

1 **Phloem-mediated spreading of SIGS-derived non-coding RNAs in *Hordeum vulgare***

2 Biedenkopf D¹, Will T², Knauer T³, Jelonek L⁴, Furch ACU⁵, Busche T⁶, Koch A¹

3 ¹Institute of Phytopathology, Centre for BioSystems, Land Use and Nutrition, Justus Liebig
4 University, Heinrich-Buff-Ring 26, D-35392, Giessen, Germany

5 ²Institute for Resistance Research and Stress Tolerance Julius Kuehn Institute, Federal
6 Research Centre for Cultivated Plants, Erwin-Baur-Straße 27, 06484 Quedlinburg, Germany

7 ³Max Planck Institute for Chemical Ecology, Hans-Knoell-Strasse 8, D-07745 Jena, Germany

8 ⁴Institute of Bioinformatics and Systems Biology, Justus Liebig University, Heinrich-Buff-
9 Ring 58, D-35392, Giessen, Germany

10 ⁵Institute of General Botany and Plant Physiology, Friedrich-Schiller-University, Dornburger
11 Str. 159, 07743 Jena, Germany

12 ⁶Centre for Biotechnology - CeBiTec, Bielefeld University, Universitätsstraße 25, D-33615,
13 Bielefeld, Germany

14 * Corresponding author

15 Aline.Koch@agr.uni-giessen.de

16 **Shorter running title**

17 Phloem-mediated spreading of SIGS-associated RNAs

18 **Highlight**

19 The use of the SIGS-technology as a biopesticide will require the systemic spreading of
20 dsRNA/siRNA signals. Our findings strongly support the notion of phloem-mediated long-
21 distance movement of SIGS-associated RNAs.

22 **Abstract**

23 Small (s)RNA molecules are crucial factors in the communication between hosts and their
24 interacting pathogens/pests that can modulate both host defense and microbial
25 virulence/pathogenicity known as cross-kingdom RNA interference (ckRNAi). Consistent
26 with this, sRNAs and their double-stranded (ds)RNA precursors have been adopted to control
27 plant diseases through exogenously applied RNA biopesticides, known as spray-induced gene
28 silencing (SIGS). While RNA spray proved to be effective, the mechanisms underlying the

transfer and uptake of SIGS-associated RNAs are inadequately understood. Moreover, the use of the SIGS-technology as a biopesticide will require the systemic spreading of dsRNA/siRNA signals. Our results strongly support the notion of phloem-mediated long-distance movement of SIGS-associated dsRNA and/or siRNA. These findings are significant contributions to our mechanistic understanding of RNA spray technology, as our previous data indicate that SIGS requires the processing of dsRNAs by the fungal RNAi machinery. In summary, our findings support the model that SIGS involves: (i) uptake of sprayed dsRNA by the plant (via stomata); (ii) transfer of apoplastic dsRNAs into the symplast (DCL processing into siRNAs); (iii) systemic translocation of siRNA or unprocessed dsRNA via the vascular system (phloem/xylem); (iv) uptake of apoplastic dsRNA or symplastic dsRNA/siRNA depending on the lifestyle/feeding behavior of the pathogen/pest.

Key words

Aphids; Barley; cross-kingdom RNAi; Fusarium; Phloem; RNAi; RNA spray; RNA-based plant protection; SIGS; stylectomy

Introduction

The vascular network of higher plants is composed of the phloem and xylem that pervades the whole organism from root to shoot and distributes nutrients and water (van Bel et al. 2011, Lucas et al. 2013). Sieve elements (SEs), companion cells (CCs) and phloem parenchyma cells (PPCs) are the three phloem elements involved in long-distance transport of photoassimilates in angiosperms (van Bel 1996, Hafke et al. 2005). A high density of pore-plasmodesma units (PPUs) and ER coupling between SE and CC underline an intimate symplasmic connection (Kempers et al. 1998, Martens et al. 2006). The cross-walls between the SE-modules become transformed into sieve plates, perforated by plasmodesmata (PD) modified into sieve pores, mediating long-distance transport of signalling molecules that play a pivotal role for the regulation of several developmental processes (Lough and Lucas 2006). This non-cell-autonomous control involves the transfer of informational molecules such as proteins, mRNA and small RNAs (Ham and Lucas 2017). Since the first detection of unspecified nucleic acids in the phloem sap in the late 1990s (Sasaki et al. 1998, Ruiz-Medrano et al. 1999), several studies demonstrated the systemic translocation of mRNA mediating non-cell autonomous control of plant development, defense and nutrient allocation via the phloem (Lough and Lucas 2006, Ham and Lucas 2017). However, decades ago scientists revealed RNA as the agent for systemic acquired gene silencing. They have shown delivery of RNA-based signals via the phloem pathway that affect gene expression at the

62 whole-plant level by sequence-specific degradation of targeted mRNA (Jorgensen 1995,
63 Palauqui et al. 1996, 1997). These scientists were the first who linked systemic RNA
64 signaling with a process known as RNA silencing.

