



**HAL**  
open science

# Analysis of defense-related gene expression and leaf metabolome in wheat during the early infection stages of *Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici*

Thierry Allario, Alice Fourquez, Maryline Magnin-Robert, Ali Siah, Matthieu Gaucher, Alessandra Maia-Grondard, Marie-Noelle Brisset, Philippe Hugueney, Philippe Reignault, Raymonde Baltenweck, et al.

## ► To cite this version:

Thierry Allario, Alice Fourquez, Maryline Magnin-Robert, Ali Siah, Matthieu Gaucher, et al.. Analysis of defense-related gene expression and leaf metabolome in wheat during the early infection stages of *Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici*. *Phytopathology*, 2023, 113 (8), pp.1537-1547. 10.1094/PHYTO-10-22-0364-R . hal-04091467

**HAL Id: hal-04091467**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04091467v1>**

Submitted on 9 May 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Copyright

1 Analysis of defense-related gene expression and leaf metabolome in wheat during the  
2 early infection stages of *Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici*

3  
4 Thierry Allario, <sup>1\*</sup> Alice Fourquez, <sup>1\*</sup> Maryline Magnin-Robert, <sup>1</sup> Ali Siah, <sup>2</sup> Alessandra  
5 Maia-Grondard, <sup>4</sup> Matthieu Gaucher, <sup>3</sup> Marie-Noelle Brisset, <sup>3</sup> Philippe Hugueneay, <sup>4</sup>  
6 Philippe Reignault, <sup>1</sup> Raymonde Baltenweck, <sup>4\*</sup> §, Beatrice Randoux <sup>1\*</sup> §

7  
8 <sup>(1)</sup> Univ. Littoral Côte d'Opale, Unité de Chimie Environnementale et Interactions sur le  
9 Vivant (UCEIV-UR 4492), SFR Condorcet FR CNRS 3417, CS 80699, F-62228, Calais  
10 cedex, France.

11 <sup>(2)</sup> Joint Research Unit 1158 BioEcoAgro, Junia, Univ. Lille, Univ. Liège, UPJV, ULCO,  
12 Univ. Artois, INRAE, 2 Rue Norbert Ségard, F-59014, Lille, France.

13 <sup>(3)</sup> IRHS-UMR1345, Université d'Angers, INRAE, Institut Agro, SFR 4207 QuaSaV, F-  
14 49071,  
15 42 rue Georges Morel, F-49071 Beaucouzé cedex, France.

16 <sup>(4)</sup> Université de Strasbourg, INRAE, SVQV UMR-A 1131, F-68000 Colmar, France.

17  
18 \* These authors contributed equally to this work

19 § Corresponding authors: Beatrice Randoux; E-mail: [Beatrice.Randoux@univ-](mailto:Beatrice.Randoux@univ-littoral.fr)  
20 [littoral.fr](mailto:Beatrice.Randoux@univ-littoral.fr); Raymonde Baltenweck; E-mail: [raymonde.baltenweck@inrae.fr](mailto:raymonde.baltenweck@inrae.fr)

21  
22 Keywords: Wheat – RT-qPCR – Metabolomic – Powdery mildew – Plant defense–  
23 Hydroxycinnamic acid amides – Pipecolic acid – Phenylpropanoid pathway

24

25 **Funding:** This research was conducted in the framework of the project CPER  
26 Alibiotech, funded by the European Union, the French State, the French Region Hauts  
27 de France and ULCO.

28

29 ABSTRACT

30

31 *Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici* (*Bgt*) is an obligate biotrophic fungal pathogen  
32 responsible for powdery mildew in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Upon *Bgt*  
33 infection, the wheat plant activates basal defense mechanisms namely PAMP-  
34 triggered immunity (PTI) in the leaves during the first few days. Understanding this  
35 early stage of quantitative resistance is crucial for developing new breeding tools and  
36 evaluating plant resistance inducers for sustainable agricultural practices. In this  
37 sense, we used a combination of transcriptomic and metabolomic approaches to  
38 analyze the early steps of the interaction between *Bgt* and the moderately susceptible  
39 wheat cultivar Pakito. *Bgt* infection resulted in an increasing expression of genes  
40 encoding pathogenesis-related proteins (PR-proteins, *PR1*, *PR4*, *PR5* and *PR8*),  
41 known to target the pathogen, during the first 48 hours post-inoculation. Moreover, RT-  
42 qPCR and metabolomic analyses pointed out the importance of the phenylpropanoid  
43 pathway in quantitative resistance against *Bgt*. Among metabolites linked to this  
44 pathway, hydroxycinnamic acid amides containing agmatine and putrescine as amine  
45 component accumulated from the second to the fourth day after inoculation. This  
46 suggests their involvement in quantitative resistance *via* cross-linking processes in cell  
47 wall for reinforcement, what is supported by the up-regulation of *PAL* (phenylalanine  
48 ammonia-lyase), *PR15* (encoding an oxalate oxidase) and *POX* (peroxidase) after  
49 inoculation. Finally, pipercolic acid, which is considered as a signal involved in systemic

50 acquired resistance (SAR), accumulated after inoculation. These new insights lead to  
51 a better understanding of basal defense in wheat leaves after *Bgt* infection.

52

53

54

## 55 INTRODUCTION

56

57 Bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is the most widespread staple food for humans with  
58 a constant increasing demand due to the growing human population (FAO, 2018). This  
59 major food crop is constantly threatened by attacks from diverse foliar fungi, and  
60 particularly the biotrophic ascomycete fungus *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *tritici* (*Bgt*)  
61 causing the powdery mildew disease. Powdery mildew is widely dispersed in  
62 temperate and humid regions of the world and provokes powdery white sporulating  
63 colonies emerging on wheat leaves and stems. This foliar disease affects wheat grain  
64 quality and can lead to severe yield losses up to 34% (Gao et al., 2018), and  
65 particularly when the fungus affects the ears. Plants suffer as a result of the rerouting  
66 of nutrients into the fungus (Mwale et al., 2014; Gao et al. 2018). This fungus  
67 overwinters mainly on plant debris with ascospores produced by sexual reproduction,  
68 which serve as primary inoculum in favorable environmental conditions. New fungal  
69 infections are produced by wind-dispersed spores blowing onto uninfected plants, and  
70 successive asexual reproduction cycles are responsible for the disease spreading. The  
71 generation time (time from spore germination to spore production) of the powdery  
72 mildew fungus can be as short as 7 to 10 days and a large number of spores may be  
73 produced each asexual generation. The infection process begins when spores  
74 germinate and form first a primary germ tube. Then a second germ tube, called

75 appressorial germ tube, emerges from the spore and forms the appressorium which  
76 enters the epidermal cell wall and generates a feeding structure called haustorium by  
77 invagination of the plasmalemma. The haustorial plasma membrane establishes a very  
78 close interface with the host plasma membrane and extracellular matrix to absorb plant  
79 host nutrients (Mwale et al., 2014; Gao et al., 2018). Mycelium develops on leaf surface  
80 and new appressoria and haustoria are formed. Asexual spores are then produced  
81 again and are rapidly dispersed by wind to infect other wheat plants.

