especially connected to management practice.
3 A recent study from our group identified that water and N availabilities can modulate the
4 tomato susceptibility to *T. absoluta* infestation and the *T. absoluta* development (Han et al.,
5 2014). In this study, the physiological clues underlying these effects were not assessed. The
6 present study was thus designed to assess the impact of N availability on the tomato plant
7 response to *T. absoluta*. Our experimental strategy was to grow tomato plants hydroponically
8 in a greenhouse under two regimes of nitrogen fertilisation, one limiting plant growth (low
9 nitrogen: LN) and the other adequate for maximum growth (high nitrogen: HN). We
10 measured tissue composition in primary insect resources (total carbon, nitrogen, protein)
11 together with defensive compounds (phenolic compounds, glycoalkaloids, polyphenol
12 oxidase activity) in the vegetative parts of HN vs. LN tomato plants subjected to *T. absoluta*
13 infestation or maintained insect-free. The consequences of N fertilisation on leaf miner life
14 traits were determined and analysed in relation to the composition of plant tissues.

15 MATERIALS AND METHODS

16 *Plant growth, Tuta absoluta infestation and harvests*

17 This experiment was carried out under glasshouse conditions in Avignon (43°56'58" N,
18 4°48'32" E). Tomato seeds (*Solanum lycopersicum* L. var. Santa Clara) were sown in an NFT
19 (nutrient film technique) system set up in a growth room as described in Larbat *et al.* (2012a).
20 Twelve-day-old plantlets were then transferred to the glasshouse and grown from May 30th to
21 June 21th 2012 under the following conditions: heating when air temperature $\leq 18^{\circ}\text{C}$, ridge
22 opening when $\geq 25^{\circ}\text{C}$, mist spraying when humidity $\leq 55\%$. The glasshouse was whitewashed
23 to ease temperature control. Plants were grown hydroponically in six fully randomised blocks,
24 each providing a complete nutrient solution at two regimes of N concentration, respectively

1 representing high N (HN, 1.5 mM NO₃⁻) and low N (LN). In the latter, [NO₃⁻] was modified
2 once per day (from 10 μM to 30 μM) in order to maintain the daily NO₃⁻ uptake of LN plants
3 around 1/3rd of the value measured in the HN plants, using the Totomatix system (Adamowicz
4 *et al.* 2012). During the experiment, [NO₃⁻] and pH were corrected hourly in the nutrient
5 solutions. In both solutions the sum (NO₃⁻ + SO₄²⁻) = 12 eq m⁻³, inferring constant
6 concentrations of other ionic species in all treatments (Le Bot *et al.* 2009).

7 Insect preparation and infestation

8 To obtain the *T. absoluta* eggs the method of Chailleux *et al.* (2013) was used. Ten couples of
9 adult insects were maintained for 24 hours in a double-cup system containing a fresh tomato
10 leaf and honey provided as foodstuff, under the following conditions: air temperature 25°C,
11 65% relative humidity, 12/12h photoperiod. The adults laid eggs on this leaf. On the
12 following day, an artificial oviposition was carried out whereby the eggs were gently
13 transferred with a wet brush, to the terminal leaflet of the third leaf (counting from the base)
14 of nineteen-day-old plantlets growing in the greenhouse. A load of two eggs was placed on
15 each leaflet to maximise the chances of *T. absoluta* development. The infested leaves were
16 bagged *i.e.* enclosed using a nylon mesh (0.2 mm, 30 × 24 cm). The third leaf of the non-
17 infested plants (controls) was similarly bagged to take into account any possible effect of the
18 mesh on leaf growth and metabolism.

19 ***Harvests and sample preparation***

20 Three harvests were taken. The first (H1) was made on June 6th 2012 prior to *T. absoluta*
21 oviposition, to characterise plant morphology and biochemical composition before infestation.
22 The second (H2) and the third (H3) were taken 7 and 14 days respectively after *T. absoluta*
23 oviposition. At each harvest, leaves, stems and roots were separated. Leaves were sub-
24 sampled within the bulk foliage to separate the infested leaf (*i.e.* 3rd leaf from the base) and its

1 opposite leaf (*i.e.* 4th leaf), which served to test for systemic plant responses. Roots were
2 rinsed in deionised water and spin-dried (2 min at 2800 g). Plant parts were weighed, frozen
3 in liquid N₂ and stored at -80 °C until freeze-drying. Dried samples were weighed, ground to a
4 fine powder and stored under dry air in a desiccator at room temperature. In addition, at
5 harvests H2 and H3, the leaflets containing the larvae were weighed and a digital picture was
6 taken in order to calculate, by image processing, the number and the surface of mines dug by
7 the larvae.

8 ***Tuta absoluta* survival and development**

9 For each infested leaf harvested at H3, larvae survival was recorded. Each infested leaf was
10 thus kept in a double-cup system containing HN or LN nutrient solution as in the initial
11 treatment, until the larvae of *T. absoluta* pupated and the adult emerged. The pupae were
12 counted and weighed individually. The development time from egg to pupa or to adult was
13 recorded for all individuals.

14 ***Standards and chemicals***

15 Chlorogenic acid (5-CGA), rutin, kaempferol rutinoside, ferulic, p-coumaric and caffeic acids
16 were purchased from Sigma (Steinheim, Germany). Solanine and tomatine were obtained
17 from Extrasynthese (Genay, France). Caffeoylputrescine was kindly provided by Dr. Werck-
18 Reichhart (IBMP, Strasbourg, France).

19 ***Analyses of plant tissues***

20 Total C and N concentrations were determined using an elemental auto-analyser (Flash EA
21 1112 series, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Courtaboeuf, France), on 3 mg of dry powder,
22 according to the Dumas method.

1 Phenolics and tomatine were extracted from 20 mg dry powder of the infested and opposite
2 leaves, stems and roots as described in Royer *et al.* (2013). For tomatine quantification, the
3 extract was diluted fiftyfold in 70% MeOH containing 2 μ M solanine as internal standard.
4 The compounds, from undiluted and diluted extracts respectively, were separated on a U-
5 HPLC system (Prominence, Shimadzu, Japan) consisting in a binary solvent delivery pump
6 connected to a diode array detector. Two microliters of extract were separated on a C18
7 Zorbax Eclipse Plus (150 mm \times 2.1 mm, 1.8 μ m) column (Agilent, USA) by using a gradient
8 elution from 1 to 50% MeOH 0.1% formic acid (FA) in 7.1 min, then 99% MeOH 0.1% FA in
9 0.8 min with a flow rate of 430 μ l min^{-1} . The column was rinsed during 2 min with 99%
10 MeOH 0.1% FA and re-equilibrated to the initial conditions for 2 min prior to the next run.
11 Phenolic quantification was based on the area under peak determined at 320 nm and
12 expressed relative to calibration curves with ferulic acid (for FQA), chlorogenic acid (for 5-
13 CGA, 1-CGA, 4-CGA), coumaric acid (for pCoQA), caffeic acid (for CHA1-6),
14 caffeoylputrescine (for CP). Regarding flavonoids, quantification was determined at 350 nm
15 and expressed relative to calibration curves with rutin (for R and QAR) and kaempferol
16 rutinoside (for KR). Tomatine was detected by mass analysis carried out in ESI positive ion
17 mode (ESI+) by following the major ion at m/z 529. The internal standard, solanine, was
18 followed at m/z 868. Tomatine was quantified relative to a tomatine calibration curve (0.2-10
19 μ M). Mass spectrometric conditions were previously described in Royer *et al.* (2013).

