The *Fusarium oxysporum* Avr2-Six5 Effector Pair Alters Plasmodesmatal Exclusion Selectivity to Facilitate Cell-to-Cell Movement of Avr2
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**ABSTRACT**

Pathogens use effector proteins to manipulate their hosts. During infection of tomato, the fungus *Fusarium oxysporum* secretes the effectors Avr2 and Six5. Whereas Avr2 suffices to trigger *I*-2-mediated cell death in heterologous systems, both effectors are required for *I*-2-mediated disease resistance in tomato. How Six5 participates in triggering resistance is unknown. Using bimolecular fluorescence complementation assays we found that Avr2 and Six5 interact at plasmodesmata. Single-cell transformation revealed that a 2xRFP marker protein and Avr2-GFP only move to neighboring cells in the presence of Six5. Six5 alone does not alter plasmodesmatal transduction as 2xRFP was only translocated in the presence of both effectors. In *SIX5*-expressing transgenic plants, the distribution of virally expressed Avr2-GFP, and subsequent onset of *I*-2-mediated cell death, differed from that in wild-type tomato. Taken together, our data show that in the presence of Six5, Avr2 moves from cell to cell, which in susceptible plants contributes to virulence, but in *I*-2 containing plants induces resistance.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Plants are challenged by a wide variety of pathogens such as bacteria, fungi, oomycetes, and nematodes. Plants have evolved a multi-layered immune system, by which they recognize and defend themselves against these biotic stresses (Jones and Dangl, 2006). Recognition of pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) by dedicated plasma membrane-localized pattern recognition receptors results in PAMP-triggered immunity (PTI). To overcome PTI and facilitate infection, pathogens produce effector proteins. To counteract effector action, plants have developed a second layer of defense called effector-triggered immunity. The latter immune system relies on immune receptors, called resistance proteins, which specifically perceive effectors and subsequently mount immune responses.

*Fusarium oxysporum* is a root-infecting fungal pathogen causing wilt disease on a wide variety of plants (Michielse and Rep, 2009). Tomato is the only host of *F. oxysporum* f. sp. *lycopersici* (*Fol*). *Fol* invades roots and progresses through epidermal and endodermal tissues to eventually colonize the xylem vessels (Michielse and Rep, 2009). In the xylem sap of *Fol*-infected tomato, 14 *Fol*-derived small “Secreted-in-Xylem” (Six) proteins have been identified (Houterman et al., 2007; Schmidt et al., 2013). Among these, Six1, Six3, Six5, and Six6 have been shown to be required for *Fol* pathogenicity, defining them *sensu stricto* as effectors (Rep et al., 2004; Houterman et al., 2009; Gawehns et al., 2014; Ma et al., 2015). Besides contributing to virulence, some of these *Fol* effectors are recognized by tomato resistance (*R*) gene products, thereby conferring avirulence to the fungus. Three *Fol* Six proteins have been identified that trigger R protein-mediated resistances and these are renamed avirulence (Avr) proteins; Six1 (Avr3), Six3 (Avr2), and Six4 (Avr1) activate *I*-3-, *I*-2-, and *I*-1-mediated resistance, respectively (Takken and Rep, 2010). *Fol* effectors Six3 (Avr2) and Six5 share a 1609-bp upstream promoter region that controls their expression (Schmidt et al., 2013). Together this pair of effectors is required to activate *I*-2-mediated immunity in tomato, and knockouts of each gene allows the fungus to overcome resistance (Ma et al., 2015). Although both genes are required for resistance, Avr2 alone suffices to trigger...
Molecular Plant

green fluorescence red fluorescence overlay

\[ \text{Avr2} \text{ and } \text{Six5} \text{ Co-localize in the Cytosol and Nucleus of Agro-Infiltrated Nicotiana benthamiana Cells.} \]

\( \Delta s p \text{AVR2-RFP}, \Delta s p \text{SIX5-GFP}, \text{ or } \Delta s p \text{AVR2-RFP/}\Delta s p \text{SIX5-GFP} \text{ were expressed in } N. \text{benthamiana} \text{ leaves using agro-infiltration, and fluorescence was monitored using confocal microscopy. In } \Delta s p \text{AVR2-RFP-expressing } N. \text{benthamiana} \text{ leaf epidermal cells, red fluorescence was observed in the cytosol and nucleus (labeled with asterisks). Green fluorescence, following } \Delta s p \text{SIX5-GFP} \text{ agro-infiltration, was detected in both the cytosol and nucleus. Yellow fluorescence shows the co-localization of Avr2 and Six5 in the cytosol and nucleus following co-infiltration of } \Delta s p \text{AVR2-RFP and } \Delta s p \text{SIX5-GFP}. \text{ Green fluorescent chloroplasts are marked by arrowheads.} \]

I-2-mediated cell death when expressed in Nicotiana benthamiana or upon virus-based expression in I-2 tomato (Houterman et al., 2009). I-2 encodes a classical intracellular NB-LRR-type immune receptor (Simons et al., 1996). The resistance gene is specifically expressed in the parenchyma cells neighboring the xylem vessels (Mes et al., 2000). Although Avr2 has originally been identified in Fol-infected tomato xylem sap, the protein acts inside host cells where it suppresses PTI (Di et al., 2016, 2017). A nuclear localization of Avr2 is compulsory for recognition by I-2 (Ma et al., 2013). Previously it was shown that Avr2 interacts with Six5 in yeast-two-hybrid (Y2H) assays, as well as in planta following transient expression in N. benthamiana (Ma et al., 2015). Here, we investigate how Six5 contributes to Avr2 function and observed that Avr2 specifically interacts with Six5 at plasmodesmata. Together, the two effectors are shown to manipulate plasmodesmata and facilitate cell-to-cell movement of Avr2, but also of a 2xRFP marker protein. Our data suggest that Six5 contributes to the virulence of Fol by facilitating Avr2 movement via plasmodesmata. In a susceptible plant, this is beneficial to the pathogen. However, in a resistant plant, it will result in perception of Avr2 by the I-2 protein present in the xylem-adjacent cells, resulting in induction of immunity, and thereby halting the pathogen.

