PLANT PATHOGEN RESISTANCE BIOTECHNOLOGY

Edited by David B. Collinge

WILEY Blackwell

Plant Pathogen Resistance Biotechnology

Plant Pathogen Resistance Biotechnology

Edited by David B. Collinge

WILEY Blackwell

Copyright © 2016 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved

Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey

Published simultaneously in Canada

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400, fax (978) 750-4470, or on the web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, (201) 748-6011, fax (201) 748-6008, or online at http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives or written sales materials. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a professional where appropriate. Neither the publisher nor author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

For general information on our other products and services or for technical support, please contact our Customer Care Department within the United States at (800) 762-2974, outside the United States at (317) 572-3993 or fax (317) 572-4002.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic formats. For more information about Wiley products, visit our web site at www.wiley.com.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Collinge, D.B. (David Brian), editor.
Title: Plant pathogen resistance biotechnology / David B. Collinge.
Description: Hoboken, New Jersey : John Wiley & Sons, [2016] | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2015049842 | ISBN 9781118867761 (cloth)
Subjects: LCSH: Plant biotechnology. | Plants–Disease and pest resistance–Molecular aspects. | Phytopathogenic microorganisms.
Classification: LCC TP248.27.P55 P568 2016 | DDC 630–dc23
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015049842

Set in 10/12pt Times by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

Cover credit: Getty/LeitnerR

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



To Andrea, Mikkel and Jakob Tak for jeres støtte

Contents

List of Cont	tributors	xiii
Foreword		xix
Acknowledg	gments	XXV
Chapter 1	The Status and Prospects for Biotechnological Approaches for Attaining Sustainable Disease Resistance David B. Collinge, Ewen Mullins, Birgit Jensen and Hans J.L. Jørgensen	1
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 Factors to consider when generating disease-resistant crops	2
	1.3 Opportunities to engineer novel cultivars for disease resistance	10
	1.4 Technical barriers to engineering novel cultivars for disease resistance	13
	1.5 Approaches for identification and selection of genes important for	1.4
	disease resistance	14
	1.0 Promising strategies for engineering disease-resistant crops	15
	References	15
Part I: I	Biological Strategies Leading Towards	04
	Disease Resistance	21
Chapter 2	Engineering Barriers to Infection by Undermining Pathogen Effector Function or by Gaining Effector Recognition Ali Abdurehim Ahmed, Hazel McLellan, Geziel Barbosa Aguilar, Ingo Hein, Hans Thordal-Christensen and Paul R.J. Birch	23

2.1	Introduction	23
2.2	Plant defence and effector function	24

vii

	2.3 Strategies for engineering resistance2.4 Perspective	33 42	
	References	43	
Chapter 3	Application of Antimicrobial Proteins and Peptides in Developing Disease-Resistant Plants Ashis Kumar Nandi		
	 3.1 Introduction 3.2 Biological role of PR-proteins 3.3 Antimicrobial peptides 3.4 Regulation of PR-protein expression 3.5 Biotechnological application of PR-protein genes in developing improved crop plants 3.6 Future directions Acknowledgement References 	51 52 56 57 60 61 63 63	
Chapter 4	Metabolic Engineering of Chemical Defence Pathways in Plant Disease Control <i>Fred Rook</i>	71	
	 4.1 Introduction 4.2 Present status of metabolic engineering in the control of plant disease 4.3 Metabolic engineering: technical challenges and opportunities 4.4 The outlook for metabolically engineering of disease resistance in crops References 	71 73 78 83 85	
Chapter 5	Arabinan: Biosynthesis and a Role in Host-Pathogen Interactions Maria Stranne and Yumiko Sakuragi	91	
	 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Biosynthesis and modification of arabinan 5.3 Distribution of arabinan in different tissues and during development 5.4 Role of arabinan in plant growth and development 5.5 Roles of arabinan degrading enzymes in virulence of phytopathogenic fungi 5.6 Roles of arabinan in pathogen interactions 5.7 Conclusion References 	91 94 96 98 99 101 103 103	
Chapter 6	Transcription Factors that Regulate Defence Responses and Their Use in Increasing Disease Resistance Prateek Tripathi, Aravind Galla, Roel C. Rabara and Paul J. Rushton	109	
	 6.1 Introduction 6.2 Transcription factors and plant defence 6.3 AP2/ERF transcription factors 6.4 bZIP transcription factors 	109 110 111 113	

