BABA-induced pathogen resistance: a multi-omics analysis of the tomato response reveals a hyper-receptive status involving ethylene

Martina Zapletalová, Corinne Rancurel, Benoit Industri, Marc Bardin, Kevin Lebrigand, Philippe C. Nicot, Virginie Magnone, Aurélie Seassau, Pascal Barbry, David Potěšil, et al.

Title: BABA-induced pathogen resistance: a multi-omics analysis of the tomato response reveals a hyper-receptive status involving ethylene

Running title: The multi-omics analysis of BABA-treated tomato

Martina Zapletalová (martinazapletalova@mail.muni.cz) [1, 2#], Corinne Rancurel (corinne.rancurel@inrae.fr) [1#], Benoit Industri (Benoit.Industri@inrae.fr) [1], Marc Bardin (marc.bardin@inrae.fr) [3], Kevin Le Brigand (lebrigand@ipmc.cnrs.fr) [4], Philippe Nicot (philippe.nicot@inrae.fr) [3], Virginie Magnone (magnone@ipmc.cnrs.fr) [4], Aurélie Seassau (aurelie.seassau@.inra.fr) [1], Pascal Barbry (barbry@ipmc.cnrs.fr) [4], David Potěšil (dpotesil@mail.muni.cz) [5], Zbyněk Zdráhal (zdrahal@sci.muni.cz) [5], Michel Ponchet (michel.ponchet@inrae.fr) [1], and Jan Lochman (jlochman@sci.muni.cz) [2*]

[1] INRAE 1355, CNRS 6254, Université Côte d'Azur, UMR Institut Sophia Agrobiotech, 400, Route des Chappes, 06903 Sophia Antipolis, France

[2] Department of Biochemistry, Faculty of Science, Masaryk University, Kotlářská 2, 61137 Brno, Czech Republic

[3] INRAE, Unité 407 Pathologie végétale, Domaine Saint-Maurice, 84143 Montfavet cedex, France

[4] Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS 7275, UMR Institut de Pharmacologie Moléculaire et Cellulaire, 660 Route des Lucioles 06560 Valbonne, France

[5]Central European Institute of Technology, Masaryk University, Kamenice 5, 625 00 Brno, Czech Republic

# co-first authors who equally contributed to the work

* Corresponding authors: Jan Lochman (email: jlochman@sci.muni.cz, Tel: +420549495602, Fax: +420549492690)

1. ABSTRACT

Prior exposure to microbial-associated molecular patterns or specific chemical compounds can promote plants into a primed state with stronger defence responses. β-aminobutyric acid (BABA) is an endogenous stress metabolite that induces resistance protecting various plants towards diverse stresses. In this study, by integrating BABA-induced changes in selected metabolites with transcriptome and proteome data, we generated a global map of the molecular processes operating in BABA-induced resistance (BABA-IR) in tomato. BABA significantly restricts the growth of the pathogens *Oidium neolycopersici* and *Phytophthora parasitica* but not *Botrytis cinerea*. A cluster analysis of the upregulated processes showed that BABA acts mainly as a stress factor in tomato. The main factor distinguishing BABA-IR from other stress conditions was the extensive induction of signaling and perception machinery playing a key role in effective resistance against pathogens. Interestingly, the signalling processes and immune response activated during BABA-IR in tomato differed from those in *Arabidopsis* with substantial enrichment of genes associated with jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene (ET) signalling and no change in Asp levels. Our results revealed key differences between the effect of BABA on tomato and other model plants studied until now. Surprisingly, salicylic acid (SA) is not involved in BABA downstream signalization whereas ET and JA play a crucial role.

2. INTRODUCTION

Throughout their lives, plants are constantly exposed to many stressful situations caused by changing environmental conditions or attacks by various pests and pathogenic microorganisms. Therefore, they have evolved structural barriers, microbicidal secondary metabolites, and inducible defence mechanisms to repel potential attackers. Unfortunately, the basal immune responses of plants are usually only sufficient to slow their colonisation by pathogens. As a result, a significant portion of the world's plant production is destroyed each year by fungi, oomycetes, bacteria, insects, and nematodes [1]. Although plants do not have the adaptive immune system of vertebrates, it has long been known that components of the innate immune system of plants can learn from the past [2]. When exposed to microbe-associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) or specific chemical compounds, plants can enter a state of enhanced defence characterised by more rapid and robust responses to stressful stimuli. Although the term "defence priming" was proposed in the 1930s, the molecular mechanisms underlying this phenomenon have only recently been partially elucidated, particularly in the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* [3,4]. Defence priming causes increased expression of genes related to stress and defence [5], including many transcription factors that regulate defence [6], and is now considered an essential component of several types of systemic

plant immunity, including acquired systemic acquired resistance (SAR), induced systemic resistance (ISR) [3,7], wound-induced resistance [8], and resistance induced by chemical compounds. Unlike strategies based on single resistance genes, defence priming activates multigenic defence mechanisms, conferring relatively durable resistance [3]. One of the most effective priming agents is the non-protein amino acid β-aminobutyric acid (BABA), which protects various plant species against a wide range of stresses [9]. Importantly, this resistance is long-lasting and can be transferred to vegetative progeny [10,11]. BABA was previously considered a xenobiotic, but it has recently been shown to accumulate in stress-exposed plants [12], suggesting that it is an endogenous stress metabolite [13]. BABA induces resistance via the action of several hormones, including salicylic acid (SA) [14,15], jasmonic acid (JA) [16], abscisic acid (ABA) [17], and ethylene (ET) [15]; the signalling pathway that is activated appears to depend strongly on the particular plant-pathogen combination [6]. Recently, it was discovered that the aspartyl-tRNA synthetase (AspRS) IBI1 in *Arabidopsis thaliana* serves as an enantiomer-specific BABA receptor that interacts with the transcription factors VOZ1 and VOZ2 [17,18]. In BABA -primed cells, this interaction represses the expression of ABA genes, resulting in increased expression of PTI genes and callose-associated defence [17]. The previous study of our laboratory showed that, as in potato, effective BABA-IR is also associated with the formation of HR -like lesions in tomato [19]. However, while BABA-IR appears to activate SA signalling pathways in *Arabidopsis* and potato plants, our results suggest that ET signalling pathways play a key role in BABA-IR in tomato plants [19].

Here, we present a study in which a combination of nontargeted approaches was used to elucidate the molecular basis of BABA-IR in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* cv. *Marmande*), an important crop [20]. BABA was applied by spraying onto leaves, as this application strategy is easy to implement in practical agriculture. Global transcriptomic and proteomic analysis of tomato plants allowed us to identify the molecular processes and signalling pathways that occur in tomato at BABA-IR.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Growth of pathogens having different lifestyles after BABA treatment

To determine the protective effect of BABA treatment towards pathogens with different lifestyles (biotrophic *Oidium neolycopersici*, hemibiotrophic *Phytophthora parasitica*, and necrotrophic *Botrytis cinerea)* in *S. lycopersicum* cv. *Marmande* plants, we treated plants with 10 mM BABA. This dose was selected based on a previous study [21] showing maximal (95%) protection against *Phytophthora infestans* with no effect on the general growth of the *S. lycopersicum* cv. F1 hybrid cv Baby plants. Indeed, BABA was unable to trigger effective resistance, in our experimental

conditions, below concentration of 5mM, as shown previously [21]. More than two days after treatment we observed not reproducibly the appearance of HR-like microlesions on some BABA spayed leaves (S1 Fig) not connected to plant age or leaf position, as described previously [21]. BABA treatment significantly reduced the sporulation of *O. neolycopersici* and the spreading of *P. parasitica* but had no effect on *B. cinerea* disease (Fig 1A). These findings are in agreement with previous studies showing that BABA-IR to biotrophic and hemibiotrophic pathogens in tomato and potato plants but gave inconsistent results against the necrotrophic pathogen *B. cinerea*, possibly due to the use of different methods to evaluate resistance [22–24].



Figure 1. Resistance, Transcriptomic, and Proteomic changes associated with BABA-IR, overlap between BABA-induced genes in different plant species and overlap between genes induced by BABA and selected elicitors. (A) Lesion surface area in 6-8 weeks-old tomato plants after spraying with 10 mM followed by challenge with the phytopathogens *Botrytis cinerea*, *Phythophtora parasitica*, and *O. neolycopersici*. (B) Total numbers of differentially expressed genes and proteins during BABA-IR (calculated as the ratio of the expression in 10 mM BABA-sprayed and water-sprayed leaves) 24 h after treatment. Cut-offs of a ≥2-fold difference in expression and $P \leq 0.01$ (for genes) or $P \leq 0.05$ (for proteins) were applied. The number of genes or proteins in each category is shown. (C) Degrees of overlap between orthologous groups identified in this study and previous transcriptomic

studies on BABA-treated potato (Bengtsson et al., 2014) and *Arabidopsis* plants (Zimmerli et al., 2008). (D) Overlap between genes induced in BABA-treated tomato Marmande plants and in tomato Rio Grande (RG)-PtoR resistant plants during MTI, ETI, or both (Pombo et al., 2014). (E) Overlap between genes induced in BABA-treated tomato Marmande plants and in tomato plants treated with the virulence factors coronatine (COR) from *Pst* DC3000 (Geng et al., 2014), flagellin from *P. syringae* (Rosli et al., 2013), and elicitin INF1 secreted by *P. infestans* (Kawamura, 2009). Induced genes were identified by applying cut-offs of a ≥2-fold difference in expression and P <0.05.

