

Engineering of Polygalacturonase-Inhibiting Protein as an Ecological, Friendly, and Non-toxic Pest Control Agent

Tiffany Chiu¹, Anita Behari¹, Justin Chartron¹, Alexander Putman¹, and Yanran Li¹

¹University of California Riverside

February 21, 2021

Abstract

Fungal pathogens cause extensive plant diseases that damage crop production in the agricultural industry, resulting in annual crop loss, diminished food security, and historically significant epidemics. Though effective fungicides are available, their risks to the environment and animal health have increased the demand for more sustainable methods to control fungal pathogens. In plants, polygalacturonic-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) play critical roles for resistance to fungal disease by inhibiting the pectin-depolymerizing activity of endopolygalacturonases (PGs), one type of enzyme secreted by pathogens that compromise plant cell walls and leave the plant susceptible to disease. Here, the interactions between PGIPs from *Phaseolus vulgaris* (PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2) and PGs from *Aspergillus niger* (AnPG2), *Botrytis cinerea* (BcPG1, BcPG2), and *Fusarium moniliforme* (FmPG3) were reconstituted through a yeast two hybrid (Y2H) system to investigate the inhibition efficiency of various PvPGIP1 and 2 truncations and mutants. We found that tPvPGIP2.5-8, which contains LRR5 to LRR8 and is of only one-third the size of the full-length peptide, exhibits the same level of interactions with AnPG and BcPGs as the full length PvPGIP2 via Y2H. The inhibitory activities of tPvPGIP2.5-8 on the growth of *A. niger* were then examined and confirmed on pectin agar. Application of both full length PvPGIP2 and tPvPGIP2.5-8 clearly slows down the growth of *A. niger* and *B. cinerea* in the presence of pectin. The investigation on the sequence-function correlation of PvPGIP2 suggests that LRR5 could have the most essential structural feature for the inhibitory activities, and may be a possible target for the future engineering of PGIP with enhanced activity. This work highlights the potential of using plant-derived PGIPs as an exogenously applied fungal control agent both to plants and postharvest crops while minimally impacting the environment and human health.

Introduction

Pathogenic fungi have long been a consistent source of devastation for the agricultural industry (De Lucca, 2007). Approximately 16% of the world's crops are lost to microbial diseases, with an estimated 70-80% of these losses caused by fungi (Moore et al., 2011). Massive crop failures due to fungal diseases occur throughout history and threaten food security (Bebber & Gurr, 2015; Money, 2007). The range of tactics used to manage fungal pathogens include host resistance breeding (Melchers & Stuiver, 2000), cultural practices (Dekker, 1983), and plant protection (Möller & Stukenbrock, 2017; Wink, 1988). However, breeding for host resistance is a slow process and is not effective for certain pathogens, and cultural practices often do not provide complete control. Plant protection has greatly reduced the loss of crops while improving yields (Morton & Staub, 2008). For example, The United States agricultural industry applies over 108 million pounds of fungicides, costing roughly \$880 million annually, but in turn, gains \$12.8 billion due to the increased production value from the control of plant diseases (Gianessi & Reigner, 2006). However, the development of fungicide resistance in pathogen populations threatens to erode the efficacy of fungicides against several important pathogens (Ishii, 2006).

Although fungicides can efficiently reduce yield loss and improve food security, concerns about their non-target effects may affect their availability or utility in the future. Fungicides with relatively higher potential for mammalian toxicity may have limits placed on their use to mitigate exposure of applicators and field

workers (Arcury & Quandt, 1998), and to ensure residue on harvested commodities remains below safe levels (Alavanja et al., 2004; Thabet et al., 2016). Fungicides may also negatively impact non-target organisms in agroecosystems, for example soil microbiota involved in nutrient cycling or plant symbionts (Yang et al., 2011), or insect symbionts (Wilson et al., 2014). To mitigate harm to pollinators the application of certain fungicides is not allowed during bloom, but this period is a critical opportunity to halt development of many diseases. Under certain conditions, fungicides may also be transported off-site following application via runoff or leaching and negatively impact aquatic organisms (Maltby et al., 2009). A more socially and environmentally sustainable method to control fungal plant pathogens is needed.

The plant cell wall is the first barrier a plant pathogen must overcome on its path to establishing a parasitic relationship (Hématy et al., 2009). Cell wall-degrading enzymes play an important role in the pathogenicity of many pathogenic fungi (Kubicek et al., 2014). To combat PGs, plants synthesize PG inhibiting proteins (PGIPs), which are highly conserved glycoproteins that contain leucine-rich repeat (LRR) regions and are located in plant cell walls (Adele Di Matteo et al., 2006; Hammond-Kosack & Jones, 1997). PGIPs can inhibit PGs through competitive inhibition, with the concave surface of the PGIP physically blocking the active site of PGs (A. Di Matteo et al., 2003; Kalunke et al., 2015). Additionally, it is believed that one of the ways in which PGIPs may play a role in plant protection is by reducing the rate at which the plant oligosaccharides are broken down (Frediani et al., 1993). A structural investigation of PGIPs indicates that the central LRR domain is flanked by the N- and C-terminal cysteine rich regions, and the residues involved in interacting with PGs are located in the concave surface between sheets B1 and B2 (Caprari et al., 1996), which are highly conserved across different PGIPs (Matsaunyan et al., 2015) (Figure 1a). These conserved regions are also known to be involved in the structural integrity of PGIPs (A. Di Matteo et al., 2003). It is believed that the central LRR pocket is responsible for recognizing the amino acids present at the active site of many PGs (Helft et al., 2011). This specificity allows PGIPs to differentiate fungal PGs from endogenous plant PGs (L. Federici et al., 2001). Prior studies indicate that overexpression of either endogenous or heterologous PGIPs in various plants enhanced their resistance towards fungal infection (Rathinam et al., 2020). However, whether this approach can be utilized as a tool for plant disease prevention remains unclear due to difficulties with public perception accepting transgenic plants.

Though there are numerous PGIPs studied for their potential in fungal protection, the best characterized PGIP is isoform 2 of PGIP from the common bean, *Phaseolus vulgaris* (PvPGIP2), which exhibits inhibitory activity toward a number of fungal PGs (Capodicasa et al., 2004; Leckie et al., 1999). Despite differing from isoform 1, PvPGIP1, by only 10 residues, PvPGIP2 confers resistance against a greater known number of fungal PGs (Kalunke et al., 2015; Maulik et al., 2009) (Figure 1). Here, we investigate the potential of using engineered PvPGIP2 as a fungal growth inhibitor. We utilized *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* as a microbial expression system, which has benefits such as the lack of background PGIP activity and a fast turnover time (Haeger et al., 2020). We reproduced previously reported interactions between PvPGIP2 and various PGs in a yeast two hybrid (Y2H) system, thus validating it as a handy approach to estimate PvPGIP2 activity. Y2H was then used to estimate the functions of various truncations and mutants of PvPGIP2. Different truncations resulted in varied levels of interaction with PGs, showing that some LRRs may be more important for recognizing certain PGs compared to others. We found that truncating the PvPGIP2 to only the region between LRR5 and LRR8 retained similar PG interaction levels to the full length PvPGIP2. Furthermore, mutants were created with amino acid residues that differed between PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2. Our approach also showed that Val172 of PvPGIP2 is the most critical residue that affects the recognition of fungal PGs, in agreement with previous research (Helft et al., 2011; Leckie et al., 1999; Sicilia et al., 2005). The interaction of PGIP2 variants with various PGs was demonstrated through assaying fungal growth on pectin agar, with or without the presence of engineered yeast strains. Our investigations highlight the potential of using engineered PGIPs as exogenous antifungal agent to inhibit the growth of phytopathogenic fungi as an environmentally and economically friendly approach.