20 ***Polyphenol oxidase and total protein assays***

21 Polyphenol oxidase (PPO) and total protein assays were made on H3 leaf extracts. All the
22 leaves of each individual plant were pooled, frozen in liquid nitrogen and crushed in a mortar.
23 Then, 50 mg of fresh weight (FW) were macerated, in a 2 ml tube, with 500 μ l cold extraction
24 buffer (sodium phosphate 0.1 M pH 7 with 3% polyvinylpolypyrrolidone (PVPP) and 1%
25 Triton X-100). This extract was mixed with a vortex for 1 min, then centrifuged at 10000 g

1 for 10 min. The supernatant was used for both the polyphenol oxidase assay and the total
2 protein assay.

3 PPO assay was carried out by mixing 20 µl of leaf extract with 200 µl of pre-warmed reaction
4 buffer (sodium phosphate 0.1 M pH 7 containing 3 mM caffeic acid). PPO activity was
5 determined by monitoring the appearance of quinone products from caffeic acid at 470 nm at
6 25°C. PPO global activity was then expressed as the rate of absorbance change per mg of FW
7 and PPO specific activity as the rate of absorbance per mg of total protein.

8 Protein quantification followed the Bradford procedure using bovine serum albumin as
9 standard. Concentration was expressed as mg protein per g of leaf FW.

10 ***Data processing***

11 Whole leaf and damaged areas, perimeters and mine numbers were determined by image
12 processing with Adobe Photoshop CS4 extended (Adobe systems Software, Ireland Ltd.).
13 Computations were performed using the R software (R project for statistical computing,
14 available at <http://www.r-project.org>) and statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Analyses
15 of variance were performed using the aov procedure, with nutrition, and infestation as fixed
16 factors and blocks as random. Box-plots, Normal Q-Q plots and correlation between variance
17 and mean, assessed the data distribution and homoscedasticity. Square root transformation
18 was necessary for homoscedasticity of third leaf weight data. *Tuta absoluta* survival on
19 tomato plants subjected to the nitrogen treatments was analysed using a log-linear model.
20 Proportions of individuals alive at each developmental stage were compared by pairwise
21 Fisher's exact tests (with the Dunn–Sidak adjustment method). The effects of the nitrogen
22 treatment on development time from egg to pupa stage and from egg to adult stage were
23 tested, as well as on pupal weight using a generalised linear model with a log-link function.

24 **RESULTS**

1 ***Impact of N and T. absoluta on plant growth***

2 In the LN treatment, the insect-free plants showed no visual symptom of N deficiency
3 throughout the entire experiment. However, they were markedly reduced in shoot FW as
4 compared with the HN plants (Table 1). At the first harvest, shoot FW was significantly
5 decreased ($p = 0.04$) by 21%, the difference between the two N regimes in favour of the HN
6 treatment increasing at harvests H2 (42%, $p = 2 \cdot 10^{-8}$) and H3 (66%, $p = 8 \cdot 10^{-18}$). For both N
7 treatments, infestation by *T. absoluta* did not significantly alter the shoot FW at H2 and H3.
8 However, the infestation specifically decreased the FW of the infested leaves at H2 and H3 in
9 the HN treatment ($p < 0.003$).

10 ***Tissue N concentration and C/N ratio***

11 At H3, tissue N concentration and C/N ratios were significantly altered by N nutrition (Fig 1.
12 A-B). Indeed, N limitation significantly reduced N concentrations ($p < 0.001$) and thus,
13 increased C/N ratios ($p < 0.001$) in all tissues. The effects were organ dependent ($p < 0.001$),
14 being more pronounced on stems. Insect feeding did not affect the N concentration or C/N
15 ratio of any tissue ($p = 0.13$ and 0.20 respectively).

16 ***Soluble phenolics***

17 The phenolic composition was highly dependent on plant organs (Sup. data 1). Fourteen
18 phenolic compounds *i.e.* six isomers of caffeoyl hexaric acid (CHA1-6), three isomers of
19 chlorogenic acid (5-CGA, 3-CGA and 1-CGA), feruloyl quinic acid (FQA), coumaroyl quinic
20 acid (pCoQA), rutin (R), quercetin apiosyl-rutinoside (QAR), kaempferol rutinoside (KR) and
21 caffoylputrescine (CP) were investigated (12 in infested and opposite leaves, 10 in stems and
22 3 in roots). Analyses were carried out for the three harvest periods (H1 to H3, all data are
23 detailed in Sup. data 2), but for the benefit of the reader, the 14 phenolic compounds were
24 pooled into 3 groups *i.e.* hydroxycinnamic acid derivatives (HCAD, comprising CHA1-6, 1-

1 CGA, 3-CGA, 5-CGA, pCoQA and FQA), flavonoids (FLA, comprising R, QAR and KR)
2 and phenolamides (PHE, comprising CP).

3 HCAD, FLA and PHE were distributed differently within the plant. HCAD and PHE were
4 detected in all plant organs (Sup. data 1-2) with the highest HCAD concentration in leaves
5 (infested and opposite, $p < 0.001$) and the highest PHE concentration in stems ($p < 0.001$).
6 FLA were detected only in shoots (Sup. data 1). The concentration of all phenolic groups
7 varied between harvests in all organs, but not in the same way (Sup. data 2). HCAD
8 concentrations were highest at H1 ($p < 0.001$) but did not differ significantly between H2 and
9 H3. PHE concentrations were highest at H1 and H2 then dropped markedly at H3 to reach
10 undetectable levels in opposite leaves. By contrast, FLA concentrations increased
11 significantly at H3 ($p < 0.001$). Nitrogen limitation did not affect HCAD and FLA
12 concentration at H1. However, LN clearly increased HCAD and FLA concentrations in all
13 organs at H2 and H3 ($p < 0.001$) (Fig. 2). LN reduced PHE concentrations in stems and roots
14 at H3 only. Insect feeding did not affect HCAD, FLA and PHE concentrations at any harvest
15 nor in any organ.

16 *Tomatine*

17 The concentration of tomatine, the major tomato glycoalkaloid involved in plant defence, was
18 determined in all plant organs at H2 and H3 (Fig. 3). Tomatine responded significantly to N
19 nutrition only in the stems, where its concentration increased under LN (H2 $p < 0.001$, H3 $p <$
20 0.05). Insect feeding significantly affected tomatine concentration in stems and roots at H2
21 with opposite effects. Indeed, tomatine concentration decreased in the roots of infested plants
22 ($p < 0.01$) while it increased in stems ($p < 0.01$). These effects disappeared at H3. Insect
23 feeding also brought about a small, non-significant ($p = 0.06831$) decrease in tomatine
24 concentration of infested leaves at H3.