82

83 Because the use of fungicides is not environmentally friendly, cultivation of resistant  
84 cultivars appears to be the most effective, economical, and environmentally safe  
85 approach to control powdery mildew disease (Gao et al., 2018). The ability of host  
86 plants to impede a given microbial pathogen to colonize its tissues determine the  
87 degree of susceptibility of the plant to this pathogen (Dangl and Jones, 2001; Jones  
88 and Dangl, 2006). To counterattack pathogen infection, plants have developed the  
89 ability to sense pathogens and to initiate immune responses. In the case of a biotrophic  
90 pathogen, such as *Bgt*, two interconnected defense lines leading to plant immunity  
91 have been depicted with namely, the pathogen-associated molecular pattern-triggered  
92 immunity (PTI) and the effector-triggered immunity (ETI). First, molecular structure of  
93 constitutive compounds of pathogen cell wall, such as chitin and glucans during a  
94 plant-pathogenic fungus interaction, can be recognized by the plant cell as pathogen-  
95 associated molecular patterns (PAMPs), thanks to transmembrane pattern recognition  
96 receptors (PRRs). After recognition, the PAMP-Triggered Immunity (PTI), also known  
97 as basal resistance, is activated to impede pathogen proliferation (Nürnberg et al.,  
98 2004; Zipfel and Felix, 2005). Nevertheless, successful pathogens are able to produce  
99 effectors disrupting PTI and strengthening pathogen virulence, which results in

100 effector-triggered susceptibility (ETS; Jones and Dangl, 2006). For instance, the  
101 RNase-like effector CSEP0064/BEC1054 produced by *Bgt* has recently been  
102 proposed to inhibit the plant ribosome-inactivating proteins (RIPs) which, otherwise,  
103 could lead to host cell death at the infection site and could prevent the colonization of  
104 wheat by pathogen fungi (Pennington et al., 2019). Nevertheless, effectors secreted  
105 by the pathogen can in turn be identified by a specialized group of plant resistance (R)  
106 proteins that induce the effector-triggered immunity (ETI) mobilizing highly efficient  
107 plant defense reactions. Plant breeders have mostly developed a breeding strategy  
108 conferring a race-specific resistance through hypersensitive reactions (Huang and  
109 Röder, 2004, Chen et al., 2005), corresponding to ETI expression. In wheat, up to now,  
110 88 powdery mildew resistance (Pm) genes or alleles have been identified (McIntosh et  
111 al., 2019; Li et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2020). However, this kind of qualitative resistance  
112 is frequently overcome with the emergence of new races of fungus presenting the  
113 corresponding virulence genes (Miedaner et al., 1993; Zhu et al., 2020). Another  
114 breeding strategy in wheat, which is race-nonspecific and known as “slow-mildewing”  
115 or “partial resistance”, consists to play on a set of factors leading to slow down the  
116 disease progress and allow the plant to mature before the manifestation of damaging  
117 symptoms (Piarulli et al., 2012). Indeed, principal differences between PTI and ETI are  
118 quantitative and/or temporal rather than qualitative, engaging plants and microbial  
119 pathogens in a race-to-survive which determine plant resistance or plant susceptibility  
120 (Yuan et al., 2021; Katagiri et al., 2004). Moreover, new control strategies of plant  
121 diseases are currently explored to bring about new control means meeting the  
122 requirements of efficacy and environmental protection. Exogenous application of  
123 elicitors can result in an induced resistance in susceptible cultivars, *via* direct induction  
124 or priming of plant defenses able to impede or limit a specific step of the fungus

125 infectious process (Walters et al., 2013). Understanding basal defense associated with  
126 PTI is then crucial to select effective elicitors leading to plant protection. In this sense,  
127 exploring the plant responses during a compatible interaction between a moderately  
128 susceptible cultivar and an infectious strain of *Bgt* may highlight pathways that could  
129 be triggered for induced resistance.

130 In this study, we combined a transcripts analysis with targeted and untargeted  
131 metabolomic analysis in order to better characterize the compatible interaction  
132 between *Bgt* and a moderately susceptible cultivar of *Triticum aestivum* L (cv. Pakito).  
133 We used a biomolecular RT-qPCR based low-density microarray tool to analyze the  
134 expression of 26 genes, considered as molecular markers of the main defense  
135 mechanisms, such as genes encoding PR proteins, genes involved in phenylpropanoid  
136 pathway, isoprenoid pathway, antioxidant system, synthesis of parietal compounds for  
137 reinforcement of cell walls or others signaling pathways (Brisset et Dugé de  
138 Bernonville, 2011; Dugé de Bernonville et al., 2014). In parallel, targeted and  
139 untargeted metabolomic analysis using ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography  
140 coupled to high resolution mass spectrometry highlighted major changes in wheat leaf  
141 metabolome in response to *Bgt* infection, which could be linked with the induction of  
142 specific defense-related genes.

143

## 144 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

145

### 146 **Biological material and growth conditions**

147

148 Bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) cv. Pakito, which was provided by RAGT (Rodez,  
149 France), is susceptible to the MPEBgt1 powdery mildew isolate of *Blumeria graminis*  
150 f. sp. *tritici* (*Bgt*) (Tayeh et al., 2015; Mustafa et al., 2017). Twenty four wheat grains  
151 were soaked overnight in water, then grown into trays containing compost (600 g  
152 Terreau Floradur A 70L, Ref 16311470) and transferred in culture chambers  
153 (Panasonic, MLR-352H) with a relative humidity of 70%, a photoperiod of 12h/12h, a  
154 luminous intensity of 250  $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ , a day temperature of 18°C and a night  
155 temperature of 12°C (Randoux et al., 2006).

156 The fungus was inoculated and maintained on cv. Alixan (Limagrain, Vertaizon,  
157 France) in a separate chamber (Randoux et al., 2006). Following a method previously  
158 established by Randoux et al. (2006), heavily sporulating leaves were shaken above  
159 11-day old plants in order to obtain fresh sporulating leaves after 10 days for the fungal  
160 inoculations in this study.

161

## 162 **Inoculation of wheat plants**

163

164 Twelve-day-old wheat plantlets were inoculated with 5 mL of a suspension of *Bgt*  
165 spores (500 000 spores/mL in Fluorinert FC43, heptacosafuorotributhylamine 3M,  
166 Cergy-Pontoise, France) with a sprayer (ITW Surfaces et Finitions, Valence, France).  
167 Mock-infected plants were sprayed with 5 mL of Fluorinert FC43  
168 (heptacosafuorotributhylamine 3M, Cergy-Pontoise, France). Twelve days after  
169 inoculation, the symptoms were checked through the development of white colonies  
170 on the first leaf, what confirms the successful infection of plantlets by *Bgt*.

171



172 **RNA extraction and real-time quantitative reverse-transcription polymerase**  
173 **chain reaction analysis of gene expression**

174

175 Samplings for the analysis of defense gene expression were carried out on the first  
176 leaves of seedlings, 24 and 48 hours post-inoculation (hpi) by *Bgt* and corresponding  
177 control plants. Sampled leaves were frozen in liquid N and stored at -80°C before use.  
178 Total RNA was extracted from 100 mg of grounded leaf tissues using the QIAGEN  
179 RNeasy mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) following the manufacturer's instructions  
180 with few modifications concerning 5 additional steps of washing with RPE buffer  
181 (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Genomic DNA contaminating the samples was removed  
182 by treatment with the RNase-Free DNase Set (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). RNA was  
183 eluted with 50 µl of RNase Free water (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). RNA quality was  
184 checked by running all RNA extracts on TAE Agarose gel 1% and RNA quantification  
185 was performed by measuring the absorbance at 260 nm using a biophotometer  
186 (Eppendorf, Hambourg, Germany). In total, 1 µg of total RNA was reverse-transcribed  
187 using the High Capacity cDNA Reverse Transcription Kit (Thermofisher scientific –  
188 ancient ref. Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) following the manufacturer's  
189 protocol. The expression level of wheat targeted genes was assessed by quantitative  
190 PCR using the bio-molecular tool patented by Brisset and Dugé de Bernonville (2011).  
191 The tool allows the simultaneous quantification of expression of 26 genes that  
192 represent a wide diversity of very well-known defense mechanisms in plants i.e. PR  
193 proteins, secondary metabolism, oxidative stress, cell-wall modification, salicylic acid  
194 (SA)/jasmonic acid (JA)/ethylene (ET) signaling pathways. Reactions were carried on  
195 a Biorad CFX connect (Biorad, Hercules, CA, USA) using the SYBR SsoAdvanced  
196 Universal Green Supermix (Biorad, Hercules, CA, USA) according to the

197 manufacturer's protocol and the following thermal profile: 15 s at 95°C (denaturation)  
198 and 1 min at 60°C (annealing/extension) for 40 cycles. Melting curve assay was  
199 performed from 65 to 95°C at 0.5°C/s. Melting peaks were visualized for checking the  
200 specificity of each amplification. The real time PCR analysis concerns twenty-six genes  
201 associated to several wheat defense mechanisms as listed in Table 1. *Tubβ*, *GADPH*  
202 and *Actin* were used as internal reference genes for normalization. The results  
203 represent the relative expression in leaf tissues of pathogen-inoculated plants (I)  
204 versus those corresponding to control (NI) according to the  $2^{(-\Delta\Delta Ct)}$  method described  
205 by Schmittgen and Livak (2008) and expressed in log<sub>2</sub> fold change. Values of gene  
206 expression level are the average of gene expressions of three distinct plants (biological  
207 replicates) for which three gene expression analysis per plant were made for each  
208 gene studied (technical replicates). Two independent experiments (Exp.1 and Exp.2)  
209 were realized to confirm the results.