Results

Interactions between PG and PGIP can be monitored using yeast two hybrid system.

Because PGIPs can physically inhibit PGs *via* competitive inhibition (Sicilia et al., 2005; Spinelli et al., 2009; Stotz et al., 2000), we tested whether the Y2H system could be used to interrogate the binding between the two proteins. The crystal structure of PvPGIP2 shows a large, negatively charged pocket on the inner LRR concave surface believed to bind to the positively charged residues on the active site of PGs (A. Di Matteo et al., 2003) (Figure 1). This physical contact between the two proteins led us to believe that Y2H can be a reasonable approach to observe PG-PGIP interactions, which were mainly monitored by surface plasmon resonance (SPR) (Cervone, 1997; L. Federici et al., 2001; Leckie et al., 1999). However, unlike Y2H, SPR requires expression and purification of each component. Although Y2H has rarely been used to estimate PG-PGIP activity, it was adopted in one previous investigation to conclude that a PGIP family protein, the carrot antifreeze protein, does not exhibit PGIP activity (Zhang et al., 2006).

We chose four PGs that play important roles in infection by their corresponding pathogens: PG2 from *A. niger* (AnPG2), PG1 and PG2 from *B. cinerea* (BcPG1 and BcPG2), and PG from *F. moniliforme* (FmPG3). *Fusarium moniliforme* (synonym = *F. verticillioides*), *Aspergillus niger*, and *Botrytis cinerea* all exhibit widespread impact on food crops. *F. moniliforme* (Pamphile & Azevedo, 2002) can produce mycotoxins with toxic secondary metabolites to both humans and animals (Schoeman et al., 2018). It is one of the most significant fungal pathogens to infect corn (Munkvold, 2003). *Aspergillus niger* is one of the most significant causes of postharvest decay due to its ability to affect many common crops, such as onions (Gherbawy et al., 2015), grapes (Logrieco et al., 2009), peanuts (Xu et al., 2015), and maize (Palencia et al., 2010). Due to its wide range of pH tolerance and quick growth, *A. niger* is considered to be one of the most significant fungi associated with postharvest decay (Sharma, 2012). *Botrytis cinerea* is a necrotrophic fungus with a wide host range of over 200 species, resulting in an economic loss upwards of \$10 billion globally every year (Weiberg et al., 2013). For example, it is considered the most economically significant pathogen of strawberry worldwide (Petrasch et al., 2019).

Previous investigations indicate that PvPGIP2 can inhibit the function of AnPG2 (Leckie et al., 1999; Spadoni et al., 2006; Spinelli et al., 2009) and BcPG1 (Leckie et al., 1999; Manfredini et al., 2005; Sicilia et al., 2005), weakly inhibits FmPG3 (L. Federici et al., 2001; Leckie et al., 1999), and possibly inhibits BcPG2 (Leckie et al., 1999). In contrast, PvPGIP1 inhibits the activity of AnPG2 (Leckie et al., 1999; Spadoni et al., 2006), weakly inhibits BcPG1 (Leckie et al., 1999) and does not inhibit FmPG3 (Leckie et al., 1999; Maulik et al., 2009). The activity of PvPGIP1 against BcPG2 is unknown. In our experiments, PGs were fused to the GAL4 binding domain (GAL4-BD), and PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2 were fused to GAL4 activation domain (GAL4-AD). The bait and prey constructs, each containing *leu2* and *trp1* gene respectively, were co-transformed into a Y2H reporter strain *S. cerevisiae* PJ69-4A (Shaffer et al., 2012) (Figure S1). PJ69-4A encodes *his3* gene regulated by the *GAL4* promoter, and interaction between the Gal4-AD and Gal4-BD fusion proteins results in growth of yeast cells in synthetic dropout (SD) medium lacking histidine (H), tryptophan (T), and leucine (L). PG-PGIP interactions were estimated using OD₆₀₀ of Y2H yeast strains at stationary phase. Growth of yeast harboring Gal4 AD-PvPGIP2 and Gal4 BD-AnPG2 was grown in -LT and used as a positive control, while yeast harboring Gal4 AD-HAB1, a protein not known to interact with PGs, and Gal4 BD-BcPG2 was grown in -HTL media and used as the negative control. With Gal4 AD-PvPGIP2, yeast containing Gal4 BD-AnPG2 or BcPG1 exhibited robust growth in -HTL medium, indicating strong PG-PGIP interactions (Figure 2). Yeast with Gal4 AD-PvPGIP2 harboring either Gal4 BD-BcPG2 or Gal4 BD-FmPG3 grows much slower than the positive control (Figure 2), which implies weak PG-PGIP interactions. The distinct PG-PGIP interactions may be due to the different specificity of the protein recognition site at the concave surface of the PGIPs (A. Di Matteo et al., 2003; Sicilia et al., 2005). Yeast harboring Gal4 AD-PvPGIP1 and Gal4 BD-AnPG2 grew at a similar level to the positive control (Figure 2). Yeast harboring FmPG3 exhibits the slowest growth that is slightly higher than the negative control indicating little to no Y2H interaction. The PG-PGIP interactions implied from Y2H assay overall are reflective of findings in previous studies (Luca Federici et al., 2006; Leckie et al., 1999; Manfredini et al., 2005; Maulik et al., 2009; Sella et al., 2004; Spadoni et al., 2006; Spinelli et al., 2009) (L. Federici et al., 2001; Leckie et al., 1999; Manfredini et al., 2005; Sella et al., 2004; Spadoni et al., 2006; Spinelli et al., 2009) and suggests that it is feasible to use Y2H assay to functionally map PG-PGIP interactions.

Truncated forms of PvPGIP1 and 2 consisting of only LRR5 to LRR8 retains similar level of interaction with AnPG2 and BcPG1 compared to the full length PvPGIP2.

The modular structure of leucine-rich repeat proteins (Figure 1) leads to the hypothesis that a fraction of PGIP may be sufficient to efficiently inhibit PG activity. Binding of PGs to truncated versions of PvPGIP2 were tested using the Y2H system. PvPGIPs lacking the N-terminus (Figure 3a) or C-terminus (Figure 3b) exhibited similar activity levels to full-length PvPGIP2, displaying comparable growth rates and final OD. This indicates that the N- and C-terminus likely do not harbor any residues integral to PG recognition. To narrow down which LRRs to truncate, we noted that a previous docking simulation of BcPG1 and PvPGIP2 found the optimal docking area of PvPGIP2 was between Val-152 and His-291, and played a vital role in the interaction with PGs. (Sicilia et al., 2005). Thus, PvPGIP2 was truncated to retain only LRR5 to LRR8 (tPvPGIP2.5-8, Figure 1c), which flanks the optimal docking area. tPvPGIP2.5-8 exhibited a comparable growth curve to full length PvPGIP2 in the Y2H assay, with only slight decreases in AnPG2 and BcPG1 interactions (Figure 3c). Further truncation of LRR5 from tPvPGIP2.5-8 to make tPvPGIP2.6-8 resulted in an almost complete loss of inhibitory activity to all the PGs tested (Figure 3d). Likewise, further truncation of tPvPGIP2.6-8 to tPvPGIP2.6-7 (Figure 3e) also exhibited no inhibitory activity to the tested PGs. Truncation of LRR8 from tPvPGIP2.5-8 to make tPvPGIP2.5-7 lead to reduced interactions with AnPG2 and BcPG1 compared to tPvPGIP2.5-8 (Figure 3f). Other truncations that contained only LRR4 to LRR5 (Figure 3g) and LRR4 to LRR6 (Figure 3h) resulted in a complete loss of interaction with PGs as well. These results imply that tPvPGIP2.5-8 is likely the smallest truncation that retains similar level of inhibitory activity towards AnPG2 and BcPGs, compared with full length PvPGIP2. Taken together, our results indicate that the regions outside of LRR5 to LRR8 in PvPGIP2 are not essential for the interaction with PGs, and the specific function of these parts of PGIPs remain to be clearly elucidated.

