EffectorO: motif-independent prediction of effectors in oomycete genomes using

machine learning and lineage specificity

Munir Nur[1#], Kelsey Wood[1,2#], and Richard Michelmore[1,3*]

[1]The Genome Center, University of California, Davis, USA

[2]Integrative Genetics & Genomics Graduate Group, University of California, Davis, USA

[3]Departments of Plant Sciences, Molecular & Cellular Biology, Medical Microbiology &

Immunology, University of California, Davis, USA.

Co-first authors

* Corresponding author e-mail: rwmichelmore@ucdavis.edu

Abstract

Oomycete plant pathogens cause a wide variety of diseases, including late blight of

potato, sudden oak death, and downy mildew of many plants. These pathogens are major

contributors to losses in many food crops. Oomycetes secrete "effector" proteins to

manipulate their hosts to the advantage of the pathogen. Plants have evolved to recognize

effectors, resulting in an evolutionary cycle of defense and counter-defense in plant–microbe

interactions. This selective pressure results in highly diverse effector sequences that can be

difficult to computationally identify using sequence similarity. We developed a pipeline,

EffectorO, that uses two complementary approaches to predict effectors in oomycete

pathogen genomes: (1) a machine learning-based pipeline that predicts effector probability

based on the biochemical properties of the N-terminal amino acid sequence of a protein and

is trained on experimentally verified oomycete effectors and (2) a pipeline based on lineage-

specificity to find proteins that are unique to one species or genus, a sign of evolutionary

divergence due to adaptation to the host. We tested EffectorO on *Bremia lactucae*, which

causes lettuce downy mildew, and *Phytophthora infestans*, which causes late blight of potato

and tomato, and predicted many novel effector candidates, while still recovering the

majority of known effector candidates. EffectorO will be useful for discovering novel families

of oomycete effectors without relying on sequence similarity to known effectors.

Introduction

Oomycetes are filamentous eukaryotic organisms that resemble fungi but are more

closely related to brown algae (Baldauf 2003). Pathogenic oomycetes cause huge losses in

agriculture and aquaculture worldwide (Derevnina et al. 2016; Haverkort et al. 2008).

Oomycete pathogens and other parasites must remain undetected by their hosts in order to

successfully infect and complete their life cycle. This is accomplished through the action of

effectors, secreted proteins that interfere with host immune signaling and physiology to

promote pathogen growth (Wang et al. 2019). To thwart the action of effectors and infection

by the pathogen, plants have evolved receptors encoded by resistance genes (R genes) to

detect effectors and trigger a defense response resulting in disease resistance (Wang et al.

2019). Therefore, identification of effectors is important for both understanding how

pathogens infect their hosts and for understanding and breeding for disease resistance.

For some oomycetes, such as *Phytophthora* species and downy mildew pathogens, the

discovery of conserved amino acid motifs and protein domains in effector proteins has

assisted in the prediction of effectors from genomes. One such motif is the RXLR motif, which

is located in the N-terminus of the protein just following the secretion-related signal peptide

(Rehmany et al. 2005). The RXLR motif is often associated with a downstream EER motif,

and both motifs have been implicated in secretion and/or translocation of effectors into host

cells (Birch et al. 2009; Whisson et al. 2007). Although their role in effector movement

remains unresolved (Ellis and Dodds 2011), the predictive value of the RXLR and EER motifs

has been demonstrated by the discovery of numerous effectors predicted in pathogen

genomes using the motif and validated by testing the candidate proteins for recognition by

resistant genotypes (avirulence activity) or immune suppression (virulence activity) *in*

planta (Deb et al. 2018; Fabro et al. 2011; Pecrix et al. 2019; Pel et al. 2009; Stassen et al.

2013; Zheng et al. 2014). While the RXLR motif is clearly a conserved effector motif in

Phytophthora species, effectors in the related downy mildew pathogens show divergence

and diversification of this motif (Bailey et al. 2011; Sharma et al. 2015).

Due to the sequence divergence of the RXLR motif in downy mildew species, both

string- and Hidden Markov Model (HMM)-based searches recover fewer effector candidates

in these pathogens compared to *Phytophthora* spp. (Baxter et al. 2010; McGowan and

Fitzpatrick 2017). Another approach to predict effectors in downy mildew species (as well

as in *Phytophthora*) is to search for the structurally conserved WY domain, which is present

in ~25–50% of RXLR effectors in *Phytophthora* and downy mildew pathogens (Bos et al.

2010; Dou et al. 2008; He et al. 2019; King et al. 2014; Win et al. 2012) and has been

implicated in effector function (Bos et al. 2010; Dou et al. 2008; He et al. 2019; King et al.

2014). While HMM searches for the WY domain have a low false positive rate for predicting

candidate effectors (Wood et al. 2020), they likely have a high false negative rate, as not all

RXLR effectors have WY domains and there may be *bona fide* effectors with novel N-terminal

motifs and uncharacterized effector domains. Unlike in oomycetes, there are no widely

conserved effector motifs across all fungi. Degenerate RXLR-like motifs have been found in

some fungal pathogens (Gu et al. 2011; Kale et al. 2010) and others have an N-terminal

Y/F/WxC motif (Godfrey et al. 2010).

Recently, EffectorP, a machine learning based approach to identify effectors in fungal

genomes using biochemical characteristics, successfully expanded the pool of candidate

effectors in fungal species (Sperschneider et al. 2016, 2018). Machine learning-based

effector prediction pipelines, such as EffectorP, work by building effector classification

models trained on known effectors and secreted non-effectors from the target organisms.

Once a suitable model is determined, the classifier calculates the biochemical features from

the amino acid sequence of the protein and outputs a probability that the protein is an

effector based on those features. To date, machine learning has not been applied to effector

prediction in oomycetes.

Due to the constant evolutionary cycle between pathogen and host, pathogenicity-

related proteins, such as effectors (as well as their corresponding R genes), often show

increased rates of sequence divergence (Dong et al. 2015). This is especially true for

organisms that have narrow host ranges, such as downy mildew pathogens. For example,

over 6,000 genes in the downy mildew pathogen *Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis* had no

identified ortholog in *Phytophthora* species (Baxter et al. 2010) and over 10,000 genes were

lineage-specific in the animal pathogen *Saprolegnia parasitica* (Jiang et al. 2013). This lineage

specificity can be accounted for in part by the lack of genomic resources in closely related

organisms, but for many of these proteins, it is likely due to co-adaptation to specific hosts

of these pathogens. We reasoned that by using lineage specificity in combination with a

machine learning-based effector classifier, we would be able to expand the candidate effector

repertoires of oomycete pathogens, especially those with narrow host ranges.