	6.5	WRKY transcription factors	114
	6.6	MYB transcription factors	116
	6.7	Other transcription factor families	117
	6.8	Can the manipulation of specific transcription factors deliver	
		sustainable disease resistance?	118
	6.9	Have we chosen the right transgenes?	119
	6.10	Have we chosen the right expression strategies?	120
	6.11	What new ideas are there for the future of TF-based	
		crop improvement?	121
	Refer	rences	124
Chapter 7	Regu Domi	lation of Abiotic and Biotic Stress Responses by Plant Hormones inik K. Groβkinsky, Eric van der Graaff and Thomas Roitsch	131
	7.1	Introduction	131
	7.2	Regulation of biotic stress responses by plant hormones	132
	7.3	Regulation of abiotic stress responses by plant hormones	140
	7.4	Conclusions and further perspectives	145
	Refer	rences	147

Part II: Case Studies for Groups of Pathogens and Important Crops. Why Is It Especially Advantageous to use Transgenic Strategies for these Pathogens or Crops? 155

Chapter 8	Engineered Resistance to Viruses: A Case of Plant Innate Immunity <i>Paula Tennant and Marc Fuchs</i>		
	8.1 Introduction	157	
	8.2 Mitigation of viruses	158	
	8.3 Biotechnology and virus resistance	158	
	8.4 Success stories	162	
	8.5 Challenges of engineering RNAi-mediated resistance	163	
	8.6 Benefits of virus-resistant transgenic crops	164	
	8.7 Conclusions	166	
	References	167	
Chapter 9	Problematic Crops: 1. Potatoes: Towards Sustainable Potato Late		
	Blight Resistance by Cisgenic <i>R</i> Gene Pyramiding		
	Kwang-Ryong Jo. Suxian Zhu, Yuling Bai, Ronald C.B. Hutten		
	G I Kessel Vivianne G A A Vleeshouwers Evert Jacobsen		
	Richard G.F. Visser and Jack H. Vossen		
	9.1 Potato late blight resistance breeding advocates GM strategies	171	
	9.2 GM strategies for late blight resistance breeding	177	
	9.3 Late blight-resistant GM varieties	186	
	References	187	

Chapter 10	Problematic Crops: 1. Grape: To Long Life and Good Health: Untangling the Complexity of Grape Diseases to Develop Pathogen-Resistant Varieties <i>Dario Cantu, M. Caroline Roper, Ann L.T. Powell and John M. Labavitch</i>	193
	 10.1 Introduction 10.2 Introduction to grapevine pathology 10.3 Approaches for the improvement of grapevine disease resistance 10.4 Pierce's disease of grapevines: a case study References 	193 194 198 202 211
Chapter 11	Developing Sustainable Disease Resistance in Coffee: Breeding vs. Transgenic Approaches Avinash Kumar, Simmi P. Sreedharan, Nandini P. Shetty and Giridhar Parvatam	217
	 11.1 Introduction 11.2 Agronomic aspects of coffee 11.3 Major threats to coffee plantations 11.4 Breeding for disease resistance and pest management 11.5 Various traits targeted for transgenic coffee development 11.6 Bottlenecks in coffee transgenic development 11.7 GM or hybrid joe: what choices to make? Acknowledgements Endnote References Webliographies 	217 217 219 225 227 229 235 236 236 236 236 243
Chapter 12	 Biotechnological Approaches for Crop Protection: Transgenes for Disease Resistance in Rice Blanca San Segundo, Belén López-García and María Coca 12.1 Introduction 12.2 Plant immunity 12.3 Transgenic approaches to engineer disease resistance in rice plants 12.4 Targeted genome engineering 12.5 Safety issues of genetically engineered rice 	245 245 247 250 260 261
	12.6 Conclusions and future prospects Acknowledgement References	263 265 265
Part III:	Status of Transgenic Crops Around the World	273
Chapter 13	Status of Transgenic Crops in Argentina Fernando F. Bravo-Almonacid and María Eugenia Segretin	275
	 13.1 Transgenic crops approved for commercialization in Argentina 13.2 Economic impact derived from transgenic crops cultivation 13.3 Local developments 13.4 Perspectives References 	275 278 278 282 282

