Proteomic analysis revealed that the oomyceticide phosphite exhibits multi-modal action in an oomycete pathosystem.

Christina E. Andronis*[12], Silke Jacques[1], Francisco J. Lopez-Ruiz[1], Richard Lipscombe[2] and Kar-Chun Tan[1*]

[*]Corresponding authors

Email: Christina.Andronis@postgrad.curtin.edu.au (ORCID: 0000-0003-4173-1232) and

Kar-Chun.Tan@curtin.edu.au (ORCID: 0000-0001-6094-823X).

Author affiliations

[1]Centre for Crop and Disease Management, Curtin University, Bentley, WA, Australia

[2]Proteomics International, Nedlands, WA, Australia

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Phytopathogenic oomycetes constitute some of the most devastating plant pathogens that cause significant crop and horticultural loss. *Phytophthora cinnamomi* is a phytopathogenic oomycete that causes dieback disease in native vegetation and a variety of crops. This pathogen can survive through harsh environmental conditions which gives it an advantage over its susceptible hosts. The only implemented chemical used to control *P. cinnamomi* is the oomyceticide phosphite. Despite its widespread use, the mode of action of phosphite is not well understood and it is unclear whether it works directly on the pathogen or through the host. Additionally, resistance to phosphite is emerging in *P. cinnamomi* isolates and other oomycete phytopathogens.

RESULTS: The mode of action of phosphite on the pathogen and through a model host was investigated using label-free quantitative proteomics. *In vitro* treatment of *P. cinnamomi* with phosphite hinders growth by interfering with metabolism, signalling and gene expression, traits that are not observed in the tolerant isolate. When the model host *L. angustifolius* was treated with phosphite, enrichment of proteins that are associated with photosynthesis, carbon fixation and lipid metabolism in the host was observed. An increase in the production of a range of defence-related proteins was observed.

CONCLUSION: We hypothesise direct and indirect models of the multi-modal action of phosphite that directly targets the pathogen as well as alters plant metabolism and immune response.

Keywords

Phytophthora cinnamomi, oomycete, phosphite, resistance, mode of action, oomyceticide

1 INTRODUCTION

Phytopathogenic oomycetes are significant plant pathogens in natural ecosystems and agriculture. These pathogens cause substantial environmental and economic losses from plant death and management costs. *Phytophthora cinnamomi* is an oomycete that causes dieback disease in native vegetation and several crops including avocado, macadamia, pineapple, and a variety of stone fruits. This necrotic pathogen attacks the roots of susceptible hosts and causes plant death via saprophytic growth [1]. The dynamic lifecycle of this organism drives its resilience and success as a plant pathogen [2]. Similarly to other *Phytophthora spp,* its spores enable it to survive through harsh environmental conditions and thrive once conditions become more favourable. This gives the pathogen an advantage over its susceptible hosts. Characteristically, oomycetes produce an assortment of virulence molecules throughout their life cycles which facilitate the infection process [3,4].

Phosphite is the only commercially available chemical used to control *P. cinnamomi* [5]. Inorganic phosphites are reduced forms of phosphate that are commonly used as oomyceticides to manage diseases caused by the *Phytophthora spp.* This includes *P. cinnamomi, P. nicotianae, P. palmivora, P. capsici* and *P. infestans,* along with other oomycetes such as downy mildews such as *Pseudoperonospora humuli* and *Bremia lactucae* [6–10]. It is applied on native trees and horticultural crops by foliar spray or direct injection into the trunk where it circulates throughout the plant system [11]. Phosphite cannot eradicate *P. cinnamomi* in the field but it can be used to reduce the severity and spread of the disease. It is also used as a preventative measure in uninfected areas [11–13]. The only other strategies implemented to combat dieback disease are the use of tolerant root stocks if they are available (such as commercially available avocado root stocks) and hygiene measures applied to vehicles and personnel, which aim to minimise spread [14–17]. *In vitro* fungicide screening of *P. cinnamomi* has shown growth inhibitory effects of chemical alternatives such as metalaxyl, fosetyl-A1, benzethonium chloride and copper salts however, these remain to be tested in the field [18,19]. As such, phosphite remains the only option for the chemical control of *P. cinnamomi.*

Despite its widespread use in dieback management, the mode of action of phosphite is not well understood. It is suggested that it acts both directly on the pathogen and indirectly through the plant host by priming the plant immune system [7,8,20–22]. It has been reported that mycelial growth and sporulation are inhibited by phosphite *in vitro* [20,21]. *In planta*, *t*he increase in transcription of defence-related genes associated with the salicylic and jasmonic acid pathways in *Arabidopsis thaliana* and potato crops have been demonstrated post-treatment with phosphite [7,8,22]. The effect of phosphite on potato leaves indicates an increase in defence responses and altered metabolism, glycolysis, and carbon fixation [22]. These findings have led to the hypothesis that phosphite primes the immune system

63 of plants for potential infection. Despite these observations, the mode of action of phosphite on the
64 pathogen has not been defined, nor have the mechanisms of phosphite primed plant defence.

65 Tolerance of *P. cinnamomi* to phosphite is widespread with most reports originating from horticultural
66 plantations and variability in phosphite sensitivity has been demonstrated *in vitro* and *in planta* [20,23].
67 Tolerance to phosphite has also been reported in *P. nicotianae, P. capsici, Bremia lactucae* and
68 *Pseudoperonospora humuli* [9,10,24–26]. This is a suspected result of prolonged use of phosphite in
69 agriculture and poses a significant threat to natural ecosystems and the agricultural industry. These
70 tolerant isolates are driving the pressure for improved management strategies.

71 To elucidate the mode of action of phosphite on the pathogen and the host, we used a label-free
72 quantitative proteomic approach to conduct a study encompassing the effects of phosphite on a
73 sensitive and a tolerant isolate of *P. cinnamomi*, as well as investigating the effects of phosphite on the
74 physiology in a model plant system that is susceptible to dieback. *P. cinnamomi* is used as model to
75 understand phosphite tolerance as it is treated with phosphite in the field and tolerant isolates have
76 emerged. By using a shotgun approach, we can obtain a snapshot of the biochemical processes that are
77 altered as a result of treatment with phosphite and determine whether phosphite exhibits a direct
78 and/or indirect mode of action.

79 2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

80 2.1 *In vitro* treatment of *P. cinnamomi* with phosphite

81 Stocks of two *P. cinnamomi* isolates, MU94-48 and CPSM366 were obtained from the Centre of
82 Phytophthora Science and Management, Perth, Australia. MU94-48 was collected from susceptible
83 *Eucalyptus marginata* in Willowdale, Western Australia with no history of phosphite use and CPSM366
84 was collected from a Western Australian avocado orchard with a history of extensive phosphite use and
85 reduced efficacy of protection on dieback was observed [2327]. To determine the level of phosphite
86 sensitivity of both isolates, they were grown on Ribeiro's media amended with phosphite at
87 concentrations ranging from 0.0 µg mL^{-1} to 1000 µg mL^{-1} [28]. Mycelial cultures were incubated at room
88 temperature in the dark. After 14 days of growth, the mycelial radial growth was measured to
89 determine the growth inhibition. The EC_{50} and minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for both isolates
90 were calculated as previously described [29]. For proteomics analysis, growth inhibition of 0% and 20%
91 were used as untreated and sub-lethal doses of phosphite to cause a physiological effect and provide
92 enough biomass for experimentation. Mycelia were harvested for protein extraction by scraping from
93 the surface of the plate, snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and freeze-dried. Lyophilised mycelia were

ground using metal beads and a tissue mill (Retsch, Haan, Germany) at a frequency of 3 Hz/s for three minutes.

2.2 *In planta* treatment of *Lupinus angustifolius* and inoculation with *P. cinnamomi*

The narrow leaf lupin *Lupinus angustifolius* (cv. 'Tanjil') seeds were surface sterilised with 5% sodium hypochlorite, washed twice with 70% ethanol and washed three times with water. Seeds were placed in clear containers lined with moist Whatman paper (Cytiva, Massachusetts, USA) and left to germinate for 3 days at room temperature under natural light [30].