RESULTS

Avr2 and Six5 Interact at Plasmodesmata

The Fol effectors Avr2 and Six5 are required together to trigger I-2 protein-mediated resistance in tomato (Ma et al., 2015). To identify where in the cell these proteins exert their action(s), we examined the subcellular localization of Avr2 or Six5 alone as well as in combination using confocal microscopy. To visualize Avr2 and Six5, we made constructs encoding the two mature proteins (i.e., without their endogenous signal peptide [Δsp]) that were C-terminally fused to a red fluorescent protein (RFP) or a green fluorescent protein (GFP), respectively. Next, ΔspAVR2-RFP and ΔspSIX5-GFP were expressed in N. benthamiana leaves using Agrobacterium-mediated transformation. Similar to a previous report (Ma et al., 2013), red fluorescence was observed for ΔspAVR2-RFP in both the cytosol and the nucleus (Figure 1, upper panel, channels “red fluorescence” and “overlay”). In N. benthamiana epidermal cells, the cytosolic RFP signal can be seen as a diffuse signal at the cell periphery and in cytoplasmic strands, as the large vacuole confines the cytosol to a thin layer at the cell periphery. A similar pattern of nuclear and cytosolic green fluorescence was observed in cells expressing Six5-GFP (Figure 1, middle panel, channel “green fluorescence”), indicating an identical subcellular localization for Avr2-RFP and Six5-GFP. Chloroplasts of N. benthamiana epidermal leaf cells showed green autofluorescence (Figure 1, green fluorescence channel labeled with arrowheads) following ΔspSIX5-GFP and ΔspAVR2-RFP expression (Figure 1, arrowheads). To test whether accumulation of Avr2-RFP affects the subcellular localization of Six5-GFP, or vice versa, we co-expressed both constructs in N. benthamiana leaves (Figure 1, lower panel). The yellow color indicated the overlap of the green and red fluorescent signals produced by Avr2-RFP and Six5-GFP in the cytosol and nucleus of double transformed cells (Figure 1, lower panel, channel “overlay”). No apparent change in localization of either protein was observed when both proteins were co-expressed. Fusion of the fluorescent RFP or GFP proteins to the N terminus of either effector did not change their localization pattern, showing that the position of the tag does not affect the subcellular localization of the effectors (Supplemental Figure 1).

To further investigate the subcellular co-localization of Avr2 and Six5 and to localize a possible interaction between
these two proteins, we performed bimolecular fluorescence complementation (BiFC) assays. To this end, Avr2 and Six5 were N-terminally tagged with either the N- or C-terminal half of yellow fluorescent protein (YFP) variants (Gehl et al., 2009). A very close proximity of, or an interaction between, two proteins that are each tagged with the opposite half of the fluorescent protein results in the ability to fluoresce upon excitation of the complemented fluorophore. To assess a potential interaction, we transiently produced both effectors in *N. benthamiana* epidermal leaf cells and monitored fluorescence by confocal microscopy. The following constructs were used: VYN::DspSIX5 (encoding the N-terminal half of Venus YFP [VY] tagged to Six5), VYC::DspSIX5 (Six5 with the C-terminal half of VY), SCYN::DspAVR2 (Avr2 with the N-terminal half of SCY), and SCYC::DspAVR2. The AVR2 and/or SIX5 constructs were also co-expressed with a construct encoding RFP (mCherry) labeled plasmodesmal marker protein PDCB1 (plasmodesmata callose-binding protein 1, see below). Green fluorescence is indicative of a Six5–Avr2 interaction due to complementation of the YFP/CFP halves. Upon co-expression of VYN::DspSIX5 and VYC::DspSIX5, no green fluorescence was observed except for autofluorescent chloroplasts (Figure 2, upper panel, arrowheads). This result implies that, in contrast to Avr2, which forms homo-dimers in *N. benthamiana* cells, Six5 does not homo-dimerize in planta and hence may serve as a negative control for the assay (Ma et al., 2015). Upon co-expression of VYN::DspSIX5 and SCYC::DspAVR2 (Figure 2, middle panel; Supplemental Figure 2), green fluorescence was observed in the cytosol (but not the nucleus) and in spots at the cell periphery (indicated by arrows). The same pattern was observed for the reverse situation when SCYN::DspAVR2 and VYC::DspSIX5 were co-expressed (Figure 2, lower panel). These spots were not observed upon co-expression of DspAVR2-RFP and DspSIX5-GFP (Figure 1), which might imply that only a minority of the effectors interact at these spots and that the larger cytoplasmic pool overshadows the fluorescence signal. The BiFC signal strongly suggests an interaction between Avr2 and Six5 in planta at two distinct subcellular locations: the aforementioned spots and the cytoplasm.

To reveal the identity of the fluorescent Avr2/Six5 spots, we determined their dynamics and mobility using time-lapse imaging over a 30-min interval (data not shown). The observed immobility of the fluorescent spots in combination with their localization at the cell periphery suggests that Avr2 and Six5 are interacting at a structure that is tethered to the cell wall. Given their localization and immobile character, we therefore examined whether the dots co-localize with plasmodesmata, a plant cell structure that fits...
such characteristics. To this end, plasmodesmata-associated callose was stained with aniline blue in *N. benthamiana* leaves that co-express the *jspAVR2*spSIX5 BiFC pair (Figure 2, aniline blue channel of the middle and lower panels). The Avr2/Six5 BiFC dots perfectly overlapped with aniline blue-stained callose (Figure 2, overlay channel of the middle and lower panels), suggesting that the Avr2/Six5 interaction indeed occurs at plasmodesmata. To further substantiate this finding, we co-expressed the gene encoding the plasmodesmatal marker protein PDCB1-mCherry with the *jspAVR2*spSIX5 BiFC constructs. Overexpression of PDCB1-mCherry resulted in bright red fluorescence at plasmodesmata and a weak background signal that might originate from ER-resident PDCB1-mCherry, (Figure 2, red fluorescence channel). The red fluorescent spots originating from PDCB1-mCherry overlapped with the green fluorescence signals originating from the Avr2/Six5 interaction and with the blue fluorescence of the aniline blue-stained callose (Figure 2, overlay). Furthermore, in the absence of an aniline blue stain, the red PDCB1-mCherry and the green Avr2/Six5 BiFC fluorescence overlapped, showing that the apparent co-localization was not an artifact induced by the staining procedure (data not shown). Taken together, Avr2-RFP and Six5-GFP were observed to accumulate in both the cytosol and nucleus. However, an interaction was only observed in the cytosol and at specific spots co-localizing with plasmodesmata.

**An I-2 Breaking Avr2 Variant Also Interacts with Six5 at Plasmodesmata**

Single amino acid substitutions in Avr2 enable *Fol* race 3 isolates to evade I-2 recognition and to cause disease on I-2 containing plants (Houterman et al., 2009). To investigate whether escape of I-2 recognition is related to an altered interaction (pattern) of the Avr2 variant with Six5, we compared the co-localization of both proteins *in planta* with the localization of wild-type Avr2 and Six5. The Avr2 R/H variant, harboring amino acid substitution R45H, was tagged at its N terminus with either SCYN or SCYC. The constructs were co-expressed with either VYN-*jspSIX5* or VYN-*jspSIX5* in *N. benthamiana* leaves by agro-infiltration. Green fluorescence was observed from both the VYN-*jspSIX5*/SCYC-*jspAVR2*R/H* and the SCYN-*jspAVR2*R/H*/VYC-*jspSIX5* combinations, thus indicating an interaction between both proteins *in planta* (Figure 3, green fluorescence channel). Similar to the interaction of the Avr2/Six5 pair, green fluorescence was observed in the cytosol and in spots at the cell periphery; occasionally, a weak GFP signal was also detected in the nucleus following *jspAVR2*R/H/*jspSIX5* expression (Figure 3). Similar to wild-type Avr2, the spots at the cell periphery co-localized with plasmodesmata, as shown by both staining of plasmodesmatal callose and co-expression with PDCB1-mCherry (Figure 3, overlay). These results show that the Avr2 variant from a *Fol* race 3 isolate interacts with Six5 when produced in *N. benthamiana* leaves, implying that the inability of I-2 to recognize Avr2 R/H is not linked to an altered interaction pattern of Avr2 with Six5.