65 RNA silencing (also known as RNA interference, RNAi) is a conserved and integral aspect of
66 gene regulation mediated by small RNAs (sRNAs) that direct gene silencing on the level of
67 transcription but also post-transcriptionally. At the transcriptional level, gene expression is
68 inhibited via RNA-directed DNA methylation (RdDM) while at the post-transcriptional level
69 (PTGS) direct mRNA interference causes inhibition of translation. Originally, RNA silencing
70 is associated with protection against viral infection, control of epigenetic modifications,
71 regulation of genome stability, curbing of transposon movement and regulation of
72 heterochromatin formation (Castel and Martienssen 2013; Koch et al. 2017). Besides its
73 natural function, RNA silencing has emerged as a powerful genetic tool for scientific research
74 over the past several years. It has been utilized not only in fundamental research for the
75 assessment of gene function, but also in various fields of applied research, such as agriculture.
76 In plants, RNA silencing strategies have the potential to protect host plants against predation
77 or infection by pathogens and pests mediated by lethal RNA silencing signals generated *in*
78 *planta* (for review see: Koch and Kogel 2014; Yin and Hulbert 2015; Zhang et al., 2017; Qi et
79 al., 2019; Liu et al. 2019). Indeed, our results showed that transgenic *Arabidopsis* and barley
80 (*Hordeum vulgare*) plants, expressing a 791 nucleotide (nt) dsRNA (CYP3RNA) targeting all
81 three copies of the *CYP51* gene (*FgCYP51A*, *FgCYP51B*, *FgCYP51C*) in *Fusarium*
82 *graminearum* (*Fg*), inhibited fungal infection via a process designated as host-induced gene
83 silencing (HIGS) (Nowara et al. 2010, Koch et al. 2013). Moreover, we demonstrated that
84 HIGS-mediated targeting of the structural sheath protein (Shp) mandatory for aphid feeding,
85 produced significantly lower levels of Shp mRNA compared to aphids feeding on wild-type
86 (wt) plants (Abdellatef et al. 2015).

87 In addition to the generation of RNA silencing signals *in planta*, plants can be protected from
88 pathogens and pests by exogenously applied RNA biopesticides (known as spray-induced
89 gene silencing, SIGS) (for review see: Mitter et al. 2017; Cai et al. 2018; Dubrovina and
90 Kiselev 2019; Gaffar and Koch 2019; Dalakouras et al. 2020). Over the last decade, our
91 research (Koch et al., 2013; 2016; 2018; 2019; Höfle et al., 2019, Werner et al., 2019) and the
92 work of others have revealed the enormous potential of RNA-silencing strategies as a
93 potential alternative to conventional pesticides for plant protection, regardless of how target-
94 specific inhibitory RNAs are applied (i.e. endogenously or exogenously).

Despite the promising potential of RNAi-based disease control and its benefits for agronomy and the ecosystem, the mechanisms underlying those technologies are virtually unresolved. Understanding the uptake and translocation processes of non-coding RNAs is critical for its successful future application in the field. Application non-coding RNAs as biopesticides will require knowledge on the paths used by dsRNA/siRNA as signal. Previously, we have shown that fluorescent dsRNA is detected in the vascular tissue of barley after spraying the leaves with the 791 nt long CYP3-dsRNA_{A488}, directed against fungal *CYP51* genes using a detached leaf assay that enabled us to assess fungal growth in distal (semi-systemic, non-sprayed) leaf segments (Koch et al. 2016).

In the present study, we demonstrated that aphids accumulate fluorescent dsRNA, when they feed on distal parts of barley leaves that were sprayed with a Shp-dsRNA. Our study claimed to further prove that sprayed RNAs are systemically translocated via the phloem. Summarizing our results we (i) found spray-induced gene silencing of an aphid mRNA target measured by qRT-PCR, (ii) visualized a fluorescent-labelled dsRNA in the phloem sap of barley using stylectomy (iii) profiled SIGS-derived siRNA in the phloem sap of barley by RNA-Seq analysis (iv) detected SIGS-associated RNAs in barley roots using RT-PCR.

Material and Methods

Maintenance of plants and aphids

The spring barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) cultivar (cv.) Golden Promise (GP) was grown in a climate chamber under 16 h light photoperiod (240 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ photon flux density) at 18°C/14°C (day/night) and 65% relative humidity. Grain aphids (*Sitobion avenae*) were reared on three-week-old barley plants in a climate chamber under the same conditions. To obtain synchronized insects, reproductive mature aphids were placed in clip cages (one aphid per cage) on GP plants for 24 h. The adults were then removed, and the offspring were used for experiments as previously described (Gaupels et al., 2008; Schmitz et al., 2012).

dsRNA synthesis

For spray experiments, the clone p7i-Ubi-Shp-RNAi that includes a partial sequence of the 3,621 bp *Shp*-cDNA (XM_001943863, ACYPI009881) of the pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (*Ap*) was used as template for the synthesis of 491 nt long Shp-dsRNA (Abdellatif et al., 2015). dsRNA was generated using MEGAscript RNAi Kit (Invitrogen) following MEGAscript[®] protocols. Primer pairs T7_F and T7_R with T7 promoter sequence at the 5'

end of both forward and reverse primers were designed for amplification of dsRNA (S1 Table).

Spray application of dsRNA

Second leaves of 2-3-wk-old barley cv. GP were detached and transferred to square petri plates containing 1% water-agar. The dsRNA was diluted in 500 μ l water to a final concentration of 20 ng μ l⁻¹. As a control, TRIS/EDTA (TE) buffer was used in a concentration corresponding to final concentration of the dsRNA sample. A typical RNA concentration after elution (see MEGAscript[®] protocols) was 500 ng μ l⁻¹ with a final TE buffer concentration of 400 μ M Tris-HCL and 40 μ M EDTA. Spraying of leaves was carried out using a spray flask as described (Koch et al., 2016). Each plate containing 10 detached leaves were sprayed in a semi-systemic setup where lower leaf segments were covered with a plastic tray as described (Koch et al., 2016), with either Shp-dsRNA or TE buffer by giving 3-4 puffs, and subsequently kept at room temperature (RT). Forty-eight hours after spraying, aphids were placed on the non-sprayed part of each leaf using clip cages.