1 ***Inducible responses of proteinaceous defence and total protein at H3***

2 The effects of N limitation and insect infestation on polyphenol oxidase (PPO) activity and
3 total protein content were assessed in infested and control leaves at H3 (Fig. 4 A, B, C). The
4 global PPO activity expressed on a leaf FW basis (Fig. 4-A) increased under *T. absoluta*
5 infestation. The effect was significant under HN ($p < 0.01$), but not under LN ($p = 0.32$). The
6 global PPO activity did not respond to N nutrition. By contrast, total protein concentration
7 (Fig. 4-B) responded significantly to N nutrition (infested and control leaves, $p < 0.001$) but
8 not to *T. absoluta* feeding ($p = 0.29$). The specific PPO activity expressed on a total protein
9 basis (Fig. 4-C) increased significantly in response to insect feeding in the HN treatment only
10 ($p < 0.05$). In addition, the specific PPO activity was higher under LN ($p < 0.001$) than under
11 HN.

12 ***Tuta absoluta traits***

13 The survival of *T. absoluta* (Fig. 5) decreased significantly in response to low N nutrition
14 ($\chi^2 = 4.8$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.028$) and varied with the insect's developmental stage ($\chi^2 = 11.9$,
15 $df = 3$, $p = 0.008$). The interaction between both factors was not significant ($\chi^2 = 2.5$, $df = 3$,
16 $p = 0.47$). Under LN, the survival rate was mainly reduced during the larval stage while under
17 HN, the survival rate did not differ significantly between egg and larva or egg and pupa
18 stages. It is only between egg and adult stages that it was possible to observe a significant
19 decrease in the survival rate of *T. absoluta*.

20 ***Tuta absoluta development***

21 Overall, the LN treatment significantly depressed pupal weight at H3 (Fig. 6-A; $\chi^2 = 6.4$,
22 $df = 1$, $p = 0.011$). Low N nutrition significantly increased the duration of insect development

1 from egg to pupa ($\chi^2 = 9.9$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.002$, Fig. 6-B), as well as from egg to adult ($\chi^2 = 4.6$,
2 $df = 1$, $p = 0.032$, Fig. 6-C).

3 DISCUSSION

4 ***Tuta absoluta* infestation slightly impaired plant growth and modified tissue composition in** 5 ***a N-dependent manner***

6 *Tuta absoluta* infestation generated moderate plant responses. It decreased FW accumulation
7 in the infested leaves, it enhanced PPO activity in HN leaves and brought about discrete and
8 transient modification of stem and root tomatine concentrations. Besides, as expected at this
9 short-term time scale, *T. absoluta* infestation did not alter the C/N ratio, or the concentrations
10 of N, proteins and phenolics in the vegetative organs. The small egg load during oviposition
11 (only two per plant) may not be the main reason for this moderate plant response. Indeed, in a
12 recent study, Mouttet *et al.* (2013) reported that the pre-infestation of tomato with three *T.*
13 *absoluta* larvae was enough to expand plant susceptibility to oïdium infection at a systemic
14 level, implying that plant physiology can respond to a small load of *T. absoluta* individuals.
15 Moreover, our recent unpublished data also confirm induction of response at a very low larval
16 density. The design of the experiment and harvest procedure may also have hindered an
17 existing stronger local response at the leaflet scale, however the study form Mouttet *et al.*
18 (2013) demonstrated the existence of a systemic tomato response to *T. absoluta*.

19 The low defensive response of tomato to *T. absoluta* could thus be explained by the insect
20 feeding mode. The plant response to *T. absoluta* has not been described previously neither on
21 tomato nor on other Solanaceous plants. But leaf mining effects on tomato have been
22 previously assessed in several studies on the serpentine leaf miner *Liriomyza sp* (Stout *et al.*,
23 1994, Inbar *et al.*, 1999, Kawazu *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, leaf mining by *Liriomyza trifolii* led,
24 also, to a smaller induction of defensive proteins in tomato plants (peroxidase, lysozyme) than

1 did other insects with other feeding guilds including leaf-chewing and sap-sucking (Stout et
2 al., 1994, Inbar et al., 1999). This stealthy effect may result from the signalling pathways
3 activated in response to the leaf miner infestation. A recent study highlighted that the
4 jasmonic acid (JA) pathway, which activates the expression of a large range of defensive
5 proteins in tomato, was induced only moderately and transiently before the leaf miners enter
6 the tissue, but not once the larvae were inside. On the contrary, once inside, the larvae
7 activated the salicylic acid (SA) pathway which acts antagonistically to the JA pathway
8 (Kawazu et al., 2012). The authors postulated that this SA activation pathway may be a
9 strategy of the leaf miner to decrease the JA-induced tomato defence. Since the low response
10 of tomato to *L. trifolii* and *T. absoluta* compared, a more in depth study should be conducted
11 to identify possible similarities in the plant response to these two leaf miners.

12 Tomato plants responded to *T. absoluta* infestation by activating some resistance mechanisms.
13 We observed in particular an increase in PPO activity in the leaves of the high N treatment.
14 Such an increase in PPO activity is a well-known response to chewing insects, and pathogens
15 (Mayer 2006, Stout *et al.* 1998) but, to our knowledge, this paper is the first to report such a
16 response for the tomato-*T. absoluta* pathosystem. The enzyme PPO catalyses the oxidation of
17 phenolic compounds into quinones, which can bind to amino acids. This accumulation of by-
18 products alters the plant nutritional quality and may also be toxic to the larvae (Constabel &
19 Barbehenn 2008). Additionally, the soluble phenolic compound concentrations in leaves and
20 other vegetative organs were not affected by *T. absoluta* infestation. A similar pattern
21 (induction of PPO with no impact on soluble phenolics) was previously shown in tomato
22 infested by the chewing insect *Helicoverpa zea* (Stout *et al.* 1998), indicating common tomato
23 response traits to different insect feeding guilds.

24 Although tomatine and more generally glycoalkaloids were previously described as toxic
25 compounds for many insect larvae (for review, see Friedman 2002), the effect of herbivory on

1 these compounds is scarcely documented and seems to depend on the insect feeding guild
2 (Fragoyannis *et al.* 2001, Hlywka *et al.* 1994). Our data show that *T. absoluta* infestation had
3 no significant effect on the foliar tomatine concentration but it induced limited and opposite
4 responses on stem (increase) and root (decrease) concentration at the second harvest, 7 days
5 after *T. absoluta* oviposition. This observation suggests the transport of tomatine from roots to
6 stems. However, a specific experiment is needed to confirm this hypothesis.

7 Leaf FW accumulation and PPO activity responded significantly to *T. absoluta* infestation
8 only under the HN treatment. Our results for PPO activity differ from other studies dealing
9 with leaf response to damage, which show that inductions of PPO and proteinase inhibitor,
10 another protein-based plant defence, were not affected by N availability in tomato (Stout *et al.*
11 1998, Tan *et al.* 2012). Our data, however, are in agreement with those of Lou & Baldwin
12 (2004), who showed that low nitrogen fertilisation reduced the magnitude of damage-induced
13 signalling pathways together with the accumulation of nicotine and trypsin inhibitor in
14 *Nicotiana attenuata* infested with the chewing insect *Manduca sexta*.