Three-day-old germinated seedlings were sprayed with a 0.5% pH 7 solution of phosphite (Sigma, St Louis, USA) using a hand-triggered spray bottle and untreated seedlings were sprayed with water [31–33]. Seedlings were incubated on a light shelf at room temperature with a 12-hour photoperiod and seedlings were sprayed daily with water [30]. Lupin root tips were harvested one day post first treatment. 1.5 cm of root tips were excised and immediately snap frozen, freeze dry, and ground to a fine powder using metal beads and a tissue mill (Retsch, Haan, Germany) at a frequency of 3 Hz/s for three minutes. Three biological replicates (of which three root tips were collected) were used for each sample.

To test the effect of phosphite on the colonisation ability of *P. cinnamomi,* 24 hours post- spraying, the infected seedlings were inoculated with 5 mm mycelial discs of each isolate. Containers were placed back on the light shelf for three days and lesion scores from zero to three were recorded.

2.3 Protein extraction and digestion

300 µl of extraction buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 0.25% SDS, 50 mM Na_2PO_4, 1 mM Na_2F, 50 µM Na_3VO_4, 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride and a protease inhibitor cocktail) was added to the ground mycelia and the samples were kept on ice for 30 minutes with regular gentle mixing. The crude extract was centrifuged at 20,000 g at 4 °C for 30 minutes, the solubilised proteins were decanted, and proteins were precipitated using six volumes of ice-cold acetone and incubated at -20 °C overnight [34].

300 µl of extraction buffer (125 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.0, 7 % SDS, 0.5 % PVP-40) was added to the whole ground plant material and the samples were kept on ice for 30 minutes with regular gentle mixing. The crude extract was centrifuged at 20,000 g at 4°C for 30 minutes. Proteins were purified by adding 800 µL of ice-cold methanol and 200 µL of ice-cold chloroform to 200 µL of the solubilised protein samples. Samples were vortexed, and 500 µL of water was added and centrifuged for 5 minutes at 15000g a 4 °C. The aqueous phase was removed and 500 µL of methanol was added. Samples were inverted and the supernatant was discarded. 1 mL of ice-cold acetone was added and the samples were incubated at -20 °C overnight [35].

125 The mycelial and root protein pellets were washed twice with ice-cold acetone and reconstituted in
126 200 µl of 0.5 M triethylammonium bicarbonate (pH 8.5) before reduction and alkylation with 20 µL of
127 50 mM tris(2-carboxyethyl)phosphine (Thermo Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) and 10 µL 200 mM
128 methyl methanethiosulfonate. Samples were tryptically digested overnight at 37 °C at a ratio of 1:10,
129 subsequently desalted on a Strata-X 33 um polymeric reverse phase column (Phenomenex, Torrance,
130 CA, USA) and dried in a vacuum centrifuge [36].

131 ## 2.4 Mass spectrometry and data analysis

132 1 µg of each sample was loaded on columns and peptides were resolved with a gradient of 10-40%
133 acetonitrile (0.1% formic acid) at 300 nL/min over 90 minutes and eluted through a nanospray interface
134 into a Q-Exactive Orbitrap mass spectrometer (Thermofisher Scientific). Qualitative and label-free
135 quantification was performed using Proteome Discoverer 2.3 [37]. Mass spectra from the *in vitro* assay
136 were matched to the *P. cinnamomi* MU94-48 genome consisting of 26,151 protein-coding sequences
137 [38]. The proteomes between phosphite-treated MU94-48 and CPSM366 were compared to
138 simultaneously gain insight into the effects of phosphite on sensitive *P. cinnamomi* and understand the
139 differences between phosphite sensitivity and tolerance. The mass spectra obtained from the *in planta*
140 assay were matched to the *L. angustifolius* genome consisting of 39,339 protein-coding sequences [39].
141 For protein identification, 1 or more 95% confidence peptides were used. For label-free quantification,
142 proteins with 2 or more 95% confidence peptides were used and for significant differential abundance
143 a p-value threshold of <0.05 was used. Ratios and p values for quantitative analysis were generated
144 using the default t-test hypothesis testing over biological replicates [37].

145 To elucidate the functions of the detected proteins and understand the biochemical differentiation
146 between samples, Gene Ontology (GO), KEGG and Interpro were used [40–42]. For qualitative analysis, a
147 Fisher's exact test was performed on assigned GOs to indicate GO enrichment within samples compared
148 to assigned ontologies of the whole genome annotation in each respective organismp.

149 # 3 RESULTS

150 ## 3.1 Growth inhibition of *P. cinnamomi* isolates by phosphite

151 To determine the sensitivity of *P. cinnamomi* isolates MU94-48 and CPSM366 to phosphite, both
152 isolates were grown on phosphite-supplemented media, and sensitivity was determined based on the
153 radial growth of hyphal colonies. Both isolates exhibited a similar radial growth rate in the absence of
154 phosphite (Figure 1). The MIC for the sensitive and tolerant isolates were 500 µg/ mL and >1000 µg/
155 mL respectively. At concentrations of 1000 µg/ mL the growth of CPSM366 was reduced but not

156 completely inhibited. The EC_{50} for the MU94-48 and CPSM366 were 10.8 µg/ mL and 415.6 µg/ mL
157 respectively.

158 For proteomic analyses, 0.0 µg/ mL and 2.5 µg/ mL were used as these represent an untreated and sub-
159 lethal dose of phosphite resulting in reduced growth of 20% and 4% for MU94-48 and CPSM366,
160 respectively.



161

162 **Figure 1.** *In vitro* growth inhibition of MU94-48 and a CPSM366 in response to phosphite treatment
163 indicating the MIC and EC_{50} for each isolate. Images of mycelial growth on the phosphite supplemented
164 media are also displayed.

165 **3.2 Phosphite induced significant alterations in the proteome of MU94-48 and CPSM366.**

166 To determine the biochemical differences between MU94-48 and CPSM366 treated with phosphite,
167 the soluble intracellular proteome of each isolate was compared by qualitative and quantitative
168 proteomic analyses. 1393 proteins were unique to MU94-48, 280 were unique to the CPSM366 and
169 1572 were common between the two isolates (Figure 2). Of the common proteins, 171 were higher in
170 abundance in MU94-48 compared to CPSM699 and 90 were lower in abundance. 1311 were not
171 differentially abundant. Overall, there was a significantly higher number of proteins identified in MU94-
172 48, with 42.9% only observed in this isolate.



173

174 **Figure 2.** Protein identification in phosphite treated MU94-48 and CPSM366. **a)** Indicating the total
175 number of unique and common proteins between the sensitive and tolerant isolates. **b)** Differential
176 abundance of the common proteins by label-free quantification shows the increased and decreased

177 abundance of proteins in phosphite-treated MU94-48 compared to phosphite-treated CPSM366. The
178 number of proteins identified in all samples obtained for the *in vitro* assay are shown in Supplementary
179 material 1.

180 **3.3 Phosphite induces a stress response in MU94-48.**

181 GO enrichment analysis and differential protein abundance between the MU94-48 and CPSM366 were
182 used to elucidate biochemical changes from phosphite treatment (Figure 3). In MU94-48, an
183 enrichment of putative stress response proteins was observed including glutathione S- transferases
184 (GST), thioredoxins, peptidases, proteasomes and proteolytic enzymes [43]. These may be indicators of
185 programmed cell death or attempts of the pathogen to stay alive. Putative stress proteins were not
186 observed in CPSM366.

187 **3.4 An increase in signalling in response to phosphite treatment**

188 Enrichment of GOs that are associated with protein signalling including phosphorylation (eg. ATPases,
189 GTPases, PKs), and ubiquitination were observed [44] (Figure 3). GOs that are associated with positive
190 regulation of DNA damage were enriched in addition to tRNA binding, DNA binding, tRNA methylation
191 and mRNA splicing and processing. Inositol signalling and phosphorylation were significantly lower in
192 abundance in MU94-48 coinciding with the enrichment of phosphatidylinositol binding in CPSM366.
193 Positive regulation of TORC1 signalling and Wnt transmembrane signalling GOs were enriched. This
194 indicates stress response signalling, increase in gene expression to compensate for the loss of biological
195 material, and signalling to coordinate cellular processes during stress conditions [45,46].

196 **3.5 More transporters in MU94-48 than CPSM366 when treated with phopshite.**

197 A higher diversity of transporters was found in MU94-48, including transmembrane transporters, and
198 intracellular transporters, along with facilitators of transport such as COPI vesicle coatomer proteins,
199 COP9 signalosome, armadillo-like proteins and clathrin proteins (Figure 3). MU94-48 may be using
200 transporters to pump out phosphite or toxic biproducts of phopshite metabolism as a means to
201 facilitate the high level of signalling.