For the RNA translocation assays barley seedling were grown in petri dishes for one week. The seedlings were then placed into moist filter paper rolls and grown for 4 days before spraying the first leaf with 20 ng μ l⁻¹ of CYP3RNA or GFP-dsRNA (control). To measure the amount of sprayed dsRNA in different tissues (first leaf, second leaf, shoot and root), samples were taken 24h, 48h and 72h after spray treatment of the first leaf. To analyse target gene silencing plants were inoculated with *Fg* after spray treatment and samples were taken five days after infection.

Stylectomy and aphid sampling

At 24 h after spray application of dsRNA, 20-30 mainly adult aphids (*Sitobion avenae*) were placed onto the upper surface of each leaf and allowed to feed for 24 h. Following successful cauterization of the mouthparts with a microcautery device (CF-50, Syntech, Fisher and Frame 1984), each aphid stylet exuding phloem sap was marked with two small dots on the leaf surface and kept moist with a drop of DEPC water to prevent early occlusion. After cutting all aphid stylets, the DEPC water droplets were removed with a paper towel and the petri dish was subsequently flooded with silicone oil (M 200, Roth) to prevent evaporation of the sieve tube exudates. Due to the observation of sporadic bacterial and fungal contamination from the leaf surface, a mixture of antimycotic (25 nl Nystatin 5mM), antibiotic (25 nl Tetracycline 5 mM), and 50nl RNase Inhibitor (Invitrogen) (with traces of Bromophenol Blue

for optical verification) was injected into each sieve tube sap sample at the beginning of the exudation phase to prevent degradation of RNA. By 24 h later, the sieve tube sap was collected using a microcapillary connected to a small syringe via a silicone tube with a side valve. Depending on the exudation time of the severed stylets, the sample amount reached up to 2 µl per stylet over 24 h. The samples of each treatment were pooled and stored at -80°C.

Aphid transcript analysis

To assess silencing of the *Shp* gene, mRNA expression analysis was performed using quantitative real-time PCR (qRT-PCR). Freshly extracted mRNA from 10 aphids was converted into cDNA using the QuantiTect Reverse Transcription Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) and 40 ng of cDNA was used as the template for qRT-PCR in an Applied Biosystems 7500 FAST real-time PCR system. Each reaction comprised 7.5 µl SYBER Green JumpStart Taq ReadyMix (Sigma-Aldrich, Steinheim, Germany) and 0.5 pmol of the gene-specific primers Shp-RNA-qpcr-F1 and Shp-RNA-qpcr-R1 (Table S1). After initial heating to 95°C for 5 min, the target was amplified by 40 cycles at 95°C for 30 s, 52°C for 30 s and 72°C for 30 s. Ct values were determined with the 7500 Fast software supplied with the instrument. Levels of *Shp* transcripts were determined via the $2^{-\Delta\Delta C_t}$ method (Livak and Schmittgen 2001) by normalizing the amount of target transcript to the amount of the reference transcript 18S ribosomal RNA (GenBank APU27819).

Small RNA library production and sequence analysis

RNA enriched for the sRNA fraction was purified from plant and fungal samples using the mirVana miRNA Isolation Kit (Life Technologies). Indexed sRNA libraries were constructed from these enriched sRNA fractions with the NEBNext Multiplex Small RNA Library Prep Set for Illumina (New England Biolabs) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Indexed sRNA libraries were pooled and sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq and NextSeq 500 platforms and the sequences sorted into individual datasets based on the unique indices of each sRNA library. The adapters and indices were trimmed with Cutadapt (Martin 2011) version 1.16. Only reads with a length between 19 bp and 30 bp in the first pair of the paired end dataset were analysed. The reads were mapped to the *shp*-dsRNA vector sequence using bowtie2 (Langmead and Salzberg 2012) with "-very-sensitive -L 10" to identify sRNAs with a perfect match. The libraries contained 4.1 and 3.5 (control) million reads before trimming and filtering and 0.6 and 0.3 million reads after trimming and filtering.

Confocal microscopy of fluorophore distribution

Fluorescent labeling of dsRNA was performed using the Atto 488 RNA Labeling Kit (Jena Bioscience, Jena, Germany) following the manufacturer's instructions. Leaves were sprayed in a semi-systemic setup with the labeled dsRNA. Twenty-four h after spraying of fluorescing dsRNA, aphids were placed onto the leaves and allowed to feed overnight. Twenty-four h after infestation only stylets of the non-sprayed leaf area were cut. Phloem droplets that appeared on the stylet tips were imaged using a Leica TCS SP2 (Leica Microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany) equipped with a 75-mW argon/krypton laser (Omnichrome, Chino, CA) and a water immersion objective (HCX APO L40x0.80 W U-V-l objective).