15

16 ***Low N nutrition altered T. absoluta development, plant growth and tissue composition***

17 LN nutrition significantly impaired the development of *T. absoluta*, by decreasing the survival
18 rate from egg to larvae, pupa and adult and by increasing the development time from egg to
19 adult. LN also reduced the pupa weight. These results accord fully with the observations of
20 Han *et al.* (2014) for the same pathosystem, and raise the question of how LN nutrition is able
21 to impair *T. absoluta* development. Our analyses of plant tissue composition (and particularly
22 the leaves) clearly indicate two possible explanations. Firstly, LN nutrition lowered the plant
23 nutritional value for *T. absoluta* by decreasing total N and protein concentrations and
24 increasing the C/N ratio. Since N concentration is higher in the herbivore than in plant tissues,

1 and because N-based compounds (notably proteins) are essential for larval growth, LN
2 conditions necessarily lower the grazing efficiency of the insect for biomass production, thus
3 impairing its development. The second explanation is that LN increased the level of tomato
4 plant constitutive defence, by increasing the concentration of glycoalkaloids and phenolic
5 compounds but not phenolamides. All these compounds are known to be toxic or repellant to
6 a large array of organisms including insects. Thus, we hypothesise that reduction in plant
7 nutritional quality and increase in constitutive defence both contribute to the observed effect
8 of LN on *T. absoluta* development. Our finding that PPO activity is not induced under LN
9 reinforces this view, and might also indicate low plant responsiveness to *T. absoluta* under N
10 limitation. To confirm these assumptions, however, it will be necessary to determine the
11 impact of LN on other tomato inducible responses. These include the induction of the methyl-
12 jasmonate pathway, the activity of other defensive enzymes and the emission of volatile
13 organic compounds, which have recently been shown to increase in *T. absoluta* infested
14 tomato plants (Strapasson *et al.* 2014).

15 From a practical viewpoint, lower N fertilisation input induced a lower survival and a sub-
16 optimal development status in *T. absoluta*, which may offer a possible means of pest
17 management strategy via manipulation of fertilisation regimes in managed cropping systems
18 (*i.e.* glasshouse tomato production). However, the efficiency of such a strategy should be
19 tested at population scales, by integrating the impact of *T. absoluta* infestation and the impact
20 of N itself on tomato yield, using different levels of N supply, since N supply is a detrimental
21 elemental governing tomato yield (Warner *et al.*, 2004). Furthermore, the induction of higher
22 chemical defence by *T. absoluta* may influence the fitness of other pest insects (*i.e.* aphids and
23 whiteflies), or the infection of plant pathogens, often coexisting in tomato crops (Moultet *et*
24 *al.* 2013). This might be even more complex when organisms from the higher trophic level
25 are involved (*i.e.* predators) (Bompard *et al.* 2013). Overall, the net effect of N fertilisation on

1 tomato plant health (or yield) depends on the interactions of various factors: the occurrence of
2 insect pests (single or multiple species), plant pathogens and natural enemies introduced into
3 the system.

4 The present study provided some clues concerning cross-responses of tomato plants and the
5 leaf miner *T. absoluta* to N nutrition. *T. absoluta* infestation led to a slight plant response,
6 restricted to induction of PPO activity and reduction of fresh weight accumulation in HN
7 plants. LN nutrition impeded PPO induction in infested plants but also impaired the
8 development of *T. absoluta*. This effect of LN nutrition on *T. absoluta* development may be
9 explained by the tissue composition of the LN-fed plants, which were depleted in primary
10 resources (total N and protein) and enriched in constitutive soluble defence molecules
11 (phenolic compounds and tomatine). Further investigation is necessary to assess the relative
12 contribution of the primary resource depletion and the constitutive defence accumulation on
13 *T. absoluta* development.

14 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

15 We acknowledge the assistance of J. Fabre, V. Serra, G. Garcia, P. Bearez, C. Hoeffler and A.
16 Fauvet for conducting the experiments and helping with harvests and analyses. We are also
17 grateful to C. Vigne for optimising the NFT system. We express our thanks to Dr. Ernest A.
18 Kirkby (Faculty of Biology, University of Leeds, UK) for revising this manuscript and
19 correcting the English style. This study was funded by the INRA Division "Environment and
20 Agronomy" ("Pari Scientifique" 2011, Taratata project).

21

1 REFERENCES

- 2 Adamowicz S., Le Bot J. (2008) Altering young tomato plant growth by nitrate and CO₂ preserves the
3 proportionate relation linking long-term organic-nitrogen accumulation to intercepted radiation.
4 *New Phytologist*, **180**, 663-672.
- 5 Adamowicz S., Le Bot J., Huanosto Magaña R., Fabre J. (2012) Totomatix: a novel automatic set-up to
6 control diurnal, diel and long-term plant nitrate nutrition. *Annals of Botany*, **109**, 309-319.
- 7 Aldea M., Hamilton J.G., Resti J.P., Zangerl A.R., Berenbaum M.R., de Lucia E.H. (2005) Indirect effects
8 of insect herbivory on leaf gas exchange in soybean. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **28**, 402-411.
- 9 Bentz J., Reeves I.J., Barbosa P., Francis B. (1995) Nitrogen fertilizer effect on selection.
10 *Environmental Entomology*, **24**, 40-45.
- 11 Bompard A., Jaworski C.C., Baerez P., Desneux N. (2013) Sharing a predator: can an invasive alien
12 pest affect the predation on a local pest? *Population Ecology*, **55**, 433-440.
- 13 Cardoso D.C., Martinati J.C., Giachetto P.F., Vidal R.O., Carazzolle M.F., Padilha L., Guerreiro-Filho O.,
14 Maluf M.P. (2014) Large-scale analysis of differential gene expression in coffee genotypes resistant
15 and susceptible to leaf miner - toward the identification of candidate genes for marker assisted-
16 selection. *BMC Genomics*, **15:66**.
- 17 Cates R.G., Henderson C.B., Redak R.A. (1987) Responses of the western spruce budworm to varying
18 levels of nitrogen and terpenes. *Oecologia*, **73**, 312-316.
- 19 Chailleux A., Biondi A., Han P., Tabone E., Desneux N. (2013) Suitability of the pest-plant system *Tuta*
20 *absoluta* (Lepidoptera:Gelechiidae)-tomato for *Trichogramma* (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae)
21 parasitoids and insights for biological control. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, **106**, 2310-2321.
- 22 Chen Y., Olson D.M., Ruberson J.R. (2010) Effects of nitrogen fertilization on tritrophic interactions.
23 *Arthropod-Plant Interactions*, **4(2)**, 81-94.
- 24 Connor E.F., Taverner M.P. (1997) The evolution and adaptative significance of the leaf-mining habit.
25 *Oikos*, **79**, 6625-6625.

1 Constabel C.P., Barbehenn R. (2008) Defensive Roles of Polyphenol Oxidase in Plants. In: Schaller A.
2 (Ed), *Induced Plant Resistance to Herbivory*. Springer Netherlands: 253-270.

3 Desneux N., Luna M.G., Guillemaud T., Urbaneja A. (2011) The invasive South American tomato
4 pinworm, *Tuta absoluta*, continues to spread in Afro-Eurasia and beyond - the new threat to tomato
5 world production. *Journal of Pest Science*, **84**, 403-408.

6 Desneux N., Wajnberg E., Wyckhuys K.A.G., Burgio G., Arpaia S., Narváez-Vasquez C.A., González
7 Cabrera J., Catalán Ruescas D., Tabone E., Frandon J., Pizzol J., Poncet C., Cabello T., Urbaneja A.
8 (2010) Biological invasion of European tomato crops by *Tuta absoluta*: ecology, geographic expansion
9 and prospects for biological control. *Journal of Pest Science*, **83**, 197-215.