Here we present EffectorO: a pipeline to predict novel effectors in oomycete genomes

that avoids the limitations of motif/domain-based searches. EffectorO consists of a machine

learning based effector classifier trained on a diverse set of oomycete effectors (EffectorO-

ML) combined with a lineage-specific protein sequence identification pipeline (EffectorO-

LSP). We used two economically important oomycete pathogens as model organisms:

Bremia lactucae, an obligate biotrophic downy mildew pathogen with complete host-

specificity to *Lactuca* spp., and *Phytophthora infestans*, which causes late blight of potato and

tomato. EffectorO had high cross-validation accuracy for classifying protein sequences as

effectors or non-effectors and predicted thousands of novel effectors in these two oomycete

genomes, while recovering known effectors. This analysis was expanded to 27 additional

oomycete genomes. One EffectorO prediction was validated by demonstrating the elicitation

of cell death on downy mildew resistant genotypes by an effector of *B. lactucae* with no

obvious canonical sequence domains. Thus, a machine learning approach, especially when

combined with lineage-specificity analysis, can be useful in gene annotation and effector

prediction in oomycete genomes.

Materials and Methods

Training sets: Positive (effectors) and negative (non-effectors)

Our positive training set consisted of oomycete effectors experimentally shown to be

either recognized by R genes (avirulence activity) or to have an immune-suppressing effect

on the host (virulence activity) (Supplemental Table 1). Seventy-seven of these sequences

were obtained from the Pathogen-Host Interaction database (PHI-base) (Urban et al. 2019)

and 15 effector candidates were added from *B. lactucae* that had avirulence (Giesbers et al.

2017; Pelgrom et al. 2019; Stassen et al. 2013; Wood et al. 2020) or virulence activity (Wood

et al. 2020) resulting in an initial set of 92 sequences. We then used CD-Hit at a sequence

identity threshold of 70% and word length of five amino acids in order to identify and

remove closely related sequences (Fu et al. 2012; Li and Godzik 2006), resulting in a final

positive training set of 88 unique oomycete effectors.

Our negative training set consisted of representative oomycete sequences that were

predicted to be secreted and highly conserved throughout the genomes of 28 oomycete

species (Supplemental Table 2). To find these sequences, we first performed an Orthofinder

search on the oomycete genomes at an e-value cutoff of 1e-10 and a query coverage cutoff of

90% (Emms and Kelly 2015, 2019). We then retrieved ortholog centroids, with the species

chosen at random, that were present in at least 26 genomes. We predicted signal peptides

using SignalP v4.1 (sensitive mode) (Petersen et al. 2011). To further reduce potential model

bias and redundancy in the set of non-effectors, we ran CD-hit and removed sequences with

greater than 40% identity. This identified 320 sequences, from which a training set of 88

sequences was chosen at random to obtain a balanced 1:1 positive to negative training set

ratio.

Feature selection and encoding for classical machine learning models

To calculate biochemical characteristics of effectors and non-effectors, we used

published amino acid scales from ExPASyProtScale (ExPaSy; Expert Protein Analysis System

2004) and evaluated six features that could be informative for effector classification. We

focused on the first 100 amino acids of the N-terminus of protein sequences, with the

rationale that (1) secretion and translocation signals are typically encoded in the N-terminus

and (2) effectors may differ in their C-terminal domains depending on their specific functions

(for example, not all validated oomycete effectors have WY domains). To ensure the feature

scales were equivalent to each other, we transformed the calculated feature distributions to

zero mean and unit variance (Z score). We calculated the average values for six N-terminal

features: the grand average of hydropathy (GRAVY), hydrophobicity, surface exposure,

disorder propensity, bulkiness, and residue interface propensity of the first 100 amino acids

using data from ExPASyProtScale (ExPaSy; Expert Protein Analysis System 2004).

PONDR VSL2 (Peng et al. 2006) was used as an additional method to visualize levels

of intrinsic disorder for effectors and secreted non-effectors across the N-terminal sequence.

The average sequence disorder was calculated at each amino acid position for the first 160

amino acids including the signal peptide in order to visualize the differences between

candidate effectors and non-effectors.

Feature encoding for Convolutional Neural Network models

In order to account for signals that may be concealed through net average

calculations, we also tried using a convolutional neural network (CNN) to extract positional-

dependent differences in amino acid sequence between effectors and non-effectors. We used

the first 100 amino acid values for each feature and padded the ends with zeros for

sequences shorter than 100 aa. For each protein in our positive and negative training sets,

this feature encoding resulted in a 6 x 100 matrix to include every positional encoding for all

six biochemical features in the first 100 amino acids.

Machine learning architectures

For the classical machine learning pipeline, we tested various parametric and non-

parametric models and evaluated what worked best for effector classification. We tested and

compared the following models using multiple cross-validation trials (resampling

procedures that rotate training and testing splits): Random Forest, Naïve Bayes (Bernoulli

and Gaussian), Logistic Regression, and K-Nearest Neighbors. To reduce overfitting, we

monitored training and testing scores (accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, false positive rate,

and area under the precision-recall curve). Models were used from the scikit-learn machine

learning library in Python (Pedregosa et al. 2011). We tested the Logistic Regression, and

Gaussian/Bernoulli Naive-Bayes models with default parameters, as well as the Random

Forest classifier with 400 estimators and a max depth of 4, and the K-Nearest Neighbors

classifier with the neighbors parameter set to 5.

Lineage Specificity

Proteins encoded by lineage specific genes were obtained using the predicted

secretome of a species as a BLASTp query against the translated open reading frames (ORFs)

of other oomycete species (Supplemental Table 2). Conserved proteins were defined as

proteins with a BLASTp hit in another species with an e-value cutoff of <10e-7, percent

identity of >30%, and a query coverage of > 30%. Protein sequences that were not conserved

in another oomycete species were considered to be lineage-specific. Similar BLASTp cutoffs

are used in other pipelines to obtain species-specific genes for numerous species, including

other oomycetes (Rujirawat et al. 2019; Zhou et al. 2015). ORFs were used instead of gene

models because most oomycete effectors are encoded by a single exon and because gene

prediction algorithms often misannotate effector genes. Orthofinder (Emms and Kelly 2015)

was tested as well but was found to predict a much higher number of lineage specific

proteins (and thus likely contained more false positives) so we used our more conservative

BLASTp-based pipeline for EffectorO-LSP.

Prediction of RXLR-EER motifs and WY domains

To predict the RXLR-EER motif, we used a string search for [RQGH]XLR and

[DE][DE][KR] for EER as well as the HMM for RXLR-EER developed by Whisson et al. (2007)

for *Phytophthora* species. To predict WY domains, we used the HMM training set containing

three *Phytophthora* species by Boutemy et al. (2011), with proteins with a HMMer bitscore

>0 classified as having a WY domain. HMMer v3.1 was used for all HMM searches (Eddy

2011).

Scripts

All scripts for running EffectorO-ML and EffectorO-LSG can be found on Github at

https://github.com/mjnur/oomycete-effector-prediction. A webapp for EffectorO-ML is

available at https://bremia.ucdavis.edu/effectorO.php.