We then measured the interactions of both tPvPGIP1.5-8 and tPvPGIP2.5-8 with different PGs. The interactions of both the truncated PGIPs with different PGs well mirrored that of the full length PGIPs (Figure S2). The growth curves for yeast harboring AnPG2 and BcPG1 had the highest stationary phase among all the yeast strains and were comparable to the positive control. This again shows that the properly truncated PGIPs (here, tPvPGIP2.5-8 and tPvPGIP1.5-8) are able to interact with PGs in a similar capacity to their full-length counterparts (Figure S2).

Both full length and truncated PvPGIP2 can efficiently inhibit the growth of *A. niger* when applied exogenously.

To validate the inhibitory activity of PGIPs to PG, and the potential of using PGIPs exogenously to inhibit fungal growth, we constructed yeast strains that can secrete PGIPs and monitored fungal growth on pectin in the presence of the PGIP-secreting yeast strains. The *Ost1* signal sequence, a well-documented secretion tag (Fitzgerald & Glick, 2014), was fused to PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2. Since the corresponding clone of PvPGIP2 (the *OST1-PvPGIP2-HA* construct) was not successful, we used PvPGIP1 construct instead to validate the utilization of *OST1* signal sequence. The presence of PvPGIP1 in both the cell lysate and medium was verified through western blot (Figure 4a). Interestingly, a faint band also detected in the medium of yeast harboring PvPGIP1 without the *Ost1* signal sequence, which implies that PvPGIP1 can be natively secreted out of the cell. This is consistent with its defense function reported previously (Kalunke et al., 2015).

With the secretion of PvPGIP1 aided by the *Ost1* signal sequence confirmed, PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2-secreting yeast strains without the HA tag were constructed and evaluated in an *in vitro* assay to evaluate whether PGIPs can inhibit the growth of fungi in the presence of pectin. *A. niger* or *B. cinerea* was inoculated on agar plate amended with 0.5% citrus pectin (weight/volume) in the presence of PGIP-secreting yeast (roughly 1.2×10^6 cells), the antifungal agent natamycin at a concentration of 100 mg/L (positive control), or wild-type yeast strains (negative control). The growth of *A. niger* and *B. cinerea* were estimated with OD readings at 630nm (Langvad, 1999). Both the full length PvPGIP2 and tPvPGIP2.5-8 efficiently delayed the growth of both fungi (Figure 4b and 4c). Meanwhile, when PvPGIP2 or tPvPGIP2 were expressed from high copy plasmids, lower OD readings at 630nm were detected than when expressed from low copy plasmids, which shows that the inhibitory activity of PGIP is likely dose dependent. To further confirm

the activities of PGIPs, the PGIP- secreting yeast was spread onto the entire plate and 2 μ L of *A. niger* (5 x 10⁵ conidia/mL) was spotted into four locations. The growth of fungi was also monitored over seven days and both full length PvPGIP2 and tPvPGIP2.5-8 delayed sporulation of *A. niger* by at least one day (Figure S3). Similarly, PvPGIP2 or tPvPGIP2.5-8 expressed from high copy plasmids was more effective in inhibiting the growth of *A. niger*, compared to the ones expressed from low copy plasmids (Figure S3). These results suggest that PvPGIP2 and tPvPGIP2, when applied exogenously, can inhibit *A. niger* and *B. cinerea* utilization of pectin and thus impede fungal growth when pectin is present as one carbon source, though with a lower efficiency than the antifungal agent natamycin. The consistency between the Y2H assay and fungal-pectin assay also demonstrates that Y2H can be utilized as a functional monitoring or screening method for PGIP-PG interactions.

Investigation on PGIP sequence-function correlation

Although PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2 are highly similar in amino acid sequence (Figure 1c), they exhibit distinct activities against different PGs, such as BcPG2 (Figure 2). Deciphering the sequence-function correlation of PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2 to PG recognition may provide insights for the engineering of PvPGIP2 for enhanced activity or spectrum. One previous docking-based study demonstrated the importance of the Val172Gly (located in LRR5) and found that replacing PvPGIP2's Val with PvPGIP1's Gly decreased inhibition activity against BcPG1 (Manfredini et al., 2005; Sicilia et al., 2005). However, in our study, we found that that PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2 had similar levels of interaction with BcPG1, with PvPGIP2 only displaying a slightly higher growth rate in the exponential phase (Figure 2). This is likely because the system lacks sensitivity, which could be due to some steric hinderance from the fused yeast reporter proteins or some post-translational modifications of the PGIP. There are ten different residues between the full length PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2, but most have previously been found to have little to no effect on PG recognition, with the exception of those found within the ODA (Sicilia et al., 2005). Three of these residues are located in the truncated region of LRR5 to LRR8 (Figure 5a). Our finding that the truncated forms possess a similar activity profile to their full-length counterparts provides a unique opportunity to clearly elucidate the sequence-function correlation of PG recognition (Figure S2). To determine which residue(s) are essential for the inhibitory activity, we constructed six tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} mutants that shuffled the sequences between tPvPGIP_{1.5-8} and tPvPGIP_{2.5-8}. Each mutant contains a combination of Val172Gly (LRR5), Ser198Ala (LRR6), or Gln244Lys (LRR8), named in that order, with each mutation designated as 1 or 2 depending on if the amino acid was from PvPGIP1 or PvPGIP2 respectively. The mutants are tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} "221" (Figure 5d), tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} "212" (Figure 5e), tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} "211" (Figure 5f), tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} "122" (Figure 5g), tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} "112" (Figure 5h), and tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} "121" (Figure 5i). The activities of the six tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} mutants were examined using the Y2H assay by mating PJ69-4A containing the different tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} with the same controls as previously described. The growth of the six diploid yeast strains in -HTL medium were compared with the controls. When the chimeric tPGIP_{2.5-8} contained Val from PvPGIP2 instead of Gly from PvPGIP1 at position 172, it retained PG interaction ability similar to tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} regardless of mutations at other sites. If residue 244 contains Gln from PvPGIP2, a slight increase in FmPG activity is found compared to pure PvPGIP1, indicating the importance of 244Gln towards the recognition of FmPG. Residue 198 was not noted to have any impact on PG-PGIP interaction (Figure 5). Furthermore, we conducted saturated site-directed mutagenesis at residue 172 of tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} (Figure 6). All 20 amino acids were compared using Y2H assay. While most mutants showed decreased levels of interaction with the tested PGs compared to the wild type tPvPGIP_{2.5-8}, several mutants displayed a different inhibition profile against different PGs. tPvPGIP_{2.5-8}^{V172M} showed a similar level of interaction with FmPG3 and BcPG2, a slightly higher interaction with BcPG1, but decreased interactions with AnPG2, compared to the wild type tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} (Figure 6). In addition, tPvPGIP_{2.5-8}^{V172L} showed slightly higher interactions than wild type tPvPGIP_{2.5-8} against BcPG1 (Figure 6b) but not the other three PGs (Figure 6). However, no amino acid substitution showed a statistically significant improvement in PG interactions compared to the wild type tPvPGIP_{2.5-8}, which indicates that natural evolution has already selected for the optimal amino acids for interacting with the tested PGs.