Results

SIGS-mediated gene silencing in *Sitobion avenae* fed on barley leaves

Mobile cell non-autonomous inhibitory RNAs that spread gene silencing into adjacent cells and tissues have been shown to move through the vascular system (Lewsey et al., 2016, Palauqui et al., 1997, Zhang et al., 2016). Previously, we demonstrated that aphids which fed on transgenic barley expressing dsRNA derived from the *Shp* gene (Shp-dsRNA), produce significantly lower levels of *Shp* mRNA compared to aphids feeding on wild-type (wt) plants (Abdellatef et al., 2015). Based on these previous data, we modified the setup for dsRNA application in order to demonstrate a semi-systemic transfer of the dsRNA. Therefore, we tested whether locally sprayed 491 nt long Shp-dsRNA confers gene silencing in grain aphids feeding from distal, non-sprayed segments of the same barley leaves. To this end, the upper part of detached leaves (local tissue) was sprayed with 20 ng μL^{-1} Shp-dsRNA, while the lower part (distal tissue) was covered by a plastic tray to prevent direct dsRNA contact. After 48 h, we placed aphids at the distal, non-sprayed part of the leaves in clip cages and led them feed on the phloem for 24 h. Subsequently aphids were harvested and assessed for downregulation of the *Shp* target gene expression using qRT-PCR. The relative expression level of the aphid's *Shp* gene was reduced by almost 60% compared to aphids that fed on control leaves sprayed with Tris-EDTA (TE) buffer (Fig. 1), suggesting that the transfer of inhibitory RNA from the plant phloem sap to the insect was successful.

Transport of sprayed dsRNA in the phloem of barley

Encouraged by the RNAi effects on the *Shp* target gene in phloem-sucking *S. avenae*, we investigate whether the sprayed Shp-dsRNA is translocated in the phloem and/or processed by the plant's silencing machinery. To this end, we used aphid stylectomy to gain access to pure phloem sap of barley leaves (Fig. 2 A-C). Stylectomy is commonly used to study a broad variety of physiological, mechanical and molecular properties of the plant phloem (Turgeon and Wolf 2009; Peel 1975; Thompson and van Bel 2012).

To further visualize the phloem-mediated transfer of sprayed Shp-dsRNA, it was labeled with the green fluorescent dye ATTO 488 (Shp-dsRNA_{ATTO488}) and sprayed onto barley leaves using the semi-systemic setup followed by stylectomy with *S. avenae* in the distal, non-sprayed leaf parts. Using confocal laser scanning microscopy, a green fluorescent signal was detected 24 h after feeding (48 h after spraying) and cutting at the stylet tip (Fig. 2 D). Together these data show that sprayed Shp-dsRNA is transferred via the plant's phloem.

RNA-Seq profiling of stylectomy samples revealed SIGS-derived siRNAs

We addressed the question whether the phloem-transferred Shp-dsRNA is stable during transport or alternatively at least partially processed into small interfering RNAs. To test this possibility, we profiled Shp-dsRNA-derived siRNAs in the phloem sap after isolation using stylectomy. Small RNA sequencing (sRNAseq) analysis revealed Shp-dsRNA-derived siRNA in distal (non-sprayed) leaf segments (Fig. 3). These data suggest that Shp-dsRNA-derived siRNAs also are processed by the plant's silencing machinery and systemically transferred via the phloem.

Translocation of sprayed dsRNA from leaves to barley roots

The RNA silencing signal can travel over long distances and trigger silencing in distant plant tissues (Molnar et al., 2010, Lewsey et al., 2016). However, little is known about how SIGS-derived dsRNAs and/or siRNAs are transported in the plant. To test whether there is wider systemic spreading of RNA silencing signals via the phloem and to further determine to what extent those sprayed RNAs are translocated within the plant we analysed the spreading of the sprayed dsRNA within intact barley plants. Towards this, we measured the amount of sprayed RNA in leaves, shoots and roots at different timepoints after spray application using qRT-PCR. To assess transport of sprayed dsRNA in systemic, non-sprayed plant tissue we used two-week old barley plants that were grown in filter paper. For the systemic setup, the plants were covered before spraying with a plastic tray leaving only the upper part/leaf tip (approximately 1 cm) of the first leaf uncovered. Using this approach we found that the

CYP3RNA translocate from the first (sprayed) leaf into the second leaf as well as the shoot tissue over time (Fig. 4), the amount of sprayed dsRNA decreased from 1 d to 3 d after spray (das) application in leaves and shoots. Interestingly, the amount of dsRNA within the roots increased from 1das to 3 das (Fig. 5), indicating a translocation route from leaves to roots. However, to test whether the amount of transferred, SIGS-derived RNAs is sufficient to provoke target gene silencing, we inoculated the plants with *Fg* and measured the transcript level of *FgCYP51* target genes in leaves, shoots and roots of infected plants (Fig. 6). Notably, we measured the strongest target gene silencing in the first leaf, the leaf that was spray treated. However, the second leaf samples exhibited an overall target gene silencing of 80%, which is still very high. In the analysed shoot and root tissue we found 50% silencing of the fungal *CYP51* target genes. Together these data are consistent with our translocation observations, indicating that the transferred SIGS-associated RNAs can provoke silencing of their complementary target genes. Moreover, we found that 7 d after infection hypocotyls of plants sprayed with CYP3RNA developed less brownish lesions compared to TE-treated control plants suggesting that the amount of transferred RNA has the potential to prevent plants from *Fg* infection (Fig. 7).