Chapter 14	The Status of Transgenic Crops in Australia Michael Gilbert	285
	 14.1 Introduction 14.2 Government policies 14.3 Field trials 14.4 Crops deregulated 14.5 Crops grown 14.6 Public sentiment toward GM crops 14.7 Value capture 	285 286 287 287 287 287 291 291
	14.8 What is in the pipeline14.9 SummaryEndnotesReferences	292 292 293 293
Chapter 15	Transgenic Crops in Spain María Coca, Belén López-García and Blanca San Segundo	295
	 15.1 Introduction 15.2 Transgenic crops in Europe 15.3 Transgenic crops in Spain 15.4 Future prospects Acknowledgements References 	295 296 297 300 302 302
Chapter 16	Biotechnology and Crop Disease Resistance in South Africa Maryke Carstens and Dave K. Berger	305
	 16.1 Genetically modified crops in South Africa 16.2 Economic, social and health benefits of GM crops in South Africa 16.3 Biotechnology initiatives for crop disease control in South Africa 16.4 Future prospects Acknowledgements References 	305 308 309 312 313 313
Part IV:	Implications of Transgenic Technologies for Improved Disease Control	317
Chapter 17	Exploiting Plant Induced Resistance as a Route to Sustainable Crop Protection Michael R. Roberts and Jane E. Taylor	319
	 17.1 Introduction 17.2 Examples of elicitors of induced resistance 17.3 Priming of induced resistance 17.4 Drivers and barriers to the adoption of plant activators in agriculture and horticulture 	319 321 326 330
	17.5 Conclusions and future prospects References	334 334

Chapter 18	Biological Control Using Microorganisms as an Alternativeto Disease ResistanceDan Funck Jensen, Magnus Karlsson, Sabrina Sarroccoand Giovanni Vannacci		
	18.1 18.2 18.3	Introduction Getting the right biocontrol organism New approaches for studying the biology of BCAs	341 343
		and biocontrol interactions	351
	18.4 Deferen	Strategy for using biocontrol in IPM	354
	Webliog	graphy	363
Chapter 19	TILLIN Frances Søren K	IG in Plant Disease Control: Applications and Perspectives sca Desiderio, Anna Maria Torp, Giampiero Valè and X. Rasmussen	365
	19.1	Concepts of forward and reverse genetics	365
	19.2	The TILLING procedure	366
	19.3	Mutagenesis	366
	19.4	DNA preparation and pooling of individuals	371
	19.5	Mutation discovery	372
	19.6	Identification and evaluation of the individual mutant	374
	19.7	Bioinformatics tools	374
	19.8	EcoTILLING	375
	19.9 19.10	Application of TILLING and TILLING-related procedures	375
	10.11	in disease resistance	376
	19.11 Referen	Perspectives ices	380 381
Chapter 20	Fitness for Croj <i>James H</i>	Costs of Pathogen Recognition in Plants and Their Implications p Improvement <i>K.M. Brown</i>	385
	20.1	The goal of durable resistance	385
	20.2	New ways of using <i>R</i> -genes	386
	20.3	Costs of resistance in crop improvement	387
	20.4	Fitness costs of <i>R</i> -gene defences	388
	20.5	Phenotypes of <i>R</i> -gene over-expression	390
	20.6	Requirements for <i>R</i> -protein function	391
	20.7	Necrotic phenotypes of <i>R</i> -gene mutants	394
	20.8	Summary of fitness costs of <i>R</i> -gene mutations	390
	20.9 20.10	A-genes in plant directing Biotech innovation and genetic diversity	397 700
	20.10	Conclusion	400
	Acknow	vledgement	400
	Referen	ices	400

List of Contributors

Geziel Barbosa Aguilar

Section for Plant and Soil Science Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Ali Abdurehim Ahmed

Section for Plant and Soil Science Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Yuling Bai

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Dave K. Berger

Department of Plant Science Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI) Genomics Research Institute (GRI) University of Pretoria Pretoria, South Africa

Paul R.J. Birch

Cell and Molecular Sciences Dundee Effector Consortium Division of Plant Sciences University of Dundee; at James Hutton Institute Dundee, UK

Fernando F. Bravo-Almonacid

Laboratorio de Biotecnología Vegetal, INGEBI-CONICET Buenos Aires, Argentina

James K.M. Brown

John Innes Centre Norwich, UK

Dario Cantu

Department of Viticulture and Enology University of California Davis, CA, USA

Maryke Carstens

Department of Plant Science Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI) Genomics Research Institute (GRI) University of Pretoria Pretoria, South Africa

María Coca

Centre for Research in Agricultural Genomics (CRAG) CSIC-IRTA-UAB-UB Barcelona, Spain

David B. Collinge

Section for Microbial Ecology and Biotechnology Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Francesca Desiderio

Council for Agricultural Research and Economics (CREA) Genomics Research Centre Fiorenzuola d'Arda, Italy

Marc Fuchs

Department of Plant Pathology and Plant-Microbe Biology New York State Agricultural Experiment Station Cornell University Geneva, NY, USA

Aravind Galla

Department of Biology & Microbiology South Dakota State University Brookings, SD, USA