210

### 211 **Targeted metabolomic analysis**

212

213 Sampling of infected (I) and mock-infected (NI = non-infected) plants was performed  
214 24, 48, 72- and 96-hours post-inoculation (hpi), using nine biological replicates for each  
215 condition and time point. Leaves were collected, frozen into liquid nitrogen and stored  
216 at -80°C until analysis. Leaves were freeze-dried for 24 hours (Freezone 2.5,  
217 Labconco, Kansas City, USA) and each sample was weighed (dry weights were  
218 between 20 and 25 mg). Leaves were then transferred into 2 mL Eppendorf tubes and  
219 2 stainless steel beads (3.2 mm diameter, Dutscher, Brumath, France) were added.  
220 The leaves were crushed 4 times during 30 s at a speed of 30 movements/s in a bead  
221 mill (TissueLyser II, Qiagen, Venlo, Netherlands) to obtain a powder. Metabolites were

222 extracted with methanol (25  $\mu\text{L}/\text{mg}$  dry weight) supplemented with 1  $\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{mL}^{-1}$  apigenin  
223 and 5  $\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{mL}^{-1}$  chloramphenicol (Sigma-Aldrich) as internal standards. The samples  
224 were sonicated in an ultrasonic bath (FB15050, Fisher Scientific, Hampton, USA) for  
225 10 min and centrifugated at 12000 g for 15 min. Supernatants were analyzed by ultra-  
226 high-performance liquid chromatography coupled to high resolution mass spectrometry  
227 (UHPLC-HRMS) as described previously (de Borba et al., 2021). Metabolites  
228 belonging to different chemical families were identified based on published works  
229 about benzoxazinoids (de Bruijn et al., 2016), flavonoids (Wojakowska et al., 2013)  
230 and hydroxycinnamic acid amides (HCAAs) (Li et al., 2018) from wheat. Putative  
231 metabolite identifications were proposed based on expertized analysis of the  
232 corresponding mass spectra and comparison with published literature. Relative  
233 quantification of the selected metabolites was performed using the Xcalibur software  
234 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). For some metabolites, identity was  
235 confirmed with the corresponding standard provided by Sigma-Aldrich (France).  
236 Differential metabolomic analyses were performed using the Tukey's Honest  
237 Significant Difference (HSD) method followed by a false discovery rate (FDR)  
238 correction using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995).  
239 Metabolites of interest were considered differentially accumulated when the false  
240 discovery rate was below 5% (FDR < 0.05).

241

## 242 **Non-targeted metabolomic analysis**

243

244 For non-targeted metabolomic analysis, raw data were converted into mzXML format  
245 using MSConvert. mzXML data were organized into eight classes according to the  
246 infection status (NI/I) and hpi conditions plants. They were then processed using the

247 XCMS software package (Smith et al. 2006). Settings of XCMS were as follows: the  
248 method to extract and detect ions used was "centWave", ppm (parts per million) = 3,  
249 noise = 30 000, mzdifff = 0.001 (mzdifff representing the minimum difference in m/z  
250 dimension required for peaks with overlapping retention times), prefilter = c (5,15000),  
251 which means that mass traces are only retained for the analyses if they contain at least  
252 5 peaks with intensity  $\geq 15000$ , snthresh (defining the signal to noise ratio cutoff) = 6,  
253 peak width = c (5,35). Peaks were aligned using the obiwrap function using the  
254 following group density settings: bw (defining the bandwidth (standard deviation) to be  
255 used) = 10, mzwid (defining the width of overlapping m/z slices to use for creating peak  
256 density chromatograms and grouping peaks across samples) = 0.005, minimum  
257 fraction of samples for group validation: 0.5. Using these settings, 3140 ion identifiers  
258 were generated by XCMS script as MxxxTyyy, where xxx is the m/z ratio and yyy the  
259 retention time in seconds. For each ion identifier in each sample, relative quantitation  
260 data (peak area) were used for statistical analyzes. Differentially accumulated  
261 metabolites that discriminate I from NI plants were selected as follows: the "diffreport"  
262 function of the XCMS software was used to perform a two-group Welch t-test for each  
263 ion. Ions significantly differentially accumulated were selected based on a p-value  
264 threshold  $< 0.05$  and a fold change threshold  $\geq 2$ . Comparison of I and NI leaves at 48  
265 hpi, resulted in 81 differentially accumulated ions (Supp. Table 3), which were sorted  
266 by retention time (RT) in order to group ions potentially originating from the same  
267 molecule. Putative molecular formulas were proposed based on the precise mass of  
268 the ions, isotopic ratios, adducts and loss of neutrals, as well as by comparison with  
269 published literature.

270

271

272 **RESULTS**

273

274 **Effect of *Bgt* infection on the expression of defense-related genes in leaf tissues**

275

276 The relative expression level of 26 defense-related genes of wheat was monitored 24  
277 and 48 hours post-inoculation (hpi) by *Bgt* spores of twelve-day-old plantlets. The  
278 functions of these genes are described in Supp Table 1. The average expression level  
279 of each gene was measured in inoculated plants (I-plants) compared to non-inoculated  
280 plants (NI-plants) and reported on a heatmap profile (Fig.1) for two independent  
281 experiments (Exp.1 and Exp.2). Genes with different patterns in their expression levels  
282 (i.e. no expression change, up-regulation and down-regulation) between the  
283 experiment 1 and the experiment 2 were not considered. Most of genes encoding PR-  
284 proteins were strongly induced during the first day after inoculation. Indeed, *PR1*  
285 (pathogenesis-related protein 1), *PR4* (pathogenesis-related protein 4 – hevein like  
286 protein) and *PR5* (pathogenesis-related protein 5 – thaumatin like protein) were  
287 strongly up-regulated 24 hpi and their expression were reinforced at 48 hpi by amount  
288 11-, 9- and 9-fold in Exp.1, and by amount 9-, 8- and 8-fold in Exp.2, respectively. The  
289 level of *PR15* (pathogenesis-related protein 15 – oxalate oxidase) expression was  
290 slightly increased 24 hpi and also strengthened 48 hpi (3-fold), whereas the *PR8*  
291 (pathogenesis-related protein 8 – class I chitinase) was only induced 48 hpi.  
292 Concerning the genes encoding proteins involved in the phenylpropanoid pathway, the  
293 expression level of *PAL* (phenylalanine ammonia-lyase) appeared to be up-regulated  
294 at 24 and 48 hpi with a peak at 24 hpi reaching 6-fold in Exp.1 and 5-fold in Exp.2,  
295 respectively, while *FNS* (flavone synthase) and *CHS* (chalcone synthase) were not  
296 induced. *WRKY* (*WRKY* transcription factor 53), involved in the regulation of oxidative