202 **3.6 Phosphite alters mitochondrial respiration in MU94-48.**

203 A significantly lower abundance of mitochondrial-associated ontologies were observed in MU94-48 as
204 indicated by mitochondrial respiratory chain, cytochrome C oxidase, mitochondrial electron transport
205 and mitochondrial ribosomal subunit GOs. This could be a result of oxidative stress in MU94-48 or may
206 suggest that similarly to other fungicides, phosphite targets mitochondrial respiration [47,48]. The KEGG
207 ontologies between phosphite-treated MU94-48 and CPSM366 did not show changes in disctinct

208 metabolic pathway clusters but rather showed general metabolic disorder (Supplementary material 2).
209 However, the disordered KEGG orthologues in MU94-48 suggest that phosphite is exerting a cytotoxic
210 effect on the sensitive isolate.

211 We then examined the proteome of MU94-48 and CPSM66 compared to their respective untreated
212 controls to ensure that these observations were not artifacts of the isolates. It was observed that the
213 proteome profile of untreated and phosphite-treated MU94-48 and CPSM366 are comparable to those
214 found between MU94-48 (Supplementary material 3). This includes the enrichment in putative stress
215 proteins such as oxidoreductase activity, intracellular signalling and protein activation, and gene
216 expression-related ontologies. Additionally, a significant reduction in inositol biosynthesis and
217 signalling, mitochondrial electron transport-related GOs were observed, reflecting the observations
218 between the two phosphite-treated isolates. Similarly, we compared the proteome of untreated and
219 phosphite-treated CPSM366 and found less biochemical responses than when MU94-48 was compared
220 to CPSM366. The full GOs, KEGG orthologues and gene functions for all *in vitro* qualitative and
221 quantitative comparisons are shown in Supplementary Material 4.


a)
CPSM366
(Resistant)
Protein binding
Protein phosphorylation
Hydrolase activity
Phosphatidylinositol binding
Translation
Microtubule based movement
Transmembrane transporter
mRNA splicing
ATPase activity
P value
Enriched
b)
MU94-48
(Sensitive)
Transmembrane transport
Organic substance metabolic process
Intracellular protein transport
CPOI vesicle coat
Protein transport
Oxidoreductase activity
tRNA binding
DNA binding
tRNA methylation
Integral component of membrane
Nucleocytoplasmic transport
Protein modification
Negative regulation of gluconeogenesis
TOR signalling
Nuclear transport
Positive regulation of DNA damage response
Transmembrane transporter activity
Enriched
c)
NAD(P)H dehydrogenase activity
Carbohydrate metabolic process
Ubiquitin protein ligase activity
Nucleotidyltransferase activity
ATPase activity
Positive regulation of TORC1 signalling
CCR4-NOT complex
Ribosome biogenesis
Calcium ion binding
Structural constituant of nuclear pore
GTPase activity
ATP binding
Metalloexopeptidase activity
Biosynthetic process
COP9 signalosome
Positive regulation of canonical Wnt signaling
Spliceosomal snRNP assembly
Protein phosphorylation
Proteolysis
Protein deubiquitination
Carbohydrate binding
mRNA splicing
Protein import into nucleus
mRNA processing
ATP-dependent microtubule motor activity
Protein kinase activity
Cellular metabolic process
Catalytic activity
Membrane coat
Glutathione metabolic process
FMN binding
Protein binding
Count
1
10
20
50
Common GOs
Enriched in MU94-48
Enriched in CPSM366


d)
Differential abundance
Glycolytic process
Inositol mediated signalling and phosphorylation
Mitochondrial respiratory chain
Cytochrome C oxidase
Mitochondiral inner membrane
Protein binding
Mitochondrial electron transport
Structural constituent of ribosome
Translation
Hydrolase activity
Catalytic activity
Mitochondrial large ribosomal subunit
P value
Log 10 ratio
(MU94-48/CPSM366)

222

223 **Figure 3.** GO enrichment and differential abundance between MU94-48 and CPSM366 treated with
224 phosphite. **a)** and **b)** show GO enrichment in the phosphite treated tolerant and sensitive isolates
225 respectively, where the P value is generated by GO enrichment and each point is separated on a log10
226 scale generated by each GO count to the total GO count for the sample set. **d)** The enriched gene
227 ontologies in the sensitive isolate at $P < 0.001$. **d)** Differential abundance of proteins between the
228 sensitive and tolerant isolate. Ratios are generated by the peptide signal of each protein in MU94-48
229 compared to CPSM366. P values depict the significance of the differential abundance.

230 3.7 Differential abundance of proteins between untreated and phosphite treated *Lupinus angustifolius*.

231 We hypothesise that phosphite in the plant physiology by facilitating plant immunity to prevent
232 infection by phytopathogens such as *P. cinnamomi.* To investigate this, the proteome of *L. angustifolius*
233 treated with and without phosphite were compared. 498 proteins were unique in the untreated Lupin
234 sample and 1725 were unique in the phosphite-treated Lupin (Figure 4). 245 proteins were common
235 between the untreated and treated lupin samples of which 46 were significantly higher in abundance
236 when phosphite was applied and 4 were significantly lower.



237

238 **Figure 4**. Protein identification between untreated and phosphite treated lupins. **a)** Indicating the total
239 number of unique and common proteins between the untreated and phosphite-treated lupin. **b)**
240 Differential abundance of the common proteins by label-free quantification shows the increased and
241 decreased abundance of proteins in phosphite-treated lupin compared to the untreated control. The
242 number of proteins identified in all samples obtained for the *in planta* assay are shown in
243 Supplementary material 1.

244

245 **3.8 Phosphite increased the abundance of photosynthetic and carbon fixation proteins in *L.***
246 ***angustifolius*.**

247 GO enrichment and KEGG pathway enrichment analyses were used to examine biochemical effects in
248 lupin treated with phosphite, (Figure 5 and 6). It was observed that GOs containing proteins that are
249 associated with photosynthesis and starch metabolism were significantly enriched in phosphite-treated
250 lupins. Photosynthesis, photosystem units, geranylgeranyl reductase, chlorophyll biosynthesis, carbon
251 fixation and TCA cycle were all enriched in phosphite-treated lupins. Clustering of KEGG ontologies only
252 found in the phosphite-treated lupin mapped to photorespiration, photosynthesis, reductive pentose
253 phosphate cycle, isoprenoid biosynthesis and carbon fixation (Figure 6). As lupin seedlings were grown
254 under artificial light with roots exposed leading to the development of photosynthetic-capable tissues,
255 these were excised as part of the excised root tip for protein extraction (Figure 7).

256 Proteins associated with glucose, starch, and lipid metabolism GOs were enriched in the phosphite-
257 treated lupin along with related KEGGs such as starch and sucrose metabolism, beta-oxidation and fatty
258 elongation and lactosylceramide. Gluconeogenesis was reduced in abundance which supports the
259 utilisation of carbohydrates and sugars as an energy source to fuel the heightened metabolism.
260 Similarly, KEGG orthologues that are associated with lipid metabolism were also observed as indicated
261 by the clustering of identified KEGG pathways only found in the phosphite-treated lupin (Figure 6).
262 Phosphite treatment results in increased abundance of proteins that are associated with
263 photosynthesis, carbon metabolism and energy production in lupin.