Michael Gilbert

Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics University of Adelaide, Waite Campus Urrbrae, South Australia, Australia

Eric van der Graaff

Section for Crop Sciences Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Taastrup, Denmark

Dominik K. Großkinsky

Section for Crop Sciences Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Taastrup, Denmark

Ingo Hein

Cell and Molecular Sciences Dundee Effector Consortium Dundee, UK

Ronald C.B. Hutten

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Evert Jacobsen

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Birgit Jensen

Section for Microbial Ecology and Biotechnology Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Dan Funck Jensen

Department of Forest Mycology and Plant Pathology Uppsala BioCenter, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences Uppsala, Sweden

Kwang-Ryong Jo

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Hans J.L. Jørgensen

Section for Plant and Soil Science Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Magnus Karlsson

Department of Forest Mycology and Plant Pathology Uppsala BioCenter, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences Uppsala, Sweden

Geert J.T. Kessel

Plant Research International (PRI) Wageningen University & Research Centre, Wageningen, The Netherlands

Avinash Kumar

Plant Cell Biotechnology Department CSIR-Central Food Technological Research Institute (CFTRI) Karnataka, India

John M. Labavitch

Department of Plant Sciences University of California Davis, CA, USA

Belén López-García

Centre for Research in Agricultural Genomics (CRAG) CSIC-IRTA-UAB-UB Barcelona, Spain

Hazel McLellan

Cell and Molecular Sciences Dundee Effector Consortium Division of Plant Sciences University of Dundee; at James Hutton Institute Dundee, UK

Ewen Mullins

Department of Crop Science Teagasc Crops, Environment and Land Use Programme Carlow, Ireland

Ashis Kumar Nandi School of Life Sciences Jawaharlal Nehru University New Delhi, India

Giridhar Parvatam

Plant Cell Biotechnology Department CSIR-Central Food Technological Research Institute (CFTRI) Karnataka, India

Ann L.T. Powell

Department of Plant Sciences University of California Davis, CA, USA

Roel C. Rabara

Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Center Dallas, TX, USA

Søren K. Rasmussen

Section for Plant and Soil Science Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Michael R. Roberts

Lancaster Environment Centre Lancaster University Lancaster, UK

Thomas Roitsch

Section for Crop Sciences Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Taastrup, Denmark

Global Change Research Centre Czech Globe AS CR Drásov, Czech Republic

Fred Rook

Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and VILLUM Research Center for Plant Plasticity University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

M. Caroline Roper Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology University of California Riverside, CA, USA

Paul J. Rushton

Texas A&M AgriLife Research and Extension Center Dallas, TX, USA

Yumiko Sakuragi

Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Sabrina Sarrocco Department of Agriculture, Food and Environment University of Pisa Pisa, Italy

María Eugenia Segretin Laboratorio de Biotecnología Vegetal, INGEBI-CONICET Buenos Aires, Argentina

Blanca San Segundo

Centre for Research in Agricultural Genomics (CRAG) CSIC-IRTA-UAB-UB Barcelona, Spain

Nandini P. Shetty Plant Cell Biotechnology Department CSIR-Central Food Technological Research Institute (CFTRI) Karnataka, India

Simmi P. Sreedharan

Plant Cell Biotechnology Department CSIR-Central Food Technological Research Institute (CFTRI) Karnataka, India

Maria Stranne

Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Jane E. Taylor

Lancaster Environment Centre Lancaster University Lancaster, UK

Paula Tennant

Department of Life Sciences The University of the West Indies Mona Jamaica, WI

Hans Thordal-Christensen

Section for Plant and Soil Science Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre University of Copenhagen Copenhagen, Denmark

Anna Maria Torp

Section for Plant and Soil Science Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Prateek Tripathi

Molecular & Computational Biology Section University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA, USA

Giampiero Valè

Council for Agricultural Research and Economics (CREA) Rice Research Unit Genomics Research Centre Vercelli, Italy

Council for Agricultural Research and Economics (CREA) Genomics Research Centre Fiorenzuola d'Arda, Italy

Giovanni Vannacci

Department of Agriculture, Food and Environment University of Pisa Pisa, Italy

Richard G.F. Visser

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Vivianne G.A.A. Vleeshouwers

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Jack H. Vossen

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Suxian Zhu

Wageningen UR Plant Breeding Wageningen University & Research Centre Wageningen, The Netherlands

Foreword

It is almost a cliché to point out that the agricultural production systems of the planet are facing a series of unprecedented challenges.

The world population is predicted to grow to more than 8 billion within 20 years, approaching 10 billion in 2050 (http://esa. un.org/wpp/).