Discussion

As the risk of conventional fungicides continue to be a cause for a concern, there is increased demand for more eco-friendly pest management approaches. Regulation of fungicide use has increased in many countries and regions, and consumers are wary of chemical residues on their fruits and vegetables. However, more sustainable approaches to control fungal pathogens, especially at the post-harvest stage, are still in the early stages of development. PGIPs are naturally occurring plant proteins that can slow the rate of infection from pathogenic fungi by inhibiting one of the key steps in the infection process—the degradation of cell walls via PGs. While conventional fungicides continue to be key to ensuring food security and preventing crop loss across the world, our approach for developing and engineering PGIPs is a step towards providing an alternative strategy to fungal pest control, and could potentially serve as a platform for future engineering of a wider range of proteins for practical applications in agriculture and post-harvest fruit storage and transportation.

PGIPs are naturally occurring plant proteins that can slow the rate of infection from pathogenic fungi by inhibiting one of the methods fungi use for colonizing plants—the degradation of cell walls via PGs. The results of this research validate the utilization of Y2H to estimate the interactions between PvPGIPs and PGs. Both PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2 have the strongest interactions with AnPG2 and BcPG1 compared to BcPG2 and FmPG3, as evidenced by both higher growth rate and stationary phase in growth curves. PvPGIP2 has greater levels of interactions with PGs compared to PvPGIP1, which supports the findings from previous studies (Bishop, 2005; D'Ovidio et al., 2004; Leckie et al., 1999; Manfredini et al., 2005). While conventional pesticides often leave residues in the soil and crop surfaces that can negatively impact non-target organisms, PGIPs are naturally occurring proteins that will likely degrade into harmless amino acids. The presence of these defensive proteins in plants increase disease resistance (De Lorenzo et al., 2001).

PGIPs are a family of LRR proteins with several highly conserved regions (Helft et al., 2011). In our study, we found that LRR5 resides in a critical region for recognizing PGs, and that regions of PvPGIP2 exclusive of LRR5 to LRR8 plays a very minor role in PG recognition. The successful truncation of PvPGIP2 to one-third of the original size with similar level of inhibition activity retained indicates the versatility of LRR proteins and the potential to engineer this group of proteins for altered recognition and activities. Although we were successful in demonstrating the interactions between PGIPs and PGs using a Y2H system, some previous studies report that PGIPs are difficult to express in soluble in microbial system. This could be due to a number of factors, such as protein instability or an aggregation of recombinant PGIPs (Haeger et al., 2020). Nevertheless, in this study we were able to reconstitute the PG-PGIP interaction using a Y2H system and identified a method to secrete functional PGIP from yeast into the medium. While a trace amount of PvPGIP1 was secreted without the *Ost1* signal, utilizing the signal peptide allowed us to clearly confirm the presence of PGIP in the medium. The presence of the N-terminus domains, Gal4 AD or *Ost1* signal peptide, may have enhanced the stability and folding of PvPGIP2 in the yeast environment.

Some challenges remain unsolved and further research is needed to develop truncated PGIP peptides into practical approach. First, there are beneficial fungi that play essential roles to promote plant growth, such as mycorrhizal fungi that mediate plant-soil feedback (Kadowaki et al., 2018). However, we do not know if the application of PvPGIP proteins will affect these nonpathogenic fungi. Second, while the full length PvPGIP2 is found in nature and is not known to negatively impact the environment, it is unknown if the truncated form has unwanted targets or toxic side products from its interactions. Although unlikely to be a toxic agent, *in vivo* studies are needed to test the toxicity of PGIPs before practical and large-scale applications. Although PGIPs are natural plant proteins, it may also be difficult to convince the public how they are different from GMOs. Education and improving laymen understanding of this potential fungal control tool will be important. PvPGIP2 may be the most studied PGIP, but other plant PGIPs are of interest as well. For example, CkPGIP1 from *Cynanchum komarovii* (Liu et al., 2016) and MdPGIP1 from *Malus domestica* (Oelofse et al., 2006) have shown to have activity against PGs that PvPGIP2 is not yet known to have, such as those from *Rhizoctonia solani*, *Diaporthe ambigua*, and *Botryosphaeria obtusa* (Liu et al., 2016; Oelofse et al., 2006). Studying how other PGIPs inhibit PGs and understanding what motifs are present that allow for that interaction may offer hints at further evolving our truncated PvPGIP2 to have a broader spectrum of activity.

As the long-term goal of this research is to develop a sustainable, alternative fungal treatment, another future direction and challenge to tackle includes improving the protein yield in the medium. *S. cerevisiae* is a well-studied model organism that is promising as a microbial host factory (Borodina & Nielsen, 2014; Siddiqui et al., 2012). Efficient protein production by yeast will require a combination of improved secretion signal peptides and fine-tuning yeast metabolism (Delic et al., 2013). By developing efficient synthesis, the cost of the proteins will decrease, enabling the peptides to be more viable and appealing as a product. This will allow for more widespread usage in agriculture. Furthermore, packaging PGIPs as a user-friendly product that can be applied with standard equipment is essential to the practical utilization of this strategy. One method is to freeze dry the PGIP-secreting yeast for application. Previous studies have found that freeze drying naturally occurring microbiota on apples and applying a resuspended solution on postharvest crops greatly reduces fungal disease and loss of crop during shipping (Navarta et al., 2020). As *Saccharomyces* is natively found on wine grapes (Valero et al., n.d.), a fruit susceptible to rot from *Botrytis* (Elmer & Reglinski, 2006; Steel et al., 2013) utilizing cryonics on PGIP-secreting yeast is a possible developmental path though it would be a genetically modified *Saccharomyces*. Furthermore, thermostability of the products would also be an important trait for storage and utility purposes.

There are numerous innovative ways that plant proteins can be developed into tools for disease prevention in crops. With more research, they can be enhanced to further improve their efficacy and more functionality may be discovered. Here, PvPGIPs are proof that plant proteins can successfully be utilized as exogenously applied, sustainable, natural fungal control agent and reduce disease incidence in postharvest crops. This research is a stepping-stone towards developing an eco-friendly future where green products are an ever-growing industry.

Materials and Methods

Plasmid construction

The PGIP (PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2) and PG (AnPG2, BcPG1, BcPG2, and FmPG3) genes were ordered from Twist Bioscience and codon optimized for *S. cerevisiae*. These pTwist genes were cloned using the Gateway system, with a destination vector containing either an AD domain for the PGIPs or a BD domain for the PGs. The LR Reaction was done using the guidelines and instructions found in the Invitrogen Gateway LR Clonase II Enzyme Mix product sheet (Fischer Scientific, catalog #11789020). Truncated versions of the PGIPs were made using various primers as seen in Table 1 that ensured the protein would not be spliced in the middle of the β -sheets. This was checked using the protein 3D imaging software, PyMOL. Primers were made for the N and C terminus, as well as for each LRR region to create a multitude of possible PGIP length combinations. Primers were designed according to the protocol “Gibson Assembly Cloning” from Addgene. Truncated versions of PGIPs were cloned from the full length PGIPs using these primers and underwent Gibson assembly with a vector containing the AD domain.

Y2H growth curve assay

S. cerevisiae strain PJ69-4A, was transformed containing plasmids with full length PvPGIP1 or PvPGIP2, and strain PJ69-4 α was transformed one of the PGs (AnPG2, BcPG1, BcPG2, FmPG3). The yeast transformations were carried out using standard protocols (Truong & Gietz, 2007). 500 μ L of overnight stock cultures of these samples were grown at 30°C with orbital shaking at 250 RPM in -T or -L YNB respectively with 5% dextrose. After 16 hours, 10 μ L of each PGIP and PG containing yeast was mated together in YPD for 24 hours. A 1/60 dilution of each culture was made into -LT for approximately 48 hours. Finally, a 1/300 dilution of the mated yeast in the -LT was then made into 3mL of -HTL YNB. Each sample had 3 biological replicates. A plate reader was used to measure the OD at 600nm every 24 hours for 4 days. The average OD across the 3 biological replicates were then plotted. The same procedure was applied for the truncated versions of the PvPGIPs. Data was collected using the Gen5TM Data Analysis Software (BioTek Instruments).