Candidate gene cloning and agroinfiltration

The *Avr6* candidate *BLE01* was cloned from *B. lactucae* genomic DNA using Gateway

cloning into pEG100 (35S promoter) as described previously (Wood et al. 2020). The signal

peptide was excluded from the coding sequence to ensure expression inside the plant cell.

Two distinct alleles were obtained. *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain C58Rif+ was

transformed with pEG100-BLE01 and infiltrations were performed on three- to five-week-

old lettuce plants as described previously (Wood et al. 2020). Leaves were scored for

necrosis 4-5 days after infiltration. *A. tumefaciens* containing pEG100 (empty vector) and

pEG100-GFP were used as negative controls, and *A. tumefaciens* containing pBAV139-

35S:HopM1 and pBAV139-35S:AvrPto were used as positive controls for cell death

(Wroblewski et al. 2009).

Results

Effector and non-effector proteins differ in their biochemical characteristics

To determine whether various N-terminal amino acid characteristics would be

sufficient to distinguish effectors from non-effector proteins, we compared predicted

biochemical parameters between validated oomycete effectors and secreted, conserved

proteins (presumed non-effectors). We found that validated effectors had higher intrinsic

disorder and had lower scores for GRAVY, hydrophobicity, exposed residues, bulkiness, and

interface, compared with secreted, conserved proteins (Fig. 1A). The intrinsic disorder score

was significantly higher in validated effectors, starting from just after the signal peptide (first

~20 aa) until approximately 80 aa after the start codon (Fig. 1B).

Evaluation of machine learning effector classifier models

To find the effector classifier with the best performance, we evaluated several

machine learning models (Random Forest, Linear SVCs, Bernoulli and Gaussian Naïve Bayes,

Logistic Regression, and K-Nearest Neighbors) as well as a convolutional neural network

model that takes into account positional information for classification. The Random Forest

classifier initially outperformed other models, so we attempted several combinations of

parameters, adjusting the number of estimators (n_estimators) and maximum tree depth

(max_depth), while monitoring the cross-validation accuracy. The best receiver-operator

curve (ROC) was achieved by the Random Forest classifier (with parameters n_estimators =

400 and max_depth = 4) with an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.89 (Figure 2) and an overall

5-fold cross-validation accuracy of 84.26% (Table 1). We also tested a convolutional neural

network (CNN), which takes position into account, to predict effectors; however, it was found

to perform similarly but not better than the most accurate Random Forest model. Therefore,

we used the Random Forest model for our EffectorO-ML pipeline to classify effectors based

on the biochemical characteristics of the first 100 amino acids of the N-terminus for all

subsequent analyses.

Figure 1. (A) Amino acid biochemical characteristics for validated oomycete effectors and
secreted non-effectors as calculated by the ExPASyProtScale and used as features for the
machine learning classifier. Violin plot shows the distribution of the N-terminal Z scores for
each group of proteins, with the p-value shown above plot. **(B)** Intrinsic disorder as
calculated by PONDR VSL2 for validated oomycete effectors and secreted non-effectors
with the *B. lactucae* secretome for reference. The average and standard error are shown for
each group of proteins at each amino acid position.

Figure 2. Receiver-operator curves (ROCs) for the various machine learning models tested on a cross validation fold, using 1:1 effector to non-effector testing and training sets.

The Random Forest effector classifier uses a default probability threshold of 0.5 to classify a protein as an effector; this probability threshold can be modified depending on preference for either inclusivity/sensitivity or specificity. For the top performing Random Forest model, we calculated and averaged accuracy, specificity, sensitivity (true positive rate), and false positive rate along the five cross-validation folds for different probability thresholds, illustrating the tradeoffs between rates of false positives and true positives when varying probability thresholds (Table 2). To obtain another estimate of the false positive and false negative rate, we ran EffectorO-ML on a set of 634 predicted secreted proteins that were conserved in at least 24 of the 28 sequenced oomycete species used for EffectorO-LSP

(presumed non-effectors) as well as on the 41 secreted *B. lactucae* WY effectors (presumed

true effectors). Secreted conserved orthologs and secreted WY proteins had significantly

different distributions (Figure 3). We found that a probability cutoff of 0.5 resulted in

approximately 28% of these conserved proteins being classified as effectors while capturing

90% of the WY effectors (Table 3). At a probability cutoff of 0.6, only 16% of the conserved

proteins were classified as effectors, with 85% of the WY proteins classified as effectors

(Table 3). Since we presume most of the conserved secreted proteins are not effectors due

to lineage specificity, 16% would be a good estimate of the false positive rate at the 0.6

threshold, which is similar to the false positive rate for string searches for the RXLR motif

(Wood et al. 2020). The false positive rate can be decreased further if desired by increasing

the probability threshold, but at the loss of true effectors. For inclusive searches (especially

if combined with other lines of evidence), we recommend between 0.5 and 0.6 as the

threshold for analyses of oomycete genomes.

Figure 3. Violin plots of effector probabilities for conserved secreted oomycete orthologs
and secreted *B. lactucae* WY domain containing proteins, generated by the top-performing
Random Forest model.

Table 1. Average cross validation metrics for various machine learning models for classifying proteins as effectors or non-effectors

	Random Forest	Logistic Regression	K-Nearest Neighbors	Bernoulli Naïve Bayes	Gaussian Naïve Bayes
Accuracy	84.26%	65.90%	70.16%	63.61%	67.87%
Specificity	82.97%	63.31%	69.12%	30.95%	61.14%
Sensitivity	86.95%	68.73%	71.10%	96.09%	74.59%
False Positive Rate	17.03%	36.69%	30.88%	69.05%	38.86%

Table 2. Metrics at different probability thresholds for the most accurate Random Forest model

	Random Forest Model Effector Probability Threshold =		
	0.7	0.6	0.5
Accuracy	76.23%	79.02%	84.26%
Specificity	89.84%	85.09%	82.97%
Sensitivity	62.74%	73.00%	86.95%
False Positive Rate	10.16%	14.91%	17.03%

Table 3. Number and percent of oomycete conserved secreted orthologous proteins (634 total) and *B. lactucae* secreted WY proteins (41 total) classified as an effector by the EffectorO-ML Random Forest model at different effector probability thresholds

	Random Forest Model Effector Probability Threshold =				
	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5
Secreted Orthologs	2 (0.3%)	12 (1.9%)	54 (8.5%)	103 (16%)	180 (28%)
Secreted WY Proteins	1 (2.5%)	5 (12.5%)	20 (50%)	34 (85%)	36 (90%)

EffectorO predicts novel effectors in oomycete species and recovers known effectors

To find novel effectors from *P. infestans* and *B. lactucae*, we used our EffectorO-ML

and LSP pipelines on the predicted secreted ORFs of these genomes. For *P. infestans*, we

found 8,685 proteins (41% of the secretome) to be lineage-specific and 5,814 proteins (30%)

to be classified as candidate effectors by machine learning, with 1,235 proteins (6%) present

in both categories (Figure 4). For *B. lactucae,* we found 2,478 proteins (34% of the

secretome) to be lineage-specific and 1,777 proteins (24%) to be classified as candidate

effectors by machine learning, with 597 proteins (8%) present in both categories (Figure 4).