297 responses to a wide array of stresses in wheat, was strongly up-regulated 24 hpi (6-  
298 and 5-fold in Exp.1 and Exp.2, respectively) and decreased to reach 3- and 2-fold the  
299 next day (Exp.1 and Exp.2, respectively). Regarding antioxidant systems, a strong and  
300 constant up-regulation of *POX* (peroxidase) across the two days (from 10-fold to 11-  
301 fold in Exp.1 and from 9-fold to 12-fold in Exp.2) accompanied with a slight up-  
302 regulation of *GST* (glutathione S-transferase), around 1.5-fold in both experiments, 48  
303 hpi, were noticed. The expression profile of genes involved in isoprenoid pathway  
304 displayed a contrasted pattern. If *HMGR* (hydroxymethyl glutarate-CoA reductase) was  
305 up-regulated during the first day after inoculation and reduced the next day from 2-fold  
306 to 1.5-fold in Exp.1 and from 2-fold to 0.7-fold in Exp.2, no significant change of  
307 expression was noticed for *FPPS* (farnesyl pyrophosphate synthase) while *FAR* ((E,E)-  
308 alpha-farnese synthase) was gradually and strongly down-regulated over time. A  
309 limited effect of *Bgt* infection was detected on wheat genes of the ethylene signaling  
310 group. *ACCS* (1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate synthase) was transiently and  
311 slightly down-regulated 24 hpi between NI-plants and I-plants while no change of  
312 expression was observed in *EIN3* (EIN3-binding F box protein 1) expression levels.  
313 Overall, RT-qPCR analysis performed on wheat plants inoculated with *Bgt* has  
314 revealed specific patterns of defense gene expression. In each group of defense genes  
315 studied, specific genes were found upregulated, downregulated or unchanged over  
316 time. However, we can cluster each group following the change of gene expression  
317 level between 24 hpi and 48 hpi. The expression level of genes from parietal  
318 compounds group *Ca/S* (callose synthase), *CesA* (cellulose synthase A) and *CAD*  
319 (cinnamyl-alcohol dehydrogenase)), cystein sulfoxide group (*CSL* (cysteine sulfoxide))  
320 and jasmonic acid signaling group (*JAR* (jasmonate resistant 1)) was unchanged  
321 between NI-plants and I-plants. All genes of the pathogenesis-related group that were

322 upregulated the first day after inoculation, i.e. *PR1*, *PR4*, *PR5*, *PR8* and *PR15*, had  
323 their expression level strengthened the next day contrasting the fact that all genes of  
324 the phenylpropanoid pathway group, the salicylic acid signaling group and the  
325 isoprenoid pathway group that were upregulated (*PAL*, *WRKY*, *HMGR*), or  
326 downregulated 24 hpi (*FAR*), had their gene expression level lowered 48 hpi. Finally,  
327 genes belonging to the antioxidant systems group were upregulated similarly during  
328 the two days (*POX*) or only upregulated the second day (*GST*).

329

### 330 **Impact of *Bgt* inoculation on a selection of wheat leaf metabolites**

331 Targeted metabolomic analysis using UHPLC-HRMS was undertaken to assess the  
332 impact of *Bgt* inoculation on the wheat leaf metabolome during a compatible  
333 interaction. The plant response was investigated 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours after  
334 inoculation by comparing leave extracts of infected plants to mock-infected ones. This  
335 targeted analysis allowed the detection and the relative quantification of 53 metabolites  
336 classified in 5 chemical or functional families: amino acids (AA), benzoxazinoids (BZ),  
337 flavonoids (F), phytohormones (H), and hydroxycinnamic acid amides (HCAAs)  
338 (Supplemental Table 2). Benzoxazinoids are plant defense metabolites found in many  
339 Poaceae species and are known to display antimicrobial and allelopathic activities  
340 (Hashimoto and Shudo, 1996; de Bruijn et al., 2018). Hydroxycinnamic acid amides  
341 are a family of plant secondary metabolites reported to be positively correlated with  
342 plant resistance in several pathosystems (Muroi et al., 2009; Gunnaiah et al., 2012;  
343 Yogendra et al., 2014). Phytohormones are particularly crucial in defense against  
344 pathogen attacks. Salicylic acid (SA) is considered to be the key hormone regulating  
345 defense against biotrophic pathogens, while jasmonic acid (JA) would trigger defense  
346 mechanisms toward necrotrophic invaders. Methyl salicylate (MeSA) is an essential

347 signal for establishing SAR (Thaler et al., 2012). In the wheat-*Bgt* pathosystem,  
348 salicylic acid (SA) and jasmonate (JA) signaling-related genes were differentially  
349 expressed, thus suggesting that they are involved in the defensive response against  
350 *Bgt* infection (Wang et al., 2012).



351 Infection with *Bgt* resulted in substantial differences in global wheat leaf metabolite  
352 patterns, as highlighted by a PCA analysis performed on all samples and all quantified  
353 metabolites, where the first and the second components explained 21.3%, 21.1% of  
354 the variances, respectively (Figure 2). Samples corresponding to (I) conditions are  
355 separated from mock-infected controls from 24 hpi on, along the second-dimension  
356 axis.

357 A differential analysis was then carried out in order to analyze the impact of *Bgt*  
358 infection on the accumulation of selected metabolites. For each time point, fold  
359 changes of significant differentially accumulated metabolites (DAMs) between I and NI  
360 conditions are presented as a heatmap (Fig. 3). During the first days after inoculation  
361 with *Bgt*, 11 of the 53 analyzed metabolites were differentially accumulated in *Bgt*-  
362 infected wheat leaves compared to control leaves (Fig. 3). DAMs included three amino  
363 acids (Phe, Glu and His), two amino acid derivatives (agmatine and pipecolic acid),  
364 and several HCAAs. Conversely, *Bgt* inoculation did not significantly impact the  
365 accumulation of the selected metabolites in the benzoxazinoid and flavonoid families.  
366 Looking in more details at the kinetic of wheat infection by *Bgt*, no DAM was detectable  
367 at 24 hpi. From 72 hpi, inoculation with *Bgt* impacted significantly but slightly the  
368 accumulation of phenylalanine, glutamine, histidine, and later (96 hpi), pipecolic acid  
369 (Fig. 3, Fig. 4). Finally, inoculation with *Bgt* resulted in a massive accumulation of  
370 HCAAs, some of them increasing by a factor 20 in *Bgt*-infected leaves compared to  
371 control leaves (Fig.3).

372

### 373 **Untargeted metabolomic analyses of the wheat - *Bgt* interaction**

374 As a complement to the quantification of a set of selected metabolites, untargeted  
375 metabolomic were used to further analyze the impact of *Bgt* infection on wheat leaf

376 metabolome. Combined analysis of raw mass spectrometry data of all samples  
377 revealed 3140 ions, which were further considered for differential analyses. Ions of  
378 interest were selected based on a statistically significant differential accumulation (p  
379 value < 0.05) between *Bgt*-infected and control wheat leaves at 48 hpi, with a fold  
380 change > 2. This selection process resulted in a set of 81 differentially accumulated  
381 ions (Supp Table 3), which were further investigated for tentative identification of some  
382 of the corresponding molecules. To this end, ions with similar retention times,  
383 potentially derived from the same molecules, were investigated for identification as  
384 pseudo-molecular ions, fragments and isotopes.

385 For example, the mass spectrum with peak identifier M291T255 (group 5) showed a  
386 pseudo-molecular ion  $m/z$  291.1451 corresponding to the chemical formula  
387  $C_{14}H_{19}O_3N_4$  (Supplemental Figure 1). This ion was furthermore associated with a  
388 fragment  $m/z$  273. 1346 ( $C_{14}H_{17}O_2N_4$ ) corresponding to the loss of a water molecule  
389 from the molecular ion, and a fragment  $m/z$  147.0440 corresponding to a coumaroyl  
390 moiety  $C_9H_7O_2$ . Combination of this spectral information made it possible to propose  
391 that M291T255 and the related ions were derived from coumaroyl-hydroxy-dehydro-  
392 agmatine (Supplemental Figure 1, Figure 6). This agmatine derivative has recently  
393 been identified in wheat leaves infected with *Bipolaris sorokiniana*, the causative agent  
394 of spot blotch of Poaceae (Ube et al., 2019a), and the corresponding hydroxylated  
395 agmatine, the *p*-coumaroyl-3-hydroxy-agmatine, has been characterized in wheat  
396 submitted to cold stress (Jin et al., 2003).

