INTRODUCTION

Tomato is a host of Pectobacterium carotovorum (Pc), the cause of bacterial soft rot disease (Rosskopf & Hong, 2016). During infection, plants generally respond by activating broad-spectrum defense responses both locally and systemically in addition to their basal resistance (Djami-Tchatchou, Allie, & Straker, 2013; Jones & Dangl, 2006). This leads to the induction of pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins which are indicators of plant-induced defense responses (Mitsuhara et al., 2008). However, specific responses by plants to attack by specific pathogens are far from being completely elucidated. Among the unknown responses are the expressions of MYB transcriptor factor, ethylene response element-binding protein, suppressor of the G2 allele of Skp1, cytochrome P450, small Sar1 GTPase, hydroxycinnamoyl-CoA:quinate hydroxycinnamoyl transferase, pathogenesis-related protein 1a, endo-1,3-beta-glucanase, chitinase, proteinase inhibitor, defensin, CC-NBS-LRR resistance protein, and phenylalanine ammonia lyase when the tomato plant is attacked by P. carotovorum subsp. carotovorum (Pcc). The main objective of this study was therefore to investigate the effects of inoculation of tomato leaves with Pcc on tomato defense responses based on the relative expression of selected genes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Three-week-old seedlings of tomato, cultivar Heinz 1370, grown in the glasshouse under overhead irrigation at a 25/15°C day/night regime were selected for the study. The plants were inoculated with the bacterial strain BD163 of P. carotovorum subsp. carotovorum (Pcc) (10^5–10^8 CFU/ml) suspended in inoculation buffer (0.0014 M KH₂PO₄, 0.0025 M Na₂HP₂O₄, pH 7.00), and control plants were mock inoculated with the buffer. Pectobacterium cells suspended in the inoculation buffer were pressure infiltrated (Djami-Tchatchou, Maake, Piater, & Dubery, 2015) at the base of the underside of a...
tomato leaf. In total, 15 plants were included in the study. Four whole leaves were infiltrated per plant.

The study consisted of five treatments. Four sets of three plants were either inoculated with buffer or with the bacterium and harvested after 24 and 72 hr. A final negative control was also included, with leaves from three untreated plants harvested at the beginning of the experiment. Once harvested, all leaves were kept at −80°C and then the frozen samples were ground in liquid nitrogen using a mortar and pestle.

Total RNA was extracted from 100 mg ground leaf tissue using the TRIzol® Reagent method (Invitrogen). The extracted RNA was treated with DNase I (Thermo Scientific). From the total RNA, cDNA was synthesized using a RevertAid™ Premium First Strand cDNA synthesis kit (Fermentas, Thermo Scientific). For accurate calculation of relative gene expression by qPCR, the input RNA was standardized to the same single concentration for cDNA synthesis across all treated and untreated samples.

During the cDNA synthesis, control reactions lacking reverse transcriptase (RT), referred to as a non-RT control, were set up to check the samples for DNA contamination. The non-RT contained the same amount of total RNA as the experimental samples, with the oligo-dT primer, dNTPs, reaction buffer, ribolock except RT. The products from the cDNA synthesis reactions were used for the qPCR and all the control reactions lacking RT samples exhibited no DNA contamination by showing no amplification. Quantitative real-time PCR was performed using a rotor Gene-3000A instrument (Qiagen) and the SensiFAST SYBR No-ROX Kit (Bioline) according to the manufacturer’s instructions to quantify the expression of defense-related genes MYB transcription factor, ethylene response element-binding protein (EREBP), suppressor of the G2 allele of Skp1 (SGT1), cytochrome P450, small Sar1 GTPase (SAR1-GTPase), hydroxycinnamoyl-CoA:quinate hydroxycinnamoyl transferase (HQT), pathogenesis-related protein 1a (PR1), endo-1,3-beta-glucanase (PR2), chitinase (PR3), proteinase inhibitor (PR6), Defensin (PR12), CC-NBS-LRR resistance protein, and phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL). Information on the primers used appears on Appendix Table A1.

Total RNA was extracted from 100 mg ground leaf tissue using the TRIzol® Reagent method (Invitrogen). The extracted RNA was treated with DNase I (Thermo Scientific). From the total RNA, cDNA was synthesized using a RevertAid™ Premium First Strand cDNA synthesis kit (Fermentas, Thermo Scientific). For accurate calculation of relative gene expression by qPCR, the input RNA was standardized to the same single concentration for cDNA synthesis across all treated and untreated samples.