**Six5 and Avr2 Facilitate Protein Transport through Plasmodesmata**

Since the interaction between Avr2 and Six5 was observed at plasmodesmata, we speculated that *Fol* infection might involve manipulation of plasmodesmata, possibly, to facilitate effector transport and/or performance. Although both Avr2 and Six5 are required to trigger I-2 protein-mediated resistance, Avr2 alone is sufficient to initiate I-2 protein-mediated hypersensitive response (HR) in *N. benthamiana* (Ma et al., 2015). This discrepancy may be explained by the assumption that during natural infection of tomato, *Fol*-produced Six5 is required to
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facilitate symplastic translocation of Avr2 to I-2-containing cells. As shown previously, I-2 is highly expressed in the vasculature tissues in which resistance to the fungus is exerted (Mes et al., 2000). Cell-to-cell movement of Avr2 from cortical cells to I-2-expressing xylem parenchyma cells would allow the plant to perceive the pathogen and mount its defenses, while in the absence of Six5 the plant is blind to the presence of the effector protein. To test this hypothesis and determine whether the presence of Six5 alters the cellular mobility of Avr2, we performed single-cell transformation experiments. Single-cell transformations were performed in wild-type Arabidopsis thaliana and in a transgenic line in which constitutively expresses spSIX5 driven by the CaMV 35S promoter (see Methods). Four-week-old wild-type (Col-0) and 35S::spSIX5 A. thaliana leaves were bombarded with gold particles coated with a spAVR2-GFP construct. To facilitate identification of transformed cells, we co-delivered a marker construct encoding a nuclear localization signal (NLS)-tagged double RFP (NLS-2xRFP). The molecular mass of the NLS-2xRFP protein exceeds the size-exclusion limit (SEL) of plasmodesmata, thus its size will prevent movement of the protein into neighboring cells (Crawford and Zambryski, 2000). Twelve hours after particle bombardment, individual transformed Col-0 cells were identified by the red fluorescence, which was detected predominantly in the nucleus (Figure 4A). Although some red fluorescence was also observed in the cytosol. These observations confirm the functionality of the NLS and show that NLS-2xRFP does not move to neighboring cells in wild-type Col-0. The cells transformed with spAVR2-GFP showed green fluorescence in the cytosol and nucleus which resembled the expression pattern observed in N. benthamiana (Figure 1A and Supplemental Figure 1). Whereas a bright green fluorescence was observed in bombarded Col-0 leaves, only a very weak green fluorescence was apparent in the transformed cells of bombarded 35S::spSIX5 leaves (Figure 4A). This observation may be explained by the assumption that Avr2-GFP is readily transported through plasmodesmata in the presence of Six5, resulting in a weak signal in the primary transformed cells. Consistent with this idea, we observed that red fluorescence originating from the NLS-2xRFP marker protein was often observed in the cells of neighboring the primary transformed cell in bombarded spSIX5-transgenic leaves (Figure 4A, red fluorescence channel). Appearance of red fluorescence in neighboring cells implies cell-to-cell movement of the 2xRFP marker protein to adjacent cells. To quantify the extent of 2xRFP translocation in spSIX5 plants, we counted the number of single cells and clusters of cells showing red nuclei. Following particle bombardment of 35S::spSIX5 A. thaliana leaves, over 65% of the transformed (i.e., NLS-2xRFP expressing) cells showed a nuclear-localized RFP signal in at least one of their adjacent cells (Figure 4B). In contrast, about 3% of the transformed cells in wild-type A. thaliana showed red fluorescence in nuclei of cells neighboring the transformed cells. Therefore, in the presence of Six5 and Avr2, the NLS-2xRFP marker efficiently translocates to adjacent cells, implying that the SEL of plasmodesmata for this chimeric protein was modified in the presence of both effector proteins. To examine whether Six5 alone suffices for the symplastic movement of NLS-2xRFP, we carried out single-cell transformations with NLS-2xRFP in wild-type and spSIX5-expressing A. thaliana. In both plant lines, red fluorescence emitted by NLS-2xRFP was observed only in nuclei of individual transformed cells, but not in neighboring cells (Figure 4C). This suggests that intercellular translocation of NLS-2xRFP through plasmodesmata requires the presence of both Six5 and Avr2.

Six5 Mediates Intercellular Translocation of Avr2 in A. thaliana and N. benthamiana

The weak green fluorescence in cells expressing spAVR2-GFP in the presence of Six5 (Figure 4A) suggests the transfer of the effector protein to neighboring cells and a concomitant reduction in amount of the protein in the transformed cell. No GFP signal was observed in neighboring cells, which might be due to the relatively low effector concentration distributed from merely a single transformed cell to all neighboring cells. To facilitate our detection of the protein in the neighboring cells, we fused Avr2 to an NLS and a GFP tag (NLS–spAVR2-GFP) to concentrate the protein in the cell nucleus. The construct was expressed in A. thaliana leaves by particle bombardment. As a control for the transformation, a construct encoding a monomeric RFP (mRFP) with an HDEL ER retention signal (ER-mRFP) was co-bombarded with the spAVR2 construct. Confocal microscopy was performed 12 h after particle bombardment of Col-0 and 35S::spAVR2/35S::spSIX5 transgenic A. thaliana. A spAVR2/spSIX5 double transgenic A. thaliana line was

Figure 4. Avr2 and Six5 Are Both Required to Facilitate Intercellular Translocation of NLS-2xRFP in Arabidopsis.

(A) spAVR2-GFP and NLS-2xRFP-carrying plasmids were co-bombarded into either Col-0 or 35S::spSIX5 Arabidopsis leaves. Expression was monitored 12 h after bombardment using confocal microscopy. In Col-0, bright green fluorescence (Avr2-GFP) was observed in both the cytoplasm and nucleus of transformed cells. Only the nuclei (marked with asterisks) of these transformed cells showed red fluorescence (NLS-2xRFP). In transformed 35S::spSIX5 cells, only very weak cytosolic green fluorescence was observed; red fluorescence was observed in both the nuclei of primary transformed cells and in their neighboring cells.