397  
398 Taking advantage of the excellent accuracy of the mass measurements (< 1 ppm), in-  
399 depth analysis of high-resolution mass spectra made it possible to assign a plausible  
400 chemical formula and then a structural proposal for 16 of the 81 ions (Supp Table 3).

401 Most of the assigned chemical formulas corresponded to HCAAs. Some metabolites  
402 have been tentatively identified according to published literature and the PubChem  
403 database (<https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>). Analysis of differential accumulation of  
404 these 81 ions between I and NI conditions was performed at different time points  
405 (Figure 5). Most of these ions were not significantly differentially accumulated at 24  
406 hpi, suggesting that the metabolic impact of *Bgt* infection starts to be significant after  
407 this time point. However, most ions accumulated further and with larger fold changes  
408 at 72 and 96 hpi, especially those associated to HCAAs (Figure 5, Supp Table 3).

409

## 410 **DISCUSSION**

411 In our study, we combined an analysis of defense related-gene expression and  
412 metabolite accumulation to provide an overview on the main mechanisms that occur  
413 during the first steps of powdery mildew infection in a moderately susceptible bread  
414 wheat cultivar. First, PR-protein genes were mainly up-regulated, which is consistent  
415 with the observations made in other studies (Liljeroth et al., 2001; Wu et al., 2014),  
416 depicting an accumulation of PR protein transcripts in both susceptible and resistant  
417 wheat in response to pathogen infection, but with a greater abundance of PR-proteins  
418 in the most resistant plants than in the susceptible ones (Geddes et al., 2008).  
419 Moreover, the accumulation of glutamine, histidine and phenylalanine suggests an  
420 elevated biosynthesis of amino-acids that would serve as building blocks for both PR-  
421 proteins and phenylpropanoids as described during a compatible interaction between  
422 barley and *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *hordei* (Voll et al., 2011). In Pakito, PR1, PR4, PR5,  
423 PR8 and PR15 are involved in partial defense mechanisms taking place during the first  
424 two days after *Bgt* inoculation. PR4, also known as hevein-like proteins, and PR8, a  
425 class I chitinase, are both endochitinases able to disrupt fungal cell wall into small

426 components used as elicitors by the plant cell to mediate plant defense response  
427 (Shoresh and Harman, 2008). Hevein-like proteins are also able to inhibit the hyphal  
428 growth of fungi by binding to chitin and can have an antimicrobial activity in plants  
429 (Nawrot et al., 2014). Antifungal hevein-type peptides with high inhibitory activity have  
430 already been reported in *Triticum kiharae* seeds facing various pathogenic fungi and  
431 bacteria (Huang et al., 2002). According to our results, *PR4* is strongly up-regulated  
432 from the first 24 hours after *Bgt* inoculation whereas *PR8* expression increased 48  
433 hours after inoculation. In the susceptible Orvantis wheat cultivar, the up-regulation of  
434 some chitinase-encoding genes occurred between 9 and 21 hpi and was correlated to  
435 the developmental stage of *Bgt* leading from conidia with primary germ tube to conidia  
436 with appressorial germ tube. This up-regulation of chitinase-encoding genes was  
437 followed with an increasing activity of chitinase enzymes 24 hpi, suggesting their role  
438 in degrading chitin polymers from the fungal pathogen cell wall at the time of the  
439 appressorial germ tube penetration (Tayeh et al., 2015).

440 Two other PR-proteins, *PR1* and *PR5*, exhibited the same expression patterns than  
441 *PR4* with a strong up-regulation 24 hpi strengthened 48 hpi. They code respectively a  
442 protein with antimicrobial properties, known to be expressed in association with SAR,  
443 and a thaumatin-like protein, known to have antifungal activities targeting pathogenic  
444 fungi hyphae and spores (Niderman et al., 1995; Singh et al., 2014; Enoki and Suzuki  
445 2016).

446 Moreover, pipercolic acid accumulated in wheat leaves 96 hours after inoculation with  
447 *Bgt*. In *Arabidopsis*, this compound is involved in local and systemic acquired  
448 resistance (SAR) against some bacterial pathogens, and is described as an  
449 endogenous mediator of defense amplification and priming (Návarová et al., 2012).

450 Increased levels of pipercolic acid and N-Hydroxypipercolic acid were observed in the

451 primary infected leaves, and both are suggested to travel through vascular tissue to  
452 distal secondary leaves, acting such as messengers for SAR establishment (Huang et  
453 al., 2020). Pipecolic acid could then orchestrate or regulate SAR via SA-dependent  
454 and -independent activation pathways (Bernsdorff et al., 2016). The late accumulation  
455 of pipecolic acid observed in infected leaves of the cultivar Pakito, which is moderately  
456 susceptible to *Bgt*, suggests its involvement in basal resistance against this fungal  
457 pathogen, and its participation in SAR or distal increased resistance has to be studied.

458  
459 The metabolomic analyses highlight the central role of the phenylpropanoid pathway  
460 in defense in wheat challenged by powdery mildew. In the phenylpropanoid  
461 biosynthesis pathway, PAL is the upstream enzyme which converts phenylalanine to  
462 trans-cinnamic acid. This compound which can serve as a precursor of SA, can be  
463 allocated for flavonoids, or various hydroxycinnamic acids biosynthesis, in different  
464 shunts of the phenylpropanoid pathway. In our study, no accumulation of flavonoids  
465 was observed, which is consistent with the lack of CHS up-regulation. However, PAL  
466 was over-expressed, and phenylalanine and HCAAs accumulated between the second  
467 and the fourth days following inoculation. HCAAs (also known as phenylamides or  
468 phenolamides) are amides of hydroxycinnamic or benzoic acids, linked with various  
469 amines, such as agmatine or putrescine. In our study, HCAAs accumulation was first  
470 highlighted by a targeted metabolomic approach applied to compounds previously  
471 identified in wheat leaves. Furthermore, the non-targeted metabolomic analysis  
472 applied to the same samples showed that many of the major ions accumulated in  
473 response to *Bgt* inoculation were actually derived from HCAAs while other defense-  
474 related metabolites such as benzoxazinoids remain relatively unaffected.

475 Altogether, our results indicate that HCAAs accumulation is a major metabolic  
476 response of the Pakito wheat cultivar subjected to *Bgt* inoculation. During biotic  
477 stresses, these secondary metabolites accumulate mainly but not exclusively in  
478 resistant plants following microbial infection, then suggesting their role in quantitative  
479 -or non-specific- resistance (Morimoto et al., 2018; von Röpenack et al., 1998). In our  
480 experiments, caffeoyl agmatine, coumaroyl agmatine, feruoyl agmatine and sinapoyl  
481 agmatine accumulated in susceptible wheat leaves from 48h after inoculation with *Bgt*,  
482 as well as caffeoyl putrescine and feruloyl putrescine. Similarly, HCAAs containing  
483 agmatine and putrescine as amine component, such as coumaroyl agmatine, feruoyl  
484 agmatine, feruoyl putrescine and coumaroyl putrescine, were induced in wheat in  
485 response to *Bipolaris sorokiniana*, the causal agent of spot blotch of *Poaceae* species  
486 (Ube et al., 2019). In addition, other HCAAs than those identified in our study  
487 accumulated, like p-coumaric acid amides of hydroxyputrescine, hydroxyagmatine,  
488 hydroxydehydroagmatine, N-cinnamoyl-9-hydroxy-8-oxotryptamine and N-cinnamoyl-  
489 8-oxotryptamine, the two last ones being considered as phytoalexins (Ube et al., 2019).  
490 Such compounds and HCAAs in general could be to investigate in our pathosystem in  
491 response to resistance induction by various biosourced molecules or beneficial  
492 microorganisms, since they could participate to the observed improvement of  
493 quantitative resistance. HCAAs also accumulate during some other compatible plant-  
494 fungi interactions, as reported in sugarcane-*Ustilago scitaminea* (Legaz et al., 1998).  
495 HCAAs containing agmatine and putrescine as amine component could then be  
496 involved in basal-resistance in wheat against *Bgt*. Their protective role could be linked  
497 to a direct antimicrobial activity and an involvement in the reinforcement of the cell wall  
498 of plants facing the pathogenic agent, *via* a multistep process involving polymerization  
499 through a peroxidase activity (Roumani et al., 2020). HCAAs accumulation, in addition