10 Erb M., Meldau S., Howe G.A. (2012) Role of phytohormones in insect-specific plant reactions. *Trends*
11 *in Plant Sciences*, **17**, 250-259.

12 Estiarte M., Filella I., Serra J., Peñelas J. (1994) Effects of nutrient and water stress on leaf phenolic
13 content of peppers and susceptibility to generalist herbivore *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner).
14 *Oecologia*, **99**, 387-391.

15 Felton G.W., Summers C.B., Mueller A.J. (1994) Oxidative responses in soybean foliage to herbivory
16 by bean leaf beetle and three-cornered alfalfa hopper. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **20**, 639-649.

17 Fischer K., Fiedler K. (2000) Response of the copper butterfly *Lycaena tityrus* to increased leaf
18 nitrogen in natural food plants: evidence against the nitrogen limitation hypothesis. *Oecologia*, **124**,
19 235-241.

20 Fragoyannis D.A., McKinlay R.G., D'Mello J.P.F. (2001) Interactions of aphid herbivory and nitrogen
21 availability on the total foliar glycoalkaloid content of potato plants. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **27**,
22 1749-1762.

23 Friedman M. (2002) Tomato glycoalkaloids: role in the plant and in the diet. *Journal of Agricultural*
24 *and Food Chemistry*, **50**, 5751-5780.

1 Fritz C., Palacios-Rojas N., Feil R., Stitt M. (2006) Regulation of secondary metabolism by the carbon-
2 nitrogen status in tobacco: nitrate inhibits large sectors of phenylpropanoid metabolism. *The Plant*
3 *Journal*, **46**, 533-548.

4 Gomez S., Ferrieri R.A., Schueller M., Orians C. (2010) Methyl jasmonate elicits rapid changes in
5 carbon and nitrogen dynamics in tomato. *New Phytologist*, **188**, 835-844.

6 Gomez S., Steinbrenner A.D., Osorio S., Schueller M., Ferrieri R.A., Fernie A.R., Orians C.M. (2012)
7 From shoots to roots: transport and metabolic changes in tomato after simulated feeding by a
8 specialist lepidopteran. *Entomologia Experimentalis Et Applicata*, **144**, 101-111.

9 Grundel R., Pavlovic N.B., Sulzman C.L. (1998) The effect of canopy cover and seasonal change on
10 host plant quality for the endangered Karner blue butterfly (*Lycaeides melissa samuelis*). *Oecologia*,
11 **114**, 243-250.

12 Guillemaud T., Blin A., Le Goff I., Desneux N., Reyes C.M., Tabone E., Tsagkarakou A., Lombaert E.
13 (2015) The tomato borer, *Tuta absoluta*, invading the Mediterranean Basin, originates from a single
14 introduction from Central Chile. *Scientific Reports*, **5**, 8371.

15 Gutbrodt B., Mody K., Dorn S. (2011) Drought changes plant chemistry and causes contrasting
16 responses in lepidopteran herbivores. *Oikos*, **120**, 1732-1740.

17 Han P., Lavoit A.V., Le Bot J., Amiens-Desneux E., Desneux N. (2014) Nitrogen and water availability
18 to tomato plants triggers bottom-up effects on the leafminer *Tuta absoluta*. *Scientific Reports*, **4**, 44-
19 55.

20 Hlywka J.J., Stephenson G.R., Sears M.K., Yada R.Y. (1994) Effects of insect damage on glycoalkaloid
21 content in potatoes (*Solanum tuberosum*). *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, **42**, 2545-
22 2550.

23 Hunter M.D., McNeil J.N. (1997) Host-plant quality influences diapause and voltinism in a
24 polyphagous insect herbivore. *Ecology*, **78**, 977-986.

25 Inbar M., Doostdar H., Mayer R.T. (2001) Suitability of stressed and vigorous plants to various insect
26 herbivores. *Oikos*, **94**, 228-235.

1 Kempema L.A., Cui X., Holzer F.M., Walling L.L. (2007) Arabidopsis transcriptome changes in
2 responses to phloem-feeding silverleaf whitefly nymphs. Similarities and distinctions in responses to
3 aphids. *Plant Physiology*, **143**, 849-865.

4 Koricheva J. (2002) Meta-analysis of sources of variation in fitness costs of plant anti-herbivore
5 defenses. *Ecology*, **83**, 176-190.

6 Larbat R., Le Bot J., Bourgaud F., Robin C., Adamowicz S. (2012a) Organ-specific responses of tomato
7 growth and phenolic metabolism to nitrate limitation. *Plant Biology*, **14**, 760-769.

8 Larbat R., Olsen K.M., Slimestad R., Løvdaal T., Bénard C., Verheul M., Bourgaud F., Robin C., Lillo C.
9 (2012b) Influence of repeated short-term nitrogen limitations on leaf phenolics metabolism in
10 tomato. *Phytochemistry*, **77**, 119-128.

11 Larbat R., Paris C., Le Bot J., Adamowicz S. (2014) Phenolic characterization and variability in leaves,
12 stems and roots of Micro-Tom and patio tomatoes, in response to nitrogen limitation. *Plant Science*,
13 **224**, 62-73.

14 Le Bot J., Bénard C., Robin C., Bourgaud F., Adamowicz S. (2009) The "trade-off" between synthesis of
15 primary and secondary compounds in young tomato leaves is altered by nitrate nutrition:
16 experimental evidence and model consistency. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **60**, 4301-4314.

17 Lou Y., Baldwin I.T. (2004) Nitrogen supply influences herbivore-induced direct and indirect defenses
18 and transcriptional responses in *Nicotiana attenuata*. *Plant Physiology*, **135**, 496-506.

19 Mattson W.J. (1980) Herbivory in relation to plant nitrogen content. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
20 *Systematics*, **11**, 119-161.

21 Mayer A.M. (2006) Polyphenol oxidase in plants and fungi: going places? A review. *Phytochemistry*,
22 **67**, 2318-2331.

23 Mouttet R., Kaplan I, Bearez P., Amiens-Desneux E., Desneux N. (2013) Spatiotemporal patterns of
24 induced resistance and susceptibility linking diverse plant parasites. *Oecologia* **173**: 1379-1386 Olson
25 M.M., Roseland C.R. (1991) Induction of the coumarins scopletin and ayapin in sunflower by insect-

1 feeding stress and effects of coumarins on the feeding of sunflower beetle (Coleoptera:
2 Chrysomelidae). *Environmental Entomology*, **20**, 1166-1172.

3 Pieterse C.M.J., Leon-Reyes A., Van der Ent S., Van Wees S.C.M. (2009) Networking by small-molecule
4 hormones in plant immunity. *Nature Chemical Biology*, **5**, 308-316.

5 Royer M., Larbat R., Le Bot J., Adamowicz S., Robin C. (2013) Is the C:N ratio a reliable indicator of C
6 allocation to primary and defence-related metabolisms in tomato. *Phytochemistry*, **88**, 25-33.

7 Schmidt L., Schurr U., Röse U.S.R. (2009) Local and systemic effects of two herbivores with different
8 feeding mechanisms on primary metabolism of cotton leaves. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **32**, 893-
9 903.