(B) The percentage of individual spAVR2-GFP and NLS-2xRFP transformed cells in which NLS-2xRFP was present in neighboring cells of both wild-type and 35S::spSIX5 Arabidopsis. For ±65% of the 35S::spSIX5 Arabidopsis cells, NLS-2xRFP was observed to be translocated from the primary transformed cell to at least one adjacent cell. In Col-0, the percentage is approximately 3%. About 100 cells from five independent biological replicates were monitored. **p < 0.001.

(C) Six5 alone is not sufficient to facilitate intercellular transport of NLS-2xRFP. An NLS-2xRFP-carrying plasmid was bombarded into either Col-0 (left) or 35S::spSIX5 (right) Arabidopsis. Red fluorescence was only observed in the nucleus (marked with an asterisk) of primary transformed cells for both wild-type and spSIX5 Arabidopsis.

(D) ER-mRFP and NLS–spAVR2-GFP constructs were co-bombarded into Col-0 and 35S::spAVR2/35S::spSIX5 Arabidopsis. The image shows ER-mRFP (red) and NLS–spAVR2-GFP (green) in Col-0 and in 35S::spAVR2/35S::spSIX5. Note that the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) was labeled red by ER-mRFP in both lines; the green fluorescence of NLS–spAVR2-GFP was readily observed in the nuclei (marked with a asterisk) of wild-type Arabidopsis cells, whereas it was rarely detected in 35S::spAVR2/35S::spSIX5 cells.
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used to ensure sufficient amounts of mobile Avr2 and Six5 to interact and modulate the plasmodesmata. As expected, in Col-0, green fluorescence produced by NLS-::spAVR2-GFP was detected predominantly in the nuclei of transformed epidermal leaf cells (Figure 4D). The green fluorescence originating from NLS-::spAVR2-GFP expression was always accompanied by the strong red fluorescence from ER-mRFP (Figure 4D, red fluorescence channel). The finding that the ER-mRFP signal is restricted to the ER of transformed cells validates the use of this protein as a marker for bombarded cells and implies that the spread of the RFP signal involves translocation of the NLS-2xFP protein rather than its mRNA to the neighboring cells. In 35S::::spAVR2/35S::::spSIX5 A. thaliana leaves, the red fluorescence of ER-mRFP was also readily detected, but green fluorescence originating from the NLS-::spAvr2-GFP protein was rarely observed in the nucleus of a transformed cell (Figure 4D). Using ER-mRFP as a marker, the number of transformed cells emitting green fluorescence was quantified in bombarded Col-0 and 35S::::spAVR2/35S::::spSIX5 A. thaliana leaves. A significant (p < 0.001) difference in detection of the green NLS-::spAvr2-GFP signal in the nuclei of transformed cells was found between the two genetic backgrounds. Whereas 83% ± 5% of the nuclei of transformed cells in Col-0 emitted both red and green fluorescence, only 13% ± 4% of that in 35S::::spAVR2/35S::::spSIX5 Arabidopsis emitted both colors. The much lower amount of nuclei containing detectable amounts of the Avr2-GFP protein in 35S::::spAVR2/35S::::spSIX5-expressing Arabidopsis could be explained by a rapid flux of this protein through plasmodesmata. Our inability to detect Avr2-GFP in 35S::::spSIX5-expressing Arabidopsis by confocal microscopy may have been due to a swift diffusion of the protein from the central bombarded cells to neighboring cells, and consequently resulted in a signal below the detection threshold of our microscopes. Nonetheless, the results provide indirect evidence for effector translocation.

To directly visualize cell-to-cell movement of Avr2, we used a single binary vector carrying genes encoding both a C-terminally tagged Avr2-GFP and an ER-localized mCherry-HDEL for infiltration of N. benthamiana leaves. In contrast to the particle bombardment experiments, in which only small numbers of cells are transformed, agro-infiltration allows a range of transformation efficiencies by simply adjusting the concentration of Agrobacterium tumefaciens used in the infiltration solution. Using an OD_{600} of 0.1 or 0.05 results in a mosaic of transformed and non-transformed cells in the infiltrated sector, allowing visualization of translocation of Avr2-GFP from multiple transformed cells to a few neighboring non-transformed cells. As before, the ER-localized mCherry served as a marker for cell transformation because the protein is unable to translocate to neighboring untransformed cells. To increase protein expression, we co-infiltrated an A. tumefaciens strain carrying a binary vector encoding the silencing suppressor p19 with each sample. Co-infiltrations of the Avr2-GFP/mCherry-HDEL construct were performed in either the presence or absence of 35S::::spSIX5 to monitor translocation of Avr2-GFP. To ensure equal A. tumefaciens concentrations in the co-infiltrations, we replaced the 35S::::spSIX5 strain with a 35S-GUS strain in the latter infiltrations. In the absence of Six5, transformed cells showed an ER-localized mCherry signal located at the cell periphery and a green Avr2-GFP signal in the cytoplasm and nucleus (Figure 5A). Furthermore, non-transformed adjacent cells did not fluoresce red or green in the absence of Six5 (Figure 5A). In the presence of Six5, however, non-transformed cells showed nuclear and cytoplasmic green fluorescence, but no red fluorescence (Figure 5A, lower panels). This observation provides direct support for Six5-mediated translocation of Avr2-GFP from transformed cells to adjacent non-transformed cells.

To assess, in an unbiased manner, the Six5-mediated translocation of Avr2-GFP, we isolated protoplasts from 35S::::spAvr2-GFP/mCherry-HDEL agro-infiltrated leaves and counted the number of green/red fluorescent cells using flow cytometry. To establish the autofluorescence background, we used untransformed cells as a reference; a representative mock is shown in Figure 5B. Based on the mock, four quadrants could be established following expression of the 35S::::spAvr2-GFP/mCherry-HDEL construct. These quadrants represent: Q1, non-transformed cells; Q2, mCherry-expressing cells; Q3, mCherry + GFP-expressing cells; and Q4, GFP-only-containing cells (Figure 5B, middle and right panels). Comparison of Q4 in the absence and presence of Six5 showed an increase in the number of GFP-only cells in the presence of Six5 (Figure 5B) from approximately 0.5% of the total GFP population (Q3 and Q4) to approximately 4% (Figure 5C). In three independent biological replicates, each of which consisted of three infiltrated leaves and subsequent cell counts, a 2- to 7-fold increase in the GFP-only population was observed, in the presence of Six5, in comparison to the GUS control. Whether Six5 itself is
also able to translocate remains unknown; experiments using DspSIX5-GFP/mCherry-HDEL were inconclusive due to the relatively low fluorescence of the Six5-GFP signal, which was about 10 times weaker than that of Avr2-GFP (Supplemental Figure 3). Based on these data, we conclude that only in the presence of Six5 is Avr2 translocated from transformed to non-transformed N. benthamiana cells.