500 to *POX* and *PR15* overexpression, is consistent with local cell wall reinforcement at  
501 the penetration sites of *Bgt*. Moreover, the up-regulation of *WRKY53*, encoding a  
502 transcription factor also known as *WRKY26* in wheat, confirms the involvement of *POX*  
503 in these first steps of defense. *WRKY53* is described to regulate oxidative responses  
504 in wheat under stress conditions, targeting a peroxidase (Van Eck et al., 2014).  
505 Previous studies noticed that phenolic compounds accumulation in epidermal cell walls  
506 is crucial during elicitor-induced resistance in wheat against *Bgt* (Randoux et al., 2010,  
507 Renard-Merlier et al., 2007), pointing out the importance of cell wall reinforcement  
508 during basal defenses in wheat against *Bgt*. In barley seedlings resistant to *Erysiphe*  
509 *graminis* f. sp. *hordei* (actually *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *hordei*), the accumulation of p-  
510 coumaroyl-hydroxyagmatine was higher in resistant plantlets than in susceptible ones  
511 upon fungal penetration attempts; this compound was supposed to participate to  
512 papillae formation and effectiveness *via* cross-linking processes. Moreover,  
513 exogenous application of p-coumaroyl-hydroxyagmatine also inhibited the formation of  
514 haustoria *in vivo*, and the formation of appressoria *in vitro* (Von Röpenack et al., 1998).  
515 In some plant species, compounds derived from the isoprenoid pathway, such as  
516 monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes, diterpenes and sterols are involved in a broad  
517 spectrum of defense mechanisms from direct effects with their biological activities on  
518 pathogens (phytoalexins) to indirect effects acting as signal molecules (specific  
519 volatiles compounds) (Singh and Sharma, 2015). On the one hand, 3-Hydroxy-3-  
520 methylglutaryl-CoA reductase (HMGR), the key enzyme that catalyzes essential  
521 regulatory steps of the mevalonic acid pathway, is considered as the first rate-limiting  
522 enzyme in cytosolic isoprenoid biosynthesis (Gu et al., 2015; Block et al., 2019). On  
523 the other hand, Farnesyl pyrophosphate synthase (FPPS) and (E, E)-alpha-farnesene  
524 synthase (FAR), both related to sesquiterpene biosynthesis, produce volatile

525 compounds to repel pest or attract pest predators (Zhang et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2017).  
526 In the susceptible wheat cultivar Pakito, *Bgt* inoculation resulted in a down regulation  
527 of *FAR* and a transient upregulation of *HMGR*. This limited upregulation of *HMGR* is  
528 consistent with the fact that wheat has not been found to accumulate significant  
529 amounts of terpenoid phytoalexins, unlike other *Poaceae* such as rice (*Oryza sativa*)  
530 or maize (*Zea mays*) (Ube et al., 2019).

531

532 In our study, RT-qPCR and metabolomics were used to assay, respectively, some  
533 defense genes expression and metabolites accumulation in a cultivar of wheat  
534 moderately susceptible to *Bgt* during the first days after inoculation. Pakito wheat  
535 exhibited a specific pattern of expression of PR-proteins sharing mainly direct  
536 antimicrobial activities, including *PR1*, *PR4*, *PR5* and *PR8*, which were continuously  
537 up-regulated and strengthened over the two first days of infection, while other defense-  
538 related genes were more transiently over-expressed at the beginning of the infection  
539 with *Bgt*. Among these genes, some genes in the phenylpropanoid pathway exhibited  
540 a significant up-regulation, which was later followed by HCAAs accumulation. HCAAs  
541 accumulated concomitantly with an oxalate oxidase (*PR15*) and a peroxidase (*POX*)  
542 gene induction in wheat leaves, which could participate to cell wall reinforcement at  
543 the penetration sites of the fungus. Pipecolic acid accumulation suggested a SA-  
544 mediated signalization. Both transcriptomic and metabolomic analyses pointed out the  
545 biosynthesis of HCAAs as a major response to *Bgt* infection in the Pakito cultivar.  
546 These new insights lead to a better understanding of basal defense mechanisms taking  
547 place in wheat leaves throughout the first days after *Bgt* inoculation. Pakito wheat  
548 cultivar being moderately susceptible, some of these defense mechanisms related to  
549 PAMP-triggered immunity (PTI) maybe not sufficient or inactivated consequently to the



550 release of some effectors by the pathogen fungus, leading to ETS (Effector-Triggered  
551 Susceptibility). Nevertheless, the induction of similar mechanisms in PTI and ETI  
552 becomes more and more evident (Yuan et al., 2021). Such results will be very useful  
553 to develop new tools and biomarkers for evaluating biocontrol treatments aiming to  
554 induce plant defense and to enhance resistance.

555

556

557 **REFERENCES**

558 Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. 1995. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A  
559 practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*  
560 *Society: Series B (Methodological)*. 57:289–300.

561 Bernsdorff, F., Döring, A.-C., Gruner, K., Schuck, S., Bräutigam, A., and Zeier, J. 2016.  
562 Pipecolic acid orchestrates plant systemic acquired resistance and defense priming via  
563 salicylic acid-dependent and -independent pathways. *Plant Cell*. 28:102–129.

564 Block, A. K., Vaughan, M. M., Schmelz, E. A., and Christensen, S. A. 2019.  
565 Biosynthesis and function of terpenoid defense compounds in maize (*Zea mays*).  
566 *Planta*. 249:21–30.

567 Brisset, M.-N., and Dugé de Bernonville, T. 2011. Device for determining or studying  
568 the state of stimulation of the natural defences of plants or portions of plants.

569 Chen, X. M., Luo, Y. H., Xia, X. C., Xia, L. Q., Chen, X., Ren, Z. L., et al. 2005.  
570 Chromosomal location of powdery mildew resistance gene Pm16 in wheat using SSR  
571 marker analysis. *Plant Breeding*. 124:225–228.

572 Dangl, J. L., and Jones, J. D. 2001. Plant pathogens and integrated defence responses  
573 to infection. *Nature*. 411:826–833.

- 574 De Borba, M. C., Velho, A. C., Maia-Grondard, A., Baltenweck, R., Magnin-Robert, M.,  
575 Randoux, B., et al. 2021. The algal polysaccharide ulvan induces resistance in wheat  
576 against *Zymoseptoria tritici* without major alteration of leaf metabolome. *Front. Plant*  
577 *Sci.* 12:703712.
- 578 De Bruijn, W. J. C., Vincken, J.-P., Duran, K., and Gruppen, H. 2016. Mass  
579 spectrometric characterization of benzoxazinoid glycosides from *Rhizopus*-elicited  
580 wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) seedlings. *J Agric Food Chem.* 64:6267–6276 De Bruijn, W.  
581 J. C., Gruppen, H., Vincken, J. P. 2018. Structure and biosynthesis of benzoxazinoids:  
582 Plant defence metabolites with potential as antimicrobial scaffolds. *Phytochemistry*  
583 155:233-243. doi: 10.1016/j.phytochem.2018.07.005.
- 584  
585 Dugé de Bernonville, T., Marolleau, B., Staub, J., Gaucher, M., and Brisset, M.-N.  
586 2014. Using molecular tools to decipher the complex world of plant resistance inducers:  
587 an apple case study. *J Agric Food Chem.* 62:11403–11411.
- 588 Enoki, S., and Suzuki, S. 2016. Pathogenesis-related proteins in grape. In *Grape and*  
589 *Wine Biotechnology*, eds. Antonio Morata and Iris Loira. Rijeka: IntechOpen. Available  
590 at: <https://doi.org/10.5772/64873>.
- 591 FAO. 2018. *Global Information and Early Warning System on Food and Agriculture*  
592 *(GIEWS)*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Food  
593 and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
- 594 Gao, H., Niu, J., and Li, S. 2018. Impacts of wheat powdery mildew on grain yield &  
595 quality and its prevention and control methods. *American Journal of Agriculture and*  
596 *Forestry.* 6:141–147.