EffectorO was largely able to recover proteins containing effector signatures, such as the

RXLR-EER motif and the WY domain (Figure 4 and Supplemental Table 3), which were not

used as classifiers in our analysis but were contained in proteins in the positive training set.

Figure 4. Venn diagrams showing the number of open reading frames (ORFs) identified in
the predicted secretomes of *P. infestans* and *B. lactucae* that are lineage specific proteins
(LSPs) and/or predicted to be an effector by the machine learning classifier (ML). The
number of RXLR-EER and WY proteins that are included or excluded from these datasets are
also shown.

The majority of EffectorO candidates are expressed in B. lactucae

To investigate whether EffectorO candidates are expressed at the transcript level, we

used an available RNA-seq dataset of *B. lactucae* grown on lettuce seedlings (NCBI BioProject

PRJNA523226). We found that transcripts that encoded proteins predicted to be effectors by

EffectorO-ML and EffectorO-LSP had similar mean expression levels as transcripts encoding

proteins containing WY domains and slightly lower expression than those containing RXLR-

EER motifs (Figure 5). Transcripts that encoded proteins predicted to be effectors by either

the ML or LSP pipeline, but not both, had lower mean expression levels and more proteins

with zero reads present in the RNA-seq dataset (Figure 5). The full secretome had the lowest

mean expression and also had 1,716 predicted transcripts with zero reads, suggesting that

many of the predicted ORFs may not represent real genes (Figure 5).

Figure 5. RNA-seq expression levels (log of the length-normalized read counts) for
candidate effector transcripts encoding proteins with the RXLR-EER motif (RXLR-EER), WY
domain (WY), EffectorO-ML -LSP (ML and LSP), EffectorO-ML only (ML), EffectorO-LSP only
(LSP), or the full secretome.

 EffectorO-ML predicts candidate effectors in diverse oomycete pathogens

To determine whether EffectorO could predict effectors in other pathogens across the

phylum Oomycota, we tested EffectorO-ML on an additional 27 published oomycete

genomes. We found that even though EffectorO was trained primarily on effectors from

downy mildew and *Phytophthora* pathogens, the algorithm predicted hundreds to thousands

of candidate effectors in distantly related oomycetes infecting animals (e.g., *Achlya hypogyna*,

Aphanomyces spp., *Saprolegnia* spp.), as well as oomycetes from the genera *Albugo* and

Pythium (Figure 6). Critically, EffectorO-ML predicted a similar number of effectors in the

free-living oomycete species *Thraustotheca clavata* (14.6% of the genome) as the false

positive rate for EffectorO (17.0%, Table 1).

Figure 6. Number of predicted secreted proteins (translated ORFs) classified as effectors
using EffectorO-ML only (cutoff = 0.5) (dark blue bars), EffectorO-LSP only (pink bars),
EffectorO-ML and LSP (purple bars), and those classified as non-effectors (grey bars) in 28
species of oomycetes, including Peronosporales (Phytophthora and downy mildew species),
Pythium species, animal pathogens (*Achlya, Saprolegnia*, and *Aphanomyces* spp.), *Albugo*

spp., and a free-living oomycete (*Thraustotheca clavata*). Numbers are estimated by
subtracting the number of EffectorO-ML hits from the false positive rate for each genome
(14.6%, estimated using *T. clavata*, which had fewer predicted effectors than the estimated
false positive rate of 17.0%).

An EffectorO candidate causes cell death when expressed in lettuce

To see whether any EffectorO candidates are recognized effectors (i.e., have

avirulence activity), we cloned a gene from *B. lactucae* that encoded a protein that does not

have RXLR or EER motifs nor predicted WY domains, but was classified as a probable effector

by both EffectorO-ML and Effector-LSP. The gene encoding this protein was not found in the

gene models (i.e. was not predicted to be a gene by the annotation software), but did encode

a predicted ORF. The candidate effector, named BLE01 for (*B*remia *l*actucae EffectorO

candidate 1), was within the mapping region for *Avr6,* as determined by sequencing of

segregating sexual progeny of *B. lactucae* isolates (R.J. Gil, unpublished data). We found that

transient expression of *BLE01* caused cell death on the lettuce cultivar Sabine, which

contains *Dm6*, but not Cobham Green, which does not contain any known *Dm* genes (Fig 7A).

When we screened a larger panel of lettuce cultivars with various *Dm* genes, we found that

it also elicited cell death in RYZ2164, but not in the other seven cultivars with other *Dm* genes

or in the non-host plant *Nicotiana benthamiana* (Fig 7B).

A

B

Cultivar	*Dm* genes	N plants	EV	GFP	BLE01-H1	BLE01-H2	HopM1	AvrPto
N. benthamiana	n/a	3	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	4.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0
Cobham Green	n/a	4	0.5 ± 0.6	0.75 ± 0.5	0.5 ± 0.6	0.5 ± 0.6	4.0 ± 0.0	3.8 ± 0.5
UCDM2	*Dm2*	4	0.5 ± 0.6	0.3 ± 0.5	0.0 ± 0.0	0.3 ± 0.5	3.8 ± 0.5	3.5 ± 0.6
Dandie	*Dm3*	4	0.5 ± 0.6	0.5 ± 0.6	0.3 ± 0.5	0.3 ± 0.5	4.0 ± 0.0	3.3 ± 0.6
Sabine	*Dm6*	6	0.8 ± 0.4	0.8 ± 0.4	2.7 ± 0.8	3.5 ± 0.6	3.7 ± 0.5	3.0 ± 0.0
LSE57/15	*Dm7*	4	0.5 ± 0.6	0.5 ± 0.6	0.3 ± 0.5	0.3 ± 0.5	3.3 ± 1.5	3.8 ± 0.5
Capitan	*Dm11*	4	1.0 ± 0.8	1.0 ± 0.8	0.8 ± 1.0	0.8 ± 0.5	3.3 ± 0.5	2.8 ± 0.5
Ninja	*Dm3,4,11,36*	4	0.3 ± 0.5	0.3 ± 0.5	0.3 ± 0.5	0.3 ± 0.5	4.0 ± 0.0	4.0 ± 0.0
Discovery	*Dm7, 37*	4	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	3.8 ± 0.5	3.5 ± 0.6
RYZ2164	*Dm25*	4	0.8 ± 1.0	0.5 ± 0.6	3.0 ± 0.0	3.3 ± 0.5	4.0 ± 0.0	2.5 ± 1.7
ViAE	R20	4	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	3.5 ± 0.6	3.3 ± 0.5

Figure 7. (A) Example transient expression results from lettuce infiltrated with *A. tumefaciens* containing two candidate effector alleles from *B. lactucae* (BLE01-H1 and BLE01-H2) as well as with the negative controls empty vector (EV) and green fluorescent protein (GFP) and the positive controls for cell death, *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* effectors HopM1 and AvrPto. Leaves are representative of four replicates and photos were taken 4 days after infiltration. **(B)** Necrosis scores four days post-agroinfiltration of the candidate effectors and controls in a panel of lettuce cultivars and the non-host *Nicotiana benthamiana*. Necrosis was scored as follows: 0 = no necrosis or chlorosis, 1 = mild chlorosis, 2 = chlorosis, 3 = chlorosis and necrosis, 4 = full necrosis. Number of replicates (N), averages, and standard deviations are shown for each line and effector combination.