3.2 Transcriptome and proteome modifications during BABA-IR in tomato

Three leaf biological replicates were sampled 24 h and 48 h after spraying with 10 mM BABA. Six samples collected at 24 hrs were used for RNA sequencing and six samples collected at 48 hrs were used for label-free LC-MS/ analysis of the proteome excluding microsomal fraction (thereafter proteome). RNA sequencing generated 334,275,668, high-quality reads with an average of 55,712,611 reads per sample (S1 Table). The reads for each sample were mapped to the *S. lycopersicum* reference genome sequence, with 74% of reads being mapped successfully. Only genes with a median count above 20% in at least one treatment were considered in the subsequent analysis. The cut-offs used in the comparison were $P < 0.01$, and ≥ 2-fold expression change. Using these criteria, we identified 24,562 genes from 34,725 annotated genes (ITAG 2.4), with 1,523 genes being differentially expressed (Fig 1B, S2 Table). In the proteome analysis, protein identification was only performed for peptides of at least six amino acids with a statistically significant peptide score ($q < 0.01$, FDR 1 %; FDR based on decoy search against the reverse database). The cut-offs used for the comparison were $q < 0.05$ and ≥ 2-fold expression change. Using these criteria, we identified 1808 protein groups (S3 Table) and 319 differentially expressed proteins (Fig 1B, S2 Table). As with the transcriptome, we found that far more proteins were upregulated (67%) than downregulated (33%) after BABA treatment (Fig 1B, S2 Table), however the correlation between proteins and transcripts changes was only about 10% as discussed previously [25]. These results confirm that BABA treatment causes extensive reprogramming of cellular processes in tomato plants, as previously observed in *Arabidopsis* and potato [22,26] . However, a comparison of orthologous groups between our transcriptomic study and previous studies on *Arabidopsis* [26] and potato [22] plants exposed to BABA revealed significantly greater overlap between the potato and tomato datasets than between *Arabidopsis* and tomato (Fig 1C, S4 Table).

3.3 BABA exhibits common features with MAMPs-triggered immunity in tomato

Sets of genes whose transcript abundance was specifically increased at 6 hours post-infection (hpi) during MAMPs-triggered immunity (MTI) and effector-triggered immunity (ETI) were recently identified using RNA-Seq technology in tomato Rio Grande (RG)-PtoR resistant plants [27].

Interestingly, almost 50% of the BABA-upregulated genes were also differentially regulated during MTI, but there was no overlap between ETI-upregulated genes and BABA treatment (Fig 1D, S5 Table). Following this result, the response of tomato plants to BABA was far more similar to that induced by exposure to a well-characterized MAMP flagellin flgII-28 from the bacterium *Pseudomonas syringae* [28] or elicitin INF1 secreted by *Phytophthora infestans* [29] than to the response induced by the virulence factor coronatine (COR) secreted by *Pst* DC3000 [30] (Fig 1E, S5 Table). Specifically, almost 48% and 57% of BABA-upregulated genes were also upregulated following exposure to flgII-28 analysed using RNA-Seq technology at 6 hpi [28] and INF1 analysed using a GeneChip tomato genomic array 12 hpi [31], respectively. Almost 85 % of COR-upregulated genes analysed using a TOM1 cDNA microarray 24 hpi of tomato var "Glamour" seedlings [32] were unaffected by BABA treatment (Fig 1E, S5 Table). The only genes upregulated by both BABA and COR were associated with ET (ACC synthase and ACC oxidase) and JA signalling pathways.

3.4 BABA functions as a stress factor

A gene ontology (GO) term enrichment analysis was performed to identify critical processes upregulated by BABA treatment. The sets of terms obtained using the transcriptomic and proteomic data were similar (S2 Fig, S6 Table), with many common terms in the GO categories "Process" and "Function".

The protein-protein interaction network based on RNA-Seq data was generated by directly mapping upregulated genes to proteins in the String database [33] (Fig 2A, S7 Table). The network is highly aggregated with clustered sub-networks comprising proteins associated with defence responses (PR proteins), JA and ET signalling and synthesis, regulation of transcription related to mitogen-activated protein kinase MPK3, and processes related to reactive oxygen species (ROS) production. This is also consistent with maps produced after the ReviGO [34] analysis showing significant enrichment of stress-associated clusters (S2 Fig, S6 Table). The protein-protein interaction network based on proteins exhibiting significant changes in abundance 48 hours after BABA treatment (Fig 2B, S7 Table) featured notable clusters relating to photosynthesis, secondary metabolite biosynthesis, and translation. The photosynthesis cluster shows that BABA induces complex changes in the regulation of photosynthesis-related energetic processes and carbohydrate metabolism. The cluster related to secondary metabolites includes the enzymes prephenate aminotransferase (PAT), arginase (ARG2), and lactate dehydrogenase. PAT plays a role in the biosynthesis of aromatic amino acids, while lactate dehydrogenase plays an important role in detoxifying D-lactate, a product of the glyoxalase pathway for detoxifying methylglyoxal, which accumulates under stress conditions [35]. The arginase in tomato leaves was suggested to be involved in ROS homeostasis when its expression was induced by JA signalling following wounding

and exposure to *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* strain DC3000 [36]. The upregulation of the proteins in the cluster related to translation is probably related to translational switching from growth to defence [37] and supports the reported role of non-canonical functions of aminoacyl-tRNA synthetase in BABA responses [18].



Figure 2. Transcriptomic and proteomic comparisons of plants treated with BABA revealed the existence of sets of genes and proteins that are specifically induced during BABA-IR. Protein-protein association networks were generated for significantly induced (A) genes and (B) proteins, applying cut-offs of a ≥2-fold difference in expression and P ≤ 0.01 (for genes) or P ≤ 0.05 (for

proteins). Interaction networks were constructed in STRING using a minimum required interaction score of 0.7 [33] and visualized with Cytoscape [96].

To distinguish between stress-related genes upregulated following BABA treatment and defence-related genes involved in BABA-IR, we compared the BABA-upregulated genes to the sets of genes upregulated in previous transcriptomic studies on tomato plants subjected to temperature [38] and salinity [39] stress as well as those upregulated in tomato plants infected by the fungus *Stemphylium lycopersici* [40] and the FIRE (flagellin-induced repressed by effectors) genes, which represent a pathogen-defined core set of immune-related genes [28]. We found that 50% of the BABA-upregulated genes overlapped only with the sets of genes upregulated by abiotic stress, confirming the hypothesis that BABA acts on tomato plants primarily as a stress factor. However, 30 % of the BABA-upregulated genes were also FIRE genes or genes upregulated following *S. lycopersici* infection, suggesting that these genes are associated with BABA-augmented defence expression against *P. parasitica* and *O. neolycopersici*. Moreover, about 20% of genes unique to the BABA treatment were significantly enriched in KEGG pathways related to plant-pathogen interaction, MAPK signalling, and phenylpropanoid synthesis, indicating that these genes are also involved in BABA-IR (Fig 3B, S5 Table).

A



B

Intersection BABA/Abiotic Stress			
Category	ID	GO Term/Pathway	FDR
Process	GO:0045449	regulation of transcription	2.9E-02
	GO:0010468	regulation of gene expression	2.9E-02
	GO:0009889	regulation of biosynthetic process	2.9E-02
Function	GO:0030528	transcription regulator activity	1.4E-05
	GO:0005509	calcium ion binding	1.4E-03
	GO:0016301	kinase activity	3.8E-03
KEGG	SLY04626	Plant-pathogen interaction	9.0E-06
	SLY04016	MAPK signaling pathway - plant	9.5E-03
	SLY04075	Plant hormone signal transduction	5.7E-03
Intersection BABA/FIRE			
Category	ID	GO Term/Pathway	FDR
Process	GO:0006468	protein amino acid phosphorylation	3.0E-03
	GO:0009607	response to biotic stimulus	3.0E-03
Function	GO:0004674	protein serine/threonine kinase activity	7.8E-12
	GO:0019199	transmembrane receptor protein kinase activity	3.2E-10
	GO:0004872	receptor activity	2.5E-08
KEGG	SLY04626	Plant-pathogen interaction	1.1E-08
	SLY00360	Phenylalanine metabolism	3.8E-04
	SLY00480	Glutathione metabolism	4.4E-04
BABA			
Category	ID	GO Term/Pathway	FDR
Function	GO:0016301	kinase activity	1.6E-03
KEGG	SLY04626	Plant-pathogen interaction	4.6E-05
	SLY04016	MAPK signaling pathway - plant	9.9E-05
	SLY00940	Phenylpropanoid biosynthesis	9.9E-05
	SLY00520	Amino sugar and nucleotide sugar metabolism	4.8E-03

Figure 3. Overlap between genes induced by BABA and genes induced in tomato plants subject to various abiotic and biotic stresses. (A) Overlap between genes induced in BABA-treated tomato Marmande plants and genes upregulated in tomato plants subject to abiotic heat stress [38], genes upregulated in abiotic salinity stress [39], genes upregulated following infection by the fungus

Stemphylium lycopersici (biotic stress; [40]), and FIRE (flagellin-induced repressed by effectors) genes, representing a pathogen-defined core set of immune-related genes [28]. Cut-offs of a ≥2-fold difference in expression and q <0.05 were applied. (B) KEGG and Gene Ontology (GO) term analysis were performed for genes in each category. The most-enriched GO terms in the process and function categories are shown. (C) Protein-protein association network for genes significantly induced by both BABA treatment and abiotic stress. The interaction network was constructed in STRING using a minimum required interaction score of 0.7 [33] and visualized with Cytoscape [96].

3.5 The BABA stress response is orchestrated via ethylene and jasmonic acid signalling

The preceding analysis revealed a clear enrichment of genes associated with JA and ET signalling pathways. Moreover, both ET and JA accumulated in tomato plants during the first few hours after BABA treatment (Fig 4A, B). Accordingly, BABA induced upregulation of several isoforms of ACC synthase (*ACS*) and ACC oxidases (*ACOs*) (Fig 4C, S8 Table), essential enzymes for ET biosynthesis [41,42]. The high upregulation of the *ACS2* and *ACS6* isoforms is also consistent with their reported activation during defence reactions in *Arabidopsis* [43] and with the observed upregulation of *WRKY33*, which activates *ACS2* and *ACS6* expression downstream of the *MPK3/MPK6* cascade [44]. Our data also support the findings of an earlier study on *Arabidopsis* [45] showing that the conversion of methylthioadenosine (MTA) to Met via the Yang (or Met salvage) cycle is generally not controlled by ET signalling because BABA treatment had no detectable effect on the regulation of the Yang cycle genes *MTN*, *MTK*, *MTI*, and *ARD* (Fig 4C, S8 Table).

Among the BABA-upregulated genes were the patatin-like proteins PLA1 and PLA3 (Fig 4D, S8 Table), which have been implicated in wound responses and resistance to necrotrophic pathogens via JA signalling [46]. In addition, there was significant upregulation of genes encoding enzymes involved in the synthesis of endogenous JA (*TomloxD*, *AOS2* and *OPR3*). The upregulation of these genes was accompanied by the accumulation of JA in BABA-treated leaves (Fig 4D). Also upregulated were 6 of the 12 Jasmonate ZIM Domain (*JAZ*) genes, key regulators of JA signalling that govern host and non-host pathogen-induced cell death in tomato. The most highly upregulated *JAZ* genes (*SlJAZ1*, *SlJAZ2* and *SlJAZ9-11*) were also induced by treatment with COR [47].