Discussion

RNA sprays may provide an alternative strategy to avoid chemical pesticides and genetically modified crops for combating agricultural pests. However, systemic translocation of sprayed RNA biopesticides is critical for its successful future application in the field. To prove phloem-mediated transport of SIGS-associated RNAs we decided to transfer a HIGS approach established for a phloem-sap sucking grain aphid *Sitobion avenae* (Abdellatef et al., 2015) to a SIGS proof-of-concept study. To investigate uptake and transport of sprayed dsRNA, we tested whether locally sprayed Shp-dsRNA confers gene silencing in *S. avenae* infecting distal, non-sprayed segments of barley leaves. To this end, we assessed whether the phloem-transported inhibitory RNA affect *Shp* target gene expression in aphids fed on the dsRNA-sprayed barley leaves using qRT-PCR. The relative expression level of the aphid's *Shp* gene was reduced by almost 60% compared to aphids that fed on buffer-sprayed controls (Fig. 1), suggesting that the transfer of inhibitory RNA from the plant phloem sap to the insect was successful. Next, we conducted another experiment to investigate whether the spray-applied Shp-dsRNA is translocated in the phloem and/or processed by the plant's silencing machinery. Specifically, we used aphid stylectomy, a widely used technique to study physiological, mechanical and molecular properties of the plant phloem (Turgeon and Wolf 2009; Peel 1975; Thompson and Van Bel 2012). Here, we used this technique to gain access to the phloem sap of barley leaves (Fig. 2). To further explore the phloem-mediated transfer of sprayed Shp-dsRNA, we sprayed fluorescent labelled Shp-dsRNA_{A488} onto barley leaves using a systemic experimental design (Koch et al., 2016) following phloem sampling by stylectomy at the distal, non-sprayed leaf parts. Using CLSM, we detected a green fluorescent signal after cutting off the stylet tip of feeding aphids (Fig. 2 D). These results are consistent with our previous detection of the unprocessed 791 nt precursor CYP3RNA in both local and distal tissue using northern blot analysis, showing that the long dsRNA is systemically translocated within the plant (Koch et al., 2016). Moreover, investigation of longitudinal leaf sections revealed that the fluorescence was not confined to the apoplast but also was present in the symplast of phloem parenchyma cells, companion cells, and mesophyll cells, as well as in trichomes and stomata (Koch et al., 2016). Supportively, apoplastic movement of RNA has been proposed, e.g. to explain how maternally expressed siRNAs could be transferred from the endosperm of developing seeds into the symplastically isolated embryo (Martienssen

2010). However, the mechanism by which the sprayed RNA overcomes the apoplastic-symplastic barrier is yet unknown.

Despite of the translocation of dsRNA, we found that also CYP3RNA-derived 21 nt and 22 nt siRNAs accumulated in the distal leaf segments, demonstrating that CYP3RNA was partly processed by the plant (Koch et al., 2016). Therefore, we predict that SIGS-derived siRNAs would also translocate via the barley phloem. To test this possibility, we additionally profiled Shp-dsRNA-derived siRNAs using stylectomy. Small RNA-sequencing analysis revealed Shp-dsRNA-derived siRNA in distal (non-sprayed) leaf segments (Fig. 3). These data suggest that Shp-dsRNA-derived siRNAs also are processed by the plant's silencing machinery and are systemically transferred via the phloem. Importantly, we have previously shown that, when CYP3RNA_{A488}-sprayed leaves were inoculated with *Fg* the fluorescent signal was also detectable inside fungal conidia, germ tubes, and fungal mycelium (Koch et al., 2016). In addition or as an alternative to plant-mediated gene silencing in the fungus, systemic translocation within the plant and accumulation by the fungus could also mediate direct processing of CYP3RNA by the fungus' gene silencing machinery to target fungal *CYP51* genes. This finding that unprocessed long dsRNA is absorbed from leaf tissue has important implications for future disease control strategies based on dsRNA. It is very likely that application of longer dsRNAs might be more efficient than application of siRNAs given their more efficient translocation. Moreover, in contrast to using only one specific siRNA, processing of long dsRNA into many different inhibitory siRNAs by the fungus may reduce the chance of pathogen resistance under field test conditions.

Consistent with our findings, there are several studies showing that mobile cell non-autonomous inhibitory RNAs that spread gene silencing into adjacent cells and tissues move through the vascular system (Lewsey et al., 2016, Palauqui et al., 1997). Grafting experiments revealed that siRNAs are detectable in tissues of DCL mutants that are defective for siRNA biogenesis (Molnar et al., 2010). This led to the speculation that siRNAs and not their long dsRNA precursors are the mobile silencing signals (Dunoyer et al., 2013). However, until now the exact molecular forms of mobile RNAs remain unclear (Parent et al., 2012). Here we showed movement of sprayed dsRNA from barley leaves over stems to the root tissue within three days after spray treatment (Fig. 4). Moreover, we found that the transferred SIGS-associated RNAs confer target gene silencing in the respective tissues as well as *Fg* disease resistance (Fig. 7, Koch et al., 2019). Interestingly, we measured the highest silencing efficiency in the tissue that was either directly sprayed or near to the sprayed locus. In other words, it seemed that the amount and/or the nature of the mobile

RNA determine the systemic silencing efficiency. Therefore, we predict a dilution effect that correlate with the distance to the initial spray site (or tissue). This is consistent with another study, where the authors confirmed the spreading of dsRNA from local to systemic tissue by one hour after rub-inoculation of dsRNA using semi-quantitative RT-PCR. Moreover, they showed that dsRNA levels continuously decreased in the local (treated) tissue from 3 dpi to 9 dpi where dsRNA was no longer detectable (Mitter et al., 2017). More recently, Kaldis et al. (2018) showed that exogenously applied dsRNA derived from the silencing suppressor HC-Pro and the coat protein genes of zucchini yellow mosaic virus (ZYMV) protect watermelon and cucumber against ZYMV and spread systemically over long distances in cucurbits (Kaldis et al., 2018).