- 597 Geddes, J., Eudes, F., Laroche, A., and Selinger, L. B. 2008. Differential expression of  
598 proteins in response to the interaction between the pathogen *Fusarium graminearum*  
599 and its host, *Hordeum vulgare*. *Proteomics*. 8:545–554.
- 600 Gu, W., Geng, C., Xue, W., Wu, Q., Chao, J., Xu, F., et al. 2015. Characterization and  
601 function of the 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-CoA reductase gene in *Alisma orientale*  
602 (Sam.) Juz. and its relationship with protostane triterpene production. *Plant Physiology*  
603 and *Biochemistry*. 97:378–389.
- 604 Gunnaiah, R., Kushalappa, A. C., Duggavathi, R., Fox, S., Somers, D. J. 2012.  
605 Integrated metabolo-proteomic approach to decipher the mechanisms by which wheat  
606 QTL (Fhb1) contributes to resistance against *Fusarium graminearum*. *PLoS One*.  
607 7(7):e40695. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0040695.
- 608 Hashimoto, Y., Shudo, K. 1996. Chemistry of biologically active benzoxazinoids,  
609 *Phytochemistry*,43 (3):551-559, ISSN 0031-9422, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9422(96)00330-5)  
610 [9422\(96\)00330-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0031-9422(96)00330-5).
- 611  
612 Huang, R.-H., Xiang, Y., Liu, X.-Z., Zhang, Y., Hu, Z., and Wang, D.-C. 2002. Two  
613 novel antifungal peptides distinct with a five-disulfide motif from the bark of *Eucommia*  
614 *ulmoides* Oliv. *FEBS Lett*. 521:87–90.
- 615 Huang, W., Wang, Y., Li, X., and Zhang, Y. 2020. Biosynthesis and regulation of  
616 salicylic acid and N-hydroxypipelicolic acid in plant immunity. *Mol Plant*. 13:31–41.
- 617 Huang, X.-Q., and Röder, M. S. 2004. Molecular mapping of powdery mildew  
618 resistance genes in wheat: A review. *Euphytica*. 137:203–223.

- 619 Jin, S., Yoshida, M., Nakajima, T., and Murai, A. 2003. Accumulation of  
620 hydroxycinnamic acid amides in winter wheat under snow. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem.*  
621 67:1245–1249.
- 622 Jones, J. D. G., and Dangl, J. L. 2006. The plant immune system. *Nature.* 444:323–  
623 329.
- 624 Katagiri, F. 2004. A global view of defense gene expression regulation--a highly  
625 interconnected signaling network. *Curr Opin Plant Biol.* 7:506–511.
- 626 Legaz, M. E., Armas, R. de, Piñón, D., and Vicente, C. 1998. Relationships between  
627 phenolics-conjugated polyamines and sensitivity of sugarcane to smut (*Ustilago*  
628 *scitaminea*). *Journal of Experimental Botany.* 49:1723–1728.
- 629 Li, H., Dong, Z., Ma, C., Xia, Q., Tian, X., Sehgal, S., et al. 2020. A spontaneous wheat-  
630 *Aegilops longissima* translocation carrying Pm66 confers resistance to powdery  
631 mildew. *Theor Appl Genet.* 133:1149–1159.
- 632 Li, Z., Zhao, C., Zhao, X., Xia, Y., Sun, X., Xie, W., et al. 2018. Deep annotation of  
633 hydroxycinnamic acid amides in plants based on ultra-high-performance liquid  
634 chromatography-high-resolution mass spectrometry and its in silico database. *Anal*  
635 *Chem.* 90:14321–14330.
- 636 Liljeroth, E., Santén, K., and Bryngelsson, T. 2001. PR protein accumulation in seminal  
637 roots of barley and wheat in response to fungal infection - the importance of cortex  
638 senescence. *Journal of Phytopathology.* 149:447–456.
- 639 Lin, J., Wang, D., Chen, X., Köllner, T. G., Mazarei, M., Guo, H., et al. 2017. An  
640 (E,E)- $\alpha$ -farnesene synthase gene of soybean has a role in defence against nematodes

641 and is involved in synthesizing insect-induced volatiles. *Plant Biotechnol J.* 15:510–  
642 519.

643 McIntosh, R. A., Dubcovsky, J., Rogers, W. J., Xia, X. C., and Raupp, W. J. 2019.  
644 *Catalogue of gene symbols for wheat: 2019 supplement.* W.J. Raupp. Manhattan (NY).

645 Miedaner, T., Schmidt, H. K., and Geiger, H. H. 1993. Components of variation for  
646 quantitative adult-plant resistance to powdery mildew in winter rye. *Phytopathology.*  
647 83:1071–1075.

648 Morimoto, N., Ueno, K., Teraishi, M., Okumoto, Y., Mori, N., and Ishihara, A. 2018.  
649 Induced phenylamide accumulation in response to pathogen infection and hormone  
650 treatment in rice (*Oryza sativa*). *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem.* 82:407–416.

651 Muroi, A., Ishihara, A., Tanaka, C. *et al.* 2009. Accumulation of hydroxycinnamic acid  
652 amides induced by pathogen infection and identification of agmatine  
653 coumaroyltransferase in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Planta* 230:517–527.  
654 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-009-0960-0>

655  
656 Mustafa, G., Khong, N. G., Tisserant, B., Randoux, B., Fontaine, J., Magnin-Robert,  
657 M., et al. 2017. Defence mechanisms associated with mycorrhiza-induced resistance  
658 in wheat against powdery mildew. *Functional Plant Biol.* 44:443.

659 Mwale, V. M., Chilembwe, E. H. C., and Uluko, H. C. 2014. Wheat powdery mildew  
660 (*Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *tritici*): Damage effects and genetic resistance developed in  
661 wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). *International Research Journal of Plant Science.* 5:1–16.

662 Návarová, H., Bernsdorff, F., Döring, A.-C., and Zeier, J. 2012. Pipecolic acid, an  
663 endogenous mediator of defense amplification and priming, is a critical regulator of  
664 inducible plant immunity. *Plant Cell.* 24:5123–5141.

- 665 Nawrot, R., Barylski, J., Nowicki, G., Broniarczyk, J., Buchwald, W., and Goździcka-  
666 Józefiak, A. 2014. Plant antimicrobial peptides. *Folia Microbiol (Praha)*. 59:181–196.
- 667 Niderman, T., Genetet, I., Bruyère, T., Gees, R., Stintzi, A., Legrand, M., Fritig, B.,  
668 Mössinger, E. 1995. Pathogenesis-related PR-1 proteins are antifungal. Isolation and  
669 characterization of three 14-kilodalton proteins of tomato and of a basic PR-1 of  
670 tobacco with inhibitory activity against *Phytophthora infestans*. *Plant Physiol.*  
671 108(1):17-27.
- 672  
673 Nürnberger, T., Brunner, F., Kemmerling, B., and Piater, L. 2004. Innate immunity in  
674 plants and animals: striking similarities and obvious differences. *Immunol Rev.*  
675 198:249–266.
- 676 Pennington, H. G., Jones, R., Kwon, S., Bonciani, G., Thieron, H., Chandler, T., et al.  
677 2019. The fungal ribonuclease-like effector protein CSEP0064/BEC1054 represses  
678 plant immunity and interferes with degradation of host ribosomal RNA. *PLoS Pathog.*  
679 15:e1007620.
- 680 Piarulli, L., Gadaleta, A., Mangini, G., Signorile, M. A., Pasquini, M., Blanco, A., et al.  
681 2012. Molecular identification of a new powdery mildew resistance gene on  
682 chromosome 2BS from *Triticum turgidum* ssp. *dicoccum*. *Plant Sci.* 196:101–106.
- 683 Randoux, B., Renard, D., Nowak, E., Sanssené, J., Courtois, J., Durand, R., et al.  
684 2006. Inhibition of *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *tritici* germination and partial enhancement  
685 of wheat defenses by Milsana. *Phytopathology*®. 96:1278–1286.
- 686 Randoux, B., Renard-Merlier, D., Mulard, G., Rossard, S., Duyme, F., Sanssené, J., et  
687 al. 2010. Distinct defenses induced in wheat against powdery mildew by acetylated  
688 and nonacetylated oligogalacturonides. *Phytopathology*. 100:1352–1363.