Surprisingly, unlike in previous studies on the effects of BABA in *Arabidopsis* [14] and potato plants [22], there was no significant enrichment of genes associated with the phytohormone SA. In keeping with this result, the levels of total SA declined slightly in leaves treated with BABA (Fig 4B). A recent study showed that ABA signalling is suppressed during BABA-IR in *Arabidopsis* plants [17]. In accordance with this result and our previous study [48], we observed no enrichment of genes associated with ABA signalling following BABA treatment in tomato and several genes involved in

ABA catabolism were upregulated including *CYP707A* (*Solyc08g005610.2.1*) and UDP-glucosyltransferase (*UGT*; *Solyc09g098080.2.1*) (Fig 4E, S8 Table).



Figure 4. Involvement of signalling pathways in BABA-IR. (A) ET accumulation was measured at 24 hrs after BABA treatment (10 mM) of leaflets (n = 8) by gas chromatography. (B) Levels of JA, jasmonic acid-isoleucine (JA-Ile), methyl-jasmonate (MeJA) and SA were measured by LC-MS 24 h after BABA treatment (10 mM) leaves (n = 6). The control tissue (CTRL) was a water-treated control sample. Each bar represents the mean ± SE. Asterisks denote mean values that differ significantly from that for the control group based on Student's t-test at P ≤ 0.01 (**). (C-E) The BABA-induced induction of genes involved in the synthesis of ET (C) and JA (D) and the degradation of ABA (E) is shown.

SAM – S-Adenosyl-L-methionine, MTA – 5´-Methylthioadenosin, MTR – 5´-Methylthioribose, MTR-P – 5´-Methylthioribose-1-phosphate, MTRu-P – 5´-Methylthioribulose-1-phosphate, DHKMP – 1,2-Dihydroxy-3-keto-5-methylthiopentene, KMTB – 2-keto-4-methyl-thiobutyrate, SAM2 – S-Adenosyl-L-methionine synthase, ACS – 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid synthase, ACC – 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid, ACO – 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid oxidase, PLA – Phospholipase A, Lox – Lipoxygenase, (13S)-HPLA – 13-

hydroperoxylinolenic acid, AOS – Allene oxide synthase, 12,13-EOLA – 12,13-epoxyoctadecatrienoic acid, AOC – Allene oxide cyclase, OPDA – (9S,13S)-12-oxo-phytodienoic acid, OPR – 12-oxo-phytodienoic acid 10,11 reductase, OPC – 3-oxo-2-(2´-pentenyl)-cyclopentane-1-octanoic acid, ACX1A – acyl-CoA oxidase, JA – Jasmonic acid, ABA – Abscisic acid, UGT – Abscisic acid glucosyl-transferase, ABA-GE – Abscisic acid glucosyl ester, 8´-OH ABA – 8´-hydroxy abscisic acid N.C. – transcript not changed, N.D. – transcript not detected.

3.6 BABA upregulates perception and signalling machinery related to abiotic stress

Protein kinases comprised 142 of the BABA-upregulated genes (S3 Fig, S9 Table), accounting for 15% of the total set of expressed kinases in our analysis. Similarly, 44 protein kinases were identified in the proteomic analysis, of which 14 were upregulated and only 3 were downregulated (S3 Fig). These results suggest that protein kinases play an important role in the BABA stress response (S3 Fig, S9 Table). An enrichment analysis of the BABA-responsive families using the chi-squared test revealed overrepresentation of the large Receptor-Like Kinase/Pelle (RLK-Pelle) family, which is crucial for plant-specific adaptation [49] (S3 Fig) at both the transcriptomic and proteomic levels. This finding agrees well with the upregulation of 27 Receptor-Like Proteins (RLP), representing 23% of the total expressed RLPs in our analysis. It is also notable that all previously reported PRRs in tomato plants were upregulated including those for flagellin (*FLS2* and *FLS3*), the fungal elicitor *EIX* (*LeEix1* and *LeEix2*), *Ave1* from *V. dahlia* (*Ve1* and *Ve2*) [50], and *Avr* factors (*Cf-2*, *Cf-4*, *Cf-5* and *Cf-9*) [51]. This increased expression of perceptual proteins is consistent with the observed protein-protein interaction between *WRKY33* and the *MPK3* kinase from the CMGC family (Fig 2B, S3 Fig). The *MPK3/MPK6* cascade causes the phosphorylation of *WRKY33* and the closely related *WRKY25*, leading to ET production due to activation of the enzyme *ACS* as described above. Two other RLKs interacting with RLPs involved in MAMPs perception, *SOBIR1* [52] and *TARK1* [53], were also upregulated.

In parallel with the induction of pathogen perception machinery, we also observed massive upregulation of genes encoding transcription factors (TFs): BABA treatment induced the upregulation of 130 TF genes (S4 Fig). The largest numbers of induced genes were found in the ERF, WRKY, MYB and NAC families (S4 Fig), which play essential roles in regulating stress responses in plants, mainly through ET and JA signalling pathways. The strong induction of ERFs following BABA treatment was particularly notable: of the 137 identified ERF genes in tomato [54], 113 were expressed, 33 were upregulated, and 5 were downregulated. The BABA response has many features in common with the responses to cold, salt, and mechanical stress observed in previous studies on tomato [38,55,56]. However, the BABA-upregulated genes *SlERF*5 (*ERF*5), *SlERF*43 (*RAV2*), *SlERF*55 (*TSRF*1), *SlERF*60 (*Pti*5) or *SlERF*69 (*ERF*1) were previously linked to the activation of defence responses against diverse pathogens (S9 Table). Unlike in previous studies on tomato, no WRKY genes were downregulated after BABA treatment; their expression patterns resembled those induced by salt stress, the tomato

spotted wilt virus (TSWV), and the fungal elicitor *EIX* [57]. The largest class of plant MYB factors are the 2R proteins, which regulate primary and secondary metabolism, hormone signal transduction, development, and responses to biotic and abiotic stresses [58]. Of the 91 expressed 2RMYB genes, 11 were upregulated following BABA treatment and 6 were downregulated. Their expression profile most closely resembled that seen in tomato plants treated with MeJA [59] or stressed by infection with the bacterial pathogens *Pst* DC3000 or *P. putida* (S9 Table).

Finally, a comparison of the BABA-upregulated RLPs/WRKY, ERF, and MYB genes to recent RNA-Seq results for tomato plants under biotic [27] and abiotic stress [38] confirmed that the pattern of upregulation induced by BABA is significantly more similar to that for abiotic stress than that for biotic stress (S9 Table).

3.7 Amino acid metabolism in BABA-treated plants

Transcriptomic and metabolomic studies have consistently shown that amino acid (AA) homeostasis plays a role in stress responses [60,61]. Moreover, BABA induces the stress-induced morphogenic response (SIMR). In *Arabidopsis*, Asp levels were increased 3-fold by treatment with the active (R)-BABA enantiomer but were unaffected by the (L) enantiomer, suggesting that BABA obstructs canonical AspRS activity [18]. Surprisingly, we observed no change in Asp levels in tomato plants after BABA treatment. However, there was a significant increase in the levels of the enzymes Asparagine-tRNA synthetase (GlnRS) and plastid Glutamyl-tRNA(Gln) amidotransferase (GATC) as well as the Glu, GABA, Pro, Phe, and Tyr, together with a reduction in Ala levels (Fig 2B, 5A). The glutamate family pathway is strongly activated under stress conditions, leading to the accumulation of GABA and proline. GABA is synthesized from Glu by a decarboxylation reaction in response to abiotic stress, viral infection, and herbivore attack [60]; its increased concentration in BABA-treated tomato plants is almost certainly connected to the strong transcriptomic and proteomic upregulation of its key biosynthetic enzyme glutamate decarboxylase (*Solyc04g025530.2.1*) (Fig 5C). Proline, which plays a pivotal role in responses to abiotic stresses, osmotic, salinity, and low temperature stresses, is synthesized predominantly from glutamate by two successive reductions catalysed by P5C synthetase (*P5CS*) and P5C reductase (*P5CR*), with *P5CS* being the rate-limiting enzyme for proline synthesis [62]. However, although BABA treatment increased the abundance of *P5CS*, it did not upregulate *P5CS* transcription. This suggests that the increase is due to a change in post-transcriptional regulation, as observed previously [63]. Conversely, there was significant transcriptional upregulation of proline dehydrogenases (*ProDH*) (*Solyc02g089630.2.1*, *Solyc02g089620.2.1*), which catalyse the catabolic conversion of Pro into the toxic intermediate P5C (Fig 5C, S10 Table). Spraying *Arabidopsis* leaves with Pro or P5C causes the formation of HR-like lesions resembling those induced by BABA [64]. We therefore suggest that the lesion formation

observed in tomato after BABA foliar spraying [19,22] spraying can be attributed to the generation of very high local BABA concentrations on leaf surfaces (white deposits) and subsequent P5C accumulation.



Figure 5. BABA-induced changes in amino acid levels and their metabolic pathways. (A) Amino acids whose abundance in BABA-treated Marmande tomato plants differs significantly from that in water-treated controls. Data are means from three replicates; the errors are standard errors of means. Statistically significant differences recorded for each amino acid as determined by the t-test are indicated with different numbers of asterisks (*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01). (B, C) Induction of genes belonging to the phenylpropanoid pathway (B) and glutamate metabolic pathway (C).

E4P – erythrose-4-phosphate, PEP – phosphoenolpyruvate, CRSM – chorismic acid, CM – chorismic acid mutase, PPA – prephenate, PDH – prephenate dehydrogenasa, PDT – prephenate dehydratase, PAL – Phenylalanine ammonia-lyase, CA – cinnamic acid, C4H – Cytochrome P450, PCA – p-coumaric acid, 4CL – 4-coumarate CoA ligase, THT – Tyramine N-(hydroxycinnamoyl) transferase, GM – Agmatine, ArgDC – Arginine

decarboxylase, 2OG – 2-ketoglutarate, GluDC – Glutamate decarboxylase, GABA – gamma-Aminobutyric acid, AS1 – Asparagine synthase, P5CS – Gamma-glutamyl phosphate reductase, AstD – N-succinylglutamate 5-semialdehyde dehydrogenase, P5C – 1-pyrroline-5-carboxylate, P5CR – Pyrroline-5-carboxylate reductase, ProDH – Proline dehydrogenase, N.C. – transcript not changed, N.D. – transcript not detected.