During the cDNA synthesis, control reactions lacking reverse transcriptase (RT), referred to as a non-RT control, were set up to check the samples for DNA contamination. The non-RT contained the same amount of total RNA as the experimental samples, with the oligo-dT primer, dNTPs, reaction buffer, ribolock except RT. The products from the cDNA synthesis reactions were used for the qPCR and all the control reactions lacking RT samples exhibited no DNA contamination by showing no amplification. Quantitative real-time PCR was performed using a rotor Gene-3000A instrument (Qiagen) and the SensiFAST SYBR No-ROX Kit (Bioline) according to the manufacturer’s instructions to quantify the expression of defense-related genes MYB transcription factor, ethylene response element-binding protein (EREBP), suppressor of the G2 allele of Skp1 (SGT1), cytochrome P450, small Sar1 GTPase (SAR1-GTPase), hydroxycinnamoyl-CoA:quinate hydroxycinnamoyl transferase (HQT), pathogenesis-related protein 1a (PR1), endo-1,3-beta-glucanase (PR2), chitinase (PR3), proteinase inhibitor (PR6), Defensin (PR12), CC-NBS-LRR resistance protein, and phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL). Information on the primers used appears on Appendix Table A1.

The gene expression analysis showed that at 24 hr following bacterial inoculation, the expression profiles of some genes, namely, Myb, EREBP, CytP450, HQT, PR3, PR6, and CC-NBS-LRR were significantly upregulated with a maximum expression of 14-fold observed with Myb. The lower significant increases with two- to fivefold changes were observed on the expression of CytP450 and CC-NBS-LRR (Figure 1d,i,j,l). Others genes such as EREBP, HQT, PR6, and PR3, exhibited an increase with a similar fold change above fivefold compared with the expression of the control sample. A downregulation was observed for the expression of SGT1, SAR1-GTPase, PR1, and PR12. PAL was not differentially expressed compared with the expression of the control sample.

At 72 hr following inoculation, the expression profiles of Myb, SGT1, CytP450, SAR1-GTPase, HQT, PR2, PR3, PR6, PR12, and CC-NBS-LRR were significantly upregulated with a fold change varying between 2 and 11 compared with the expression of the control sample. CytP450 and PR6 exhibited the highest significant increase with a fold change >7 (Figure 1d,j). The other genes: EREBP, PR1, and PAL were downregulated compared with the expression of the control sample. These results point to the validity of using real-time PCR to analyze the expression of host genes during plant-pathogen interactions. This study was not an exhaustive investigation of the genetic defense mechanisms of tomato against Pcc but a preliminary investigation to assess overall response to create a platform for future studies.

The selected genes investigated were previously reported to be involved in tomato (or related family) defense responses to pathogen attack (Alfano et al., 2007; Block, Schmelz, O’Donnell, Jones, & Klee, 2005; Djami-Tchatchou et al., 2015; Hafez, Hashem, Balbaa, El-Saadani, & Ahmed, 2013; Medeiros, Resende, Medeiros, Zhang, & Pare, 2009). Their expressions profiles detected by qPCR enable us to gain insight into the defense mechanism by which tomato responds to Pcc.

During plant-pathogen interactions, EREBP has been shown to be intimately related to defense responses, stress signaling pathways (Wang, Li, & Ecker, 2002); and the level of the biosynthesis of ethylene increases rapidly leading to the transcription of some defense-related genes such as β-1,3-glucanase and chitinase class I (Sharma et al., 2010).
**TABLE 1** Differential expression of genes selected for investigating the response of tomato to infection with Pectobacterium carotovorum subsp. carotovorum

| Gene                                | Downregulated at 24 hr postinoculation? | Upregulated at 24 hr postinoculation? | Downregulated at 72 hr postinoculation? | Upregulated at 72 hr postinoculation? |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Endo-1,3-beta-glucanase (PR2)       | Yes                                    | Yes                                   |                                          | Yes                                    |
| Proteinase inhibitor (PR6)          | Yes                                    | Yes                                   |                                          | Yes                                    |
| Chitinase (PR3)                     | Yes                                    | Yes                                   |                                          | Yes                                    |
| PR-1a                               | Yes                                    |                                        |                                          | Yes                                    |
| Cytochrome P450                     |                                        | Yes                                   |                                          | Yes                                    |
| Defensin2 (PR12)                    | Yes                                    |                                        |                                          | Yes                                    |
| MYB transcriptor factor             | Yes                                    |                                        |                                          | Yes                                    |
| CC-NBS-LRR resistance protein       |                                        | Yes                                   |                                          | Yes                                    |
| EREBP                               | Yes                                    |                                        |                                          | Yes                                    |
| HQT                                 |                                        | Yes                                   |                                          |                                        |
| PAL                                 | No change                              | No change                             | No change                                |                                       |
| SAR1(GTPases)                       | No change                              | No change                             | No change                                | Yes                                    |
| SGT1                                |                                        |                                       |                                          | Yes                                    |