264


a) - Phosphite
b) + Phosphite
c)
Amino acid biosynthesis
Glycolytic process
Protein binding
Gluconeogenesis
Integral component of membrane
Vesicle mediated transport
Redox homeostasis
Nucleic acid binding
De novo pyrimidine nucleobase biosynthesis
ARF signal transduction
Nucleosome assembly
P value
Enriched
Oxidoreductase activity
Lipid binding
Nitrogen compound metabolism
Signalling receptor activity
Signal peptidase complex
Dephosphorylation
Abscisic acid signalling
Proteolysis
Photosystem I
Actin filament depolymerisation
Microtubule cytoskeleton organisation
Monoxygenase activity
Enriched
Photosystem I reaction centre
Cellular oxidant detoxification
Hydrolase activity
Photosystem II repair
Chlorophyll biosynthetic process
Cellular response to oxidative stress
Response to oxidative stress
Photosystem II stabilisation
Response to heat
RNA processing
Nicotinamidase activity
Photosystem II oxygen evolving process
Regulation of pH
Geranylgeranyl reductase activity
Superoxide metabolic process
Carbon fixation
Glutathione dehydrogenase activity
Chloroplast
Proteolysis
Glutathione metabolic process
Photosynthesis
Response to light stimulus
Nucleocytoplasmic transport
Starch metabolic process
Photosystem II
Isoprenoid biosynthetic process
Peroxidase activity
Photosystem II assembly
HSP binding protein
Glucose metabolic process
Protein phosphorylation
Tricarboxylic acid
DNA topological change
Ribosome
Translation
Count
1
25
50
75
> 100
Common GOs
Enriched in +Phi
Enriched in -Phi


d) Differential abundance
Lipid transport/ binding
Translation
Protein binding
Protein disulfide isomerase activity
Pigment
Defence response
Pectin metabolism
Phosphotransferase activity
Abscisic acid signalling
Ribosome biogenesis
Ribonueleoprotein complex
Nucleic acid binding
Fatty acid metabolism
Photosystem II
Photosystem II oxygen evolving complex
Gluconeogenesis
Glycolytic process
Photosynthesis
Mitochondrial matrix
Nucleic acid binding
Abscisic acid signalling
Defence response
P value
Log 10 ratio
(+Phi/-Phi)

265

266 **Figure 5.** GO enrichment and differential abundance between untreated and phosphite-treated lupin.
267 **a)** and **b)** show GO enrichment in the untreated and phosphite-treated lupin respectively, where the P
268 value is generated by GO enrichment and each point is separated on a log10 scale generated by each
269 GO count to the total GO count for the sample set. **c)** The enriched gene ontologies in the phosphite-
270 treated lupin at $P < 0.001$. **d)** differential abundance of proteins between the untreated and treated
271 lupin. Ratios are generated by the peptide signal of treated lupin compared to the untreated control. P
272 values depict the significance of the differential abundance.

273 **3.9 Transcriptional activities in phosphite-treated *L. angustifolius* are enhanced.**

274 As a complement to the abundance of photosynthetic and metabolic gene ontologies, gene expression
275 was also overrepresented. Translation, ribosomal proteins, DNA topological change, and RNA
276 processing were all enriched in the phosphite treatment (Figure 5). This is also shown by the clustering
277 of KEGG pathways in the phosphite-treated lupin including pyrimidine biosynthesis and keratan sulfate
278 degradation (Figure 6). Hence, an increase in gene expression and biosynthesis accompanies massive
279 physiological and metabolic changes.

280 **3.10 Phosphite triggers the accumulation of defence-related proteins in lupin**

281 Phosphite has previously been reported to increase the production of defence-related molecules in
282 plants, particularly salicylic and jasmonic acid [7,8,49]. An enrichment of defence-related GOs was observed
283 in the phosphite-treated lupin. These included proteolysis, oxidoreductase activity, hydrolases, cellular
284 oxidant detoxification and response to oxidative stress (Figure 5). Secretory peroxidases, superoxide
285 metabolism, abscisic acid signalling, and defence response GOs encompassing genes such as steroid
286 chaperones, programmed cell death and apoptosis were also enriched. Several secondary metabolites
287 were enriched including nicotinamidase and isochorismatase were also found only in the phosphite-
288 treated lupin.

289 Precursors to the salicylic acid (SA) pathway including isochorismatase and actin depolymerisation GOs
290 were enriched in the phosphite-treated lupin. KEGG analysis revealed components associated with the
291 jasmonic acid (JA) pathway were only found in the phosphite-treated lupin. This shows that more
292 defence-related proteins including secondary metabolites were enriched and higher in abundance in
293 the phosphite-treated lupin.

294

295



Figure 6. A representative set of the KEGG pathways enriched in the phosphite-treated lupin. Each dot represents a KEGG entry, and each line represents individual KEGG ontology identifiers. Pathway sets from overrepresented modules are labelled.

3.11 The effect of phosphite on MU94-48 and CPSM366 isolates during host infection.

To test the effect of phosphite during host infection, *L. angustifolius* was treated with phosphite and subsequently inoculated with the sensitive or tolerant isolate of *P. cinnamomi* (Figure 7). Untreated lupin infected with MU94-48 and CPSM366 developed comparable lesions. When phosphite-treated *L. angustifolius* was infected with MU94-38 no lesion was observed showing sensitivity to phosphite *in planta.* When inoculated with CPSM366, there was no reduction in lesion score compared to the untreated lupin.



Figure 7. Lesion scores of lupin roots when treated with phosphite and infected with the two isolates of *P. cinnamomi*. Lesion scores were taken on day 3.

4 DISCUSSION

The mode of action of phosphite in *Pythophthora* pathosystems is a central question in the development of future management strategies. As resistance to the only effective chemical for the control of *P. cinnamomi* and other ooomycetes emerges, the pressure to find resistance genes or alternative management strategies mounts. An understanding of the mode of action of phosphite could aid in the development of better oomyceticides, which in turn would contribute to improving existing management strategies. Previous literature has suggested both direct and indirect mechanisms of phosphite on the pathogen and its host plants however the biochemical mechanisms in which these occur have not been defined. Our study aims to deconvolute the biochemistry of this system and gain a clearer insight into the pathways altered by phosphite. *L. angustifolius* (lupin) is used as a model as it is susceptible to *P. cinnamomi* infection, it has a published genome sequence required for proteomics work, and it grows rapidly compared to native and horticultural *P. cinnamomi* hosts [39,50].

The *in vitro* growth assay demonstrates that phosphite has a direct inhibitory effect on mycelial growth in *P. cinnamomi*. The EC_{50} of previously reported phosphite-sensitive *P. cinnamomi* isolates ranges between 4 µg mL^{-1} and 25 µg mL^{-1} [20,51]. The EC_{50} MU94-48 falls within this range and can be considered highly sensitive to phosphite. Reported tolerant isolates of *P. cinnamomi* have EC_{50} concentrations up to 150 µg mL^{-1} and other species of *Phytophthora* have EC_{50} values up to 350 µg mL^{-1} , of which CMSP366 exceeds [20,51–53]. *P. citrophthor* and *P. syringae* isolates screened for sensitivity to phosphite

328 were considered sensitive when their EC_{50} values were below 25 µg mL^{-1}), whereas *P. nicotianae*
329 isolates with EC_{50} values above 75 µg mL^{-1} were considered moderately resistant or resistant [24].
330 CPSM366 is therefore considered as highly resistant to phosphite, highlighting the need for
331 understanding its biochemistry and the development of alternative management strategies.

332 A proteomic approach was taken to understand how phosphite interacts with the two *P. cinnamomi*
333 isolates MU94-48 and CPSM366 and causes growth reduction. The data obtained from this work was
334 used to build a model suggesting the possible mechanisms in which phosphite directly affects the
335 pathogen (Figure 8). In the presence of phosphite, an abundance of putative stress proteins is observed
336 in the sensitive isolate (Figure 8a). The pathogen is trying to find ways to cope with the influx of
337 phosphite by expressing GSTs and thioredoxins [54]. Hydrolase, proteolysis and peptidase proteins could
338 also be produced by the pathogen in this case for nutrient recycling, detoxification of xenobiotics, or
339 could be products of cell death caused by phosphite [43,55]. Putative stress response proteins were only
340 observed in MU94-48 indicating that CPSM366 does not undergo abiotic stress when treated with
341 phosphite.

342 Signalling molecules related to stress response were also induced along with the disruption of the
343 regulation of cellular processes caused by the exposure of MU94-48 to phosphite (Figure 8b). Several
344 core regulators of cell growth, metabolism and signalling were altered as a result of phosphite
345 treatment. For example, TORCI signalling was enriched in MU94-48, which is involved in aspects of cell
346 growth and metabolism [46]. This indicates that the pathogen attempts to cope with disrupted cell growth
347 and metabolism caused by phosphite. Positive response to regulation of DNA damage and increase in
348 gene expression-related ontologies shows that phosphite could cause DNA damage and subsequent
349 increase in gene expression to compensate for the loss of DNA, proteins and cell material through
350 biosynthesis (Figure 8d) [56]. Canonical Wnt proteins are core regulators of development, another
351 biochemical pathway that is altered by phosphite. Inositol signalling and phosphorylation, which play
352 important roles in aspects of cell growth, structure and signalling, were significantly lower in abundance
353 in MU94-48 (Figure 8e). These mechanisms of coping with extensive damage do not seem to be
354 effective enough to protect the sensitive isolate from damage by phosphite.