Initiation and Development of I-2-mediated HR Following Systemic Spread of PVX::DspAVR2 is Delayed in SIX5 Tomato

The single-cell transformation experiments in Arabidopsis and N. benthamiana show that Avr2 is transported to neighboring plant cells only in the presence of Six5. To assess whether Six5-mediated Avr2 translocation also occurs in tomato, we used its ability to trigger an I-2-mediated immune response as a proxy for translocation (Houterman et al., 2009). For expression of DspAVR2 in I-2 tomato plants, a potato virus X (PVX)-based expression system was employed. Expression of DspAVR2 by PVX triggers an I-2-dependent HR, which is visible as trailing necrosis around the vasculature when the virus spreads systemically through the plant (Houterman et al., 2009). If Six5 alters the distribution pattern of Avr2, one would expect that the pattern of necrotic cell death following spread of the virus in an I-2-containing plant to differ from that of a DspSIX5/I-2 plant. Three independent transgenic DspSIX5/I-2 tomato lines were generated that stably expressed the DspSIX5 gene driven by a CaMV 35S promoter (see Methods). Subsequently, PVX::DspAVR2 was toothpick-agro-inoculated on i-2 tomato plants (susceptible line C32), I-2 plants (resistant line), and the three independent homozygous DspSIX5/I-2 tomato lines. The same genotypes were inoculated with the PVX::DspAVR2R/H construct to allow us to distinguish DspAVR2/I-2-mediated HR from disease symptoms caused by PVX infection (Houterman et al., 2009). Consistent with the observations made by Houterman et al. (2009), no HR was observed following PVX::DspAVR2R/H inoculation (Figure 6A, upper panel; the lower left corner insets show close-up views of the representative leaf). As expected, susceptible i-2 tomato plants also did not show an HR or chlorosis upon inoculation with PVX::DspAVR2. However, consistent with expression of I-2 in the vasculature, in I-2 tomato plants, systematic HR around the vasculature and at leaf tips was detected nine days post inoculation (dpi). Interestingly, no HR was detectable in inoculated DspSIX5/I-2

Figure 6. The Avr2/I-2-Mediated Hypersensitive Response is Delayed in SIX5 Transgenic Tomato.
Tomato plants were inoculated with PVX::DspAVR2 and PVX::DspAVR2R/H and photographed at 21 dpi. (A) The upper panel shows PVX::DspAVR2R/H-inoculated plants that did not develop an HR. The lower panel shows the systemic HR that developed in PVX::DspAVR2-inoculated I-2 tomato that showed a severely impaired growth. In DspSIX5/I-2 plants, the HR was delayed and plants were only mildly stunted in comparison with the inoculated i-2 controls. (B) Immunoblot showing comparable amounts of Avr2R/H in PVX::DspAVR2R/H-infected wild-type and SIX5 tomato plants. Total protein extracts were subjected to immunoblot analysis and probed with an Avr2 antibody. Ponceau staining shows equal protein loading of PVX::GFP- or PVX::DspAVR2R/H-infected tomato lines.

plants at this time point (data not shown). The growth of PVX::spAVR2-inoculated SIX5 tomato lines was unaffected and the inoculated plants had sizes similar to those of PVX::spAVR2R/H-inoculated tomato lines. At 21 dpi, however, PVX::spAVR2-inoculated spSIX5/I-2 plants became moderately stunted and grew slightly smaller than the susceptible controls (i-2) (Figure 6A, lower panel). In spSIX5/I-2 plants, a few necrotic spots emerged along the main leaf veins and close to the leaf tips in fully expanded leaves (Figure 6A, lower panel; the close-ups are representative leaves exhibiting necrosis). At this time point, massive necrosis had developed in PVX::AVR2-infected I-2 plants, and these plants were severely stunted while their leaves became chlorotic. Typically, around four weeks after inoculation, all PVX::AVR2-infected I-2 plants were dead. PVX::spAVR2-infected spSIX5/I-2 plants, however, continued to grow (plants were monitored until eight weeks after inoculation with PVX::spAVR2), although necrosis progressed and necrotic sectors eventually developed in all fully developed leaves. Hence, compared with wild-type I-2 plants, HR onset is severely delayed and less pronounced in spSIX5/I-2 tomato following inoculation with PVX::spAVR2.

To test whether the observed differences in onset and pattern of cell death is due to (a) reduced accumulation of Avr2 or (b) altered distribution of Avr2, we performed immunoblot analyses. As cell death prohibited a reliable protein extraction from PVX::spAVR2-inoculated I-2 tomato lines (data not shown), the accumulation of Avr2R/H was monitored nine days post-PVX inoculation in the second leaf counted from the top of a plant. The Avr2R/H protein has similar properties and the same subcellular localization as Avr2 (Figure 3). Comparable amounts of Avr2R/H were detected in all five PVX::spAVR2R/H-inoculated tomato lines (Figure 6B), which implies that the compromised HR in I-2/spSIX5 tomato is not due to a reduced accumulation of the Avr2 protein following PVX-mediated expression, but possibly to an altered distribution pattern.

Six5 Changes the Distribution of Avr2 in Tomato

The presence of Six5 compromised HR following PVX::spAVR2 infection of I-2 tomato plants, but did not affect accumulation of the Avr2R/H protein. To assess whether Six5 alters the localization pattern of Avr2 in PVX-infected leaves of I-2 and spSIX5/I-2 tomato, we monitored the presence and distribution of a fluorescently labeled Avr2-GFP protein upon inoculation with a recombinant PVX::spAVR2-GFP construct. Since PVX::spAVR2-GFP was severely affected in its ability to induce I-2-mediated HR in tomato (data not shown), a trimmed Avr2 variant was used that lacks the first 37 amino acids of the N terminus. This truncated Δ37Avr2 protein elicits a faster and stronger I-2-mediated HR in N. benthamiana than Avr2 (Ma et al., 2013). PVX::Δ37AVR2-GFP was introduced into 10-day-old I-2 and spSIX5/I-2 tomato seedlings by agro-mediated toothpick inoculation. Necrosis developed three weeks after inoculation with PVX::Δ37AVR2-GFP and, as before, HR development in spSIX5/I-2 tomato was delayed and reduced as compared to that of I-2 tomato. Small necrotic spots were observed adjacent to the leaf main veins in fully expanded leaves and occasionally in the tips of newly developing leaves of the Six5-containing plants. In contrast, strong chlorosis and extensive necrosis was found along the major veins of all leaves of the I-2 wild-type tomato, thereby exhibiting the functionality of the PVX-encoded GFP-tagged Δ37Avr2 protein (data not shown).