Discussion

We demonstrated that our EffectorO pipeline can predict novel candidate effectors using a machine learning-based approach combined with a lineage-specificity criterion for oomycete effector classification. Therefore, EffectorO can be used to mine oomycete

genomes to expand the set of predicted effectors without relying on canonical N-terminal

motifs (such as RXLR and EER) or C-terminal domains (such as the WY domain); thus, it may

reveal effectors that were previously missed by only searching for these features. EffectorO

predicts an additional ~600 ML+LSP candidate effectors from *B. lactucae* and ~1,200

additional ML+LSP candidate effectors from *P. infestans*. The percent of effectors predicted

in the secretome by EffectorO-ML was approximately 25%, which is similar to what was

predicted for fungal secretomes with EffectorP (Sperschneider et al. 2018). The number of

potentially novel effectors in *B. lactucae* and *P. infestans* that were identified is much larger

than previous reports of effector repertoires from these two species (Fletcher et al. 2019;

Haas et al. 2009). The large size of these candidate sets should not preclude functional

analysis when combined with additional data from the pathogen of interest such as

avirulence gene mapping, population genomics, and gene expression data.

EffectorO-ML was trained on the N-terminal sequences of validated effectors

compared to conserved secreted proteins (presumed non-effectors), which we show differ

in several biochemical characteristics and especially in the degree of N-terminal disorder.

Sequences in the N-terminus of effector proteins are known to be important for secretion

and translocation of effectors; here we demonstrate that they have distinct biochemical

signatures that can be used to predict the probability that a given sequence is an effector.

EffectorO-ML was able to recover the majority of predicted RXLR-EER and WY domain

containing proteins from *B. lactucae* and *P. infestans*, without relying on using those motifs

for prediction. By focusing on the N-terminus for effector classification, our pipeline allows

for a diversity of C-terminal domains, which are typically considered to be the functional

region of effector proteins. EffectorO may help to uncover new effector families, which can

then be bioinformatically characterized using motif/domain-based analysis, as well as

structurally characterized using cryo-EM or x-ray crystallography of effector proteins, as has

been done for WY-containing effectors (Boutemy et al. 2011). The predicted effector

repertoires should also be analyzed with the latest ML structural prediction algorithms such

as AlphaFold (Senior et al. 2020) and trRosetta (Yang et al. 2020). Recently, trRosetta was

used to predict effectors based on structure for the fungal species *Magnaporthe oryzae*

(Seong and Krasileva 2021) and a similar analysis should be done with EffectorO candidates.

The most accurate model for EffectorO-ML was the Random Forest classifier. Random

Forest classifiers work by building many decision trees and then taking the consensus of all

of the decision trees to calculate an overall probability for a given classification (Pavlov

2000). Because the final output is the average of many independent models, Random Forest

classifiers are robust to individual errors in any given single model. The fungal effector

classifier, EffectorP 2.0, uses a similar approach by utilizing an ensemble classifier that takes

the consensus predictions of multiple Naive-Bayes and decision trees to obtain an accuracy

of 89% for predicting fungal effectors. While EffectorP is trained on a larger set of effectors

than EffectorO and relies on additional biochemical characteristics (16 features vs. our six),

we achieved a similar accuracy to EffectorP 2.0 in predicting oomycete effectors. Our

Random Forest model had an estimated 84% accuracy and 82% specificity at a probability

cutoff of 0.5. The false positive rate can be decreased by increasing the probability cutoff for

classification of an effector; however, this will also result in more false negatives (missed

true effectors). We recommend 0.5 as an inclusive threshold for casting a wide net to catch

effectors; however, depending on the application the researcher may want to use a more

stringent threshold to find higher confidence effectors. It may also be possible to further

improve the accuracy and specificity of EffectorO by adding additional proteins to the

training set or by adding more biochemical and structural characteristics. Gene models may

be used instead of ORFs to reduce false positives, although gene prediction algorithms may

miss true effectors (as was the case for the *Avr6* candidate *BLE01*).

Similar to EffectorO-ML, EffectorO-LSP will predict additional proteins besides

effectors, not only due to false positives but also due to the biological reality that there may

be lineage specific proteins that fulfill other functions. Thus, EffectorO-LSP predictions are

most useful in combination with other lines of evidence of effector activity (such as

EffectorO-ML, expression during infection, RXLR motifs and/or WY domains).

Approximately 41% of the *P. infestans* secretome and 34% of the *B. lactucae* secretome were

predicted to be lineage specific. Some of these predicted proteins may not actually be

lineage-specific; some may be encoded by pseudogenes or result from failure to detect

homology (Weisman et al. 2020). We found that many were expressed in *B. lactucae* during

infection, suggesting that some of these represent true genes. In addition to effectors, these

lineage-specific secreted proteins could also be related to the lifestyles of these organisms,

their sexual reproduction, or may be products of co-evolution with other microbes rather

than co-evolution with the host. The amount of lineage specificity expected for a given

organism will depend on whether or not closely related organisms are used in the analysis

and how closely pathogens are adapted to their hosts. Depending on the relatedness of a

given species to those in the database, we recommend that BLAST results from very closely

related species be filtered out in order to find proteins that are truly lineage specific.

EffectorO predictions were validated for an effector from *B. lactucae* that was within

the region co-segregating with *Avr6* but did not have RXLR or EER motifs nor any WY

domains. Here we have shown that this effector, *BLE01*, causes cell death when expressed in

lettuce with the *Dm6* gene but not on cultivars containing other known *Dm* genes, making it

a good candidate for the protein encoded by *Avr6.* Expression of *BLE01* also caused cell death

on RYZ2164. The background of RYZ2164 is proprietary, so it may have *Dm6* in its lineage

or it may contain another *Dm* gene that recognizes the effector.

EffectorO-ML and -LSP can expand the set of predicted effectors for identification of

genes for resistance to agriculturally important oomycetes. These predictions can be used to

choose candidates for "effectoromics" (Vleeshouwers and Oliver 2015) screens to identify

effectors with avirulence and virulence activities. EffectorO predictions will be especially

useful when combined with mapping of avirulence phenotypes for the cloning of specific

avirulence genes enabling an effector-driven approach to R gene identification.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank John Emerson for greenhouse support, Elizabeth

Georgian for manuscript editing and formatting, Kyle Fletcher for very helpful comments and

suggestions, and Mary Corrigan for additional minor editing.