**FIGURE 1** Defense-related genes expression analysis in tomato following Pectobacterium carotovorum inoculation. (a) MYB transcriptor factor, (b) Ethylene response element-binding protein (ERBP), (c) Suppressor of the G2 allele of Skp1 (SGT1), (d) Cytochrome P450, (e) Small Sar1 GTPase (SAR1-GTPase), (f) Hydroxycinnamoyl-CoA:quinate hydroxycinnamoyl transferase (HQT), (g) Phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL), (h) Pathogenesis-Related protein 1a (PR1), (i) Endo-1,3-beta-glucanase (PR2), (j) Chitinase (PR3), (k) Proteinase inhibitor (PR6), (l) Defensin1(PR12) and (m) Cc-nbs-Irr resistance protein. The data was normalized using Elf α and 18S to give the relative gene expression. Each data point is the average of 3 biological replicates, and error bars represent the SEM between biological replicates. Results were analyzed using ANOVA, with confidence level of 95%, followed by a Tukey’s post-test. Same letter indicates no significant difference and different letters indicate significant difference between samples with \( p < .05 \).
SGT1 regulates defense responses triggered by various pathogens, and it has been found from previous findings that SGT1 is involved in plant resistance to pathogen attack (Djami-Tchatchou et al., 2015; Meldau, Baldwin, & Wu, 2011). In this study, we found that the transcripts of SGT1 exhibited an upregulation at 72 hr post-inoculation. SGT1 was first found to confer resistance to Peronospora parasitica in Arabidopsis (Austin et al., 2002), and the SGT1 gene interacts with RAR1 (required for Mla12 resistance), to confer resistance by multiple R genes recognizing distinct avirulent P. parasitica or Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato isolates (Muskett et al., 2002).

Plant CyrP450 has been shown to be involved in various biochemical pathways to produce primary and secondary metabolites such as phenylpropanoids, alkaloids, terpenoids, lipids, cyanogenic glycosides, and glucosinolates as well as plant hormones (Mizutani, 2012). SAR1-GTPase is a small monomeric GTP-binding protein belonging to the Rho subfamily which plays an important role in plant signal perception and transduction (Djami-Tchatchou et al., 2015, 2017; Sanabria, Heerden, & Dubery, 2012). SAR1-GTPase was not expressed at 24 hr, but was upregulated at 72 hr following Pcc inoculation.

The transcript of HQT, an important defense component (Mhlongo, Piater, Steenkamp, Madala, & Dubery, 2014; Niggeweg, Michael, & Martin, 2004; Yu & Jez, 2008), exhibited a rapid up-regulation as early as 24 hr postinoculation, reached maximum levels then decreased but remained upregulated at 72 hr following Pcc infection. The patterns of expression of HQT are similar to the patterns of MYB transcription factor expression observed in this study (Figure 1a,f). A previous investigation reported that in potato, specific overexpression of an MYB transcription factor increased the level of CGA and the expression of HQT which resulted in CGA accumulation (Lepelley et al., 2007; Rommens et al., 2008).

Our results indicate that HQT is involved in the response of tomato to Pcc infection with a positive regulation with MYB transcription factor. HQT is also known to be correlated with phenylalanine ammonia-lyase (PAL), the first enzyme in the phenylpropanoid pathway linking primary metabolism to secondary metabolism (Tohge, Watanabe, Hoefergen, & Fernie, 2013). We found that the transcript of PAL was not differentially expressed at 24 hr with a slight non-significant downregulation at 72 hr. A positive correlation was expected between PAL and the HQT expression profile as PAL is involved in the biosynthesis of CGA. Our study showed that at 24 hr postinoculation, the transcripts of CC-NBS-LRR resistance and the pathogenicity-related genes, PR3 and PR6, exhibited a significant upregulation as well as at 72 hr together with PR2 and PR12.