Verifying and qualifying secreted PvPGIP protein presence via western blot

To verify that our PvPGIP protein was being secreted, samples were prepared by using the protein secretion assay as follows. *S. cerevisiae* strain PJ69-4A, was transformed containing either the plasmid with full length PvPGIP1 with the HA tag (PvPGIP1-HA), or the full length PvPGIP1 with the HA tag and preOST1 secretion signal (preOST1-PvPGIP1-HA). An empty vector yeast was used as a negative control. The yeast was grown for 72 hours in 2mL of -T YNB in a shaker at 30°C at 250 rpm. 200µL of media was pipetted into 1.5mL tubes and 10µL of 1mg/ML BSA was added to each tube. 20µL of 0.15% deoxycholate was added and samples were immediately vortexed then sat at room temperature for 10 minutes. 20µL of 1M TCA was added to each sample, vortexed, then placed on ice for 30 minutes to precipitate. Samples were centrifuged for 30 minutes at 4°C at 22,000g. After centrifugation, the supernatant was aspirated out and resultant pellet was washed with 200µL of ice-cold acetone once. Pellet was left to air dry at room temperature for 30 minutes, then was treated with 32.5µL DI water, 12.5µL of LDS buffer, and 5µL of reducing agent. Samples were mixed by pipetting and heated to 70°C for ten minutes. After heating, the tubes were centrifuged at room temperature for five minutes and supernatant was used to load into a gel. An 8% tris-glycine gel was used for the SDS-PAGE which was made according to the protocol found in the Surecast Handcast System Quick Reference sheet by Thermo Fisher Scientific. The SDS-PAGE was run at 150V for one hour in tris-glycine running buffer with a ladder (Fisher Scientific, catalog #50491514). A protein transfer with a PVDF membrane (Fisher Scientific, catalog #ISEQ0010) followed using the Protein Transfer Technical Handbook provided by Thermo Fisher Scientific. Once finished, the membrane was removed and incubated at room temperature for 2 hours in 1x TBST + 5% milk. This was washed twice with 1x TBST for 5 minutes each time, then incubated in 10mL of 1x TBST + 3% milk + 2µL of antibody (Anti-HA tag antibody HRP ab1190 from Abcam) overnight at 4°C. A standard protein detection protocol was then used according to the Protein Detection Technical Handbook from Thermo Fisher Scientific.

Site-Directed Mutagenesis

To confirm if various mutations at residue 172 of tPvPGIP2_5-8 enhance PG interaction, a saturated site-directed mutagenesis was performed. A modified version of splicing by overlap extension (SOE) was done. Five oligonucleotides, listed in Table S3, were annealed together to create tPvPGIP2_5-8 mutants with residue 172 replaced in the first oligonucleotide. Each PCR reaction contained 20µL of DI water, 2.5µL of Expand polymerase, 0.5µL of 10mM dNTPs, 0.3µL of each oligonucleotide, and 0.3µL of Expand polymerase. Afterwards, an additional 0.3µL of the first and last oligonucleotide were added, along with 0.3µL dNTPs and 0.2µL Expand polymerase for another round of PCR. The product was run on a 0.8% agarose gel, then gel purified to retrieve the DNA. The assembled DNA fragment was then inserted to the corresponding vector containing the AD-Gal domain through Gibson Assembly.

Fungal pectin assay

The fungal pectin assay is an *in vitro* assay that observes the effects of PvPGIP proteins on fungal growth. *S. cerevisiae* containing plasmids with PvPGIP2, preOST1-PvPGIP2, or a negative control containing an empty vector were grown for 16 hours in -Trp Dropout YNB. The fungi used were *B. cinerea* isolate ECC-0165 obtained from *Prunus persica* in Fresno, CA and *A. niger* isolate ATCC 16888 obtained from ARS Culture Collection (NRRL). A plug from an actively growing colony was transferred to fresh potato flake agar plates that were sealed with Parafilm and incubated on the lab bench or not sealed and incubated in a drawer for *A. niger* and *B. cinerea*, respectively. After sufficient sporulation, sterile DI water was added to plates, and a cell spreader was used to scrape the surface of the colony. The liquid was then poured through several layers of cheesecloth to exclude hyphal fragments. The spore concentration was quantified with a hemocytometer, then the suspension was diluted to a concentration of 2.5×10^5 spores per mL. The suspension was aliquoted into 2 mL microcentrifuge tubes with screw caps and stored at 4°C until use. Two different growth media were used in this assay: potato flake agar for *A. niger* and potato dextrose agar (PDA) for *B. cinerea*. The potato flake medium contains 4g potato flakes (Bob's Red Mill Potato Flakes), 1g citrus pectin (Fischer Scientific, catalog #AAJ6102122), and 2.5g agarose (VWR, catalog #97062-250) into 200mL of the medium. The PDA medium contains 4.8g potato dextrose broth (VWR, catalog #90003-494), 1g citrus pectin, and 2.5g agarose in 200mL of the medium. The medium was autoclaved and 150µL was pipetted into each well of

a 96 well plate, with the exception of the edge-most wells due to evaporation. 60μL of the yeast in YNB was added to each plate along with 20μL of the fungal inoculum. The yeast and inoculum were added directly on top of the wells. These plates were left in a dark room at 20°C for 4 days and observed. The wells were visually compared for their fungal growth and the OD was measured at 630nm in a plate reader using the Gen5™ Data Analysis Software (BioTek Instruments). The OD correlates directly to fungal dry weight. Another fungal pectin assay was performed where the growth radius of the resultant fungal colonies was compared. The same media, potato flake agar, was made with the same protocol as above but poured into petri dishes instead of 96 well plates. The yeast and fungal inoculum are also prepared the same way. Once the plates solidified, 200μL of natamycin, yeast, or water was spread evenly onto the plates and allowed to dry. 2μL of the *A. niger* fungal inoculum was then spotted into four locations per plate and growth was observed over several days.

Acknowledgements

We thank Shanhui Xu, Anqi Zhou, Dr. Rongbin Hu, and Dr. Sheng Wu for valuable feedback in the preparation of the manuscript. We thank Lindsey Pedroncelli for assistance with lab experiments, and Dr. James Adaskaveg (UC Riverside) for supplying the *B. cinerea* isolate. This work was supported by LG Chem Ltd. and the Frank G. and Janice B. Delfino Agricultural Technology Research Initiative (grants to Y.L. and A.P.).

Author contributions

Y.L. and A.P. conceived of the project, Y.L., T.C., A.B., J.C., and A.P. designed the experiments, T.C. and A.B. performed the experiment and analyzed the results, Y.L., T.C., and A.P. wrote the manuscript.

Additional information

Competing financial interests: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Hosted file

image1.emf available at <https://authorea.com/users/397099/articles/510110-engineering-of-polygalacturonase-inhibiting-protein-as-an-ecological-friendly-and-non-toxic-pest-control-agent>

Figure 1 Structure and protein sequence of PvPGIPs. **(a)** Ribbon structure of PvPGIP2. The structure is readapted from the previously published PvPGIP2 (PDB accession 1OGQ) (A. Di Matteo et al., 2003). LRR domains are color coded. Sheet B1 is engaged with binding to PGs. **(b)** Surface representation of BcPG1 and PvPGIP2 interaction. The docking structure is readapted from the previously published docking result (Sicilia et al., 2005) (DB accession 1OGQ) (A. Di Matteo et al., 2003). This complex shows the partial coverage of the active site cleft. **(c)** The amino acid sequences of PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2. LRRs are color coded and differences in residues are shown with astricks.