Literature Cited

Bailey, K., Cevik, V., Holton, N., Byrne-Richardson, J., Sohn, K. H., Coates, M., Woods-Tör, A.,

Aksoy, H. M., Hughes, L., Baxter, L., Jones, J. D. G., Beynon, J., Holub, E. B., and Tör, M.

2011. Molecular cloning of ATR5(Emoy2) from *Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis*, an

avirulence determinant that triggers RPP5-mediated defense in Arabidopsis.

Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions. 24:827–838

Baldauf, S. L. 2003. The Deep Roots of Eukaryotes. Science. 300:1703–1706

Baxter, L., Tripathy, S., Ishaque, N., Boot, N., Cabral, A., Kemen, E., Thines, M., Ah-Fong, A.,

480   Anderson, R., Badejoko, W., Bittner-Eddy, P., Boore, J. L., Chibucos, M. C., Coates, M.,

481   Dehal, P., Delehaunty, K., Dong, S., Downton, P., Dumas, B., Fabro, G., Fronick, C.,

482   Fuerstenberg, S. I., Fulton, L., Gaulin, E., Govers, F., Hughes, L., Humphray, S., Jiang, R.

483   H. Y., Judelson, H., Kamoun, S., Kyung, K., Meijer, H., Minx, P., Morris, P., Nelson, J.,

484   Phuntumart, V., Qutob, D., Rehmany, A., Rougon-Cardoso, A., Ryden, P., Torto-

485   Alalibo, T., Studholme, D., Wang, Y., Win, J., Wood, J., Clifton, S. W., Rogers, J., Van den

486   Ackerveken, G., Jones, J. D. G., McDowell, J. M., Beynon, J., and Tyler, B. M. 2010.

487   Signatures of adaptation to obligate biotrophy in the *Hyaloperonospora*

488   *arabidopsidis* genome. Science. 330:1549–1551

489   Birch, P. R. J., Armstrong, M., Bos, J., Boevink, P., Gilroy, E. M., Taylor, R. M., Wawra, S.,

490   Pritchard, L., Conti, L., Ewan, R., Whisson, S. C., van West, P., Sadanandom, A., and

491   Kamoun, S. 2009. Towards understanding the virulence functions of RXLR effectors

492   of the oomycete plant pathogen *Phytophthora infestans*. Journal of Experimental

493   Botany. 60:1133–1140

494   Bos, J. I. B., Armstrong, M. R., Gilroy, E. M., Boevink, P. C., Hein, I., Taylor, R. M., Zhendong, T.,

495   Engelhardt, S., Vetukuri, R. R., Harrower, B., Dixelius, C., Bryan, G., Sadanandom, A.,

496   Whisson, S. C., Kamoun, S., and Birch, P. R. J. 2010. *Phytophthora infestans* effector

497   AVR3a is essential for virulence and manipulates plant immunity by stabilizing host

498   E3 ligase CMPG1. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 107:9909–9914

499   Boutemy, L. S., King, S. R. F., Win, J., Hughes, R. K., Clarke, T. A., Blumenschein, T. M. A.,

500   Kamoun, S., and Banfield, M. J. 2011. Structures of *Phytophthora* RXLR effector

proteins: a conserved but adaptable fold underpins functional diversity. Journal of

Biological Chemistry. 286:35834–35842

Deb, D., Anderson, R. G., How-Yew-Kin, T., Tyler, B. M., and McDowell, J. M. 2018. Conserved

RxLR Effectors From Oomycetes *Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis* and *Phytophthora*

sojae Suppress PAMP- and Effector-Triggered Immunity in Diverse Plants. Molecular

Plant-Microbe Interactions. 31:374–385

Derevnina, L., Petre, B., Kellner, R., Dagdas, Y. F., Sarowar, M. N., Giannakopoulou, A., De la

Concepcion, J. C., Chaparro-Garcia, A., Pennington, H. G., van West, P., and Kamoun, S.

2016. Emerging oomycete threats to plants and animals. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.

B Biol. Sci. 371

Dong, S., Raffaele, S., and Kamoun, S. 2015. The two-speed genomes of filamentous

pathogens: waltz with plants. Current Opinion in Genetics & Development. 35:57–65

Dou, D., Kale, S. D., Wang, X., Jiang, R. H. Y., Bruce, N. A., Arredondo, F. D., Zhang, X., and

Tyler, B. M. 2008. RXLR-mediated entry of *Phytophthora sojae* effector Avr1b into

soybean cells does not require pathogen-encoded machinery. Plant Cell. 20:1930–

1947

Eddy, S. R. 2011. Accelerated Profile HMM Searches. PLoS Comput. Biol. 7:e1002195

Ellis, J. G., and Dodds, P. N. 2011. Showdown at the RXLR motif: Serious differences of

opinion in how effector proteins from filamentous eukaryotic pathogens enter plant

cells. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 108:14381–14382

Emms, D. M., and Kelly, S. 2015. OrthoFinder: solving fundamental biases in whole genome

comparisons dramatically improves orthogroup inference accuracy. Genome

Biology. 16:157

Emms, D. M., and Kelly, S. 2019. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for

comparative genomics. Genome Biology. 20:238

ExPaSy (Expert Protein Analysis System). 2004. Encyclopedic Dictionary of Genetics,

Genomics and Proteomics.

Fabro, G., Steinbrenner, J., Coates, M., Ishaque, N., Baxter, L., Studholme, D. J., Körner, E.,

Allen, R. L., Piquerez, S. J. M., Rougon-Cardoso, A., Greenshields, D., Lei, R., Badel, J. L.,

Caillaud, M.-C., Sohn, K.-H., Van den Ackerveken, G., Parker, J. E., Beynon, J., and

Jones, J. D. G. 2011. Multiple Candidate Effectors from the Oomycete Pathogen

Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis Suppress Host Plant Immunity. PLOS Pathogens.

7:e1002348

Fletcher, K., Gil, J., Bertier, L. D., Kenefick, A., Wood, K. J., Zhang, L., Reyes-Chin-Wo, S.,

Cavanaugh, K., Tsuchida, C., Wong, J., and Michelmore, R. 2019. Genomic signatures

of heterokaryosis in the oomycete pathogen *Bremia lactucae*. Nature

Communications. 10:2645

Fu, L., Niu, B., Zhu, Z., Wu, S., and Li, W. 2012. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-

generation sequencing data. Bioinformatics. 28:3150–3152

Giesbers, A. K. J., Pelgrom, A. J. E., Visser, R. G. F., Niks, R. E., Van den Ackerveken, G., and

Jeuken, M. J. W. 2017. Effector-mediated discovery of a novel resistance gene against

Bremia lactucae in a nonhost lettuce species. New Phytologist. 216:915–926

Godfrey, D., Böhlenius, H., Pedersen, C., Zhang, Z., Emmersen, J., and Thordal-Christensen, H.