355 Greater diversity of membrane transporters were observed in the proteome of MU94-48 than in
356 CPSM366 (Figure 8c). These transporters include ABC and MSF-type, which have been described to
357 participate in the removal of xenobiotics from the cell [57,58]. Additionally, facilitators of intracellular
358 transport were also enriched in MU94-48 suggesting that, unlike CPSM366, MU94-48 attempts to
359 remove the toxic xenobiotic.

Compared to the tolerant isolate CPSM366, several constituents of the mitochondrial respiratory pathway were reduced in abundance in the sensitive isolate (Figure 8f). In fungal pathogens, programmed cell death can be triggered by mitochondrial-initiated signalling that can be activated by cell damage, exposure to toxic xenobiotics and oxidative stress [59]. During these stress conditions, reactive oxygen species can disrupt components of the mitochondrial respiration chain causing subsequent cell death [60–62]. As this is a core pathway for cellular function, mitochondrial respiration is commonly used as a target for chemical control of fungal phytopathogens by single-site fungicides [48,63]. For example, strobilurins are a broad-spectrum class of fungicide applied to control fungal crop diseases. Strobilurin binds cytochrome b complex III, inhibiting mitochondrial respiration [64]. Similarly, azoxystrobin blocks electron transport in mitochondrial respiration by blocking electron transport [64,65,66]. Evidence presented here might suggest a broader inhibitory activity in the case of phosphite as it seems to be affectiving the pathogen's metabolism at multiple levels. Many fungicides have multi-site modes of action, where several biochemical processes are disrupted such as chlorothalonil, folpet, thiram, sulphur and copper [67,68].

The metabolic, signalling, regulatory and stress responses were not observed in CPSM366. If phosphite acts as a multi-site oomyceticide, CPSM366 has likely developed physiological adaptation to tolerate phosphite or alteration in target sites [69,70].



Figure 8- A proposed model on the direct effect of phosphite on *P. cinnamomi* MU94-48 from the combination of qualitative and quantitative comparisons between MU94-48 and CPSM366. Black arrows indicate a possible cascading effect of core biochemical pathways that are disrupted as a result

381 of phosphite treatment. The size of bubbles represents enrichment relative to each other for
382 visualisation.

383 It has been suggested that phosphite alters the plant system to better cope with potential attacks from
384 oomycete pathogens by priming the plant immune system [7,8]. In addition, phosphite has been reported
385 to act as a biostimulant in plants [71]. A proteomic approach was used to obtain a detailed biochemical
386 snapshot of the proteins differentially abundant in phosphite-treated *L. angustifolius.* The proteomic
387 data obtained from the *in planta* assay was used to generate a model that describes how phosphite
388 alters plant metabolism and induces an increase in defence-related proteins (Figure 9).

389 The biochemical differentiation between phosphite treated and untreated *L. angustifolius* suggests an
390 increase in metabolic activity. Constituents of the photosynthetic process, carbon fixation and citric
391 acid cycle suggest that phosphite is driving metabolism in plants (Figure 9a). In addition, an increase in
392 lipid and carbohydrate metabolism was observed, indicating that stored carbohydrates can be
393 metabolised for energy generation (Figure 9b). The reductive pentose phosphate cycle was observed
394 in the KEGG ontologies of the phosphite-treated lupin and generates NADPH that feeds back into
395 glycolysis [72]. Gluconeogenesis is significantly reduced in the phosphite-treated lupin highlighting that
396 sugars are utilised for energy production in this state, not stored. This is reinforced by enrichment in
397 gene expression to keep up with the metabolism and to cope with the increase in photosynthesis
398 through the process of biosynthesis (Figure 9c).

399 An increased metabolism has been observed in other phosphite-treated plants compared to untreated
400 controls along with its biostimulant effect [22,71,73,74]. The application of phosphite improves yield,
401 biomass, fruiting and growth, with a field trial applying phosphite in avocado plantations showing a
402 significant increase in fruit production [75,76]. In potato, phosphite application resulted in reduced
403 seedling emergence time, increased leaf size and biomass [77]. This 'greening effect' has been
404 demonstrated amongst other fungicides in agriculture, where yield, biomass, leaf surface area, and
405 protein content are increased as a result of fungicide application [78–80]. The response observed in the
406 phosphite-treated lupin seedlings is similar to the greening effect, where phosphite boosts the
407 metabolism of the plant. Non-leaf plant structures such as roots, stems, flowers and seeds have
408 photosynthetic potential when exposed to light and carbon fixation has been reported to occur in many
409 plant roots along with green roots [81–83].

410 Defence-related gene expression has been demonstrated in several phosphite-treated crops. In potato,
411 phosphite treatment caused a significant increase in transcription of salicylic and jasmonic acid [8].
412 Proteomic analysis of a similar system showed an increase in the abundance of peroxidases, glutathione
413 S-transferase and proteinase inhibitors [84]. In the present study, enrichment of defence and stress-

414 related proteins in *L. angustifolius* were detected as a result of phosphite treatment, which may act in
415 favour of the defence response of the plant.

416 Secretory peroxidases were also enriched in the phosphite-treated lupin which can oxidise toxic
417 compounds and have functional roles in defence and biosynthesis [85]. Superoxide metabolism and
418 phospholipid binding composed of annexin genes were also enriched. Superoxide dismutase is used in
419 plant defence against reactive oxygen species [86,87]. Isoprenoids identified in the phosphite-treated lupin
420 are not only carriers in photosynthetic and respiratory electron transport and have additional functions
421 as antioxidants [88]. Defence-related ontologies with gene functions related to steroid chaperoning
422 indicating programmed cell death and apoptosis were also abundant [89]. Signalling and binding of
423 abscisic acid, a key hormone involved in signalling during stress and defence response to abiotic and
424 pathogens was significantly higher in abundance in the phosphite-treated lupin. Nicotinamidase and
425 isochorismatase are involved in plant growth, hydrolase activity and synthesis of salicylic acid [90–93] JA
426 pathway is associated with defence response against necrotrophic microbial pathogens and abiotic
427 stresses and the SA pathway is involved with biotic stressors, cell death and hypersensitive responses
428 in plants [94,95].



429

430 **Figure 9**- A proposed model on the effects of phosphite on *L. angustifolius* from the combination of
431 qualitative and quantitative proteome data between the untreated and treated lupin.

432 In this system, phosphite is driving both metabolism and defence by directly promoting their
433 biochemical pathways [8]. The production of stress molecules such as abscisic acid can at the same time
434 be used as signalling molecules to trigger plant immunity [96]. The production of defence and stress-

435 related molecules in the plant could also be acting in response to phosphite as a xenobiotic substance
436 [97,98]. In the field, the ideal use of phosphite part of a preventative strategy for the management of *P.*
437 *cinnamomi* infection [11–13]. The *in planta* assay demonstrates that phosphite application does not reduce
438 the observed lesion when lupin plants are infected with the tolerant isolate. If the elevated defence
439 response impacts the colonisation ability of *P. cinnamomi,* it is not observed in this system. Potentially
440 the induction of defense molecules by phosphite in this system may not have reached a sufficient
441 amplitude for host resistance.

442 5 CONCLUSION

443 Our data present a new perspective on the mode of action of phosphite. We have provided evidence
444 to propose models of the direct and indirect mode of action of phosphite. This data demonstrates a
445 comprehensive snapshot of the metabolic dysregulation in the sensitive isolate when treated with
446 phosphite, suggesting it is a substrate for one or more core biochemical pathways. The tolerant isolate
447 is likely to have adapted to block phosphite from entering the cell, or if phosphite targets constituents
448 of mitochondrial respiration, adapted to block this interaction. Our model proposes an alternative
449 avenue of plant responses to phosphite, where phosphite drives multiple biochemical pathways and as
450 a bi-product, more defence-related proteins are produced. We proposed probable mechanisms based
451 on proteomic data that indicates a bi-modal mode of action of phosphite on both the pathogen and the
452 host plant. Further studies are required to determine systemic changes in phosphite-treated *L.*
453 *angustifolius* such as changes in photosynthesis and respiration in leaves to confirm the current
454 observations. Additionally, the accumulation of phosphite in the plant tissue and subsequent uptake by
455 the pathogen cannot be excluded. The outcome of this study presented opportunities for functional
456 validation to determine the phosphite mode of action in crop protection.