Hosted file

image2.emf available at <https://authorea.com/users/397099/articles/510110-engineering-of-polygalacturonase-inhibiting-protein-as-an-ecological-friendly-and-non-toxic-pest-control-agent>

Figure 2. Verification of PG-PGIP interactions using the Y2H system. Growth curves of Y2H yeast strains were grown in -HTL dropout media harboring various PGs with **(a)** full length AD-PvPGIP1 and **(b)** full length AD-PvPGIP2. The positive control is a yeast strain harboring BD-AnPG2 with AD-PvPGIP2 and grown in -LT dropout media, while the negative control is a yeast strain harboring BD-BcPG2 with AD-HAB1, a protein not known to interact with PGs, grown in -HTL dropout media. The curves represent the mean values of three biological replicates, and the error bars represent the standard deviation of the replicates.

Hosted file

image3.emf available at <https://authorea.com/users/397099/articles/510110-engineering-of-polygalacturonase-inhibiting-protein-as-an-ecological-friendly-and-non-toxic-pest-control-agent>

Figure 3. Truncation of PvPGIP2 retains the inhibitory activity towards AnPG2, BcPGs, and FmPG3. Growth curves of yeast strains harboring AnPG2, BcPG1, BcPG2, and FmPG3 with truncated PvPGIP2s with (a) no N-terminus, (b) No C-terminus, (c) tPvPGIP2.5-8, (d) tPvPGIP2.6-8, (e) tPvPGIP2.6-7, (f) tPvPGIP2.5-7, (g) tPvPGIP2.4-5, and (h) tPvPGIP2.4-6. The positive control yeast was harboring BD-AnPG2 and AD-PvPGIP2 grown in -LT dropout media, while the negative control was yeast harboring BD-BcPG2 and AD-HAB1 grown in -HTL dropout media. The curves represent the mean values of three biological replicates, and the error bars represent the standard deviation of the replicates.




Figure 4: Construction of the yeast strain secreting PvPGIPs and establishment of fungal growth inhibition assay. (a) Western blot analysis of *S. cerevisiae* engineered to secrete PvPGIP1 with anti-HA antibody after three days of growth. PvPGIP1-HA has an expected size at 43kDa. The cell lysate samples indicate the presence of the protein inside the cell. The medium samples indicate the presence of the secreted protein into the yeast medium. The inhibition activity of the secreted PvPGIPs was then tested on a fungal growth inhibition assay. OD readings at 630nm of (b) *A. niger* and (c) *B. cinerea* treated with either natamycin (positive control), empty vector yeast (negative control), tPvPGIP2.5-8 secreting yeast, or PvPGIP2 secreting yeast were taken after four days. At 630nm, OD readings are reported to be proportional to the dry weight of fungi (Langvad, 1999). Each bar represents the mean values of six biological replicates, and the error bars represent the standard deviation of the replicates. The well pictured above each bar is representative sample of the replicates.

Hosted file

image5.emf available at <https://authorea.com/users/397099/articles/510110-engineering-of-polygalacturonase-inhibiting-protein-as-an-ecological-friendly-and-non-toxic-pest-control-agent>

Figure 5. Sequence-function correlation of tPvPGIP2.5-8. tPvPGIP2.5-8 containing different combinations of the three residues differing between PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2 were tested using a Y2H system. (a) shows the three differing residues between PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2, highlighted in yellow. Each mutant contains a residue from either PvPGIP1 or PvPGIP2 different at LRR5, LRR7, and LRR8, named sequentially as shown in (b) tPvPGIP2.5-8 “221,” (c) tPvPGIP2.5-8 “212,” (d) tPvPGIP2.5-8 “221,” (e) tPvPGIP2.5-8 “122,” (f) tPvPGIP2.5-8 “112,” and (g) tPvPGIP2.5-8 “121.” The positive control yeast was harboring BD-AnPG2 and AD-PvPGIP2 grown in -LT dropout media, while the negative control was yeast harboring BD-BcPG2 and AD-HAB1 grown in -HTL dropout media. The curves represent the mean values of three biological replicates, and the error bars represent the standard deviation of the replicates.




Figure 6. Testing of various mutations at residue 172 of PvPGIP2.5-8 with PGs using the Y2H system. After 48 hours, the OD of the yeast harboring various mutations mated to (a) BD-AnPG2(b) BD-BcPG1, (c) BD-BcPG2, and (d) BD-FmPG3 was measured. Each column represents the mean values of five biological replicates, and the error bars represent the standard deviation of the replicates. The lower limit shows the activity level of the negative control. G indicates the tPvPGIP1.5-8, and V indicates the tPvPGIP2.5-8. The wild type residues for PvPGIP1 and PvPGIP2 are G and V, respectively, and highlighted by the blue and orange bars, respectively.

References

- Alavanja, M. C. R., Hoppin, J. A., & Kamel, F. (2004). Health Effects of Chronic Pesticide Exposure: Cancer and Neurotoxicity. *Annual Review of Public Health* . <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.25.101802.123020>
- Arcury, T. A., & Quandt, S. A. (1998). Chronic agricultural chemical exposure among migrant and seasonal farmworkers. *Society and Natural Resources* . <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941929809381121>
- Bebber, D. P., & Gurr, S. J. (2015). Crop-destroying fungal and oomycete pathogens challenge food security. *Fungal Genetics and Biology* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fgb.2014.10.012>
- Bishop, J. G. (2005). Directed mutagenesis confirms the functional importance of positively selected sites in polygalacturonase inhibitor protein. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* . <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msi146>
- Borodina, I., & Nielsen, J. (2014). Advances in metabolic engineering of yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for production of chemicals. In *Biotechnology Journal* . <https://doi.org/10.1002/biot.201300445>
- Capodicasa, C., Vairo, D., Zabotina, O., McCartney, L., Caprari, C., Mattei, B., Manfredini, C., Aracri, B., Benen, J., Knox, J. P., De Lorenzo, G., & Cervone, F. (2004). Targeted modification of homogalacturonan by transgenic expression of a fungal polygalacturonase alters plant growth. *Plant Physiology* . <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.104.042788>
- Caprari, C., Mattei, B., Basile, M. L., Salvi, G., Crescenzi, V., De Lorenzo, G., & Cervone, F. (1996). Mutagenesis of endopolygalacturonase from *fusarium moniliforme* : Histidine residue 234 is critical for enzymatic and macerating activities and not for binding to polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP). *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions* . <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-9-0617>
- Cervone, F. (1997). Polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) with different specificities are expressed in *Phaseolus vulgaris*. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions* . <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI.1997.10.7.852>
- D'Ovidio, R., Raiola, A., Capodicasa, C., Devoto, A., Pontiggia, D., Roberti, S., Galletti, R., Conti, E., O'Sullivan, D., & De Lorenzo, G. (2004). Characterization of the complex locus of bean encoding polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins reveals subfunctionalization for defense against fungi and insects. *Plant Physiology* . <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.104.044644>
- De Lorenzo, G., D'Ovidio, R., & Cervone, F. (2001). The role of polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) in defense against pathogenic fungi. In *Annual Review of Phytopathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.phyto.39.1.313>
- De Lucca, A. J. (2007). Harmful fungi in both agriculture and medicine. In *Revista Iberoamericana de Micología* . [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-1406\(07\)70002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-1406(07)70002-5)
- Dekker, J. (1983). Cultural practices and infectious crop diseases. *Scientia Horticulturae* . [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4238\(83\)90118-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4238(83)90118-8)
- Delic, M., Valli, M., Graf, A. B., Pfeffer, M., Mattanovich, D., & Gasser, B. (2013). The secretory pathway: Exploring yeast diversity. In *FEMS Microbiology Reviews* . <https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-6976.12020>
- Di Matteo, A., Federici, L., Mattei, B., Salvi, G., Johnson, K. A., Savino, C., De Lorenzo, G., Tsernoglou, D., & Cervone, F. (2003). The crystal structure of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP), a leucine-rich repeat protein involved in plant defense. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* , 100 (17), 10124–10128. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1733690100>
- Di Matteo, Adele, Bonivento, D., Tsernoglou, D., Federici, L., & Cervone, F. (2006). Polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP) in plant defence: A structural view. In *Phytochemistry* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phytochem.2005.12.025>