2010. Powdery mildew fungal effector candidates share N-terminal Y/F/WxC-motif.

BMC Genomics. 11:317

Gu, B., Kale, S. D., Wang, Q., Wang, D., Pan, Q., Cao, H., Meng, Y., Kang, Z., Tyler, B. M., and

Shan, W. 2011. Rust Secreted Protein Ps87 Is Conserved in Diverse Fungal

Pathogens and Contains a RXLR-like Motif Sufficient for Translocation into Plant

Cells. PLOS ONE. 6:e27217

Haas, B. J., Kamoun, S., Zody, M. C., Jiang, R. H. Y., Handsaker, R. E., Cano, L. M., Grabherr, M.,

Kodira, C. D., Raffaele, S., Torto-Alalibo, T., Bozkurt, T. O., Ah-Fong, A. M. V., Alvarado,

L., Anderson, V. L., Armstrong, M. R., Avrova, A., Baxter, L., Beynon, J., Boevink, P. C.,

Bollmann, S. R., Bos, J. I. B., Bulone, V., Cai, G., Cakir, C., Carrington, J. C., Chawner, M.,

Conti, L., Costanzo, S., Ewan, R., Fahlgren, N., Fischbach, M. A., Fugelstad, J., Gilroy, E.

M., Gnerre, S., Green, P. J., Grenville-Briggs, L. J., Griffith, J., Grünwald, N. J., Horn, K.,

Horner, N. R., Hu, C.-H., Huitema, E., Jeong, D.-H., Jones, A. M. E., Jones, J. D. G., Jones,

R. W., Karlsson, E. K., Kunjeti, S. G., Lamour, K., Liu, Z., Ma, L., Maclean, D., Chibucos,

M. C., McDonald, H., McWalters, J., Meijer, H. J. G., Morgan, W., Morris, P. F., Munro, C.

A., O'Neill, K., Ospina-Giraldo, M., Pinzón, A., Pritchard, L., Ramsahoye, B., Ren, Q.,

Restrepo, S., Roy, S., Sadanandom, A., Savidor, A., Schornack, S., Schwartz, D. C.,

Schumann, U. D., Schwessinger, B., Seyer, L., Sharpe, T., Silvar, C., Song, J., Studholme,

D. J., Sykes, S., Thines, M., van de Vondervoort, P. J. I., Phuntumart, V., Wawra, S.,

Weide, R., Win, J., Young, C., Zhou, S., Fry, W., Meyers, B. C., van West, P., Ristaino, J.,

Govers, F., Birch, P. R. J., Whisson, S. C., Judelson, H. S., and Nusbaum, C. 2009.

Genome sequence and analysis of the Irish potato famine pathogen *Phytophthora*

infestans. Nature. 461:393–398

Haverkort, A. J., Boonekamp, P. M., Hutten, R., Jacobsen, E., Lotz, L. A. P., Kessel, G. J. T.,

Visser, R. G. F., and van der Vossen, E. A. G. 2008. Societal Costs of Late Blight in

Potato and Prospects of Durable Resistance Through Cisgenic Modification. Potato

Research. 51:47–57

He, J., Ye, W., Choi, D. S., Wu, B., Zhai, Y., Guo, B., Duan, S., Wang, Y., Gan, J., Ma, W., and Ma, J.

2019. Structural analysis of *Phytophthora* suppressor of RNA silencing 2 (PSR2)

reveals a conserved modular fold contributing to virulence. Proceedings of the

National Academy of Sciences. 116:8054–8059

Jiang, R. H. Y., de Bruijn, I., Haas, B. J., Belmonte, R., Löbach, L., Christie, J., van den

Ackerveken, G., Bottin, A., Bulone, V., Díaz-Moreno, S. M., Dumas, B., Fan, L., Gaulin,

E., Govers, F., Grenville-Briggs, L. J., Horner, N. R., Levin, J. Z., Mammella, M., Meijer,

H. J. G., Morris, P., Nusbaum, C., Oome, S., Phillips, A. J., van Rooyen, D., Rzeszutek, E.,

Saraiva, M., Secombes, C. J., Seidl, M. F., Snel, B., Stassen, J. H. M., Sykes, S., Tripathy,

S., van den Berg, H., Vega-Arreguin, J. C., Wawra, S., Young, S. K., Zeng, Q., Dieguez-

Uribeondo, J., Russ, C., Tyler, B. M., and van West, P. 2013. Distinctive expansion of

potential virulence genes in the genome of the oomycete fish pathogen *Saprolegnia*

parasitica. PLOS Genetics. 9:e1003272

Kale, S. D., Gu, B., Capelluto, D. G. S., Dou, D., Feldman, E., Rumore, A., Arredondo, F. D.,

Hanlon, R., Fudal, I., Rouxel, T., Lawrence, C. B., Shan, W., and Tyler, B. M. 2010.

External Lipid PI3P Mediates Entry of Eukaryotic Pathogen Effectors into Plant and

Animal Host Cells. Cell. 142:284–295

King, S. R. F., McLellan, H., Boevink, P. C., Armstrong, M. R., Bukharova, T., Sukarta, O., Win,

J., Kamoun, S., Birch, P. R. J., and Banfield, M. J. 2014. *Phytophthora infestans* RXLR

effector PexRD2 interacts with host MAPKKK ε to suppress plant immune signaling.

Plant Cell. 26:1345–1359

Li, W., and Godzik, A. 2006. Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets of

protein or nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics. 22:1658–1659

McGowan, J., and Fitzpatrick, D. A. 2017. Genomic, Network, and Phylogenetic Analysis of

the Oomycete Effector Arsenal. mSphere. 2

Pavlov, Y. L. 2000. Random Forests. VSP Publishers, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

Pecrix, Y., Buendia, L., Penouilh-Suzette, C., Maréchaux, M., Legrand, L., Bouchez, O., Rengel,

D., Gouzy, J., Cottret, L., Vear, F., and Godiard, L. 2019. Sunflower resistance to

multiple downy mildew pathotypes revealed by recognition of conserved effectors

of the oomycete *Plasmopara halstedii*. Plant J. 97:730–748

Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, Blondel, M.,

Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., Cournapeau, D.,

Brucher, M., Perrot, M., and Duchesnay, E. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J

Mach Learn Res. 2011;12: 2825–2830.

Pelgrom, A. J. E., Eikelhof, J., Elberse, J., Meisrimler, C.-N., Raedts, R., Klein, J., and Van den

Ackerveken, G. 2019. Recognition of lettuce downy mildew effector BLR38 in

Lactuca serriola LS102 requires two unlinked loci. Molecular Plant Pathology.