BABA treatment also upregulated transcription of branched-chain amino acid aminotransferase (*Solyc03g043880.2.1*) and cysteine desulfurase (*Solyc11g005840.1.1*) (Fig 5C). Both of these enzymes are important in the degradation of branched AAs, whose complete oxidation in the mitochondria allows large amounts of ATP to be generated under stress conditions that impair photosynthesis [60]. BABA treatment also caused upregulation of the glutamine-dependent asparagine synthetase *AS1* (*Solyc06g007180.2.1*) and LHTs, which function as high-affinity transporters of uncharged/acidic AAs in the mesophyll plasma membrane (*Solyc11g066800.1.1*, *Solyc01g111980.2.1*, *Solyc10g055740.1.1*). These changes indicate an effect on overall nitrogen metabolism in the plant (Fig 5C, S10 Table). The upregulation of all these proteins was previously observed during chlorosis caused by proteolytic activity and amino acid deamination during *P. syringae* infections [65]. BABA also upregulated four glutamate receptor genes (*SlGLR1.2*, *SlGLR2.1*, *SlGLR2.2* and *SlGLR2.5*) implicated in various processes including the response to aluminium [66] and enhanced drought tolerance in plants [67].

Two prephenate dehydrogenases (*Solyc09g011870.1.1*, *Solyc06g050630.2.1*) and one prephenate dehydratase (*Solyc06g074530.1.1*) were strongly upregulated at the transcript level following BABA treatment, and prephenate aminotransferase was upregulated at the protein level. These changes are clearly connected to the BABA-induced upregulation of the phenylpropanoid pathway and especially its lignin/lignan branch. Important upregulated enzymes of this branch include 4-coumarate CoA ligase (4-CL) and several caffeoyl-CoA O-methyltransferase (COMT), laccases (LAC), and peroxidases (PER), which catalyse the synthesis of several secondary metabolites (Fig 5B). BABA treatment also caused transcript-level upregulation of arginine decarboxylase (*Solyc10g054440.1.1*), which converts arginine into agmatine, a precursor of polyamines including putrescine, spermidine, and spermine (Fig 5B, S10 Table). Interestingly, however, we observed no increase in polyamine levels, suggesting that agmatine serves some other metabolic purpose in BABA-treated tomato plants [68]. It could possibly be converted into *p*-coumaroylagmatine; this hypothesis is supported by the upregulation of *4-CL* (*Solyc06g035960.2.1*) and *PAL* together with several hydroxycinnamoyl-CoA:tyramine N-(hydroxycinnamoyl) transferases (*THT1-3*, *THT1-4*, *THT7-1*, *THT7-8*), which are also upregulated during incompatible interactions of *Pst* with tomato [69] (Fig 5B, S10 Table).

4. DISCUSSION

BABA has long been described as an agent inducing highly effective resistance against a wide spectrum of biotic and abiotic stresses in multiple plant species [9,14]. Although much has been learned about the perception and molecular action of BABA in *Arabidopsis* [17,18], many questions remain regarding its mechanisms of action. Since recent studies have shown that during plant immune responses translation is tightly regulated and poorly correlated with transcription [25], as observed here, we characterized BABA-induced changes in both the transcriptome and the intracellular proteome. In our experimental conditions only high BABA concentration after foliar spraying of the crop tomato cultivar Marmande (which would be a viable agricultural application strategy) behaves as a strong stress inducer that does not only triggers highly effective resistance and that deeply remodels transcriptome and subsequent proteome of tomato. Whether BABA primed tomato defences at lower concentrations without any protective effect was not our aim since it cannot be useful for crop protection. Transcriptomic and proteomic analyses showed a similar trend when most of differentially expressed genes and proteins were upregulated and have been linked to general stress responses and defence. Besides, many proteins exhibiting decreased amounts can be linked to the general decrease in the rate of photosynthesis and carbon metabolism under stress conditions as previously described [61]. It is this stress-induced reduction in plant growth induced by BABA that is the major factor limiting its commercial exploitation [18].

Analysis of the genes and proteins upregulated following BABA treatment revealed enrichment of cellular processes related to primary metabolism and responses to stimuli when BABA increased the amount of enzymes involved in carbohydrate metabolism. Previous transcriptomic and genetic analyses have demonstrated the induction of genes involved in carbohydrate metabolism upon challenge by pathogens or PAMPs, and the expression of these genes was shown to affect downstream defence responses including ROS production and PR gene expression [61]. Induction of these genes was also observed in genome-wide studies in *Arabidopsis* plants infected with the avirulent pathogen *P. syringae* pv. Tomato [70] and in rice leaf sheaths infected by *Rhizoctonia solani* [71]. Thus, the genes upregulated in our study and publicly available datasets of potato [22] and *Arabidopsis* [26] (Fig 1C) can be seen as common defence response genes that contribute to BABA-IR.

Previous studies have also shown that BABA-IR is driven by different signalling molecules in different plant species [15,16,72,73]. In *Arabidopsis*, BABA treatment induces accumulation of SA and SA glucoside (SAG) and causes significant changes in the abundance of isochorismate synthase (ICS), which is directly involved in SA biosynthesis which, in turn, is associated with the expression of acidic PR proteins [15,26]. Although we paid a particular attention to the role of SA in BABA-induced resistance, none of these responses were observed in tomato as in our recent study in which we determined decreased level of SA after BABA treatment of tomato leaflets via petiole aspiration [48]. In addition, unpublished results from our lab, clearly show that SA treatment on tomato leaves failed

to induce both a resistance to mildews and the classical defence marker genes outlined in the literature and in this paper (mainly PR-proteins coding genes). It seems that SA is probably not so important in tomato defence to biotic stresses since attempts to protect tomato with SA and SA mimics always failed in available literature with the exception of a protective effect observed towards tomato canker (*Clavibacter michiganensis*) with acibenzolar-S-methyl. Indeed, some plants, like rice or wintergreen, exhibit a high constitutive level of SA or SA methyl ester without being protected from diseases [74] and we have previously demonstrated that SA sensitizes carnation to disease by inhibiting N-benzoate-based phytoalexins biosynthesis [75]. Thus, what was demonstrated in Arabidopsis and even in tobacco should not signify that all the plant kingdom, especially among crops diversity, would follow the same defence regulation scheme. However, treatment of tomato with BABA did affect genes involved in the biosynthesis of JA and ET as well as basic isoforms of PR proteins, which were also observed in an earlier study on BABA-treated potato and tomato plants [22,48]. This finding is in accordance with impaired BABA-IR towards *P. infestans* in the tomato *def* mutant, which is defective in JA accumulation [73] and pivotal importance of ET in chitosan- and Flg22-induced local and systemic defence responses of tomato plants previously proved in Never-ripe (*Nr*) tomato mutants exhibiting insensitivity to ET in all vegetative tissues due to mutation in SlETR3 receptor [76,77]. All these findings clearly emphasize the need to study plant biology with a necessary hindsight when comparisons to model plants fail to confirm established mechanisms.

A recent screening of *Arabidopsis* mutations affecting BABA-IR revealed defects associated with the gene *IBI1*, which encodes aspartyl-tRNA synthetase (AspRS). The specific binding of R-BABA to the L-Asp-binding domain of *IBI1* primes the protein for non-canonical defence activity [18]. In accordance with these findings, we found that BABA had no effect on the regulation of the *IBI1* orthologue in tomato plants. However, we found no evidence of any change in aspartate levels driven by the accumulation of uncharged $tRNA^{Asp}$ leading to inhibition of translation activity via phosphorylation of the initiation factor eIF2α [18]. Instead we observed elevated glutamate levels and increased expression of the enzymes GlnRS and GATC, which are involved in $tRNA^{Gln}$ synthesis [78]. Following these findings, BABA treatment of tomato plants upregulated transcription of HSF24 (*Solyc02g090820.2.1*), a HSF-type homologue of TBF1. The heat shock factor(HSF)-like transcription factor TBF1 was proven to play a crucial role in the growth-to-defence switch that activates multiple defence mechanisms and inhibits primary growth and development upon pathogen challenge [79]. Interestingly, one suggested activation mechanism for TBF1 is related to the GCN2-dependent phosphorylation of eIF2α, which is regulated via the accumulation of uncharged tRNAs. This is consistent with the reported inhibitory activity of R-BABA towards the cellular AspRS activity of *IBI1* in *Arabidopsis* [18]. Moreover, TBF1 controls distinct output genes in SAR and MTI, which could be connected to our observation that BABA-IR in tomato is mediated by genes involved in MTI.

Together, these observations convincingly explain the finding that BABA has dual activities in tomato, simultaneously activating defence mechanisms and downregulating protein synthesis and carbon metabolism. The latter activity is similar to the stress responses [61] associated with SIMR in *Arabidopsis*. It has been suggested that BABA primes defence responses simply via this stress imprinting process because L-glutamine treatment reduced both BABA-induced SIMR and BABA-IR [80]. In keeping with this hypothesis, 70% of the BABA-induced transcripts overlapped with the set of transcripts upregulated by abiotic salt [39].

Two important processes in pathogen recognition and the subsequent activation of plant defence mechanisms are the secretion and spotting of diverse pattern-recognition receptors (PRRs) to the plasma membrane and the activation of protein kinases involved in signal transduction cascades. Augmented perception of stress signals by plant cells seems to be essential in BABA-IR, as demonstrated by the significant enrichment of GO terms and pathways related to receptor activity after BABA treatment. Moreover, extensive induction of signalling and perception machinery was one of the main factors distinguishing BABA-treatment from the other stress conditions and put forward in our data set. BABA induced a significant number of receptor and receptor-like kinases involved in abiotic stress responses (L-type lectin receptor kinases) [81], MAMPs perception, *Phytophthora* resistance (*LysM*, *Bti9*, *SOBIR1*) [52,82], and responses to pathogen infection, mechanical wounding, and oxidative stress (*TPK1b*) [83]. This is the first demonstration that BABA-IR in tomato is connected to a hyper-receptive status. In that way, BABA acts as a real priming agent, preparing the plant to rapidly recognize pathogens and to set-up strong defences.