10 Schoonhoven L.M., van Loon J.J.A., Dicke M. (2005) *Insect-plant biology*, 2nd Ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford
11 University Press; xvii + 421 pp.

12 Stout M.J., Brovont R.A., Duffey S.S. (1998) Effect of nitrogen availability on expression of constitutive
13 and inducible chemical defence in tomato, *Lycopersicon esculentum*. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **24**,
14 945-963.

15 Stout M.J., Workman J., Duffey S.S. (1994) Differential induction of tomato foliar proteins by
16 arthropod herbivores. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **20**, 2575-2593.

17 Strapasson P., Pinto-Zevallos D.M., Paudel S., Rajotte E.G., Felton G.W., Zarbin P.H.G. (2014)
18 Enhancing plant resistance at the seed stage: low concentrations of methyl-jasmonate reduce the
19 performance of the leaf miner *Tuta absoluta* but do not alter the behavior of its predator *Chrisoperla*
20 *externa*. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, **40**, 1090-1098.

21 Strauss S.Y., Agrawal A.A. (1999) The ecology and evolution of plant tolerance to herbivory. *Trends in*
22 *Ecology & Evolution*, **14**, 179-185.

23 Tan C.W., Chiang S.Y., Ravuiwasa K.T., Yadav J., Hwang S.S. (2012) Jasmonate-induced defenses in
24 tomato against *Helicoverpa armigera* depend in part on nutrient availability, but artificial induction
25 via methyl jasmonate does not. *Arthropod-Plant Interactions*, **6**, 534-541.

1 Tang J.Y., Zielinski R.E., Zangerl A.R., Crofts A.R., Berenbaum M.R., de Lucia E.H. (2006) The
2 differential effects of herbivory by first and fourth instars of *Trichoplusia ni* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)
3 on photosynthesis in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **57**, 527-536.
4 Tiffin P. (2000) Mechanisms of tolerance to herbivore damage: what do we know? *Evolutionary*
5 *Ecology*, **14**, 523-536.
6 Zangerl A.R., Hamilton J.G., Miller T.J., Crofts A.R., Oxborough K., Berenbaum M.R., de Lucia E.H.
7 (2002) Impact of folivory on photosynthesis is greater than the sum of its holes. *Proceedings of the*
8 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **99**, 1088-1091.
9 Zhang S., Zhang Z., Kang L. (2012) Transcriptome response analysis of *Arabidopsis thaliana* to
10 leafminer (*Liriomyza huidobrensis*). *BMC Plant Biology*, **12**, 234-234.

11

12

1 FIGURE LEGENDS

2 Figure 1: Effects of N supply and *T. absoluta* infestation on C/N ratio (A) and N
3 concentrations (B) in tomato vegetative organs at the third harvest (H3). Inf L: Infested leaf,
4 Opp L: Leaf opposite to the infestation site, S: Stem, R: Root. Error bars are standard error of
5 means (\pm SEM, n=6).

6 Figure 2: Effects of N supply and *T. absoluta* infestation on HCAD (A), FLA (B) and PHE
7 (C) concentrations in tomato vegetative organs at the third harvest (H3). Inf L: Infested leaf,
8 Opp L: Leaf opposite of the infestation site, S: Stem, R: Root. Error bars are standard error of
9 means (\pm SEM, n=6)

10 Figure 3: Effects of N supply and *T. absoluta* infestation on tomatine concentrations at the
11 second (H2) and third (H3) harvests in infested leaf (A), leaf opposite to the infestation site
12 (B), stem (C) and root (D). Error bars are standard error of means (\pm SEM, n=6).

13 Figure 4: Effects of N supply and *T. absoluta* infestation on global PPO activity (A), total
14 protein content (B) and specific PPO activity (C) in leaves at the third harvest (H3). Error bars
15 are standard error of means (\pm SEM, n=6).

16 Figure 5: Survival rate of *T. absoluta* individual eggs reaching larva, pupa or adult stage
17 feeding on HN or LN tomato plants (HN: high nitrogen; LN: low nitrogen; n=24) For each
18 nitrogen treatment, bars followed by the same letter are not significantly different (pairwise
19 Fisher's exact tests with Dunn–Sidak adjustment method).

20 Figure 6: (A) Mean pupal weight (mg, \pm SEM, n = 9-16); Mean development time (B) from
21 egg to pupa (days, \pm SEM, n = 9-16) and (C) from egg to adult (days, \pm SEM, n = 7-15) of *T.*
22 *absoluta* individuals feeding on HN or LN tomato plants (HN: high nitrogen; LN: low
23 nitrogen). * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ GLM analysis).

1 Supplemental data 1: U-HPLC chromatograms of soluble phenolics from vegetative organs of
2 tomato (cv. Santa Clara) grown under HN (high nitrogen) nutrition. The profiles were
3 recorded at 300 nm. A: leaf; B: stem; C: root. IS: Internal Standard.

4 Supplemental data 2: Concentration of phenolic compounds and tomatine in different tomato
5 organs in Control (= insect-free) or *T. absoluta* infested (= Tuta) plants harvested immediately
6 prior to infestation (H1), 7 days (H2) or 14 days (H3) after the infestation. Plants were grown
7 hydroponically in the greenhouse and supplied with a complete nutrient solution with either
8 high nitrogen (HN) or low nitrogen (LN) concentration. Inf L: Infested leaves, Opp L:
9 opposite leaves. All concentrations are given in $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ DW except for tomatine (in mg g^{-1}
10 DW). Molecules abbreviations as follows: CHA1-6 = six isomers of caffeoyl hexaric acid; 5-
11 CGA, 4-CGA and 1-CGA = three isomers of chlorogenic acid; FQA = feruloyl quinic acid;
12 pCoQA = coumaroyl quinic acid; R = rutin; QAR = quercetin apiosyl-rutinoside;
13 KR = kaemperol rutinoside; CP = caffoylputrescine; HCAD = hydroxycinnamic acid
14 derivatives (CHA1-6 + 1,4,5 CGA + FQA + pCoQA); FLA = flavonoids (R + KR + QAR).
15 Values are means of 6 replicates and are given \pm SE. nd: not defined.




Figure 1: Effects of N availability and *T. absoluta* infestation on CN ratio (A) and N concentrations (B) in tomato vegetative organs at the third harvest (H3). Inf L: Infested leaf, Opp L: Leaf opposite to the infestation site, S: Stem, R: Root. Error bars are standard error of means (\pm SEM, n=6).




Figure 2: Effects of N availability and *T. absoluta* infestation on HCAD (A), FLA (B) and PHE (C) concentrations in tomato vegetative organs at the third harvest (H3). Inf L: Infected leaf, Opp L: Leaf opposite to the infestation site, S: Stem, R: Root. Error bars are standard error of means (\pm SEM, n=6).




Figure 3: Effects of N availability and *T. absoluta* infestation on tomatine concentrations at the second (H2) and third (H3) harvests in infested leaf (A), leaf opposite to the infestation site (B), stem (C) and root (D). Error bars are standard error of means (\pm SEM, n=6).




Figure 4: Effects of N availability and *T. absoluta* infestation on global PPO activity (A), total protein content (B) and specific PPO activity (C) in leaves at the third harvest (H3). Error bars are standard error of means (\pm SEM, n=6).