To monitor the distribution of the GFP signal, we harvested the second fully expanded leaf (counting from the top) of an inoculated I-2 or Δ37AVR2/SIX5/I-2 tomato plant and subjected it to confocal microscopy analysis. Leaves were harvested at 21 dpi before a visible HR developed, and green fluorescence originating from the Δ37AVR2-GFP protein was observed mostly in the nuclei from both I-2 and Δ37AVR2/SIX5/I-2 tomato leaves (Figure 7A). Numbers of green fluorescent cells observed in Δ37AVR2-expressing tomato were greater than in wild-type I-2 tomato (Figure 7A). As shown in the merged green fluorescence/bright-field images, there are distinct differences in the distribution of the green fluorescence between I-2 and Δ37AVR2/SIX5/I-2 tomato plants (Figure 7A). In I-2 plants, the Δ37Avr2-GFP signal was mostly localized in cells that are in close vicinity of the leaf veins, whereas in Δ37AVR2/SIX5/I-2 leaves, more cells emitting green fluorescence were observed, and these fluorescent cells were also found at further distances from the veins. To quantify the number of cells along the leaf veins that expressed Δ37Avr2-GFP in I-2 and Δ37AVR2/SIX5/I-2 tomato leaves, we used an ImageJ script to count the number of green nuclei per frame (Jiang et al., 2015). Analyzing 15 frames/genotype revealed an average number of green fluorescent cells in I-2 tomato plants of 35.1 ± 9.46 per frame while in Δ37AVR2/SIX5/I-2 tomato, this number was about three times higher (96.3 ± 20.87, Figure 7B). This significant difference (p < 0.001) shows that expression of Δ37SIX5 altering the distribution of Δ37Avr2 can also occur in tomato.

DISCUSSION

Avr2 and Six5 are both required for fungal virulence and to trigger I-2-mediated resistance in tomato (Ma et al., 2015). Here we show that Avr2 and Six5 interact at plasmodesmata. Their combined presence in a plant cell alters the physical properties of the plasmodesmata, allowing NLS-2xRFP and Avr2-GFP to move to neighboring cells (Figure 7C). Whereas these effector proteins are restricted to the transformed cells in the absence of Six5, they were found to move to neighboring cells only in the presence of Six5. The observation that NLS-2xRFP was detected in the nuclei of neighboring cells shows that part of the protein pool was transported before it was translocated to the nucleus. When ER-RFP encoding constructs were co-bombarded with Δ37Avr2-GFP into Δ37SIX5-expressing Arabidopsis leaves, or co-expressed in N. benthamiana, red fluorescence was observed only in the ER of the transformed cell and not in the neighboring cells. These observations imply a greater likelihood that the protein of NLS-2xRFP, and not its transcript, is translocated in the presence of Six5 and Avr2, as in the latter case, and consequently the ER of neighboring cells would become red fluorescent.

Using three different experimental systems, we provided data in support of Six5-dependent cell-to-cell movement of Avr2 in tomato, Arabidopsis, and N. benthamiana. The finding that the effector can spread in three evolutionarily distinct plant species implies that the Avr2/Six5 effector pair targets a
A conserved process regulating plasmodesmatal SEL. The potential plasmodesmatal protein involved in this process is unknown, and pull-down experiments and extensive Y2H screens have not revealed obvious candidates (Ma et al., 2015). BiFC experiments showed that upon overexpression of Avr2 and Six5, both proteins also interacted in the cytosol. Occasionally, following co-expression of DspSIX5 and the DspAVR2R/H variant that typically accumulates to slightly higher levels (Houterman et al., 2009), fluorescence complementation was also observed in the nucleus. At lower expression levels, however, fluorescence complementation was only observed at plasmodesmata, suggesting that a plasmodesmata-localized protein stabilizes their interaction (data not shown). Revealing the identity of this protein targeted by the effector pair remains a subject for future studies.

The onset and severity of the systemic HR in I-2 and DspSIX5/I-2 tomato following PVX::AVR2 inoculation was severely delayed in the latter transgenic tomato. Whereas accumulation of Avr2R/H was unaffected, the distribution of the Δ37Avr2-GFP protein in the leaf was altered and fluorescence was observed in more cells that were also found at greater distances from the vasculature. This altered distribution, correlating with a delayed and reduced onset of HR, may have different causes. Possibly, the virus can spread more efficiently due to the presence of Avr2 and Six5. One speculation is that the effector pair functionally mimics a viral movement protein. If so, one would predict an enhanced HR phenotype, which was not observed. Alternatively, the delayed onset of HR can be explained by the assumption that in I-2-containing cells, the concentration of Avr2 should exceed a specific threshold before HR is initiated. PVX systemically spreads

---

**Figure 7. Distribution of Avr2Δ37-GFP Differences between Wild-Type and 35S::DspSIX5 Tomato Following PVX::Avr2Δ37-GFP Infection.**

(A) Representative images of PVX::Avr2Δ37-GFP-inoculated I-2 and 35S::DspSIX5/I-2 tomato leaves at 21 dpi. In wild-type I-2 tomato, the green fluorescence of Avr2Δ37-GFP was mostly localized in cells adjacent to the vessels. In 35S::DspSIX5/I-2 tomato leaves, the Avr2Δ37-GFP fluorescence spread to cells further from the vessels and was detected in a larger area.

(B) The number of green fluorescent tomato cells along the leaf vessels containing Avr2Δ37-GFP. Quantification was performed in I-2 and 35S::DspSIX5/I-2 tomato using ImageJ. Fifteen slides were analyzed for each genotype, and an average number of 35.1 ± 9.46 green fluorescent cells per view in I-2 tomato plants and 96.3 ± 20.87 per view in SIX5/I-2 tomato were recorded. ***p < 0.001.

(C) Graphical model depicting the alteration of the plasmodesmal size exclusion limit by the Fusarium oxysporum Avr2-Six5 effector pair facilitating cell-to-cell movement of Avr2.
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through plants, via the vasculature (Baulcombe et al., 1995), from where it infects the I-2-expressing cells localized in this tissue (Mes et al., 1999). In the absence of Six5, Avr2 cannot move to neighboring cells. Thus in PVX::JspAVR2-infected wild-type tomato, the Avr2 protein will accumulate in the I-2-expressing cells aligning the vasculature. Containment would enable the elicitor to reach a tentative I-2 activation threshold earlier than in JspSIX5 plants, in which the effector can freely move to neighboring cells. This hypothesis is consistent with the observation that the overall amount of Avr2 protein in PVX-infected leaves was the same for wild-type and JspSIX5 plants. The threshold hypothesis is further supported by the observation that only relatively high amounts of Avr2, e.g., following agro-infiltration in N. benthamiana or upon PVX-based expression in I-2 tomato, result in an HR, whereas an HR is not observed in I-2 tomato following infection with an avirulent Fol strain (Houterman et al., 2009; Ma et al., 2015).