457 Availability of data and materials

458 Spectral data used for this study are available at Figshare (DOI:10.6084/m9.figshare.20026214).

459 Acknowledgements

460 Proteomics International provided funding for the project. Curtin University provided funding for
461 sample preparation through the postgraduate maintenance fund. KCT, FLR and SJ are supported by the
462 Centre for Crop and Disease Management, a joint initiative of Curtin University and the Grains Research
463 and Development Corporation (CUR00023). We thank Dr Lars Kamphuis from the Centre for Crop and
464 Disease Management and CSIRO for providing the seed stocks. We also thank Johannes Debler for his
465 technical input for functional annotation. We thank Prof. Giles Hardy and Dr Bill Dunstan from the
466 Centre of Phytophthora and Science Management at Murdoch University for providing the *P.*

467 *cinnamomi* isolates. We also thank Mr Leon Lenzo for his critical feedback on the manuscript and Dr
468 Paula Moolhuijzen for her input into bioinformatic visualisation.

469 Conflict of interest

470 The authors declare that the manuscript 'The oomyceticide phosphite exhibits potential multi-modal
471 action in an oomycete pathosystem' was undertaken with no conflicts of interest. No additional
472 financial support, affiliations, patents or copyrights are associated with this manuscript.

473 Supplementary material 1- Protein identification of *in vitro phosphite* treated MU94-48 and CPSM366
474 treated with phosphite and of the phosphite treated lupin roots. FDR was set to <1%.

475 Supplementary material 2- Th KEGG pathways identified from the protenis only found in MU94-48.
476 Green lines indicate the KEGG pathways assigned to the unique proteins in phopshite treated MU94-
477 48 compared to the untreated control. There are no clear clusters of pathways in this sample indicating
478 that phosphite affects multiple processes in the sensitive isolate.

479 Supplementary material 3- Representative GOs obtained from phosphite treated MU94-48 and
480 CPSM366 compared to their respective untreated controls.. a) Enriched GOs in the proteins uniquely
481 identidied in untreated MU94-48 compared to treated MU94-48. b) GOs associates with the
482 differentially abundant proteins between untreated and phopshite treated MU94-48. c) Enriched GOs
483 in the proteins uniquely identidied in treated MU94-48 compared to tnreated MU94-48. d) Enriched
484 GOs in the proteins uniquely identidied in untreated CPSM366 compared to treated CPSM366. e) GOs
485 associates with the differentially abundant proteins between untreated and phopshite treated
486 CPSM366. f) Enriched GOs in the proteins uniquely identidied in treated MU94-48 compared to
487 tnreated MU94-48. Green bubbles in a), c), d) and f) indicate significantly enriched GOs, green bubbles
488 in b) and e) indicated significantly higher in abundance in the treated samples and red bubbles indicate
489 significantly lower abundance in the treated samples compared to untreated samples.

490 Supplementary material 4- The full list of GOs, Interpro and KEGGs for the qualitative and quantitative
491 *in vitro* data set.

492 Supplementary material 5- The full list of GOs, Interpro and KEGGs for the qualitative and quantitative
493 *in planta* data set.

494 References

495 1 Hardham AR, Blackman LM. Phytophthora cinnamomi. Mol Plant Pathol **19**:260–285 (2018).

496 2 Hardham AR. Pathogen Profile: Phytophthora cinnamomi. Mol Plant Pathol **6**:589–604 (2005).

497 3 Sonah H, Deshmukh RK, Bélanger RR. Computational prediction of effector proteins in fungi:

498 Opportunities and challenges. Front Plant Sci **7**:126 (2016).

499 4 Girard V, Dieryckx C, Job C, Job D. Secretomes: The fungal strike force. Proteomics **13**:597–608
500 (2013).

501 5 Hardy GESJ, Barrett S, Shearer BL. The future of phosphite as a fungicide to control the
502 soilborne plant pathogen Phytophthora cinnamomi in natural ecosystems. Australas Plant
503 Pathol **30**:133–139 (2001).

504 6 Smillie R. The Mode of Action of Phosphite: Evidence for Both Direct and Indirect Modes of
505 Action on Three Phytophthora spp. in Plants. Phytopathology **79**:921–926 (1989).

506 7 Eshraghi L, Anderson J, Aryamanesh N, Shearer B, Mccomb J, … O'Brien PA. Phosphite primed
507 defence responses and enhanced expression of defence genes in Arabidopsis thaliana infected
508 with Phytophthora cinnamomi. Plant Pathol **60**:1086–1095 (2011).

509 8 Machinandiarena MF, Lobato MC, Feldman ML, Daleo GR, Andreu AB. Potassium phosphite
510 primes defense responses in potato against Phytophthora infestans. J Plant Physiol **169**:1417–
511 1424 (2012).

512 9 Brown S, Koike ST, Ochoa OE, Laemmlen F, Michelmore RW. Insensitivity to the Fungicide
513 Fosetyl-Aluminum in California Isolates of the Lettuce Downy Mildew Pathogen, Bremia
514 lactucae. Plant Dis **88**:502–508 (2004).

515 10 Nelson ME, Eastwell KC, Grove GG, Barbour JD, Ocamb CM, Alldredge JR. Sensitivity of
516 Pseudoperonospora humuli (the Causal Agent of Hop Downy Mildew) from Oregon, Idaho, and
517 Washington to Fosetyl-Al (Aliette). doi:10.1094/PHP-2004-0811-01-
518 RShttps://doi.org/101094/PHP-2004-0811-01-RS **5** (2018).

519 11 Masikane SL, Novela P, Mohale P, McLeod A. Effect of phosphonate application timing and -
520 strategy on phosphite fruit and root residues of avocado. Crop Prot **128**:105008 (2020).

521 12 Grobler M, Meyer J, Liebenberg J. Phosphite treatments as part of early preventative control
522 of Phytophthora root rot, pre- and post-planting. South African avocado Grow Assoc Yearb
523 **39**:30–35 (2016).

524 13 Ramallo AC, Cerioni L, Olmedo GM, Volentini SI, Ramallo J, Rapisarda VA. Control of
525 Phytophthora brown rot of lemons by pre- and postharvest applications of potassium
526 phosphite. Eur J Plant Pathol **154**:975–982 (2019).

527 14 Shearer BL, Crane CE, Barrett S, Cochrane A. Phytophthora cinnamomi invasion, a major

528 threatening process to conservation of flora diversity in the South-west Botanical Province of
529 Western Australia. Aust J Bot. **55**:225–238 (2007).

530 15 Cahill D, Rookes J, Wilson B, Gibson L, Mcdougall K. Phytophthora cinnamomi and Australia ' s
531 biodiversity : impacts , predictions and progress towards control. Aust J Bot **56**:279–310
532 (2008).

533 16 Smith LA, Dann EK, Pegg KG, Whiley AW, Giblin FR, … Kopittke R. Field assessment of avocado
534 rootstock selections for resistance to phytophthora root rot. Australas Plant Pathol **40**:39–47
535 (2011).

536 17 Kellam MK, Coffey MD. Quantitative Comparison of the Resistance to Phytophthora Root Rot
537 in Three Avocado Rootstocks. Phytopathology **75**:230–234 (1985).

538 18 González M, Caetano P, Sánchez ME. Testing systemic fungicides for control of Phytophthora
539 oak root disease. For Pathol **47**:e12343 (2017).

540 19 Lawrence SA, Armstrong CB, Patrick WM, Gerth ML. High-throughput chemical screening
541 identifies compounds that inhibit different stages of the Phytophthora agathidicida and
542 Phytophthora cinnamomi life cycles. Front Microbiol **8**:1340 (2017).

543 20 Wilkinson CJ, Shearer BL, Jackson TJ, Hardy GESJ. Variation in sensitivity of Western Australian
544 isolates of Phytophthora cinnamomi to phosphite in vitro. Plant Pathol **50**:83–89 (2001).

545 21 Wong MH, McComb J, Hardy GESJ, Brien PAO. Phosphite induces expression of a putative
546 proteophosphoglycan gene in Phytophthora cinnamomi. Australas Plant Pathol **38**:235–241
547 (2009).

548 22 Lim S, Borza T, Peters RD, Coffin RH, Al-Mughrabi KI, … Wang-Pruski G. Proteomics analysis
549 suggests broad functional changes in potato leaves triggered by phosphites and a complex
550 indirect mode of action against Phytophthora infestans. J Proteomics **93**:207–223 (2013).