20:240–253

Pel, M. A., Foster, S. J., Park, T.-H., Rietman, H., van Arkel, G., Jones, J. D. G., Van Eck, H. J.,

Jacobsen, E., Visser, R. G. F., and Van der Vossen, E. A. G. 2009. Mapping and cloning

of late blight resistance genes from *Solanum venturii* using an interspecific candidate

gene approach. Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions. 22:601–615

Peng, K., Radivojac, P., Vucetic, S., Dunker, A. K., and Obradovic, Z. 2006. Length-dependent

prediction of protein intrinsic disorder. BMC Bioinformatics. 7:208

Petersen, T. N., Brunak, S., von Heijne, G., and Nielsen, H. 2011. SignalP 4.0: discriminating

signal peptides from transmembrane regions. Nat. Methods. 8:785–786

Rehmany, A. P., Gordon, A., Rose, L. E., Allen, R. L., Armstrong, M. R., Whisson, S. C., Kamoun,

S., Tyler, B. M., Birch, P. R. J., and Beynon, J. L. 2005. Differential recognition of highly

divergent downy mildew avirulence gene alleles by RPP1 resistance genes from two

Arabidopsis lines. Plant Cell. 17:1839–1850

Rujirawat, T., Patumcharoenpol, P., Kittichotirat, W., and Krajaejun, T. 2019. Oomycete

Gene Table: an online database for comparative genomic analyses of the oomycete

microorganisms. Database. 2019

Senior, A. W., Evans, R., Jumper, J., Kirkpatrick, J., Sifre, L., Green, T., Qin, C., Žídek, A., Nelson,

A. W. R., Bridgland, A., Penedones, H., Petersen, S., Simonyan, K., Crossan, S., Kohli, P.,

Jones, D. T., Silver, D., Kavukcuoglu, K., and Hassabis, D. 2020. Improved protein

structure prediction using potentials from deep learning. Nature. 577:706–710

Seong, K., and Krasileva, K. V. 2021. Computational structural genomics unravels common

folds and predicted functions in the secretome of fungal phytopathogen

Magnaporthe oryzae. bioRxiv doi: 10.1101/2021.01.25.427855

Sharma, R., Xia, X., Cano, L. M., Evangelisti, E., Kemen, E., Judelson, H., Oome, S., Sambles, C.,

van den Hoogen, D. J., Kitner, M., Klein, J., Meijer, H. J. G., Spring, O., Win, J., Zipper, R.,

Bode, H. B., Govers, F., Kamoun, S., Schornack, S., Studholme, D. J., Van den

Ackerveken, G., and Thines, M. 2015. Genome analyses of the sunflower pathogen

Plasmopara halstedii provide insights into effector evolution in downy mildews and

Phytophthora. BMC Genomics. 16:741

Sperschneider, J., Dodds, P. N., Gardiner, D. M., Singh, K. B., and Taylor, J. M. 2018. Improved

prediction of fungal effector proteins from secretomes with EffectorP 2.0. Molecular

Plant Pathology. 19:2094–2110

Sperschneider, J., Gardiner, D. M., Dodds, P. N., Tini, F., Covarelli, L., Singh, K. B., Manners, J.

M., and Taylor, J. M. 2016. EffectorP: predicting fungal effector proteins from

secretomes using machine learning. New Phytol. 210:743–761

Stassen, J. H. M., den Boer, E., Vergeer, P. W. J., Andel, A., Ellendorff, U., Pelgrom, K., Pel, M.,

Schut, J., Zonneveld, O., Jeuken, M. J. W., and Van den Ackerveken, G. 2013. Specific In

Planta Recognition of Two GKLR Proteins of the Downy Mildew *Bremia lactucae*

Revealed in a Large Effector Screen in Lettuce. Molecular Plant-Microbe

Interactions. 26:1259–1270

Urban, M., Cuzick, A., Seager, J., Wood, V., Rutherford, K., Venkatesh, S. Y., De Silva, N.,

Martinez, M. C., Pedro, H., Yates, A. D., Hassani-Pak, K., and Hammond-Kosack, K. E.

2019. PHI-base: the pathogen–host interactions database. Nucleic Acids Research.

Vleeshouwers, V. G. A. A., and Oliver, R. P. 2015. Effectors as Tools in Disease Resistance

Breeding Against Biotrophic, Hemibiotrophic, and Necrotrophic Plant Pathogens.

Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions. 2015:17–27

Wang, Y., Tyler, B. M., and Wang, Y. 2019. Defense and Counterdefense During Plant-

Pathogenic Oomycete Infection. Annu. Rev. Microbiol. 73:667–696

Weisman, C. M., Murray, A. W., and Eddy, S. R. 2020. Many but not all lineage-specific genes

can be explained by homology detection failure. PLOS Biology 18(11):e3000862.

Whisson, S. C., Boevink, P. C., Moleleki, L., Avrova, A. O., Morales, J. G., Gilroy, E. M.,

Armstrong, M. R., Grouffaud, S., van West, P., Chapman, S., Hein, I., Toth, I. K.,

Pritchard, L., and Birch, P. R. J. 2007. A translocation signal for delivery of oomycete

effector proteins into host plant cells. Nature. 450:115–118

Win, J., Krasileva, K. V., Kamoun, S., Shirasu, K., Staskawicz, B. J., and Banfield, M. J. 2012.

Sequence Divergent RXLR Effectors Share a Structural Fold Conserved across Plant

Pathogenic Oomycete Species. PLOS Pathogens. 8:e1002400

Wood, K., Nur, M., Gil, J., Fletcher, K., Lakeman, K., Gothberg, A., Khuu, T., Kopetzky, J.,

Pandya, A., Pel, M., and Michelmore, R. 2020. Effector prediction and

characterization in the oomycete pathogen *Bremia lactucae* reveal host-recognized

WY domain proteins that lack the canonical RXLR motif. PLOS Pathogens 10:

e1009012

Wroblewski T., Caldwell K .S., Piskurewicz U., Cavanaugh K. A., Xu H., Kozik A., Ochoa O.,

McHale L. K., Lahre K., Jelenska J., Castillo J. A., Blumenthal D., Vinatzer B. A.,

Greenberg J. T., and Michelmore R. W. 2009. Comparative large-scale analysis of

interactions between several crop species and the effector repertoires from multiple

pathovars of *Pseudomonas* and *Ralstonia*. Plant Physiology. 150: 1733–49.

doi:10.1104/pp.109.140251

Yang, J., Anishchenko, I., Park, H., Peng, Z., Ovchinnikov, S., and Baker, D. 2020. Improved

protein structure prediction using predicted interresidue orientations. Proceedings

of the National Academy of Sciences. 117:1496–1503

Zheng, X., McLellan, H., Fraiture, M., Liu, X., Boevink, P. C., Gilroy, E. M., Chen, Y., Kandel, K.,

Sessa, G., Birch, P. R. J., and Brunner, F. 2014. Functionally Redundant RXLR

Effectors from *Phytophthora infestans* Act at Different Steps to Suppress Early flg22-

Triggered Immunity. PLOS Pathogens. 10:e1004057

Zhou, K., Huang, B., Zou, M., Lu, D., He, S., and Wang, G. 2015. Data in support of genome-

wide identification of lineage-specific genes within *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Data in

Brief. 4:595–601