However, as stated above, BABA also induce a major plant stress. Whether these two aspects can be disconnected is a pending question to only keep the hyper-receptive side unless this status could be a consequence of the major stress. Plant defence responses are also modulated by AA homeostasis and treatment with high concentrations of AAs. For example, the *Arabidopsis thaliana lht1* mutant, which has reduced levels of Gln, Ala, and Pro, exhibits SA dependent resistance to a wide range of diseases [84]. In addition, treatment of rice roots with the AAs Glu, Asn, Met, and Asp induced systemic disease resistance against rice blast that was partially dependent on SA signalling and did not cause any change in the content of free AAs in leaves [85]. In our experiments, treatment with BABA increased levels of Pro and the expression of the Glu biosynthetic enzyme ProDH, as well as the levels of free Glu in the leaves (Fig 5A, C). The ProDH is an enzyme that plays a crucial role in plant metabolism. Recent studies have shown that ProDH activity is upregulated in response to pathogen infection and contribute to HR and disease resistance, which apparently potentiates the accumulation of ROS. In addition, ProDH may also regulate the balance between proline and P5C, which has been shown to affect the accumulation of defence-related metabolites and the expression of defence genes [86–88]. Decreases in Glu and Pro levels are also associated with microbial

community breakdown and disease incidence , supporting the idea that they play an important role in the plant's defence response [89]. Free Glu may be recognized by glutamate receptor-like proteins (GLRs), which have been implicated in enhanced resistance to *Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis*, and *Pseudomonas syringae* in *Arabidopsis* [90]. The initial cellular events in BABA-IR in tomato may thus involve GLRs as suggested previously in a study on AA-ISR to rice blast in leaves [85]. Interestingly, despite significant differences, the upregulated gene clusters in BABA-treated tomato overlap extensively with the sets of orthologous upregulated genes identified by microarray analysis of *A. thaliana lht1* plants [84] and the genes upregulated in Glu-treated rice plants [85] (Fig 6A). Notably, the orthologous genes common to all three sets exhibited functional enrichment in the plant-pathogen interaction pathway (KEGG) and in protein domains related to signal transduction (INTERPRO), suggesting that, in all three cases, induced resistance is driven by similar molecular mechanisms based on sensitization to stress responsiveness (Fig 6B), which may be characteristic of priming phenomena [3].



Figure 6. Overlap between genes induced by BABA and genes induced in selected plants with altered amino acid homeostasis. (A) Degrees of overlap between orthologous groups identified in this study and previous transcriptomic studies on A. thaliana lht1 plants [84], and Glu-treated rice plants [85]. (B) Functional enrichment of the plant-pathogen interaction pathway (KEGG) and protein domains related to signal transduction (INTERPRO) among the orthologous genes common to all three sets.

Collectively, here we demonstrate that a strong BABA-IR towards *Phytophthora parasitica* and *Oidium neolycopersici* in tomato cv Marmande resemble in many aspects responses to general stress. This resistance was largely explained by the activation of the ET and JA pathways resulting in a strong defence set-up involving PR-proteins as well as phenyl propanoid pathway, lipid peroxidation but in the same time revealed a complete remodelling of plant functions including decrease in primary metabolism and in photosynthesis together with an enhanced ability to perceive (P)(M)(D)AMPs and to set-up downstream signalling. In conclusion, much more attention should be

519 paid to comparative studies between plants of agronomic interest submitted to R-BABA treatment.
520 We clearly evidenced that multiomics as well as targeted approaches can bring original insight on
521 who to who, even though many black boxes still remain closed.

522 ## 5. MATERIALS AND METHODS

523 ### *5.1 Plant material and growing conditions*

524 Tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum* cv. *Marmande*) were grown at 75% humidity and 14
525 hours of light (day 24°C, night 22°C). After 6 or 7 weeks of growth, whole tomato plants were sprayed
526 with 10 mM DL-BABA or water. Leaflets were then removed from plants 24 or 48 hours after spraying
527 for transcriptome and proteome analysis and processed immediately or stored at -80°C until use.
528 Plants assigned to each treatment were randomly selected, labelled, and then returned to the
529 growth chamber. Three biological replicates were selected for each treatment.

530 ### *5.2 Botrytis cinerea* and *Phytophthora parasitica* inoculation and measurement

531 Two days after spraying with 10 mM BABA or water, leaflets were removed from 7-8 week-
532 old tomato plants and placed in clear Styrofoam boxes with moist absorbent paper to maintain high
533 relative humidity. The centre of each leaflet was inoculated with a mycelial plug (5 mm in diameter)
534 from the growth margin of a 3-day-old culture of the BC21 strain of *B. cinerea*. Alternatively, leaflets
535 were pricked with a needle at a marked spot and 20 µl of a *P. parasitica* zoospore suspension (40 000
536 zoospores/ml) was applied to the wounded spot. Five replicates in styrofoam boxes with 3 leaflets
537 each were used. After inoculation, the detached leaflets were incubated in a growth chamber under
538 conditions conducive to disease development (21°C, 14-h photoperiod, 114 µmol.s-1.m-2).
539 Symptoms were recorded after 3 days of incubation for *P. parasitica* or 4 days for *B. cinerea*.
540 Photographs were analysed using the ImageJ image analysis programme to quantify the surface area
541 of necrotic lesions (in mm^2). Analysis of variance was used to evaluate whether differences between
542 controls and treatments were significant for each of the three independent experiments.

543 ### *5.3 Oidium neolycopersici* inoculation and measurement

544 Spraying with 10 mM BABA or water was done on whole 5-6 week old tomato plants. Two
545 days later, each plant was inoculated with approximately 10 ml of a spore suspension of *O.*
546 *neolycopersici* at a concentration of 10^4 sp/ml. The inoculated plants were then incubated in a growth
547 chamber under conditions conducive to disease development (21°C, RH > 80%, 14 hours of light). The
548 number of powdery mildew colonies was counted 14 days after inoculation on 2 leaves per plant
549 with 5 plants per test. Three independent tests were performed.

550 ### *5.4 Identification and quantification of proteins by LC-MS/MS*

Three biological replicates in the form of separate plants were subjected to analysis. For each replicate, 4 g of leaflets from 3 different plants were harvested on ice and homogenised at 4°C in 20 ml of extraction buffer (50 mM Tris-Mes (pH=8.0), 20 mM EDTA, 500 mM sucrose, 10 mM DTT, 100 mM PMSF, cOmplete Mini Protease Inhibitor Cocktail tablets) using an Ultraturrax homogenizer (IKA, DE) at 15 000 rpm. Samples were filtered through Miracloth and centrifuged at 20 000 x g and 4°C. The supernatant was collected and centrifuged in a Beckman Optima (Beckman-Coulter) ultracentrifuge at 35 000 rpm and 4°C with a Ti45 rotor. The supernatant was collected and concentrated using Vivaspin® 3 kDa (GE Healthcare) sample concentrators. The concentrated samples were dialyzed overnight to 10 mM ammonium acetate and finally concentrated to 0.5 ml using 4 ml Amicon® Ultra 4 3 kDa (Merck Millipore Ltd.) sample concentrators. Each sample was then fractionated into 5 fractions by HPLC using an IEX PolyWAX LP mixed bed column (200 x 4.6 mm, 5 µm particles, PolyLC Inc., Columbia, USA) and a gradient of ammonium acetate. The collected fractions were dried under vacuum and subjected to LC-MS /MS analysis (S3 Table). The dried protein fractions were processed using a philtre filter-aided sample preparation (FASP) method [83]. LC-MS /MS analyses of the peptide mixtures were performed using the RSLCnano system connected to the Orbitrap Elite hybrid spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). For more details, see the supplemental material (S1 Appendix).

5.5 RNA sequencing analysis

Total RNA was isolated using TRIzol reagent (Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY, USA) and checked for integrity on a Bioanalyzer 2200 (RIN ≥ 7.40). Libraries for sequencing were prepared according to a standard protocol for the SOLiD 5500 system (Life Technology). Sequencing was performed using the SOLiD 5500W platform. Raw reads of 75 bp in length were mapped to the Solanum lycopersicum build 2.40 reference using ITAG2.4 as the gene model in colour space with the Maxmapper algorithm implemented in Lifescope software (Life Technologies, Ltd). RNA content was assessed using a whole-transcriptome workflow with the quality threshold set to 10, resulting in an assignment probability of greater than 90. The raw sequencing data with corresponding metadata are available in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) repository under accession number GSE108421. Analytical comparison between BABA and the control treatments was performed using the DESeq package [91].

5.6 Orthology and Gene Ontology enrichment analysis

Orthologous gene clusters were compared and annotated using the OrthoVenn web platform [92], and the results obtained were visualised using the eulerr R package [93]. Significantly differentially expressed genes and proteins were analysed by Singular Enrichment Analysis (SEA) for GO term

584 enrichment using agriGO [94] based on GO terms retrieved from the PLAZA 3.0 database [95].
585 Summarisation and visualization of SEA were done using REViGO [34] and Cytoscape [96] with DyNet
586 [97]. Protein-protein association networks for significantly differentially expressed genes and
587 proteins were generated using the STRING database with an interaction score of 0.9 [33] and
588 visualized using Cytoscape [96].

589 *5.7 HPLC analysis of amino acids*

590 Twenty-four hours after treatment with BABA, tomato leaves were collected, frozen in liquid
591 nitrogen, and ground to a fine powder. A portion of 250 mg of this powder was then extracted with 1
592 ml of extraction buffer (0.1 M HCl and 4.6 µg/ml L-2-aminoadipic acid as an internal standard), mixed
593 thoroughly, incubated on ice for 5 minutes, and centrifuged. A 500 µl aliquot of the resulting
594 supernatant was then diluted with 100 µl methanol and loaded onto an SPE C18 column to adsorb
595 interfering secondary metabolites, which had previously been wetted with 1 ml MeOH and
596 equilibrated with 20% MeOH in 0.1M HCl. The sample was loaded and the column was washed with
597 400 µl of 20% MeOH in 0.1 M HCl. Amino acids were recovered in both the flow-through and wash
598 fractions and derivatized and analyzed as previously described [98]. See supplemental material (S1
599 Appendix) for further details.