Figure 5: Survival rate of *T. absoluta* individual eggs reaching larva, pupa or adult stage feeding on the tomato plants treated with HN or LN input (HN: high nitrogen; LN: low nitrogen; n=24) For each nitrogen treatment, bars followed by the same letter are not significantly different (pairwise Fisher's exact tests with Dunn–Sidak adjustment method).







Figure 6: (A) Pupal weight (mean \pm SEM, n = 9-16); Development time from (B) egg to pupa (mean \pm SEM, n = 9-16) and (C) from egg to adult (mean \pm SEM, n = 7-15) of *T. absoluta* feeding on high nitrogen (HN) vs. low nitrogen (LN) tomato plants. (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ GLM analysis).

	Harvests	Insect-free		Infested	
		HN	LN	HN	LN
Shoot	1	4.1 (0.4)	3.2 (0.3)	-	-
	2	38.4 (2.2)	22.3 (1.6)	34.3 (1.9)	23.6 (2.1)
	3	227.0 (13.1)	77.3 (3.9)	183.6 (12.3)	81.0 (5.5)
3rd Leaf	2	5.3 (0.4)	3.4 (0.4)	4.6 (0.4)	3.1 (0.2)
	3	9.8 (0.6)	4.4 (0.3)	6.6 (0.7)	4.4 (0.3)

Table 1 : Impact of N availability and *T. absoluta* feeding on the plant fresh weight (g/plant). n=12, standard errors are between brackets



Supplemental data 1: U-HPLC chromatograms of soluble phenolics from vegetative organs of tomato (cv. Santa Clara) grown under HN (high nitrogen) nutrition. The profiles were recorded at 300 nm. A: leaf; B: stem; C: root. IS: Internal Standard.

Supplemental data 2: Concentration of phenolic compounds and tomatine in different tomato organs in Control (= insect-free) or T. absoluta-infested (= Tuta) plants harvested immediately prior to infestation (H1), 7 days (H2) or 14 days (H3) after the infestation. Plants were grown hydroponically in the greenhouse and supplied with a complete nutrient solution with either high nitrogen (HN) or low nitrogen (LN) concentration. Inf L: Infested leaves, Opp L: opposite leaves. All concentrations are given in $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ DW except for tomatine (in mg g^{-1} DW). Molecules abbreviations as follows: CHA1-6 = six isomers of caffeoyl hexaric acid; 5-CGA, 4-CGA and 1-CGA = three isomers of chlorogenic acid; FQA = feruloyl quinic acid; pCoQA = coumaroyl quinic acid; R = rutin; QAR = quercetin apiosyl-rutinoside; KR = kaemperol rutinoside; CP = caffoylputrescine; HCAD = hydroxycinnamic acid derivatives (CHA1-6 + 1,4,5 CGA + FQA + pCoQA); FLA = flavonoids (R + KR + QAR). Values are means of 6 replicates and are given \pm SE. nd: not defined.

Inf L

Harvests	Nutr	Treat	CHA1	CHA2	CHA3	CHA4	CHA5	CHA6	5CGA	1CGA	AR	R	KR	FQA	CP	Tomatin (mg/g DW^{-1})	HCAD	FLA
H1	HN	Control	514 \pm 91	37 \pm 7	739 \pm 136	5070 \pm 588	137 \pm 25	420 \pm 58	3000 \pm 228	133 \pm 34	109 \pm 7	636 \pm 20	241 \pm 10	36 \pm 2	80 \pm 13	nd	10088 \pm 1114	986 \pm 25
	LN	Control	788 \pm 65	54 \pm 4	1206 \pm 110	6422 \pm 667	108 \pm 25	575 \pm 69	2949 \pm 288	135 \pm 29	112 \pm 5	694 \pm 70	250 \pm 9	34 \pm 2	67 \pm 10	nd	12273 \pm 1194	1057 \pm 69
H2	HN	Control	293 \pm 20	18 \pm 2	541 \pm 44	2875 \pm 175	29 \pm 2	340 \pm 17	1601 \pm 109	70 \pm 4	59 \pm 16	651 \pm 42	99 \pm 5	28 \pm 2	107 \pm 14	7.5 \pm 1.0	5796 \pm 324	810 \pm 52
	HN	Tuta	281 \pm 32	20 \pm 2	518 \pm 62	2814 \pm 253	27 \pm 2	340 \pm 26	1589 \pm 131	75 \pm 7	63 \pm 6	695 \pm 55	104 \pm 12	30 \pm 2	113 \pm 11	7.2 \pm 0.6	5691 \pm 490	862 \pm 72
	LN	Control	478 \pm 19	27 \pm 4	951 \pm 51	4171 \pm 153	46 \pm 2	574 \pm 39	1848 \pm 197	81 \pm 9	88 \pm 5	1024 \pm 73	165 \pm 10	32 \pm 1	118 \pm 8	7.8 \pm 1.2	8208 \pm 242	1277 \pm 85
	LN	Tuta	422 \pm 31	27 \pm 2	836 \pm 73	3714 \pm 234	44 \pm 5	506 \pm 22	1638 \pm 144	73 \pm 7	79 \pm 9	914 \pm 80	152 \pm 12	29 \pm 2	113 \pm 16	9.2 \pm 0.8	7289 \pm 404	1145 \pm 99
H3	HN	Control	385 \pm 44	16 \pm 4	805 \pm 95	2574 \pm 300	42 \pm 9	535 \pm 36	967 \pm 158	54 \pm 16	326 \pm 26	1606 \pm 150	185 \pm 13	43 \pm 4	45 \pm 11	9.4 \pm 0.7	5421 \pm 462	2117 \pm 167
	HN	Tuta	405 \pm 31	18 \pm 3	860 \pm 70	2563 \pm 155	41 \pm 6	634 \pm 64	1004 \pm 142	52 \pm 13	431 \pm 129	1617 \pm 227	179 \pm 21	40 \pm 7	36 \pm 7	6.5 \pm 1.0	5619 \pm 309	2226 \pm 245
	LN	Control	660 \pm 89	25 \pm 3	1534 \pm 225	3947 \pm 392	61 \pm 9	981 \pm 127	1710 \pm 228	48 \pm 2	409 \pm 49	2195 \pm 7287	263 \pm 37	67 \pm 10	28 \pm 6	7.7 \pm 0.4	9723 \pm 709	3117 \pm 299
	LN	Tuta	539 \pm 38	22 \pm 3	1280 \pm 85	3618 \pm 248	52 \pm 6	855 \pm 50	1868 \pm 115	65 \pm 16	487 \pm 22	2607 \pm 111	304 \pm 19	86 \pm 9	26 \pm 5	6.3 \pm 1.0	8388 \pm 420	3398 \pm 149