In summary, our data suggest that sprayed dsRNAs are taken up by the plant, spread systemically via the plant vascular system, and are partially processed into siRNAs by the plant's gene silencing machinery (Fig. 8). As our results strongly support the notion of phloem-mediated long-distance movement of SIGS-associated dsRNA and/or siRNA, further research is needed to address central questions as: How are dsRNA transported at the apoplast-symplast interface? How does the fungus take up SIGS-associated RNAs from the apoplast and/or the symplast?

386

387

388

389 **Acknowledgment**

390 We thank C. Birkenstock, U. Schnepf and V. Weisel for excellent plant cultivation. We also
391 thank Dr. Jens Steinbrenner for assisting in microscopic analyses. This work was supported
392 by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Research Training Group (RTG) 2355 (project
393 number 325443116) to AK.

394

395 **References**

396 **Abdellatif E, Will T, Koch A, Imani J, Vilcinskas A, Kogel KH.** 2015. Silencing the
397 expression of the salivary sheath protein causes transgenerational feeding suppression in the
398 aphid *Sitobion avenae*. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **13**, 849-857.

399 **Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B.** 2014. Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina
400 Sequence Data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114-2120.

401 **Cai Q, He B, Kogel KH, Jin H.** 2018. Cross-kingdom RNA trafficking and environmental
402 RNAi — nature's blueprint for modern crop protection strategies. *Current Opinion*
403 *Microbiology*, **46**, 58–64.

404 **Castel SE, Martienssen RA.** 2013. RNA interference in the nucleus: roles for small RNAs in
405 transcription, epigenetics and beyond. *Nature Review Genetics* **14**, 100-112.

406 **Dalakouras A, Wassenegger M, Dadami E, Ganopoulos I, Pappas ML, Papadopoulou K.**
407 2020. Genetically Modified Organism-Free RNA Interference: Exogenous. *Plant Physiology*,
408 **182**.

409 **Dubrovina AS, Kiselev KV.** 2019. Exogenous RNAs for Gene Regulation and Plant
410 Resistance. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, **20**(9), 2282

411 **Dunoyer P, Melnyk C, Molnar A, Slotkin RK.** 2013. Plant Mobile Small RNAs. *Cold*
412 *Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology* **5**, 017897.

413 **Fisher DB, Frame JM.** 1984. A guide to the use of the exuding-stylet technique in phloem
414 physiology. *Planta* **161**, 385-393.

415 **Gaffar F, Imani J, Karlovsky JP, Koch A and Kogel KH.** 2019 Various components of the
416 RNAi pathway are required for conidiation, ascosporeogenesis, virulence, DON production
417 and SIGS-mediated fungal inhibition by exogenous dsRNA in the Head Blight pathogen
418 *Fusarium graminearum*. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.01662

419 **Gaffar FY, Koch A.** 2019. Catch me if you can! RNA silencing-based improvement of
420 antiviral plant immunity. *Viruses* **11**, 673.

- 421 **Gaupels F, Buhtz A, Knauer T, Deshmukh S, Waller F, van Bel AJE, Kogel KH and**
422 **Kehr J.** 2008. Adaptation of aphid stylectomy for analyses of proteins and mRNAs in barley
423 phloem sap. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **59**, 3297-3306.
- 424 **Hafke JB, van Amerongen J-K, Kelling F, Furch ACU, Gaupels F, van Bel AJE.** 2005.
425 Thermodynamic battle for photosynthate acquisition between sieve tubes and adjoining
426 parenchyma in transport phloem. *Plant Physiology* **138**, 1527-1537.
- 427 **Ham BK, Lucas WJ.** 2017. Phloem-Mobile RNAs as Systemic Signaling Agents. *Annual*
428 *Review Plant Biology* **28**, 173-195.
- 429 **Höfle L, Shrestha A, Werner BT, Jelonek L, Koch A.** 2019. Study on the efficacy of
430 dsRNAs with increasing length targeting *Fusarium graminearum* *CYP51* genes comparing
431 HIGS and SIGS approaches. *RNA Biology*. accepted.
- 432 **Jorgensen RA.** 1995. Cosuppression, flower color patterns, and metastable gene expression
433 states. *Science* **268**, 686–691
- 434 **Kaldis A, Berbati M, Melita O, Reppa C, Holeva M, Otten P, Voloudakis A.** 2018.
435 Exogenously applied dsRNA molecules deriving from the Zucchini yellow mosaic virus
436 (ZYMV) genome move systemically and protect cucurbits against ZYMV. *Molecular Plant*
437 *Pathology* **19**, 883-895.
- 438 **Kempers R, Ammerlaan A, van Bel AJE.** 1998. Symplasmic constriction and ultrastructural
439 features of the sieve element/companion cell complex in the transport phloem of
440 apoplasmically and symplasmically phloem-loading species. *Plant Physiology* **116**, 271-278.
- 441 **Koch A, Biedenkopf D, Furch ACU, et al.,** 2016. An RNAi-based control of *Fusarium*
442 *graminearum* infections through spraying of long dsRNAs involves a plant passage and is
443 controlled by the fungal silencing machinery. *Plos Pathogens* **12**, e1005901.
- 444 **Koch A, Höfle L, Werner BT, Imani J, Schmidt A, Jelonek L, Kogel KH.** 2019. SIGS vs
445 HIGS: A study on the efficacy of two dsRNA delivery strategies to silence *Fusarium*
446 *FgCYP51* genes in infected host and non-host plants. *Molecular Plant Pathology*. doi:
447 10.1111/mpp.12866
- 448 **Koch A, Kang HG, Steinbrenner J, Dempsey DA, Klessig DF, Kogel KH.** 2017. MORC
449 Proteins: Novel Players in Plant and Animal Health. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **18**, 1720.
- 450 **Koch A, Kogel KH** 2014. New wind in the sails: improving the agronomic value of crop
451 plants through RNAi-mediated gene silencing. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **12**, 821-831.
- 452 **Koch A, Kumar N, Weber L, Keller H, Imani J, Kogel KH** 2013. Host-induced gene
453 silencing of cytochrome P450 lanosterol C14 α -demethylase-encoding genes confers strong
454 resistance to *Fusarium spec.* *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
455 *States of America* **110**, 19324-19329.
- 456 **Koch A, Stein E, Kogel KH.** 2018 RNA-Based Disease Control as a Complementary
457 Measure to Fight *Fusarium* Fungi Through Silencing of the Azole Target Cytochrome P450
458 Lanosterol C-14 α -Demethylase. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*.
- 459 **Konakalla NC, Kaldis A, Berbati M, Masarapu H, Voloudakis AE.** 2016. Exogenous
460 application of double-stranded RNA molecules from TMV p126 and CP genes confers
461 resistance against TMV in tobacco. *Planta* **244**, 961-969.
- 462 **Langmead B, Salzberg S.** 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nature Methods*
463 **9**, 357-359.