- Elmer, P. A. G., & Reglinski, T. (2006). Biosuppression of *Botrytis cinerea* in grapes. In *Plant Pathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2006.01348.x>
- Federici, L., Caprari, C., Mattei, B., Savino, C., Di Matteo, A., De Lorenzo, G., Cervone, F., & Tsernoglou, D. (2001). Structural requirements of endopolygalacturonase for the interaction with PGIP (polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* . <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.231473698>
- Federici, Luca, Di Matteo, A., Fernandez-Recio, J., Tsernoglou, D., & Cervone, F. (2006). Polygalacturonase inhibiting proteins: Players in plant innate immunity? *Trends in Plant Science* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2005.12.005>
- Fitzgerald, I., & Glick, B. S. (2014). Secretion of a foreign protein from budding yeasts is enhanced by cotranslational translocation and by suppression of vacuolar targeting. *Microbial Cell Factories* . <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12934-014-0125-0>
- Frediani, M., Cremonini, R., Salvi, G., Caprari, C., Desiderio, A., D'Ovidio, R., Cervone, F., & De Lorenzo, G. (1993). Cytological localization of the PGIP genes in the embryo suspensor cells of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics: International Journal of Plant Breeding Research* . <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01184925>
- Gherbawy, Y., Elhariry, H., Kocsubé, S., Bahobial, A., Deeb, B. El, Altalhi, A., Varga, J., & Vágvölgyi, C. (2015). Molecular characterization of black aspergillus species from onion and their potential for ochratoxin A and fumonisin B2 production. *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* . <https://doi.org/10.1089/fpd.2014.1870>
- Gianessi, L., & Reigner, N. (2006). The importance of fungicides in U.S. crop production. In *Outlooks on Pest Management* . <https://doi.org/10.1564/17oct06>
- Haeger, W., Henning, J., Heckel, D., Pauchet, Y., & Kirsch, R. (2020). Direct evidence for a new mode of plant defense against insects via a novel polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein expression strategy. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* . <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.RA120.014027>
- Hammond-Kosack, K. E., & Jones, J. D. G. (1997). PLANT DISEASE RESISTANCE GENES. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* .
- Helft, L., Reddy, V., Chen, X., Koller, T., Federici, L., Fernández-Recio, J., Gupta, R., & Bent, A. (2011). LRR conservation mapping to predict functional sites within protein leucine-rich repeat domains. *PLoS ONE* , 6 (7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021614>
- Hématy, K., Cherk, C., & Somerville, S. (2009). Host-pathogen warfare at the plant cell wall. In *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2009.06.007>
- Ishii, H. (2006). Impact of fungicide resistance in plant pathogens on crop disease control and agricultural environment. In *Japan Agricultural Research Quarterly* . <https://doi.org/10.6090/jarq.40.205>
- Kadowaki, K., Yamamoto, S., Sato, H., Tanabe, A. S., Hidaka, A., & Toju, H. (2018). Mycorrhizal fungi mediate the direction and strength of plant–soil feedbacks differently between arbuscular mycorrhizal and ectomycorrhizal communities. *Communications Biology* . <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-018-0201-9>
- Kalunke, R. M., Tundo, S., Benedetti, M., Cervone, F., De Lorenzo, G., & D'Ovidio, R. (2015). An update on polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP), aleucine-rich repeat protein that protects crop plants against pathogens. In *Frontiers in Plant Science* . <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00146>
- Kubicek, C. P., Starr, T. L., & Glass, N. L. (2014). Plant cell wall-degrading enzymes and their secretion in plant-pathogenic fungi. *Annual Review of Phytopathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-102313-045831>
- Langvad, F. (1999). A rapid and efficient method for growth measurement of filamentous fungi. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* , 37 (1), 97–100. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7012\(99\)00053-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7012(99)00053-6)

- Leckie, F., Mattei, B., Capodicasa, C., Hemmings, A., Nuss, L., Aracri, B., De Lorenzo, G., & Cervone, F. (1999). The specificity of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP): A single amino acid substitution in the solvent-exposed β -strand/ β -turn region of the leucine-rich repeats (LRRs) confers a new recognition capability. *EMBO Journal* . <https://doi.org/10.1093/emboj/18.9.2352>
- Liu, N., Ma, X., Zhou, S., Wang, P., Sun, Y., Li, X., & Hou, Y. (2016). Molecular and Functional Characterization of a Polygalacturonase-Inhibiting Protein from *Cynanchum komarovii* That Confers Fungal Resistance in *Arabidopsis*. *PLOS ONE* , 11 (1), e0146959. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0146959>
- Logrieco, A., Ferracane, R., Haidukowsky, M., Cozzi, G., Visconti, A., & Ritieni, A. (2009). Fumonisin B2 production by *Aspergillus niger* from grapes and natural occurrence in must. *Food Additives and Contaminants - Part A Chemistry, Analysis, Control, Exposure and Risk Assessment* . <https://doi.org/10.1080/02652030903148322>
- Maltby, L., Brock, T. C. M., & Van Den Brink, P. J. (2009). Fungicide risk assessment for aquatic ecosystems: Importance of interspecific variation, toxic mode of action, and exposure regime. *Environmental Science and Technology* . <https://doi.org/10.1021/es901461c>
- Manfredini, C., Sicilia, F., Ferrari, S., Pontiggia, D., Salvi, G., Caprari, C., Lorito, M., & Lorenzo, G. De. (2005). Polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein 2 of *Phaseolus vulgaris* inhibits BcPG1, a polygalacturonase of *Botrytis cinerea* important for pathogenicity, and protects transgenic plants from infection. *Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmpp.2005.10.002>
- Matsaunyane, L. B., Oelofse, D., & Dubery, I. A. (2015). In silico analysis of the polygalacturonase inhibiting protein 1 from apple, *Malus domestica*. *BMC Research Notes* , 8 (1), 76. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1025-z>
- Maulik, A., Ghosh, H., & Basu, S. (2009). Comparative study of protein-protein interaction observed in PolyGalacturonase-Inhibiting Proteins from *Phaseolus vulgaris* and *Glycine max* and PolyGalacturonase from *Fusarium moniliforme*. *BMC Genomics* , 10 (SUPPL. 3), S19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-10-S3-S19>
- Melchers, L. S., & Stuiver, M. H. (2000). Novel genes for disease-resistance breeding. In *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* . [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1369-5266\(99\)00055-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1369-5266(99)00055-2)
- Möller, M., & Stukenbrock, E. H. (2017). Evolution and genome architecture in fungal plant pathogens. In *Nature Reviews Microbiology* . <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro.2017.76>
- Money, N. P. (2007). Triumph of the fungi: A rotten history. In *Triumph of the Fungi: A Rotten History* . <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195189711.001.0001>
- Moore, D., Robson, G., & Trinci, T. (2011). 21st Century Guidebook to Fungi. In *21st Century Guidebook to Fungi* . <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511977022>
- Morton, V., & Staub, T. (2008). A Short History of Fungicides. *APSnet Feature Articles* . <https://doi.org/10.1094/apsnetfeature-2008-0308>
- Munkvold, G. P. (2003). Epidemiology of *Fusarium* diseases and their mycotoxins in maize ears. In *European Journal of Plant Pathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026078324268>
- Navarta, L. G., Calvo, J., Posetto, P., Benuzzi, D., María, J., & Sanz, I. (2020). Freeze-drying of a mixture of bacterium and yeast for application in postharvest control of pathogenic fungi . 2 , 1223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-3049-9>
- Oelofse, D., Dubery, I. A., Meyer, R., Arendse, M. S., Gazendam, I., & Berger, D. K. (2006a). Apple polygalacturonase inhibiting protein1 expressed in transgenic tobacco inhibits polygalacturonases from fungal pathogens of apple and the anthracnose pathogen of lupins. *Phytochemistry* , 67 (3), 255–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phytochem.2005.10.029>