Urbanization of the population is reducing the available area of agricultural land by encroachment and affecting adjacent areas with pollution and increased water demand.

The advanced economic growth and social development of regions, especially in Asia, is driving demand for meat-based diets with the knock-on effect of increasing the cultivation of commodity crops (e.g., maize, soybean) for animal feed purposes whilst simultaneously elevating greenhouse gas emissions (Smith et al., 2007).

Climate change is challenging the sustainability of traditional cropping systems via stochastic temperature fluctuations, rising CO_2 levels, increased frequency of extreme weather events and by moving climate zones.

Faced with these multiple challenges, global agriculture must adopt more dynamic, efficient and sustainable production methods to increase food and fodder production to feed a growing population with fewer resources (FAO). Finally, climate changes alone present several independent factors affecting the pallette of disease and disease control. In particular, emerging pathogens (and pests) find favourable conditions in new regions and, secondly, the increased unpredictability of the weather is leading to an increase in and unpredictability of abiotic stresses, such as drought, heat and cold, thereby altering risk patterns for specific diseases (Chakraborty and Newton, 2011). In turn, the latter leads to the need to understand the subtle interactions between these abiotic stress factors, the hormones regulating the ability of the plant to adapt to abiotic stress and microorganisms exhibiting different lifestyles. These range from beneficial endophytes and symbionts to harmful pathogens, and indeed there are examples where the same microbe can act as a benign if not beneficial endophyte under some conditions and as a harmful pathogen under others. While plant diseases can devastate crops, they can often be controlled by cultural practice, disease resistance, biological control and the use of pesticides. A level of complexity for the biologist attempting to unravel the nature of plant defence and the influence of abiotic factors, however, lies in the fact that evolution is based on adaptation of the tools available. This means that many of the same tools and their regulators are used in radically different processes in the plant where signal transduction processes regulate, e.g., growth and development as well as responses to biotic and abiotic stress. Examples of genes include those encoding different classes of receptors and components of signal transduction such as protein kinases as well as transcription factors. The regulators include phytohormones such as abscisic acid and cytokinins and ions such as Ca²⁺. Plants are well capable of defending themselves against most pathogens through innate immunity, as the mechanisms of disease resistance are termed at the cellular level, and disease resistance is the most costeffective and environmentally friendly way of protecting crops from diseases: the plants themselves do the job. However, successful pathogens overcome the plants' defences and, indeed, effective natural disease-resistance is often not available for the breeder. This is especially true for some hemibiotrophs and necrotrophs. In these cases, transgenic strategies may afford a viable alternative for crop production. Thus, the main aim of this book is to provide an in-depth overview of the current strategies available to develop transgenic-based disease-resistant plants, whilst also presenting the knowledge gained to date in this area and thus evaluating the potential of such strategies for disease control.

No magic bullet has been developed to combat fungal and bacterial diseases effectively, but an increased understanding of the underlying biology suggests several approaches, which may be combined – pyramided – to provide sustainable resistance. The strategies differ depending both on the organisms to be controlled as well as on the lifestyle strategy used by the pathogen and these are exemplified in the different chapters. Disease resistance (or, at this level, immunity) is triggered by the recognition in the host of molecules produced by the pathogen, or by the perturbations that pathogen

molecules have on plant immunity. The response event leads to inhibition of pathogen development through several independent physiological mechanisms which are activated concomitantly. Strategies for developing transgenic disease resistance attempt to exploit the recognition events, the signalling pathways regulating the immune response or the tools actually responsible for pathogen arrest. The different chapters of the first part of the book explore examples of these mechanisms in order to highlight the depth of knowledge gained from research in this field to date and demonstrate the potential for how this information can be exploited for biotechnological purposes for targeted plant breeding.

The second part of the book provides contrasting case studies of globally important crops, namely coffee, grapevine, potato and rice and their diseases, where effective and durable disease resistance to the major pathogens has not been achieved by conventional breeding, and describes the strategies which are being tested to assist pathogen defence of for these diverse crops.

A third section combines national and regional surveys of the actual use of transgenic crops including those conferring disease resistance in the field coupled with those currently in development and regulatory pipelines. This section of the book presents several case studies in which the authors in question were asked to answer the following questions: Which transgenic crops are grown? What is the economic and agronomic impact of these studies? Are there transgenic disease resistant crops among these? In addition, BT maize is grown in many countries to control European Corn Borer (Ostrinia nubilalis) and the corn earworm (Helicoverpa zea), but are there studies from their country showing enhanced resistance to Fusarium and reduced levels of mycotoxins compared to the non-transgenic crop (see (Clements et al., 2003; Duvick

2001))? Is there promising work aiming to introduce disease-resistant crops in the foreseeable future? The reader is also referred to the pro-GM (genetically modified) lobby ISAAA's (International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications) annual reports http://www.isaaa.org/ where the latest reports that "18 million farmers in 27 countries planted biotech crops in 2013, reflecting a five million, or three percent, increase in global biotech crop hectarage" (James, 2013). The penetration in the domestic market for some of these transgenic varieties exceeds 90% in some countries, according to the IAAA.