464 **Lewsey MG, Hardcastle TJ, Melnyk CW, Molnar A, Valli A, Ulrich MA, Nery JR,**
 465 **Baulcombe DC, Ecker JR.** 2016. Mobile small RNAs regulate genome-wide DNA
 466 methylation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
 467 *America* **113**, 801-810.

468 **Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD.** 2001. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time
 469 quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta C(T)) Method. *Methods (San Diego, Calif.)* **25**, 402-408.

470 **Lough TJ, Lucas W.** 2006. Integrative plant biology: role of phloem long-distance
 471 macromolecular trafficking. *Annual Review Plant Biology* **57**, 203-232.

472 **Lucas WJ, Groover A, Lichtenberger R, et al.,** 2013. The plant vascular system: evolution,
 473 development and functions. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology* **55**, 294-388.

474 **Martens HJ, Roberts AG, Oparka KJ, Schulz A.** 2006. Quantification of plasmodesmatal
 475 endoplasmic reticulum coupling between sieve elements and companion cells using
 476 fluorescence redistribution after photobleaching. *Plant Physiology* **142**, 471-480.

477 **Martin M.** 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing
 478 reads. *EMBnet.journal*, **17**, 10-12.

479 **Mitter N, Worrall EA, Robinson KE, et al.,** 2017. Clay nanosheets for topical delivery of
 480 RNAi for sustained protection against plant viruses. *Nature plants* **3**, 16207.

481 **Molnar A, Molnar A, Melnyk CW, Bassett A, Hardcastle TJ, Dunn R, Baulcombe DC.**
 482 2010. Small silencing RNAs in plants are mobile and direct epigenetic modification in
 483 recipient cells. *Science* **328**, 872-875.

484 **Palauqui JC, Elmayan T, De Borne FD, Crete P, Charles C, Vaucheret H.** 1996.
 485 Frequencies, timing, and spatial patterns of co-suppression of nitrate reductase and nitrite
 486 reductase in transgenic tobacco plants. *Plant Physiology* **112**, 1447-1456.

487 **Palauqui JC, Elmayan T, Pollien JM, Vaucheret H.** 1997. Systemic acquired silencing:
 488 transgene-specific posttranscriptional silencing is transmitted by grafting from silenced stocks
 489 to non-silenced scions. *EMBO Journal* **16**, 4738-4745.

490 **Parent JS, Martínez de Alba AE, Vaucheret H.** 2012. The origin and effect of small RNA
 491 signaling in plants. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **9**, 179.

492 **Peel AJ.** 1975. Investigations with aphid stylets into the physiology of the sieve tube. In
 493 *Transport in Plants 1 Phloem Transport*. Volume 1st edition. Edited by Zimmerman MH,
 494 Milburn JA. Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer; 171-195.

495 **Ruiz-Medrano R, Xoconostle-Cázares B, Lucas WJ.** 1999. Phloem long-distance transport
 496 of mNACP mRNA: implications for supracellular regulation in plants. *Development* **126**,
 497 4405-4419.

498 **Sasaki T, Chino M, Hayashi H, Fujiwara T** 1998. Detection of several mRNA species in
 499 rice phloem sap. *Plant and Cell Physiology* **39**, 895-897.

500 **Schmitz A, Anselme C, Ravallec M, Rebuf C, Simon JC, Gatti JL and Poirié M.** 2012.
 501 The cellular immune responses of the pea aphid to foreign intrusion and symbiotic challenge.
 502 *Plos One* **7**. e42114.

503 **Thompson GA, Van Bel AJE.** 2012. *Phloem: Molecular cell biology, systemic*
 504 *communication, biotic interactions*. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford, UK.