Knowing that chitinases have lysozyme-like activity, our results indicate that PR3 was induced at 24 and 72 hr to inhibit the proteinase produced by Pcc in order to restrict Pcc spread in tomato. A similar observation was done in a previous study where it was found that PR6 was produced to restrict P. syringae spread in tomato (Koiwa, Bressan, & Hasigawa, 1997). Our results indicate that the upregulation of PR12 at 72 hr was to enhance tomato resistance to Pcc. The noninduction of PR1 observed in this study showed that it is not involved in the response of tomato to Pcc. In this study, genes of interest were selected based on the fact that they were previously reported to be involved in tomato (or related family) defense response to pathogen attack (Alfano et al., 2007; Block et al., 2005; Djami-Tchatchou et al., 2015; Hafez et al., 2013; Medeiros et al., 2009). We conclude that Pcc infection of the tomato triggers the expression of a number of the genes selected, which is an indication of their involvement in defense. However, this preliminary finding requires further investigation such as the use of knockout tomato mutants to comprehensively assess gene function and the defense response.
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**APPENDIX**

**TABLE A1** Primers used in this study

| GENES                          | Direction | Primer Sequence (5′-3′)                          | Accession number of target gene |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Endo-1,3-beta-glucanase (PR2) | Forward   | ACAGCTCATACATGGCCTTCT                          | Medeiros et al. (2009)          |
|                               | Reverse   | ATGGGCTCTTTGTTGGTGTG                         |                                 |
| Proteinase inhibitor (PR6)    | Forward   | CGGAAATCTGAAATGGGTAAGC GA                    | Medeiros et al. (2009)          |
|                               | Reverse   | ACAAGCGTGTTAAGAGTCCCAA                      |                                 |
| Chitinase (PR3)               | Forward   | ATGCCCCTAATCTACTACTGGGAA                     | Medeiros et al. (2009)          |
|                               | Reverse   | ACATGGTACATGCTCATTGTGCA                      |                                 |
| PR-1a                         | Forward   | GAGGGCGGCGGTGCAA                             | Block et al. (2005)             |
|                               | Reverse   | CAAATTTTTGCAACACACAG                        |                                 |
| Cytochrome P450                | Forward   | CTAGTCGAGAATGATGTT                          | Shi et al. (2013)               |
|                               | Reverse   | AACTCTCAACTATGTTCT                          |                                 |
| Defensin2 (PR12)              | Forward   | TCAACAACTATTGAGTTTCAA                       | Hafez et al. (2013)             |
|                               | Reverse   | GACCTCAATGTTTTACACTCT                       |                                 |
| MYB transcriptor factor       | Forward   | CCTACAATCATGAGA                            | Alfano et al. (2007)            |
|                               | Reverse   | ATGTACACACACACACACAG                       |                                 |
| Cc-nbs-Irr resistance protein | Forward   | TCAACAAATGTGAGGCTTGTG                       | Shi et al. (2013)               |
|                               | Reverse   | CATACCTGCTGTGTTACATCTG                      |                                 |
| EREBP                         | Forward   | AGCATTTCACCATCTCCTGTGTC                     | Djami-Tchatchou et al. (2015)   |
|                               | Reverse   | TCCAGATGAAATGTTCTCGAGATCCTG                 |                                 |
| HQT                           | Forward   | GGAGGAGATTACACACTTTATC                      | Djami-Tchatchou et al. (2015)   |
|                               | Reverse   | AGAGATGAGGAGGAGTAC                        |                                 |
| PAL                           | Forward   | GTCAACATACCACAACAGA                         | Djami-Tchatchou et al. (2015)   |
|                               | Reverse   | GTTTCATAATAGCAGCAGGCT                    |                                 |
| SAR1(GTPases)                 | Forward   | ACCTAGACAAAGAACTATAGC                      | Djami-Tchatchou et al. (2015)   |
|                               | Reverse   | TGGAAGGCTTGAGATGTTGC                      |                                 |
| SGT1                          | Forward   | GAAGCTGAGAAGAATAC                         | Djami-Tchatchou et al. (2015)   |
|                               | Reverse   | AGGTGACATGGTGTTG                          |                                 |
| 18S ribosomal RNA gene        | Forward   | GGCAAATAGGAGCCAAATGAA                      | Djami-Tchatchou et al. (2015)   |
|                               | Reverse   | GGCGTGACAAAAAGCTGTA                      |                                 |
| Elongation factor α           | Forward   | ACC AGA TCA ATG AGC CCA AG                  | Djami-Tchatchou et al. (2015)   |
|                               | Reverse   | AAG AGC TTC GTG GTG CAT CT                 |                                 |