Opp L

Harvests	Nutr	Treat	CHA1	CHA2	CHA3	CHA4	CHA5	CHA6	5CGA	1CGA	AR	R	KR	FQA	CP	Tomatin (mg/g DW^{-1})	HCAD	FLA
H2	HN	Control	329 \pm 52	22 \pm 6	637 \pm 146	2889 \pm 567	38 \pm 9	360 \pm 43	1141 \pm 253	56 \pm 13	50 \pm 8	510 \pm 98	83 \pm 16	24 \pm 4	8 \pm 3	5.7 \pm 0.8	5497 \pm 1100	644 \pm 120
	HN	Tuta	363 \pm 40	24 \pm 5	708 \pm 80	3126 \pm 312	43 \pm 5	358 \pm 22	1197 \pm 185	63 \pm 8	59 \pm 9	681 \pm 93	99 \pm 14	25 \pm 3	16 \pm 5	7.7 \pm 0.9	5908 \pm 634	839 \pm 115
	LN	Control	651 \pm 20	29 \pm 7	1316 \pm 40	5372 \pm 268	62 \pm 2	550 \pm 18	1539 \pm 79	66 \pm 5	98 \pm 8	968 \pm 64	157 \pm 13	31 \pm 2	14 \pm 4	7.7 \pm 0.9	9617 \pm 307	1223 \pm 81
	LN	Tuta	508 \pm 53	33 \pm 4	1050 \pm 110	4209 \pm 498	52 \pm 6	464 \pm 48	1234 \pm 222	54 \pm 11	78 \pm 12	767 \pm 132	136 \pm 21	24 \pm 3	11 \pm 4	9.2 \pm 0.6	7629 \pm 858	980 \pm 164
H3	HN	Control	185 \pm 11	10 \pm 1	440 \pm 27	1322 \pm 66	23 \pm 2	542 \pm 16	236 \pm 417	25 \pm 4	95 \pm 7	532 \pm 39	58 \pm 4	13 \pm 2	0	6.7 \pm 0.9	2797 \pm 125	685 \pm 47
	HN	Tuta	170 \pm 22	8 \pm 2	407 \pm 49	1223 \pm 145	21 \pm 3	488 \pm 57	224 \pm 30	18 \pm 2	78 \pm 13	574 \pm 113	57 \pm 10	11 \pm 2	0	8.8 \pm 1.6	2570 \pm 300	709 \pm 135
	LN	Control	560 \pm 38	27 \pm 1	1398 \pm 77	3237 \pm 237	61 \pm 4	1355 \pm 54	659 \pm 86	56 \pm 9	214 \pm 27	1100 \pm 184	147 \pm 24	23 \pm 3	0	8.8 \pm 0.8	7377 \pm 541	1461 \pm 233
	LN	Tuta	534 \pm 38	25 \pm 2	1357 \pm 104	3075 \pm 195	58 \pm 6	1361 \pm 91	525 \pm 37	38 \pm 2	185 \pm 21	905 \pm 146	120 \pm 21	18 \pm 2	0	9.7 \pm 1.2	6991 \pm 423	1210 \pm 187

Stems

Harvests	Nutr	Treat	CHA1	CHA3	CHA4	4CGA	5CGA	1CGA	AR	R	FQA	pCoQA	CP	Tomatin (mg/g DW^{-1})	HCAD	FLA
H1	HN	Control	228 \pm 31	301 \pm 44	1614 \pm 89	34 \pm 6	2392 \pm 165	55 \pm 4	nd	594 \pm 43	89 \pm 5	21 \pm 2	188 \pm 23	nd	4733 \pm 298	594 \pm 43
	LN	Control	291 \pm 24	375 \pm 34	1438 \pm 131	39 \pm 9	2173 \pm 162	52 \pm 2	nd	485 \pm 58	94 \pm 5	19 \pm 2	1689 \pm 16	nd	4482 \pm 303	485 \pm 59
H2	HN	Control	39 \pm 6	67 \pm 9	403 \pm 60	49 \pm 8	847 \pm 139	56 \pm 11	42 \pm 4	351 \pm 28	45 \pm 5	11 \pm 1	197 \pm 33	4.6 \pm 0.3	1734 \pm 96	407 \pm 31
	HN	Tuta	46 \pm 4	81 \pm 8	436 \pm 34	66 \pm 8	967 \pm 53	66 \pm 7	47 \pm 8	367 \pm 24	51 \pm 3	12 \pm 1	201 \pm 12	5.2 \pm 0.4	1725 \pm 98	413 \pm 32
	LN	Control	98 \pm 10	167 \pm 18	616 \pm 36	70 \pm 5	1112 \pm 66	57 \pm 5	74 \pm 7	527 \pm 27	64 \pm 5	13 \pm 1	153 \pm 12	6.9 \pm 0.2	2198 \pm 119	600 \pm 33
	LN	Tuta	69 \pm 11	120 \pm 19	501 \pm 85	46 \pm 9	908 \pm 163	52 \pm 11	59 \pm 7	484 \pm 43	53 \pm 7	11 \pm 1	145 \pm 23	8.5 \pm 0.6	2052 \pm 68	549 \pm 54
H3	HN	Control	31 \pm 6	50 \pm 10	175 \pm 36	104 \pm 21	513 \pm 157	13 \pm 3	216 \pm 15	695 \pm 62	27 \pm 6	29 \pm 5	32 \pm 13	4.4 \pm 0.6	943 \pm 225	911 \pm 73
	HN	Tuta	33 \pm 4	56 \pm 6	237 \pm 30	132 \pm 8	769 \pm 154	17 \pm 2	232 \pm 30	689 \pm 47	47 \pm 7	33 \pm 5	59 \pm 19	5.0 \pm 0.4	1324 \pm 211	921 \pm 72
	LN	Control	79 \pm 9	146 \pm 17	423 \pm 37	185 \pm 17	1311 \pm 110	36 \pm 2	484 \pm 36	270 \pm 13	47 \pm 11	59 \pm 8	38 \pm 9	7.5 \pm 1.1	2287 \pm 176	1754 \pm 165
	LN	Tuta	81 \pm 6	144 \pm 10	429 \pm 48	231 \pm 16	1393 \pm 166	38 \pm 2	566 \pm 24	1332 \pm 49	61 \pm 12	58 \pm 5	23 \pm 3	7.2 \pm 0.7	2435 \pm 239	1898 \pm 69

Roots

Harvests	Nutr	Treat	5CGA	1CGA	CP	Tomatin (mg/g DW ⁻¹)	HCAD
H1	HN	Control	670 ± 109	5.4 ± 0.6	72 ± 17	nd	675 ± 110
	LN	Control	557 ± 73	5.5 ± 1.1	51 ± 12	nd	562 ± 74
H2	HN	Control	265 ± 41	29 ± 6.5	27 ± 7	8.9 ± 0.5	294 ± 44
	HN	Tuta	272 ± 49	23 ± 5.3	34 ± 5	5.9 ± 0.8	295 ± 51
	LN	Control	363 ± 46	35 ± 4.9	22 ± 7	7.9 ± 0.5	399 ± 46
	LN	Tuta	449 ± 74	37 ± 6.1	19 ± 3	6.9 ± 0.6	486 ± 69
H3	HN	Control	154 ± 39	9.9 ± 1.7	22 ± 5	13 ± 0.8	163 ± 39
	HN	Tuta	162 ± 20	5.6 ± 0.7	19 ± 2	13 ± 0.8	167 ± 20
	LN	Control	439 ± 71	9.0 ± 1.0	2.3 ± 0.4	13 ± 1.2	448 ± 72
	LN	Tuta	652 ± 82	12 ± 0.8	3.2 ± 0.7	14 ± 2.0	664 ± 84