Several chapters impinge on the issues perceived by society as being important in relation to the extent that GM technology can be implemented, seen in relation to the approaches taken by those countries who are focused on the need both to thrive agronomically and economically whilst respecting public opinion on an issue of intense debate. It is no secret that there is considerable opposition against GM food amongst consumers worldwide, but the nature of this opposition differs geographically. This means that only about 30 countries use GM crops in commercial agriculture, although many others import GM plant products either for fodder, industrial purposes (including cotton) or other consumer products (e.g., cut flowers). Many more use GM microorganisms in industry for the production of enzymes or medicines, and there is little or no opposition against these applications. Within those countries which have adopted the GM technology, the main crops have often reached a very high level of penetration in the potential market: again, according to ISAAA (ibid), 96% rape (canola) is GM in Canada, in the USA over 90% maize, cotton and soybean are GM. In India and China, over 90% of the cotton is GM and in India 18 million farmers use GM. In other words, 90% of farmers using GM crops

are in developing countries (James, 2013). Economy is the driving force. Farmers cannot be expected to plant a crop for more than one season unless it pays – or they are persuaded.

The need to feed populations across the world is not equally distributed. The pressure is greatest in Asia which includes some of the world's most densely-populated countries. Among these are India and China, which are currently experiencing a rapid economic development that is leading to a shift from being largely vegetarian to omnivore, meaning that the requirement of fodder is increasing accordingly. It is estimated that the demand for rice will at least double by 2050 (see Chapter 12 by San Segundo et al.). Europeans (and North Americans) can (still) afford to import the food and fodder that cannot be produced locally, so the incentive to accept GM food is perhaps therefore lower (Brookes and Barfoot, 2013; Klümper and Oaim, 2014).

The wide and carefully regulated use of GMs in Argentina (see Chapter 13 by Bravo-Almonacid and Segretin) has led to the development of an innovative culture to develop new solutions aimed at local problems. Although all GM crops grown commercially at present originate from wellinternational companies, known e.g., Monsanto and Syngenta, many new crops (often termed "events") have been developed and are passing through the regulatory pipeline leading to commercial release (e.g., transgenic lines for PVY resistance in potato). There is a much lower incentive in Europe to develop GM crops; however, although the European moratorium reduces the incentive to look for GM solutions to solve serious problems, it stimulates alternative, more refined technologies, e.g., cisgenics (Holme et al., 2013), and gene targeting approaches such as CRISPR (clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats) (Belhaj et al., 2013) in the host and to target the pathogen using siRNA by HIGS (host-induced gene silencing) (Fairbairn et al., 2007; Ghag et al., 2014; Pliego et al., 2013). The development and potential for these "soft GM" technologies has led to a renewed debate in the EU. These issues are discussed in more detail in Chapters 1 and 4. See also European Academies Science Advisory Council, 2013 (Hartung and Schiemann, 2014).

Much disease resistance has been introduced by crossing in from related plant species. For example, in tomato the Cf genes conferring resistance to Cladosporium fulvum originate from, e.g., Solanum pimpinellifolium (Kruijt et al., 2004), various grasses in the tribe tritici to wheat (Kleinhofs et al., 2009) and Solanum spp (see Chapter 10). Plant breeding by introgression is intrinsically less precise than genetic engineering since many fragments of chromosome from the donor species are introgressed. Of course, errors also occur with genetic engineering, but these can be eliminated for further use by selecting only the verified clean insertion events. What might the consequences be if disease resistance is transferred? Is there any evidence that disease controls the populations of wild relatives? These are among the questions addressed in Chapter 20.

Organisation of the book

- An introduction to the problems of diseases, life style strategies and taxonomic groups of pathogens, the nature of plant immunity, and its exploitation for disease resistance.
- Biological strategies leading towards disease resistance. Which genes have been used to confer disease resistance and which genes and strategies offer the greatest hope for the future?
- Case studies should certain crops be prioritized or avoided and which special

problems are presented by these? Why is it especially advantageous to use transgenic strategies for these pathogens or crops?