A premise of the hypothesis that Six5 facilitates translocation of Avr2, which in susceptible tomato plants likely benefits Fol infection as Avr2 is a potent PTI suppressor (Di et al., 2017), implies an obligatory dependency of the effectors on each other to function. Indeed, Six5 and Avr2 Fol knockout strains are equally impaired in their ability to cause disease (Ma et al., 2015). Furthermore, both knockout strains have a highly similar effect on the xylem sap proteome composition, pointing to a largely overlapping activity in planta (Gawehns et al., 2015). Also, the observation that expression of both effector genes is driven by a shared promoter region (Schmidt et al., 2013) and that they always occur as a gene pair in Fol (Ma et al., 2015) suggest that they function together. Transient expression of Avr2 alone is sufficient to trigger I-2-mediated signaling in N. benthamiana, yet Six5 is required for I-2-mediated resistance in tomato (Ma et al., 2015). Our finding that Six5 facilitates cell-to-cell transport of Avr2 could provide a mechanistic explanation for these observations (Mes et al., 1999). The fungus secretes Avr2 and Six5 when it infects the roots (Houterman et al., 2007, 2009) and colonizes endodermal cells and the apoplastic spaces between root cortical cells before entering the xylem vessels (van der Does et al., 2008). Avr2 promoter reporter fusions show that Avr2 is strongly expressed in these invading hyphae (Ma et al., 2013), and it is likely that the root endodermal and cortical cells take up the secreted effectors from the extracellular space in the presence of the fungus (Di et al., 2016, 2017). These cortical cells do not express I-2, and hence are unable to recognize Avr2 and mount an immune response. Following Avr2/Six5 uptake, Six5 assists translocation of Avr2, enabling Avr2 to reach the I-2-containing cells adjacent to the vasculature, resulting in the activation of an immune response. Such a mechanism would explain why loss of either Six5 or Avr2 compromises I-2-mediated immunity, while Avr2 alone suffices to trigger I-2-mediated HR when heterologously expressed inside I-2-containing cells.

Viruses specifically manipulate plasmodesmata and viral movement proteins (MPs) enlarge the exclusion size of plasmodesmata, allowing the virus to move from cell to cell (Wolf et al., 1989). There are two main strategies for viral movement through plasmodesmata: tubule-guided and non-tubule-guided movement (Schoelz et al., 2011). In the first case, MP dramatically restructures the plasmodesmata by removing the desmotubule and ER within plasmodesmata to expand the pore size. For the non-tubule-guided MPs, no major restructuring of plasmodesmata occurs but the SEL is increased. Whether Avr2/Six5 use similar or distinct mechanisms to alter the exclusion limit of plasmodesmata is unclear, but the tools described here will facilitate future studies aimed at elucidating this process. Studies using fluorescently labeled effectors from Magnaporthe oryzae revealed that the PWL2 and BAS1 proteins are observed in the cytosol of both invaded and uninvaded neighboring cells (Khang et al., 2010). Possibly, symplastic effector translocation from infected cells to uninfected neighbors via plasmodesmata is a generic property of plant pathogens. If so, it will be interesting to investigate whether these effectors also similarly manipulate the plasmodesmata. To our knowledge, no M. oryzae effectors have yet been confirmed to interact with the plasmodesmata, although BAS3 is a likely candidate to do so (Mosquera et al., 2009).

An interesting question is whether Six5 is co-translocated with Avr2 to neighboring cells. Unfortunately, our experiments aimed at showing direct translocation of GFP-tagged Six5 were unsuccessful due to the poor accumulation of the effector. In conclusion, Six5 and Avr2 together function as a fungal movement protein allowing translocation of Avr2 to neighboring cells. We speculate that spread of Avr2 through root tissues facilitates the infection process by suppressing immune responses (Di et al., 2017). It will be interesting to investigate whether other plant pathogens have a similar mechanism to allow effectors to spread to neighboring cells.

METHODS

Plant Material

The Arabidopsis ecotype Columbia (Col-0) and Solanum lycopersicum cv. C32 (susceptible i-2 tomato) (Kroon and Elgersma, 1993) and OT364 (resistant i-2 tomato) (Mes et al., 1999) were used for SIX5 transformation. The Arabidopsis plants used in this study were grown in a growth chamber under short-day conditions with 13 h of dark and 11 h of light at a temperature of 22°C. Tomato plants used for PVX inoculation were grown in a climatized greenhouse at 25°C, 65% relative humidity, and a 16-h photoperiod.

Plant Transformation

For in planta production of Six5x, the entry vector pENTR207::JspSIX5 (Ma et al., 2015) was recombined into binary vector pGWB402 according to the Gateway protocol for LR recombination reaction (Invitrogen). The resulting vector was introduced by electroporation into Agrobacterium tumefaciens strain GV3101 (Berres et al., 1992) or EHA105 (Tang et al., 1996) for Arabidopsis or tomato transformation, respectively. A. tumefaciens transformants were selected on Luria–Bertani mannitol medium (10 g/l tryptone, 5 g/l yeast extract, 2.5 g/l NaCl, 10 g/l mannitol, and 15 g/l Daishin agar) supplemented with 100 mg/l spectino-mycin and 25 mg/l rifampicin.

Arabidopsis Col-0 plants were transformed by the floral dipping method. First-generation transformants were selected on half strength Murashige–Skoog (MS) medium containing kanamycin, timentin, and nystatin (40, 100 and 100 mg/l, respectively) and subsequently transferred to soil. In total, nine independent single insertion lines were selected according to segregation analysis on selective plates, and among these lines were three homozygous T3 lines that were selected and used for particle bombardment assays. Presence of the transgene was confirmed by PCR with primers FP872 (GGG GAC AAG TTT GTA CAA AAA AAG CAG GCT) and FP873 (GGG GAC CAC TTT GTA CAA GAA ACG TGG GT).
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S. lycopersicum cv. C32 and OT364 were transformed with pGWB402::\(\text{spAVR2}\) by Agrobacterium-mediated transformation (Cortina and Cualianez-Macia, 2004). The presence of \(\text{SIX5}\) in transgenic tomato plants was confirmed by PCR with primers FP872 (GGG GAC AAG TTT GTA CAA AAA AAG CAG GCT) and FP873 (GGG GAC CAC TTT GTA CAA GAA AGC TGG GT), and using immunoblots probed with a Six5 antibody (Ma et al., 2015). The ploidy level of \(\text{SIX5}\) transgenic tomato plants was examined by counting the chloroplast numbers in leaf guard cells (Jacobs and Yoder, 1989). Out of 27 regenerated tomato plants, 13 were diploid and contained the \(\text{SIX5}\) transgene. Four independent homozygous single insertion lines were selected according to segregation of the \(\text{SIX5}\) gene as confirmed with PCR (primer pair FP872/FP873). Three independent homozygous T3 lines were used in the PVX inoculation assay.

Construction of Double Transformants

\(35S::\text{spAVR2}\) plants were crossed to \(35S::\text{spSIX5}\) Arabidopsis. F3 progeny homozygous for \(35S::\text{spAVR2}/35S::\text{spSIX5}\) were obtained by screening on kanamycin plates (40 mg/ml kanamycin, 100 mg/ml timentin, and 100 mg/ml nystatin) and by detection of \(\text{AVR2}\) and \(\text{SIX5}\) using primer pairs: FP2849 (GGA CTG AAT CAC CGC ATT TAC GA)/FP2848 (ACT GAT TGT GGC TGG ACC TC) and FP872/FP873.