- Turgeon R, Wolf S.** 2009. Phloem transport: Cellular pathways and molecular trafficking. *Annual Review Plant Biology* **60**, 207–221.
- van Bel AJE, Furch ACU, Hafke JB, Knoblauch M, Patrick JW.** 2011. (Questions) on phloem biology. 2. Mass flow, molecular hopping, distribution patterns and macromolecular signalling. *Plant Science* **181**, 325-330.
- van Bel AJE.** 1996. Interaction between sieve element and companion cell and the consequences for photoassimilate distribution. Two structural hardware frames with associated physiological software packages in dicotyledons? *Journal of Experimental Botany* **47**, 1129-1140.
- Wang M, Weiberg A, Lin FM, Thomma BP, Huang HD, Jin H.** 2016. Bidirectional cross-kingdom RNAi and fungal uptake of external RNAs confer plant protection. *Nature Plants* **2**, 16151.
- Yin C, Hulbert S.** 2015. Host Induced Gene Silencing (HIGS), a Promising Strategy for Developing Disease Resistant Crops. *Gene Technology* **4**, 130.
- Zhang J, Khan SA, Heckel DG, Bock R.** 2017. Next-Generation Insect-Resistant Plants: RNAi-Mediated Crop Protection. *Trends in Biotechnology* **35**, 871-882.

Figure legends

Figure 1: Silencing of *Shp* gene in *Sitobion avenae* that fed on dsRNA sprayed barley leaves. Gene-specific expression of *Shp* was measured by qRT-PCR and normalized to aphid 18S ribosomal RNA (GenBank APU27819) as reference gene. cDNA was generated after total RNA extraction from aphids at 5 days of inoculation after dsRNA spray. The reduction in *Shp* gene expression in the aphids that fed on Shp-dsRNA sprayed leaves compared to the mock sprayed control was statistically significant. Error bars represent SE of three independent experiments each using 5-10 adult aphids for each treatment (**p<0.01; students t-test).

Figure 2: Stylectomy. (A) *Sitobion avenae* feeding on a barley leaf shortly before cutting the mouthparts (stylet) with a tungsten needle connected to a microcautery device. (B) Injection of antimycotic, antibiotic and RNase-inhibitor using a microcapillary at the beginning of the exudation period after overlaying with silicone oil. (C) Sampling of sieve-tube exudate from a cut aphid stylet under silicone oil with a microcapillary after an exudation period of 24 hours. (D) Stylectomy of ATTO 488-labeled Shp-dsRNA_{A488} in sprayed barley leaves. Detection of Shp-dsRNA_{A488} (green) in the phloem sap droplet using stylectomy. Aphids were placed on non-sprayed leaf parts and stylectomy was performed 48 hours after spray treatment with Shp-dsRNA_{A488}.

Figure 3: Profiling of Shp-dsRNA-derived siRNAs in the phloem sap from barley leaves. Phloem sap was sampled by stylectomy. Total RNAs were isolated using a single cell RNA purification kit (Norgen Biotek Corp.). sRNA reads between 19 and 30 nt from Shp-dsRNA-

sprayed and mock-treated barley leaves were mapped to Shp-dsRNA precursor (Abdellatef et al., 2015). Read coverage varied from 0-162 as indicated. Sequencing data are gained from 5 pooled separate phloem sap isolations experiments with a total sample amount of 10µl phloem sap from sprayed leaves and 10µl phloem sap from non-sprayed leaves, respectively.

Figure 4: Detection of CYP3RNA in barley leaves and shoots at different time points after spray application. Amount of CYP3RNA in the first (sprayed) leaf as well as non-sprayed second leaves and shoot tissue. The relative amount of sprayed CYP3RNA measured by qPCR decreased over time in leaves and increased in roots compared to mock-sprayed control leaves. Bars represent mean values \pm SEs of three independent experiments. The reduction of CYP3RNA vs. mock-sprayed leaves was statistically significant (*P < 0.05; Student's t-test).

Figure 5: Detection of CYP3RNA in barley roots at different time points after spray application. Amount of CYP3RNA in the roots of barley plants 24h, 48h and 72h after spray treatment, respectively. The relative amount of sprayed CYP3RNA measured by qPCR decreased over time in leaves and increased in roots compared to mock-sprayed control leaves. Bars represent mean values \pm SEs of three independent experiments. The reduction of CYP3RNA vs. mock-sprayed leaves was statistically significant (*P < 0.05; Student's t-test).

Figure 6: Gene-specific qPCR analysis of fungal *CYP51A*, *CYP51B*, and *CYP51C* transcripts at 6 dpi (corresponding to 9 d after spraying). The reduction in fungal *CYP51* gene expression on CYP3-dsRNA-sprayed leaves as compared with GFP-dsRNA-sprayed controls was statistically significant (*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001; Student's t test).

Figure 7: SIGS-mediated control of *Fg* on barley plants sprayed with CYP3RNA. (A) Two-week-old barley plants cv. Golden Promise were sprayed with CYP3RNA (20 ng µL⁻¹) or TE-buffer, respectively. 72 hours later plants were inoculated with 2×10^4 conidia mL⁻¹ of *Fg*. 7 d after infection hypocotyls of plants sprayed with CYP3RNA developed less brownish lesions compared to TE-treated control plants.

Figure 8: The molecular mechanism of SIGS is controlled by the fungal silencing machinery. In summary, our findings support the model that SIGS involves: (1) uptake of sprayed dsRNA by the plant (via stomata); (2) transfer of apoplastic dsRNAs into the symplast (DCL processing into siRNAs); (3) systemic translocation of siRNA or unprocessed dsRNA via the vascular system (phloem/xylem); (4) uptake of apoplastic dsRNA (a) or symplastic dsRNA/siRNA by the fungus (b); (5) processing into siRNA by fungal DCLs (Koch et al., 2016, Gaffar et al., 2019).

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6






Figure 7




Spray-induced gene silencing





TE spray





CYP3RNA













A



B



C



D