600 *5.8 Quantitative analysis of salicylic acid, jasmonic acid, and jasmonic acid-isoleucine*

601 The tomato leaflest (100 mg) was frozen immediately after the harvest using liquid nitrogen,
602 and the frozen materials ground under liquid nitrogen and extracted with 750 µl of MeOH-H_2O-HOAc
603 (90:9:1, v/v/v) containing 100 ng of o-anisic acid as an internal standard. The mixture was centrifuged
604 at 10,000 x g for 1 min, the supernatant was collected, and the pellet was repeatadly extracted. The
605 pooled supernatants were dried under nitrogen, resuspended in 200 µl of 0.1% HOAc in H_2O-MeOH
606 (90:10, v/v), and a portion of the mixture (2–5 µl) was subjected to LC-MS analyzes using a TOF mass
607 spectrometer (Agilent Technologies) as previously described [99]. Further details can be found in the
608 supplemental material (S1 Appendix).

609 *5.9 Measurement of ethylene production*

610 Single tomato leaflets 24 hours after treatment with BABA or water were placed in 20 ml test
611 tube when the cut end of the petiole was in sterile water and sealed with a air-tight rubber syringe
612 cap. ETwas accumulated for 4 hours before a 1-ml sample was withdrawn for analysis. ET production
613 was measured using gas chromatography with a flame ionization detector quantified by using a gas
614 chromatograph flame ionization detector (Agilent GC 6890, Agilent Technologies) as previously
615 described [19].

616

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

D.P. acknovledges support of the European Regional Development Fund-Project "Centre for Experimental Plant Biology": No. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000738 funded by MEYS CR and by the Institutional Research Fund of Masaryk university, MUNI/A/1492/2021. CIISB research infrastructure project LM2018127 funded by MEYS CR are gratefully acknowledged for the financial support of the measurements at the CEITEC Proteomics Core Facility. This work was also supported by INRAE, Département Santé des Plantes et Environnement through the funding of the ELICITOM project. This project was supported by the National Infrastructure France Génomique (Commissariat aux Grands Investissements, ANR-10-INBS-09-03, ANR-10-INBS-09-02).

Contributions

Conceptualization: JL, MP, CR and ZZ; Data curation: MZ, CR, BI, MB, KLB, PN, VM, AS, PB, and DP; Data analysis: MZ, CR, DP, AS and BI; Funding acquisition: JL, MP and ZZ; Methodology: MZ, CR, JL, MP and ZZ; Project administration: JL and MP; Resources: JL, MP and ZZ; Validation: MZ, CR, JL, MP and ZZ; Writing, review, and editing: MZ, JL, and MP; Supervision: JL and MP.

Data availability statement

Raw sequencing data with appropriate metadata are available in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) repository under accession number GSE108421.
The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD038074

Competing interests

We declare that none of the authors have any competing interests.

7. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

S1 Appendix - Supplementary methods

S1 Figure. HR-like microlesions on BABA spayed leaves.

S2 Figure. ReviGO analysis of enriched GO terms.

S3 Figure. BABA perception affects gene expression of certain protein kinase families.

S4 Figure. BABA perception affects gene expression of certain transcription factor families.

S1 Table. Workflow of sequence analysis.

S2 Table. Significant differentially expressed proteins and transcripts.

S3 Table. Identified protein groups.

S4 Table. Orthologous across our and previous transcriptomic studies of BABA treated potato and *Arabidopsis* plants.

S5 Table. Overlap between genes induced by BABA and different elicitors.

S6 Table. GO analysis of up-regulated proteins and transcripts in tomato leaves after treatment with 10 mM BABA.

S7 Table. Protein-protein association network for significantly induced genes and proteins.

S8 Table. Involvement of signalling pathways in BABA-IR.

S9 Table. Transcripts of protein kinases, receptor like proteins and transcription factors found in our study and their comparison with other studies.

S10 Table. Induction of genes in glutamate metabolic pathway and phenylpropanoid pathway.

8. REFERENCES

1. Savary S, Ficke A, Aubertot J-N, Hollier C. Crop losses due to diseases and their implications for global food production losses and food security. Food Secur. 2012;4: 519–537. doi:10.1007/s12571-012-0200-5

2. Jones JDG, Dangl JL. The plant immune system. Nature. 2006;444: 323–329. doi:10.1038/nature05286

3. Conrath U, Beckers GJM, Langenbach CJG, Jaskiewicz MR. Priming for enhanced defense. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2015;53: 97–119. doi:10.1146/annurev-phyto-080614-120132

4. Westman SM, Kloth KJ, Hanson J, Ohlsson AB, Albrectsen BR. Defence priming in Arabidopsis – a Meta-Analysis. Sci Rep. 2019;9: 13309. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-49811-9

5. Vijayakumari K, Jisha KC, Puthur JT. GABA/BABA priming: a means for enhancing abiotic stress tolerance potential of plants with less energy investments on defence cache. Acta Physiol Plant. 2016;38: 230. doi:10.1007/s11738-016-2254-z

6. Baccelli I, Mauch-Mani B. Beta-aminobutyric acid priming of plant defense: the role of ABA and other hormones. Plant Mol Biol. 2016;91: 703–711. doi:10.1007/s11103-015-0406-y

7. Pieterse CMJ, Zamioudis C, Berendsen RL, Weller DM, Wees SCMV, Bakker PAHM. Induced Systemic Resistance by Beneficial Microbes. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2014;52: 347–375. doi:10.1146/annurev-phyto-082712-102340

8. Chassot C, Buchala A, Schoonbeek H-J, Métraux J-P, Lamotte O. Wounding of Arabidopsis leaves causes a powerful but transient protection against Botrytis infection. Plant J Cell Mol Biol. 2008;55: 555–567. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2008.03540.x

9. Cohen Y, Vaknin M, Mauch-Mani B. BABA-induced resistance: milestones along a 55-year journey. Phytoparasitica. 2016;44: 513–538. doi:10.1007/s12600-016-0546-x

10. Kuźnicki D, Meller B, Arasimowicz-Jelonek M, Braszewska-Zalewska A, Drozda A, Floryszak-Wieczorek J. BABA-Induced DNA Methylome Adjustment to Intergenerational Defense Priming in Potato to Phytophthora infestans. Front Plant Sci. 2019;10. doi:10.3389/fpls.2019.00650

11. Luna E, López A, Kooiman J, Ton J. Role of NPR1 and KYP in long-lasting induced resistance by β-aminobutyric acid. Front Plant Sci. 2014;5: 184. doi:10.3389/fpls.2014.00184

12. Thevenet D, Pastor V, Baccelli I, Balmer A, Vallat A, Neier R, et al. The priming molecule β-aminobutyric acid is naturally present in plants and is induced by stress. New Phytol. 2017;213: 552–559. doi:10.1111/nph.14298

13. Baccelli I, Glauser G, Mauch-Mani B. The accumulation of β-aminobutyric acid is controlled by the plant's immune system. Planta. 2017;246: 791–796. doi:10.1007/s00425-017-2751-3

14. Ton J, Jakab G, Toquin V, Flors V, Iavicoli A, Maeder MN, et al. Dissecting the beta-aminobutyric acid-induced priming phenomenon in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell. 2005;17: 987–999. doi:10.1105/tpc.104.029728

15. Zimmerli L, Jakab G, Metraux JP, Mauch-Mani B. Potentiation of pathogen-specific defense mechanisms in Arabidopsis by beta -aminobutyric acid. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2000;97: 12920–12925. doi:10.1073/pnas.230416897

16. Hamiduzzaman MMd, Jakab G, Barnavon L, Neuhaus J-M, Mauch-Mani B. β-Aminobutyric Acid-Induced Resistance Against Downy Mildew in Grapevine Acts Through the Potentiation of Callose Formation and Jasmonic Acid Signaling. Mol Plant Microbe Interact. 2005;18: 819–829. doi:10.1094/MPMI-18-0819

17. Schwarzenbacher RE, Wardell G, Stassen J, Guest E, Zhang P, Luna E, et al. The IBI1 Receptor of β-Aminobutyric Acid Interacts with VOZ Transcription Factors to Regulate Abscisic Acid Signaling and Callose-Associated Defense. Mol Plant. 2020;13: 1455–1469. doi:10.1016/j.molp.2020.07.010

18. Luna E, van Hulten M, Zhang Y, Berkowitz O, López A, Pétriacq P, et al. Plant perception of β-aminobutyric acid is mediated by an aspartyl-tRNA synthetase. Nat Chem Biol. 2014;10: 450–456. doi:10.1038/nchembio.1520

19. Satková P, Starý T, Plešková V, Zapletalová M, Kašparovský T, Činčalová-Kubienová L, et al. Diverse responses of wild and cultivated tomato to BABA, oligandrin and Oidium neolycopersici infection. Ann Bot. 2016. doi:10.1093/aob/mcw188

20. Home | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. [cited 15 Feb 2021]. Available: http://www.fao.org/home/en/

21. Cohen Y. Local and Systemic Control of *Phytophthora infestans* in Tomato Plants by dl-3-Amino-n-Butanoic Acids. Phytopathology. 1994;84: 55. doi:10.1094/Phyto-84-55

22. Bengtsson T, Weighill D, Proux-Wéra E, Levander F, Resjö S, Burra DD, et al. Proteomics and transcriptomics of the BABA-induced resistance response in potato using a novel functional annotation approach. BMC Genomics. 2014;15: 315. doi:10.1186/1471-2164-15-315

719 23. Luna E, Beardon E, Ravnskov S, Scholes J, Ton J. Optimizing Chemically Induced Resistance in
720 Tomato Against Botrytis cinerea. Plant Dis. 2015;100: 704–710. doi:10.1094/PDIS-03-15-0347-
721 RE

722 24. Worrall D, Holroyd GH, Moore JP, Glowacz M, Croft P, Taylor JE, et al. Treating seeds with
723 activators of plant defence generates long-lasting priming of resistance to pests and
724 pathogens. New Phytol. 2012;193: 770–778. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03987.x

725 25. Xu G, Greene GH, Yoo H, Liu L, Marqués J, Motley J, et al. Global translational reprogramming
726 is a fundamental layer of immune regulation in plants. Nature. 2017;545: 487–490.
727 doi:10.1038/nature22371