Vector Construction

To generate RFP- and GFP-tagged Avr2 and Six5 for subcellular localization studies, we recombined the entry vectors pENTR207::\(\text{spAVR2}\) (Houterman et al., 2009) and pENTR207::\(\text{spSIX5}\) (Ma et al., 2015) into respective binary vectors pGWB454/455 and pGWB451/452 (Nakagawa et al., 2007) according to the Gateway protocol for LR recombination reaction (Invitrogen) to create respectively N- or C-terminal fusions. To construct NLS-2xRFP, we introduced an NLS into the forward primer FP5455 (AAA AGC AGG CTC CAT GCT GCA TAA GAA GAG AAA GGT TGG AGG ATG GAT GAA GGA CGA CGA GGA CGA GGA CGA CGA CTC ACC ATG GAT CCA TCC TCT GAG GAT GTA AGA TAG ATG), and FP5456 (AGA AAG CTC CAT GGC TCG TTG GTC GAG TGC TGG GTG GAA GAT GCC TGG ACC ACC ATG GAT GAA GGA CGA CGA GGA CGA TCA CAA TAG A), respectively. The fragment obtained with this primer set was used as a template for a second round of PCR with primer set FP872/FP873. The resulting fragment containing the NLS and RFP coding sequences was recombined into binary vector pGWB454 by an LR recombination reaction.

To generate the cell-to-cell movement vector, we used pDONR207-\(\text{spAVR2}\) and pDONR207-\(\text{spSIX5}\) to amplify the \(\text{spAVR2}\) and \(\text{spSIX5}\) coding sequences with primer sets FP7937 (CAC CAT TTA CGA ACG ATA GCC ATG AGG GAT CAT CAG TAC TGT CAT GTG GAA GAT GCC GAT TC) and FP7940 (GGA TCC ATG GTG AGC AAG GGC GAG GAG CTG TTC ACC GGG GTG GT). Recombination occurred using primer set FP2849 (GGA CTG AAT CAC CGC ATT TAC GA)/FP2848 (ACT GAT TGT GGC TGG ACC TC) and FP872/FP873.

Protein Extraction and Western Blotting

Tomato leaves were harvested and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen. After homogenizing with TissueLyser (Qiagen), the plant material was thawed in urea protein extraction buffer (9.5 M urea, 100 mM Tris [pH 6.8], 2% SDS, and 5 mM DTT) and incubated on ice for 15 min (200 μl buffer per 100 mg tissue). Extracts were centrifuged at 12 000 g at 4 °C for 10 min, and the supernatant was passed through four layers of Miracloth to obtain a total protein extract. Total protein extracts (40 μl) were mixed with Laemmli sample buffer and heated for 1 min at 98 °C. The samples were electrophoresed on 14% SDS-PAGE gels and blotted on PVDF membrane by semi-dry blotting. Blocking was performed with 5% skimmed milk powder and hybridization was performed in the presence of 0.1% Tween 20. Primary antibody anti-Avr2 (Ma et al., 2015) was used at a 1:10 000 dilution and the secondary goat-anti-rabbit antibody conjugated with horseradish peroxidase (Pierce, Rockford, IL, USA) was used at a 1:2500 dilution. The presence of Avr2 protein was visualized by ECL using Fujifilm Super RX-N (http://www.fujifilm.com/).

Flow Cytometry

Flow cytometry analysis was performed on N. benthamiana protoplasts, using a BD FACSAria III (BD Biosciences, USA). Protoplasts were identified by size and complexity (forward scatter-A versus side scatter-A). A Neutral Density filter 2.0 was used to keep the forward scatter protoplast on scale. Excitation of GFP was produced at 488 nm and emission was captured at 530/30 nm. mCherry was excited at 561 nm and emission was captured at 610/20 nm. All samples were filtered over a 50-μm mesh prior to analysis. A total of 50 000 cells was analyzed for each
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Agro-Mediated Transient Transformation of N. benthamiana Leaves and Protoplast Isolation

Agro-infiltration of N. benthamiana leaves was performed as described by Ma et al. (2013). For BIFC assays, co-infiltrations of A. tumefaciens strains containing the \(\text{spAVR2}\) and \(\text{spSIX5}\) BIFC vectors (Ma et al., 2015) and the PDCB1-mCherry encoding construct (Grangeon et al., 2013) were carried out using an OD\(_{600}\) of 0.5 for each culture. The leaves were subjected to confocal microscopy 48 h after infiltration. For cell-to-cell movement assays, co-infiltrations of A. tumefaciens strains containing \(\text{spAVR2}\)-GFP/mCherry-HDEL or \(\text{spSIX5}\)-GFP/mCherry-HDEL were carried out at an OD\(_{600}\) of 0.05 and 0.1, respectively. All other constructs, \(35S::\text{spAVR2}, 35S::\text{spSIX5}, 35S::\text{GUS},\) and p19, were infiltrated at an OD\(_{600}\) of 0.5.

The agro-infiltrated leaves were subjected to confocal microscopy and protoplast isolation 72 h after infiltration. N. benthamiana protoplasts were prepared as described by Faraco et al. (2011), with minor modification. Half an agro-infiltrated leaf of 5-week-old plants was cut into 1- to 2-mm leaf strips, submerged in leaf digestion buffer (Faraco et al., 2011), and, without shaking, kept overnight in the dark.

Confocal Microscopy

Confocal microscopy was performed with an LSM510 (Zeiss, Germany). GFP and BIFC recombinant were excited at 488 nm with an Ar-ion laser and emission was recorded at 505–530/550 nm. Excitation of RFP and mCherry was achieved at 543 nm with an HeNe laser and emission was captured with a 565/585–615 nm filter. To visualize callose, we infiltrated 0.1% aniline blue using a needleless syringe into N. benthamiana leaves at 0.5 h before analysis. The aniline blue fluorochrome was excited at 405 nm and emission was recorded at 385–470 nm. Multi-labeling with GFP and RFP or BIFC, mCherry, and aniline blue were imaged by sequential scanning to monitor co-localization.

Flow Cytometry

Flow cytometry analysis was performed on N. benthamiana protoplasts, using a BD FACSAria III (BD Biosciences, USA). Protoplasts were identified by size and complexity (forward scatter-A versus side scatter-A). A Neutral Density filter 2.0 was used to keep the forward scatter protoplast on scale. Excitation of GFP was produced at 488 nm and emission was captured at 530/30 nm. mCherry was excited at 561 nm and emission was captured at 610/20 nm. All samples were filtered over a 50-μm mesh prior to analysis. A total of 50 000 cells was analyzed for each
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sample. Data were analyzed with Kaluza Flow Cytometry Analysis software version 1.2 (Beckman Coulter, USA).
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