551 23 Dobrowolski MP, Shearer BL, Colquhoun IJ, O'Brien PA, Hardy GESJ. Selection for decreased
552 sensitivity to phosphite in Phytophthora cinnamomi with prolonged use of fungicide. Plant
553 Pathol **57**:928–936 (2008).

554 24 Hao W, Forster H, Adaskaveg JE. Resistance to potassium phosphite in phytophthora species
555 causing citrus brown rot and integrated practices for management of resistant isolates. Plant
556 Dis **105**:972–977 (2021).

557 25 Veena SS, Anandaraj M, Sarma Y. Variability in the sensitivity of Phytophthora capsici isolates

558 to potassium phosphonate. | Semantic Scholar. Indian Phytopathol **63**:71–75 (2010).

559 26 Gent DH, Block M, Claassen BJ. High levels of insensitivity to phosphonate fungicides in
560 Pseudoperonospora humuli. Plant Dis **104**:1400–1406 (2020).

561 27 Simamora A V., Stukely MJC, Barber PA, Hardy GESJ, Burgess TI. Age-related susceptibility of
562 Eucalyptus species to Phytophthora boodjera. Plant Pathol **66**:501–512 (2017).

563 28 Ribeiro OK. A Source Book of the Genus Phytophthora. Mycologia **71**:74–77 (1979).

564 29 Lóopez-Ruiz FJ, Pérez-García A, Fernández-Ortuño D, Romero D, García E, … Torés JA.
565 Sensitivities to DMI fungicides in populations of Podosphaera fusca in south central Spain. Pest
566 Manag Sci **66**:801–808 (2010).

567 30 Smillie R, Grant BR, Guest D. The Mode of Action of Phosphite: Evidence for Both Direct and
568 Indirect Modes of Action on Three Phytophthora spp. in Plants. Phytopathology **79**:921–926
569 (1989).

570 31 Pilbeam R a, Colquhoun IJ, Shearer B, Hardy GES. Phosphite concentration: its effect on
571 phytotoxicity symptoms and colonisation by Phytophthora cinnamomi in three understorey
572 species of Eucalyptus marginata forest. Australas Plant Pathol **29**:86–95 (2000).

573 32 Cerioni L, Rapisarda VA. Use of Phosphite Salts in Laboratory and Semicommercial Tests to
574 Control Citrus Postharvest Decay. Plant Dis **97**:201–212 (2013).

575 33 Barrett SR, Shearer BL, Hardy GESJ. The efficacy of phosphite a pp lied after inoculation on the
576 colonisation of Banksia brownii sterns by Phytophthora cinnamomi. Australas Plant Pathol
577 2003 321 **32**:1–7 (2003).

578 34 Bianco L, Perrotta G. Methodologies and perspectives of proteomics applied to filamentous
579 fungi: From sample preparation to secretome analysis. Int J Mol Sci **16**:5803–5829 (2015).

580 35 Wessel D, Flügge UI. A method for the quantitative recovery of protein in dilute solution in the
581 presence of detergents and lipids. Anal Biochem **138**:141–143 (1984).

582 36 Casey TM, Khan JM, Bringans SD, Koudelka T, Takle PS, … Lipscombe RJ. Analysis of
583 Reproducibility of Proteome Coverage and Quantitation Using Isobaric Mass Tags (iTRAQ and
584 TMT). J Proteome Res **16**:384–392 (2017).

585 37 Orsburn BC. Proteome Discoverer—A Community Enhanced Data Processing Suite for Protein
586 Informatics. Proteomes **9**:15 (2021).

587 38 Andronis CE, Hane JK, Bringans S, S Hardy GE, Jacques S, Tan K-C. Gene validation and
588 remodelling using proteogenomics of Phytophthora cinnamomi, the causal agent of Dieback.
589 Front Microbiol 12:1519 (2021).

590 39 Garg G, Kamphuis LG, Bayer PE, Kaur P, Dudchenko O, … Singh KB. A pan-genome and
591 chromosome-length reference genome of narrow-leafed lupin (Lupinus angustifolius) reveals
592 genomic diversity and insights into key industry and biological traits.
593 doi:10.1111/TPJ.15885Plant J (2022).

594 40 Zdobnov EM, Apweiler R. InterProScan – an integration platform for the signature-recognition
595 methods in InterPro. Bioinformatics 17:847–848 (2001).

596 41 Harris MA, Clark J, Ireland A, Lomax J, Ashburner M, … White R. The Gene Ontology (GO)
597 database and informatics resource. Nucleic Acids Res 32:D258–D261 (2004).

598 42 Kanehisa M, Goto S. KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes. Nucleic Acids Res
599 28:27–30 (2000).

600 43 Meister AMEA. Glutathione. Annu Rev Biochem 52:711–760 (1983).

601 44 Lengeler KB, Davidson RC, D'souza C, Harashima T, Shen W-C, … Heitman J. Signal Transduction
602 Cascades Regulating Fungal Development and Virulence. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 64:746
603 (2000).

604 45 Niehrs C. The complex world of WNT receptor signalling. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2012 1312
605 13:767–779 (2012).

606 46 Yan G, Lai Y, Jiang Y. TOR under stress: Targeting TORC1 by Rho1 GTPase. Cell Cycle 11:3384
607 (2012).

608 47 Li Q, Harvey LM, McNeil B. Oxidative stress in industrial fungi. Crit Rev Biotechnol 29:199–213
609 (2009).

610 48 Li D, Calderone R. Exploiting mitochondria as targets for the development of new antifungals.
611 Virulence 8:159 (2017).

612 49 Eshraghi L, Anderson JP, Aryamanesh N, McComb JA, Shearer B, Giles GE. Defence Signalling
613 Pathways Involved in Plant Resistance and Phosphite-Mediated Control of Phytophthora
614 Cinnamomi. Plant Mol Biol Report 32:342–356 (2014).

615 50 Qiu R, Qu D, Hardy GESJ, Trengove R, Agarwal M, Ren Y. Optimization of headspace solid-
616 phase microextraction conditions for the identification of Phytophthora cinnamomi rands.

617 Plant Dis **98**:1088–1098 (2014).

618 51 Coffey MD, Bower LA. In vitro variability among isolates of eight Phytophthora species in
619 response to phosphorous acid. Phytopathology **6**:738–742 (1984).

620 52 Hunter S, McDougal R, Williams N, Scott P. Variability in phosphite sensitivity observed within
621 and between seven Phytophthora species. Australas Plant Pathol **51**:273–279 (2022).

622 53 Hunter S, Williams N, McDougal R, Scott P, Garbelotto M. Evidence for rapid adaptive
623 evolution of tolerance to chemical treatments in Phytophthora species and its practical
624 implications. PLoS One **13**:e0208961 (2018).

625 54 Lenoir I, Fontaine J, Lounès-Hadj Sahraoui A. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal responses to
626 abiotic stresses: A review. Phytochemistry **123**:4–15 (2016).

627 55 Barata-Antunes C, Alves R, Talaia G, Casal M, Gerós H, … Paiva S. Endocytosis of nutrient
628 transporters in fungi: The ART of connecting signaling and trafficking. Comput Struct
629 Biotechnol J **19**:1713–1737 (2021).

630 56 Moye-Rowley WS. Regulation of the Transcriptional Response to Oxidative Stress in Fungi:
631 Similarities and Differences. Eukaryot Cell **2**:381 (2003).

632 57 Víglaš J, Olejníková P. An update on ABC transporters of filamentous fungi – from physiological
633 substrates to xenobiotics. Microbiol Res **246**:126684 (2021).

634 58 Sang H, Hulvey JP, Green R, Xu H, Im J, … Jung G. A xenobiotic detoxification pathway through
635 transcriptional regulation in filamentous fungi. MBio **9**:e00457-18 (2018).

636 59 Sharon A, Finkelstein A, Shlezinger N, Hatam I. Fungal apoptosis: function, genes and gene
637 function. FEMS Microbiol Rev **33**:833–854 (2009).

638 60 Calderone R, Li D, Traven A. System-level impact of mitochondria on fungal virulence: to
639 metabolism and beyond. FEMS Yeast Res **15**:27 (2015).

640 61 Breitenbach M, Weber M, Rinnerthaler M, Karl T, Breitenbach-Koller L. Oxidative Stress in
641 Fungi: Its Function in Signal Transduction, Interaction with Plant Hosts, and Lignocellulose
642 Degradation. Biomolecules **5**:318 (2015).