728 26. Zimmerli L, Hou B-H, Tsai C-H, Jakab G, Mauch-Mani B, Somerville S. The xenobiotic beta-
729 aminobutyric acid enhances Arabidopsis thermotolerance. Plant J Cell Mol Biol. 2008;53: 144–
730 156. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2007.03343.x

731 27. Pombo MA, Zheng Y, Fernandez-Pozo N, Dunham DM, Fei Z, Martin GB. Transcriptomic
732 analysis reveals tomato genes whose expression is induced specifically during effector-
733 triggered immunity and identifies the Epk1 protein kinase which is required for the host
734 response to three bacterial effector proteins. Genome Biol. 2014;15: 492.
735 doi:10.1186/s13059-014-0492-1

736 28. Rosli HG, Zheng Y, Pombo MA, Zhong S, Bombarely A, Fei Z, et al. Transcriptomics-based
737 screen for genes induced by flagellin and repressed by pathogen effectors identifies a cell
738 wall-associated kinase involved in plant immunity. Genome Biol. 2013;14: R139.
739 doi:10.1186/gb-2013-14-12-r139

740 29. Solanský M, Mikulášek K, Zapletalová M, Petřivalský M, Chiltz A, Zdráhal Z, et al. Elicitins'
741 Oligomeric States Affect The Hypersensitive Response And Resistance In Tobacco. J Exp Bot.
742 2021. doi:10.1093/jxb/erab011

743 30. Geng X, Jin L, Shimada M, Kim MG, Mackey D. The phytotoxin coronatine is a multifunctional
744 component of the virulence armament of Pseudomonas syringae. Planta. 2014;240: 1149–
745 1165. doi:10.1007/s00425-014-2151-x

746 31. Kawamura SHY. INF1 Elicitin Activates Jasmonic Acid- and Ethylene-mediated Signalling
747 Pathways and Induces Resistance to Bacterial Wilt Disease in Tomato. J Phytopathol.
748 2009;157: 287–297. doi:10.1111/j.1439-0434.2008.01489.x

749 32. Uppalapati SR, Ishiga Y, Wangdi T, Kunkel BN, Anand A, Mysore KS, et al. The phytotoxin
750 coronatine contributes to pathogen fitness and is required for suppression of salicylic acid
751 accumulation in tomato inoculated with Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato DC3000. Mol
752 Plant-Microbe Interact MPMI. 2007;20: 955–965. doi:10.1094/MPMI-20-8-0955

753 33. Szklarczyk D, Morris JH, Cook H, Kuhn M, Wyder S, Simonovic M, et al. The STRING database in
754 2017: quality-controlled protein-protein association networks, made broadly accessible.
755 Nucleic Acids Res. 2017;45: D362–D368. doi:10.1093/nar/gkw937

756 34. Supek F, Bošnjak M, Škunca N, Šmuc T. REVIGO Summarizes and Visualizes Long Lists of Gene
757 Ontology Terms. PLOS ONE. 2011;6: e21800. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0021800

35. Jain M, Aggarwal S, Nagar P, Tiwari R, Mustafiz A. A D-lactate dehydrogenase from rice is involved in conferring tolerance to multiple abiotic stresses by maintaining cellular homeostasis. Sci Rep. 2020;10: 12835. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-69742-0

36. Chen H, McCaig BC, Melotto M, He SY, Howe GA. Regulation of Plant Arginase by Wounding, Jasmonate, and the Phytotoxin Coronatine *. J Biol Chem. 2004;279: 45998–46007. doi:10.1074/jbc.M407151200

37. Meteignier L-V, El Oirdi M, Cohen M, Barff T, Matteau D, Lucier J-F, et al. Translatome analysis of an NB-LRR immune response identifies important contributors to plant immunity in Arabidopsis. J Exp Bot. 2017;68: 2333–2344. doi:10.1093/jxb/erx078

38. Chen H, Chen X, Chen D, Li J, Zhang Y, Wang A. A comparison of the low temperature transcriptomes of two tomato genotypes that differ in freezing tolerance: Solanum lycopersicum and Solanum habrochaites. BMC Plant Biol. 2015;15: 132. doi:10.1186/s12870-015-0521-6

39. Sun W, Xu X, Zhu H, Liu A, Liu L, Li J, et al. Comparative Transcriptomic Profiling of a Salt-Tolerant Wild Tomato Species and a Salt-Sensitive Tomato Cultivar. Plant Cell Physiol. 2010;51: 997–1006. doi:10.1093/pcp/pcq056

40. Yang H, Zhao T, Jiang J, Chen X, Zhang H, Liu G, et al. Transcriptome Analysis of the Sm-Mediated Hypersensitive Response to Stemphylium lycopersici in Tomato. Front Plant Sci. 2017;8. doi:10.3389/fpls.2017.01257

41. Li G, Meng X, Wang R, Mao G, Han L, Liu Y, et al. Dual-level regulation of ACC synthase activity by MPK3/MPK6 cascade and its downstream WRKY transcription factor during ethylene induction in Arabidopsis. PLoS Genet. 2012;8: e1002767. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1002767

42. Skottke KR, Yoon GM, Kieber JJ, DeLong A. Protein phosphatase 2A controls ethylene biosynthesis by differentially regulating the turnover of ACC synthase isoforms. PLoS Genet. 2011;7: e1001370. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1001370

43. Li G, Meng X, Wang R, Mao G, Han L, Liu Y, et al. Dual-level regulation of ACC synthase activity by MPK3/MPK6 cascade and its downstream WRKY transcription factor during ethylene induction in Arabidopsis. PLoS Genet. 2012;8: e1002767. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1002767

44. Skottke KR, Yoon GM, Kieber JJ, DeLong A. Protein phosphatase 2A controls ethylene biosynthesis by differentially regulating the turnover of ACC synthase isoforms. PLoS Genet. 2011;7: e1001370. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1001370

45. Bürstenbinder K, Rzewuski G, Wirtz M, Hell R, Sauter M. The role of methionine recycling for ethylene synthesis in Arabidopsis. Plant J Cell Mol Biol. 2007;49: 238–249. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2006.02942.x

46. Canonne J, Froidure-Nicolas S, Rivas S. Phospholipases in action during plant defense signaling. Plant Signal Behav. 2011;6: 13–18. doi:10.4161/psb.6.1.14037

47. Ishiga Y, Ishiga T, Uppalapati SR, Mysore KS. Jasmonate ZIM-domain (JAZ) protein regulates host and nonhost pathogen-induced cell death in tomato and Nicotiana benthamiana. PloS One. 2013;8: e75728. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0075728

48. Janotík A, Dadáková K, Lochman J, Zapletalová M. L-Aspartate and L-Glutamine Inhibit Beta-Aminobutyric Acid-Induced Resistance in Tomatoes. Plants Basel Switz. 2022;11. doi:10.3390/plants11212908

49. Lehti-Shiu MD, Zou C, Hanada K, Shiu S-H. Evolutionary History and Stress Regulation of Plant Receptor-Like Kinase/Pelle Genes. Plant Physiol. 2009;150: 12–26. doi:10.1104/pp.108.134353

50. de Jonge R, van Esse HP, Maruthachalam K, Bolton MD, Santhanam P, Saber MK, et al. Tomato immune receptor Ve1 recognizes effector of multiple fungal pathogens uncovered by genome and RNA sequencing. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2012;109: 5110–5115. doi:10.1073/pnas.1119623109

51. Zhou J-M, Tang D, Wang G. Receptor kinases in plant pathogen interactions: more than pattern recognition. Plant Cell Online. 2017; tpc.00891.2016. doi:10.1105/tpc.16.00891

52. Peng K-C, Wang C-W, Wu C-H, Huang C-T, Liou R-F. Tomato SOBIR1/EVR Homologs Are Involved in Elicitin Perception and Plant Defense Against the Oomycete Pathogen Phytophthora parasitica. Mol Plant-Microbe Interact MPMI. 2015;28: 913–926. doi:10.1094/MPMI-12-14-0405-R

53. Kim J-G, Li X, Roden JA, Taylor KW, Aakre CD, Su B, et al. Xanthomonas T3S Effector XopN Suppresses PAMP-Triggered Immunity and Interacts with a Tomato Atypical Receptor-Like Kinase and TFT1. Plant Cell. 2009;21: 1305–1323. doi:10.1105/tpc.108.063123

54. iTAK. iTAK - Plant Transcription factor & Protein Kinase Identifier and Classifier. [cited 26 Jul 2017]. Available: http://bioinfo.bti.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/itak/index.cgi

55. Pan Y, Seymour GB, Lu C, Hu Z, Chen X, Chen G. An ethylene response factor (ERF5) promoting adaptation to drought and salt tolerance in tomato. Plant Cell Rep. 2012;31: 349–360. doi:10.1007/s00299-011-1170-3

56. Sharma MK, Kumar R, Solanke AU, Sharma R, Tyagi AK, Sharma AK. Identification, phylogeny, and transcript profiling of ERF family genes during development and abiotic stress treatments in tomato. Mol Genet Genomics MGG. 2010;284: 455–475. doi:10.1007/s00438-010-0580-1

57. Huang S, Gao Y, Liu J, Peng X, Niu X, Fei Z, et al. Genome-wide analysis of WRKY transcription factors in Solanum lycopersicum. Mol Genet Genomics MGG. 2012;287: 495–513. doi:10.1007/s00438-012-0696-6

58. Du H, Wang Y-B, Xie Y, Liang Z, Jiang S-J, Zhang S-S, et al. Genome-Wide Identification and Evolutionary and Expression Analyses of MYB-Related Genes in Land Plants. DNA Res Int J Rapid Publ Rep Genes Genomes. 2013;20: 437–448. doi:10.1093/dnares/dst021

59. Li Z, Peng R, Tian Y, Han H, Xu J, Yao Q. Genome-Wide Identification and Analysis of the MYB Transcription Factor Superfamily in Solanum lycopersicum. Plant Cell Physiol. 2016;57: 1657–1677. doi:10.1093/pcp/pcw091

60. Hildebrandt TM, Nunes Nesi A, Araújo WL, Braun H-P. Amino Acid Catabolism in Plants. Mol Plant. 2015;8: 1563–1579. doi:10.1016/j.molp.2015.09.005

61. Rojas CM, Senthil-Kumar M, Tzin V, Mysore KS. Regulation of primary plant metabolism during plant-pathogen interactions and its contribution to plant defense. Front Plant Sci. 2014;5. doi:10.3389/fpls.2014.00017

62. Hu CA, Delauney AJ, Verma DP. A bifunctional enzyme (delta 1-pyrroline-5-carboxylate synthetase) catalyzes the first two steps in proline biosynthesis in plants. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 1992;89: 9354–9358. doi:10.1073/pnas.89.19.9354

63. Hua XJ, Van De Cotte B, Van Montagu M, Verbruggen N. The 5' untranslated region of the At-P5R gene is involved in both transcriptional and post-transcriptional regulation. Plant J. 2001;26: 157–169. doi:10.1046/j.1365-313x.2001.01020.x

64. Deuschle K, Funck D, Forlani G, Stransky H, Biehl A, Leister D, et al. The Role of Δ1-Pyrroline-5-Carboxylate Dehydrogenase in Proline Degradation. Plant Cell. 2004;16: 3413–3425. doi:10.1105/tpc.104.023622

65. Yang H, Ludewig U. Lysine catabolism, amino acid transport, and systemic acquired resistance. Plant Signal Behav. 2014;9. doi:10.4161/psb.28933

66. Sivaguru M, Pike S, Gassmann W, Baskin TI. Aluminum rapidly depolymerizes cortical microtubules and depolarizes the plasma membrane: evidence that these responses are mediated by a glutamate receptor. Plant Cell Physiol. 2003;44: 667–675.