- Oelofse, D., Dubery, I. A., Meyer, R., Arendse, M. S., Gazendam, I., & Berger, D. K. (2006b). Apple polygalacturonase inhibiting protein1 expressed in transgenic tobacco inhibits polygalacturonases from fungal pathogens of apple and the anthracnose pathogen of lupins. *Phytochemistry* , 67 (3), 255–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phytochem.2005.10.029>
- Palencia, E. R., Hinton, D. M., & Bacon, C. W. (2010). The black Aspergillus species of maize and peanuts and their potential for mycotoxin production. In *Toxins* (Vol. 2, Issue 4, pp. 399–416). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins2040399>
- Pamphile, J. A., & Azevedo, J. L. (2002). Molecular characterization of endophytic strains of Fusarium verticillioides (= Fusarium moniliforme) from maize (Zea mays. L). *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* . <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015507008786>
- Petrash, S., Knapp, S. J., van Kan, J. A. L., & Blanco-Ulate, B. (2019). Grey mould of strawberry, a devastating disease caused by the ubiquitous necrotrophic fungal pathogen Botrytis cinerea. In *Molecular Plant Pathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1111/mpp.12794>
- Rathinam, M., Rao, U., & Sreevathsa, R. (2020). Novel biotechnological strategies to combat biotic stresses: polygalacturonase inhibitor (PGIP) proteins as a promising comprehensive option. In *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* . <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-020-10396-3>
- Schoeman, A., Flett, B. C., Janse van Rensburg, B., Ncube, E., & Viljoen, A. (2018). Pathogenicity and toxigenicity of Fusarium verticillioides isolates collected from maize roots, stems and ears in South Africa. *European Journal of Plant Pathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-018-1510-z>
- Sella, L., Castiglioni, C., Roberti, S., D'Ovidio, R., & Favaron, F. (2004). An endo-polygalacturonase (PG) of Fusarium moniliforme escaping inhibition by plant polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) provides new insights into the PG-PGIP interaction. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsle.2004.09.019>
- Shaffer, H. A., Rood, M. K., Kashlan, B., Chang, E. I. lin., Doyle, D. F., & Azizi, B. (2012). BAPJ69-4A: A yeast two-hybrid strain for both positive and negative genetic selection. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2012.07.003>
- Sharma, R. (2012). Pathogenecity of aspergillus niger in plants. *Cibtech Journal of Microbiology* . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.615>
- Sicilia, F., Fernandez-Recio, J., Caprari, C., De Lorenzo, G., Tsernoglou, D., Cervone, F., & Federici, L. (2005). The polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein PGIP2 of Phaseolus vulgaris has evolved a mixed mode of inhibition of endopolygalacturonase PG1 of Botrytis cinerea. *Plant Physiology* . <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.105.067546>
- Siddiqui, M. S., Thodey, K., Trenchard, I., & Smolke, C. D. (2012). Advancing secondary metabolite biosynthesis in yeast with synthetic biology tools. In *FEMS Yeast Research* . <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-1364.2011.00774.x>
- Spadoni, S., Zabolina, O., Di Matteo, A., Mikkelsen, J. D., Cervone, F., De Lorenzo, G., Mattei, B., & Belincampi, D. (2006). Polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein interacts with pectin through a binding site formed by four clustered residues of arginine and lysine. *Plant Physiology* . <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.076950>
- Spinelli, F., Mariotti, L., Mattei, B., Salvi, G., Cervone, F., & Caprari, C. (2009). Three aspartic acid residues of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP) from Phaseolus vulgaris are critical for inhibition of Fusarium phylophilum PG. *Plant Biology (Stuttgart, Germany)* . <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1438-8677.2008.00175.x>
- Steel, C. C., Blackman, J. W., & Schmidtke, L. M. (2013). Grapevine bunch rots: Impacts on wine composition, quality, and potential procedures for the removal of wine faults. In *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* . <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf400641r>

- Stotz, H. U., Bishop, J. G., Bergmann, C. W., Koch, M., Albersheim, P., Darvill, A. G., & Labavitch, J. M. (2000). Identification of target amino acids that affect interactions of fungal polygalacturonases and their plant inhibitors. *Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology* . <https://doi.org/10.1006/pmpp.2000.0258>
- Thabet, W. M., Shendy, A. H., & Gadalla, S. A. (2016). Chronic exposure of insecticide and fungicide as indicator of health impact in some commonly consumed leafy vegetables: Case study. *Cogent Food & Agriculture* . <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2016.1193926>
- Truong, D., & Gietz, R. D. (2007). 3 Yeast Transformation. In *Methods in Microbiology* . [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0580-9517\(06\)36003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0580-9517(06)36003-5)
- Valero, E., Cambon, B., Schuller, D., Casal, M., Dequin, S., & El Encin, F. (n.d.). *Biodiversity of Saccharomyces yeast strains from grape berries of wine-producing areas using starter commercial yeasts* . <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-1364.2006.00161.x>
- Weiberg, A., Wang, M., Lin, F. M., Zhao, H., Zhang, Z., Kaloshian, I., Huang, H. Da, & Jin, H. (2013). Fungal small RNAs suppress plant immunity by hijacking host RNA interference pathways. *Science* . <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1239705>
- Wilson, E. R., Smalling, K. L., Reilly, T. J., Gray, E., Bond, L., Steele, L., Kandel, P., Chamberlin, A., Gause, J., Reynolds, N., Robertson, I., Novak, S., Feris, K., & White, M. M. (2014). Assessing the potential effects of fungicides on nontarget gut fungi (trichomycetes) and their associated larval black fly hosts. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* . <https://doi.org/10.1111/jawr.12166>
- Wink, M. (1988). Plant breeding: importance of plant secondary metabolites for protection against pathogens and herbivores. In *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* . <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00303957>
- Xu, M. L., Yang, J. G., Wu, J. X., Chi, Y. C., & Xie, L. H. (2015). First report of aspergillus niger causing root rot of peanut in China. *Plant Disease* . <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-05-14-0530-PDN>
- Yang, C., Hamel, C., Vujanovic, V., & Gan, Y. (2011). Fungicide: Modes of Action and Possible Impact on Nontarget Microorganisms. *ISRN Ecology* . <https://doi.org/10.5402/2011/130289>
- ZHANG, D. Q., WANG, H. Bin, LIU, B., FENG, D. R., HE, Y. M., & WANG, J. F. (2006). Carrot Antifreeze Protein Does Not Exhibit the Polygalacturonase-inhibiting Activity of PGIP Family. *Acta Genetica Sinica* . [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-4172\(06\)60139-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-4172(06)60139-X)