643 62 Oliver RP, Hewitt GH. Fungicides in Crop Protection. 2nd ed. Cabi, 2014.

644 63 Kim YS, Dixon EW, Vincelli P, Farman ML. Field Resistance to Strobilurin (QoI) Fungicides in
645 Pyricularia grisea Caused by Mutations in the Mitochondrial Cytochrome b Gene.

646 http://dx.doi.org/101094/PHYTO2003937891 **93**:891–900 (2007).

647 64 Feng Y, Huang Y, Zhan H, Bhatt P, Chen S. An Overview of Strobilurin Fungicide
648 Degradation:Current Status and Future Perspective. Front Microbiol **11**:389 (2020).

649 65 Affourtit C, Heaney SP, Moore AL. Mitochondrial electron transfer in the wheat pathogenic
650 fungus Septoria tritici: on the role of alternative respiratory enzymes in fungicide resistance.
651 Biochim Biophys Acta - Bioenerg **1459**:291–298 (2000).

652 66 Fernández-Ortuño D, Tores JA, Pérez-García A. Mechanisms of resistance to QoI fungicides in
653 phytopathogenic fungi. Int Microbiol **11**:1–9 (2008).

654 67 Tillman RW, Siegel MR, Long JW. Mechanism of action and fate of the fungicide chlorothalonil
655 (2,4,5,6-tetrachloroisophthalonitrile) in biological systems: I. Reactions with cells and
656 subcellular components of Saccharomyces pastorianus. Pestic Biochem Physiol **3**:160–167
657 (1973).

658 68 McCallan SEA. The nature of the fungicidal action of copper and sulfur. Bot Rev **15**:629–643
659 (1949).

660 69 Corkley I, Fraaije B, Hawkins N. Fungicide resistance management: Maximizing the effective life
661 of plant protection products. Plant Pathol **71**:150–169 (2022).

662 70 Grimmer MK, van den Bosch F, Powers SJ, Paveley ND. Evaluation of a matrix to calculate
663 fungicide resistance risk. Pest Manag Sci **70**:1008–1016 (2014).

664 71 Achary VMM, Ram B, Manna M, Datta D, Bhatt A, … Agrawal PK. Phosphite: a novel P fertilizer
665 for weed management and pathogen control. Plant Biotechnol J **15**:1493–1508 (2017).

666 72 Ramos-Martinez JI. The regulation of the pentose phosphate pathway: Remember Krebs. Arch
667 Biochem Biophys **614**:50–52 (2017).

668 73 Feldman ML, Guzzo MC, Machinandiarena MF, Rey-Burusco MF, Beligni MV, … Andreu AB.
669 New insights into the molecular basis of induced resistance triggered by potassium phosphite
670 in potato. Physiol Mol Plant Pathol **109**:101452 (2020).

671 74 Wu L, Gao X, Xia F, Joshi J, Borza T, Wang-Pruski G. Biostimulant and fungicidal effects of
672 phosphite assessed by GC-TOF-MS analysis of potato leaf metabolome. Physiol Mol Plant
673 Pathol **106**:49–56 (2019).

674 75 Gómez-Merino FC, Trejo-Téllez LI. Biostimulant activity of phosphite in horticulture. Sci Hortic
675 (Amsterdam) **196**:82–90 (2015).

676 76 Lovatt CJ. Properly Timing Foliar-applied Fertilizers Increases Efficacy: A Review and Update on
677 Timing Foliar Nutrient Applications to Citrus and Avocado. Horttechnology **23**:536–541 (2013).

678 77 Tambascio C, Covacevich F, Lobato MC, Lasa C de, Caldiz D, … Andreu A. The Application of K
679 Phosphites to Seed Tubers Enhanced Emergence, Early Growth and Mycorrhizal Colonization
680 in Potato (Solanum tuberosum). Am J Plant Sci **5**:132–137 (2014).

681 78 Eiiner FM. Results of long-term field studies into the effect of strobilurin containing fungicides
682 on the production of mycotoxins in several winter wheat varieties. Mycotoxin Res **21**:112–115
683 (2005).

684 79 Kyveryga PM, Blackmer TM, Mueller DS. When Do Foliar Pyraclostrobin Fungicide Applications
685 Produce Profitable Soybean Yield Responses? doi:10.1094/PHP-2013-0928-01-RSPlant Heal
686 Prog **14** (2013).

687 80 Spitzer T, Matušinsky P, Klemová Z, Kazda J. Effect of Fungicide Application Date against
688 Sclerotinia sclerotiorum on Yield and Greening of Winter Rape. Plant Prot Sci **48**:105–109
689 (2012).

690 81 Aschan G, Pfanz H. Non-foliar photosynthesis – a strategy of additional carbon acquisition.
691 Flora - Morphol Distrib Funct Ecol Plants **198**:81–97 (2003).

692 82 Flores HE, Dai YR, Cuello JL, Maldonado-Mendoza IE, Loyola-Vargas VM. Green Roots:
693 Photosynthesis and Photoautotrophy in an Underground Plant Organ. Plant Physiol **101**:363–
694 371 (1993).

695 83 Henry RJ, Furtado A, Rangan P. Pathways of Photosynthesis in Non-Leaf Tissues. Biol 2020, Vol
696 9, Page 438 **9**:438 (2020).

697 84 Lim S, Borza T, Peters RD, Coffin RH, Al-Mughrabi KI, … Wang-Pruski G. Proteomics analysis
698 suggests broad functional changes in potato leaves triggered by phosphites and a complex
699 indirect mode of action against Phytophthora infestans. J Proteomics **93**:207–223 (2013).

700 85 Yoshida K, Kaothien P, Matsui T, Kawaoka A, Shinmyo A. Molecular biology and application of
701 plant peroxidase genes. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol **60**:665–670 (2003).

702 86 Yadav D, Boyidi P, Ahmed I, Kirti PB. Plant annexins and their involvement in stress responses.
703 Environ Exp Bot **155**:293–306 (2018).

704 87 Alscher RG, Erturk N, Heath LS. Role of superoxide dismutases (SODs) in controlling oxidative
705 stress in plants. J Exp Bot **53**:1331–1341 (2002).

706 88 Chappell J. Biochemistry and Molecular Biology of the Isoprenoid Biosynthetic Pathway in
707 Plants. http://dx.doi.org/101146/annurev.pp46060195002513 **46**:521–547 (2003).

708 89 Tang D, Ade J, Frye CA, Innes RW. Regulation of plant defense responses in Arabidopsis by
709 EDR2, a PH and START domain-containing protein. Plant J **44**:245–257 (2005).

710 90 Hunt L, Holdsworth MJ, Gray JE. Nicotinamidase activity is important for germination. Plant J
711 **51**:341–351 (2007).

712 91 Wang G, Pichersky E. Nicotinamidase participates in the salvage pathway of NAD biosynthesis
713 in Arabidopsis. Plant J **49**:1020–1029 (2007).

714 92 Wildermuth MC, Dewdney J, Wu G, Ausubel FM. Isochorismate synthase is required to
715 synthesize salicylic acid for plant defence. Nature **414**:562–565 (2001).

716 93 Leontovyčová H, Kalachova T, Trdá L, Pospíchalová R, Lamparová L, … Janda M. Actin
717 depolymerization is able to increase plant resistance against pathogens via activation of
718 salicylic acid signalling pathway. Sci Reports 2019 91 **9**:1–10 (2019).

719 94 Ruan J, Zhou Y, Zhou M, Yan J, Khurshid M, … Zhang K. Jasmonic Acid Signaling Pathway in
720 Plants. Int J Mol Sci 2019, Vol 20, Page 2479 **20**:2479 (2019).

721 95 Ding P, Ding Y. Stories of Salicylic Acid: A Plant Defense Hormone. Trends Plant Sci **25**:549–565
722 (2020).

723 96 Morgutti S, Negrini N, Pucciariello C, Sacchi GA. Role of trehalose and regulation of its levels as
724 a signal molecule to abiotic stresses in plants. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-816451-8.00014-9
725 Elsevier, 2019.

726 97 Ramel F, Sulmon C, Serra AA, Gouesbet G, Couée I. Xenobiotic sensing and signalling in higher
727 plants. J Exp Bot **63**:3999–4014 (2012).

728 98 Singh A, Sheo ·, Prasad M, Singh RP. Plant Responses to Xenobiotics. Springer, 2016.

729