67. Lu G, Wang X, Liu J, Yu K, Gao Y, Liu H, et al. Application of T-DNA activation tagging to identify glutamate receptor-like genes that enhance drought tolerance in plants. Plant Cell Rep. 2014;33: 617–631. doi:10.1007/s00299-014-1586-7

68. Bird CR, Smith TA. The biosynthesis of coumarylagmatine in barley seedlings. Phytochemistry. 1981;20: 2345–2346. doi:10.1016/S0031-9422(00)82662-X

69. Roepenack-Lahaye E von, Newman M-A, Schornack S, Hammond-Kosack KE, Lahaye T, Jones JDG, et al. p-Coumaroylnoradrenaline, a Novel Plant Metabolite Implicated in Tomato Defense against Pathogens. J Biol Chem. 2003;278: 43373–43383. doi:10.1074/jbc.M305084200

70. Scheideler M, Schlaich NL, Fellenberg K, Beissbarth T, Hauser NC, Vingron M, et al. Monitoring the switch from housekeeping to pathogen defense metabolism in Arabidopsis thaliana using cDNA arrays. J Biol Chem. 2002;277: 10555–10561. doi:10.1074/jbc.M104863200

71. Mutuku JM, Nose A. Changes in the Contents of Metabolites and Enzyme Activities in Rice Plants Responding to Rhizoctonia solani Kuhn Infection: Activation of Glycolysis and Connection to Phenylpropanoid Pathway. Plant Cell Physiol. 2012;53: 1017–1032. doi:10.1093/pcp/pcs047

72. Ton J, Mauch-Mani B. Beta-amino-butyric acid-induced resistance against necrotrophic pathogens is based on ABA-dependent priming for callose. Plant J Cell Mol Biol. 2004;38: 119–130. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2004.02028.x

73. Yan Z, Reddy MS, Ryu C-M, McInroy JA, Wilson M, Kloepper JW. Induced systemic protection against tomato late blight elicited by plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria. Phytopathology. 2002;92: 1329–1333. doi:10.1094/PHYTO.2002.92.12.1329

74. Klessig DF, Tian M, Choi HW. Multiple Targets of Salicylic Acid and Its Derivatives in Plants and Animals. Front Immunol. 2016;7. Available: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fimmu.2016.00206

75. PONCHET M, DUPREZ V, RICCI P. SUPPRESSION OF BOTH INDUCED RESISTANCE AND PHYTOALEXIN PRODUCTION BY SALICYLIC ACID DURING ELICITATION OF CARNATION

CUTTINGS. Acta Horticulturae. International Society for Horticultural Science (ISHS), Leuven, Belgium; 1983. pp. 61–70. doi:10.17660/ActaHortic.1983.141.9

76. Czékus Z, Iqbal N, Pollák B, Martics A, Ördög A, Poór P. Role of ethylene and light in chitosan-induced local and systemic defence responses of tomato plants. J Plant Physiol. 2021;263: 153461. doi:10.1016/j.jplph.2021.153461

77. Czékus Z, Kukri A, Hamow KÁ, Szalai G, Tari I, Ördög A, et al. Activation of Local and Systemic Defence Responses by Flg22 Is Dependent on Daytime and Ethylene in Intact Tomato Plants. Int J Mol Sci. 2021;22: 8354. doi:10.3390/ijms22158354

78. Pujol C, Bailly M, Kern D, Maréchal-Drouard L, Becker H, Duchêne A-M. Dual-targeted tRNA-dependent amidotransferase ensures both mitochondrial and chloroplastic Gln-tRNAGln synthesis in plants. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008;105: 6481–6485. doi:10.1073/pnas.0712299105

79. Pajerowska-Mukhtar KM, Wang W, Tada Y, Oka N, Tucker CL, Fonseca JP, et al. The HSF-like transcription factor TBF1 is a major molecular switch for plant growth-to-defense transition. Curr Biol CB. 2012;22: 103–112. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.12.015

80. Wu C-C, Singh P, Chen M-C, Zimmerli L. L-Glutamine inhibits beta-aminobutyric acid-induced stress resistance and priming in Arabidopsis. J Exp Bot. 2010;61: 995–1002. doi:10.1093/jxb/erp363

81. Wang Y, Weide R, Govers F, Bouwmeester K. L-type lectin receptor kinases in *Nicotiana benthamiana* and tomato and their role in *Phytophthora* resistance. J Exp Bot. 2015;66: 6731–6743. doi:10.1093/jxb/erv379

82. Miya A, Albert P, Shinya T, Desaki Y, Ichimura K, Shirasu K, et al. CERK1, a LysM receptor kinase, is essential for chitin elicitor signaling in Arabidopsis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2007;104: 19613–19618. doi:10.1073/pnas.0705147104

83. AbuQamar S, Chai M-F, Luo H, Song F, Mengiste T. Tomato Protein Kinase 1b Mediates Signaling of Plant Responses to Necrotrophic Fungi and Insect Herbivory. Plant Cell. 2008;20: 1964–1983. doi:10.1105/tpc.108.059477

84. Liu G, Ji Y, Bhuiyan NH, Pilot G, Selvaraj G, Zou J, et al. Amino acid homeostasis modulates salicylic acid-associated redox status and defense responses in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell. 2010;22: 3845–3863. doi:10.1105/tpc.110.079392

85. Kadotani N, Akagi A, Takatsuji H, Miwa T, Igarashi D. Exogenous proteinogenic amino acids induce systemic resistance in rice. BMC Plant Biol. 2016;16: 60. doi:10.1186/s12870-016-0748-x

86. Fabro G, Kovács I, Pavet V, Szabados L, Alvarez ME. Proline accumulation and AtP5CS2 gene activation are induced by plant-pathogen incompatible interactions in Arabidopsis. Mol Plant-Microbe Interact MPMI. 2004;17: 343–350. doi:10.1094/MPMI.2004.17.4.343

87. Cecchini NM, Monteoliva MI, Alvarez ME. Proline dehydrogenase contributes to pathogen defense in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol. 2011;155: 1947–1959. doi:10.1104/pp.110.167163

88. Rizzi YS, Cecchini NM, Fabro G, Alvarez ME. Differential control and function of Arabidopsis ProDH1 and ProDH2 genes on infection with biotrophic and necrotrophic pathogens. Mol Plant Pathol. 2017;18: 1164–1174. doi:10.1111/mpp.12470

89. Kim D-R, Jeon C-W, Cho G, Thomashow LS, Weller DM, Paik M-J, et al. Glutamic acid reshapes the plant microbiota to protect plants against pathogens. Microbiome. 2021;9: 244. doi:10.1186/s40168-021-01186-8

90. Manzoor H, Kelloniemi J, Chiltz A, Wendehenne D, Pugin A, Poinssot B, et al. Involvement of the glutamate receptor AtGLR3.3 in plant defense signaling and resistance to Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis. Plant J Cell Mol Biol. 2013;76: 466–480. doi:10.1111/tpj.12311

91. Anders S, Huber W. Differential expression analysis for sequence count data. Genome Biol. 2010;11: R106. doi:10.1186/gb-2010-11-10-r106

92. Wang Y, Coleman-Derr D, Chen G, Gu YQ. OrthoVenn: a web server for genome wide comparison and annotation of orthologous clusters across multiple species. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015;43: W78-84. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv487

93. eulerr citation info. [cited 21 Jan 2021]. Available: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/eulerr/citation.html

94. Tian T, Liu Y, Yan H, You Q, Yi X, Du Z, et al. agriGO v2.0: a GO analysis toolkit for the agricultural community, 2017 update. Nucleic Acids Res. 2017. doi:10.1093/nar/gkx382

95. Proost S, Van Bel M, Vaneechoutte D, Van de Peer Y, Inzé D, Mueller-Roeber B, et al. PLAZA 3.0: an access point for plant comparative genomics. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014; gku986. doi:10.1093/nar/gku986

96. Shannon P, Markiel A, Ozier O, Baliga NS, Wang JT, Ramage D, et al. Cytoscape: A Software Environment for Integrated Models of Biomolecular Interaction Networks. Genome Res. 2003;13: 2498–2504. doi:10.1101/gr.1239303

97. Goenawan IH, Bryan K, Lynn DJ. DyNet: visualization and analysis of dynamic molecular interaction networks. Bioinformatics. 2016; btw187. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btw187

98. Gómez-Alonso S, Hermosín-Gutiérrez I, García-Romero E. Simultaneous HPLC Analysis of Biogenic Amines, Amino Acids, and Ammonium Ion as Aminoenone Derivatives in Wine and Beer Samples. J Agric Food Chem. 2007;55: 608–613. doi:10.1021/jf062820m

99. Segarra G, Jáuregui O, Casanova E, Trillas I. Simultaneous quantitative LC–ESI-MS/MS analyses of salicylic acid and jasmonic acid in crude extracts of Cucumis sativus under biotic stress. Phytochemistry. 2006;67: 395–401. doi:10.1016/j.phytochem.2005.11.017