- Status of transgenic crops around the world. Summaries of the current situation and prospects for the future for four countries on different continents where transgenic strategies are widely used.
- Transgenic disease resistance is not the only way of exploiting the knowledge gained from transgenic technology: discussed here is how the status and prospects of how the knowledge gained through experimental molecular genetics and related forms of biotechnology benefit plant protection. The examples chosen represent molecular breeding, induced resistance and biological control.

References

- Belhaj K, Chaparro-Garcia A, Kamoun S, Nekrasov V (2013) Plant genome editing made easy: targeted mutagenesis in model and crop plants using the CRISPR/Cas system. Plant Methods 9: 39.
- Brookes G, Barfoot P (2013) Key environmental impacts of global genetically modified (GM) crop use 1996–2011. GM Crops & Food: Biotechnology in Agriculture and the Food Chain 4: 109–119.
- Chakraborty S, Newton AC (2011) Climate change, plant diseases and food security: an overview. Plant Pathol 60: 2–14.
- Clements MJ, Campbell KW, Maragos CM, Pilcher C, Headrick JM, Pataky JK, White DG (2003) Influence of Cry1Ab protein and hybrid genotype on fumonisin contamination and fusarium ear rot of corn. Crop Sci 43: 1283–1293.
- Duvick J (2001) Prospects for reducing fumonisin contamination of maize through genetic modification. Environ Health Perspect 109: 337–342.
- Fairbairn DJ, Cavallaro AS, Bernard M, Mahalinga-Iyer J, Graham MW, Botella JR (2007) Hostdelivered RNAi: an effective strategy to silence genes in plant parasitic nematodes. Planta 226: 1525–1533.
- Ghag SB, Shekhawat UKS, Ganapathi TR (2014) Hostinduced post-transcriptional hairpin RNA-mediated gene silencing of vital fungal genes confers efficient resistance against Fusarium wilt in banana. Plant Biotechnol J 12: 541–553.

- Hartung F, Schiemann J (2014) Precise plant breeding using new genome editing techniques: opportunities, safety and regulation in the EU. Plant J 78: 742–752.
- Holme IB, Wendt T, Holm PB (2013) Intragenesis and cisgenesis as alternatives to transgenic crop development. Plant Biotechnol J 11: 395–407.
- James C (2013) Global Status of Commercialized Biotech/GM Crops: 2013. ISAAA Brief No. 46. ISAAA, Ithaca, NY.
- Kleinhofs A, Brueggeman R, Nirmala J, Zhang L, Mirlohi A, Druka A, Rostoks N, Steffenson BJ (2009) Barleystem rust resistance genes: structure and function. The Plant Genome 2: 109–120.
- Klümper W, Qaim M (2014) A meta-analysis of the impacts of genetically modified crops. Plos One, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0111629
- Kruijt M, Brandwagt BF, De Wit PJGM (2004) Rearrangements in the Cf-9 disease resistance gene

cluster of wild tomato have resulted in three genes that mediate Avr9 responsiveness. Genetics 168: 1655–1663.

- Pliego C, Nowara D, Bonciani G, Gheorghe DM, Xu R, Surana P, Whigham E, Nettleton D, Bogdanove AJ, Wise RP, Schweizer P, Bindschedler LV, Spanu PD (2013) Host-induced gene silencing in barley powdery mildew reveals a class of ribonuclease-like effectors. MPMI 26: 633–642.
- Smith P, Martino D, Cai Z, Gwary D, Janzen H, Kumar P, McCarl B, Ogle S, O'Mara F, Rice C, Scholes B, Sirotenko O (2007) Agriculture. In B Metz, OR Davidson, PR Bosch, R Dave, LA Meyer, eds, Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, pp 499–532.

Acknowledgments

I particularly wish to acknowledge several colleagues who have contributed by brainstorming and by reading specific chapters within their areas of special expertise. Especially, my close friend and collaborator Hans Jørgensen has read and commented on several chapters, and I am also very grateful to Elisabeth Johansen, Yan-Jun Chen, María Coca, Rikke Bagger Jørgensen and Rosanna Hennessy for their invaluable contributions in the review process. Finally, and not least, I am indebted to all the authors who have made such fine contributions to this book.

Chapter 1

The Status and Prospects for Biotechnological Approaches for Attaining Sustainable Disease Resistance

David B. Collinge¹, Ewen Mullins², Birgit Jensen¹ and Hans J.L. Jørgensen³

¹Section for Microbial Ecology and Biotechnology, Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

²Department of Crop Science, Teagasc Crops, Environment and Land Use Programme, Carlow, Ireland

1.1 Introduction

Plant pathogens constitute major constraints on crop yield. In fact, a recent conservative estimate suggests that crop diseases are responsible for average annual yield losses of 10% (Chakraborty and Newton, 2011). For example, late blight of potatoes, caused by *Phytophthora infestans*, is estimated to cause annual losses of over €5 billion worldwide (Chapter 9). Another disease complex, Fusarium head blight, represents a more complex problem because the disease not only affects yield, but also contaminates food and fodder with mycotoxins which impact negatively on the health of both humans and livestock (Buerstmayr and Lemmens, 2015).

Several factors suggest that the negative impact of advancing plant diseases is increasing. For example, increasing areas of monoculture with reduced rotation to meet food productivity and profitability increases crop vulnerability to pathogenic microorganisms. This is matched by the erosion of crop management systems as witnessed by, for instance, the alarming increase in fungicide resistance within cereal pathogens (Cools and Fraaije, 2012). Furthermore, the passive spread of opportunistic pathogens has increased as a consequence of globalisation, which has promoted open markets across continents. A recent example in Asian Europe is the East fungus Hymenoscyphus fraxineus, a saprophyte of Fraxinus mandshurica. This was not known as a pathogen before colonisation and subsequent decimation of European ash (Fraxinus excelsior) populations was observed in Eastern Europe about 20 years ago (reviewed by McKinney et al., 2014). Climate changes are also assisting the spread of crop pathogens, as evidenced by the devastating migration of coffee rust (caused by Hemileia

Plant Pathogen Resistance Biotechnology, First Edition. Edited by David B. Collinge.

³Section for Plant and Soil Science, Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences and Copenhagen Plant Science Centre, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

 $[\]ensuremath{\mathbb{G}}$ 2016 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2016 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

vastatrix) strains across the central and northern parts of South America into coffee plantations at higher altitudes, which were previously not attacked (Ghini et al., 2011).

But how can the alarming progression of crop diseases be halted? There are several methods which can contribute to the control of plant diseases. Good farm management is always a prerequisite, but other measures, especially disease resistance obtained by classical breeding and the use of pesticides, are highly important to secure food production worldwide. Furthermore, biological control and induced resistance are promising alternatives, especially in sustainable and integrated pest management strategies (Strange and Scott, 2005; Chapters 17 and 18). Yet, when taken individually, each of these methods has its limitations, and none can stand alone to solve all the problems in the effort to feed the increasing world population.

We believe that the employment of biotechnology-based approaches can contribute towards developing more effective and higher levels of disease control. The development of transgenic disease resistant plants is only one - albeit the most obvious - way of exploiting these biotechnological approaches (Campbell et al., 2002; Chen et al., 2012; Collinge et al., 2008; Collinge et al., 2010; Fuchs and Gonsalves, 2007; Gurr and Rushton, 2005a; Gurr and Rushton 2005b). Indirect biotechnological approaches, such as marker-assisted breeding, as well as the exploitation of association genetics and genomic selection, are closely-linked methods where the identification of genes responsible for specific traits can be used to develop gene-specific molecular makers to accelerate the process of conventional breeding and/or make it more efficient (Mammadov et al., 2007; Moose and Mumm 2008; Chapter 19, this volume). In addition, the development and understanding of alternative control measures, including induced disease resistance (Chapter 17) and biological control (Chapter 18), has benefited from the

application of multiple biotechnological approaches coupled with molecular and cellular approaches.

Among the thousands of species of plant pathogenic microorganisms, only a small minority have the capacity to infect a broad range of plant species. Most pathogens instead exhibit a high degree of host specificity and only cause disease in one or a few hosts. On the other hand, most hosts are susceptible to a number of pathogenic species. Therefore, different host-pathogen interactions represent different challenges, agronomically, biologically and ecologically. This chapter provides an overview of the mechanisms of disease resistance, which show the greatest potential for being targeted by GM approaches, and discusses how our increased understanding of the processes of plant defence can lead to improved disease control. In addition, the technical and biological constraints which are likely to hamper the successful development of GM crops are exemplified and discussed.

1.2 Factors to consider when generating diseaseresistant crops

Disease resistance or, at the cellular level, plant immunity, is complex and depends on a plethora of independent but interacting physiological mechanisms. This section introduces important pathogen and host factors involved in the interaction between pathogens and their hosts. This is the platform for successful manipulation of the plant to achieve resistance.

1.2.1 The diversity and life styles of microbial pathogens

Many types of organisms can cause diseases in plants. Prokaryotes and eukaryotes themselves are highly diverse, and the latter encompasses three important kingdoms: Fungi, Chromista (oomycetes) and Protozoa