- 689 Renard-Merlier, D., Randoux, B., Nowak, E., Farcy, F., Durand, R., and Reignault, P.  
690 2007. Ioduric acid, salicylic acid, heptanoyl salicylic acid and trehalose exhibit different  
691 efficacies and defence targets during a wheat/powdery mildew interaction.  
692 *Phytochemistry*. 68:1156–1164.
- 693 Roumani, M., Besseau, S., Gagneul, D., Robin, C., and Larbat, R. 2021. Phenolamides  
694 in plants: an update on their function, regulation, and origin of their biosynthetic  
695 enzymes. *J Exp Bot*. 72:2334–2355.
- 696 Schmittgen, T. D., and Livak, K. J. 2008. Analyzing real-time PCR data by the  
697 comparative CT method. *Nat Protoc*. 3:1101–1108.
- 698 Shoresh, M., and Harman, G. E. 2008. Genome-wide identification, expression and  
699 chromosomal location of the genes encoding chitinolytic enzymes in *Zea mays*. *Mol*  
700 *Genet Genomics*. 280:173–185.
- 701 Singh, B., and Sharma, R. A. 2015. Plant terpenes: defense responses, phylogenetic  
702 analysis, regulation and clinical applications. *3 Biotech*. 5:129–151.
- 703 Singh, R., Tiwari, J. K., Sharma, V., Singh, B. P., and Rawat, S. 2014. Role of Pathogen  
704 related protein families in defence mechanism with potential role in applied  
705 biotechnology. *International Journal of Advanced Research*. 2:210–226.
- 706 Smith, C. A., Want, E. J., O'Maille, G., Abagyan, R., and Siuzdak, G. 2006. XCMS:  
707 processing mass spectrometry data for metabolite profiling using nonlinear peak  
708 alignment, matching, and identification. *Anal Chem*. 78:779–787.
- 709 Tayeh, Ch., Randoux, B., Tisserant, B., Khong, G., Jacques, Ph., and Reignault, Ph.  
710 2015. Are ineffective defence reactions potential target for induced resistance during

- 711 the compatible wheat-powdery mildew interaction? *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry*.  
712 96:9–19.
- 713 Thaler, J. S., Humphrey, P. T., Whiteman, N. K. 2012. Evolution of jasmonate and  
714 salicylate signal crosstalk. *Trends Plant Sci.* 17:260–270. doi:  
715 10.1016/j.tplants.2012.02.010
- 716  
717 Ube, N., Harada, D., Katsuyama, Y., Osaki-Oka, K., Tonooka, T., Ueno, K., et al. 2019.  
718 Identification of phenylamide phytoalexins and characterization of inducible  
719 phenylamide metabolism in wheat. *Phytochemistry*. 167:112098.
- 720 Van Eck, L., Davidson, R. M., Wu, S., Zhao, B. Y., Botha, A.-M., Leach, J. E., et al.  
721 2014. The transcriptional network of WRKY53 in cereals links oxidative responses to  
722 biotic and abiotic stress inputs. *Funct Integr Genomics*. 14:351–362.
- 723 Voll, L. M., Horst, R. J., Voitsik, A.-M., Zajic, D., Samans, B., Pons-Kühnemann, J., et  
724 al. 2011. Common motifs in the response of cereal primary metabolism to fungal  
725 pathogens are not based on similar transcriptional reprogramming. *Front Plant Sci*.  
726 2:39.
- 727 Von Röpenack, E., Parr, A., and Schulze-Lefert, P. 1998. Structural analyses and  
728 dynamics of soluble and cell wall-bound phenolics in a broad-spectrum resistance to  
729 the powdery mildew fungus in barley. *J Biol Chem*. 273:9013–9022.
- 730 Walters, D. R., Ratsep, J., and Havis, N. D. 2013. Controlling crop diseases using  
731 induced resistance: challenges for the future. *Journal of Experimental Botany*.  
732 64:1263–1280.



- 733 Wang, J. M., Liu, H.Y., Xu, H. M. *et al.* 2012. Analysis of differential transcriptional  
734 profiling in wheat infected by *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *tritici* using GeneChip. Mol Biol  
735 Rep 39:381–387. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11033-011-0749-7>
- 736 Wojakowska, A., Perkowski, J., Góral, T., and Stobiecki, M. 2013. Structural  
737 characterization of flavonoid glycosides from leaves of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)  
738 using LC/MS/MS profiling of the target compounds. J Mass Spectrom. 48:329–339.
- 739 Wu, S., Wang, H., Yang, Z., and Kong, L. 2014. Expression comparisons of  
740 Pathogenesis-Related (PR) genes in wheat in response to infection/infestation by  
741 Fusarium, Yellow dwarf virus (YDV) Aphid-Transmitted and Hessian Fly. Journal of  
742 Integrative Agriculture. 13:926–936.
- 743 Yogendra, K. N., Pushpa, D., Mosa, K. A., Kushalappa, A. C., Murphy, A., and  
744 Mosquera, T. 2014. Quantitative resistance in potato leaves to late blight associated  
745 with induced hydroxycinnamic acid amides. Funct. Integr. Genomics. 14:285–298. doi:  
746 10.1007/s10142-013-0358-8
- 747  
748 Yuan, M., Ngou, B. P. M., Ding, P., and Xin, X.-F. 2021. PTI-ETI crosstalk: an  
749 integrative view of plant immunity. Curr Opin Plant Biol. 62:102030.
- 750 Zhang, Y., Li, Z.-X., Yu, X.-D., Fan, J., Pickett, J. A., Jones, H. D., et al. 2015. Molecular  
751 characterization of two isoforms of a farnesyl pyrophosphate synthase gene in wheat  
752 and their roles in sesquiterpene synthesis and inducible defence against aphid  
753 infestation. New Phytol. 206:1101–1115.
- 754 Zhu, T., Wu, L., He, H., Song, J., Jia, M., Liu, L., et al. 2020. Bulk segregant RNA-  
755 Seq reveals distinct expression profiling in chinese wheat cultivar Jimai 23 responding  
756 to powdery mildew. Front Genet. 11:474.

757 Zipfel, C., and Felix, G. 2005. Plants and animals: a different taste for microbes? *Curr*  
758 *Opin Plant Biol.* 8:353–360.

759

760

**761 Figure captions**

762

763

764 **Figure 1.** Profile of defense gene expression, monitored at 24h and 48h following the  
765 inoculation of wheat with *B. graminis* f.sp. *tritici* (*Bgt*). Average defense gene  
766 expression was obtained by the  $2^{(-\Delta\Delta Ct)}$  calculation method expressed in log2 fold  
767 change, using *Bgt*-infected plants compared to non-infected control plants for each  
768 time point, using 3 biological replicates corresponding to first leaves from 3 different  
769 plants. Defense gene expression fold changes are given by shades of red or blue  
770 colors according to the scale bar and two experiments (Exp.1 and Exp.2) were  
771 performed to confirm the results.

772

773

774 **Figure 2.** Global wheat leaf metabolite changes following inoculation with *B. graminis*  
775 f.sp. *tritici*. Principal component analysis was performed on all compounds quantified  
776 in the targeted analysis, in all conditions and time points. Data represent nine biological  
777 replicates for each condition and time point. The shown principal components explain  
778 respectively 21.3% and 21.1% of the variance separating the six groups of plants.

779

780

781 **Figure 3.** Heatmap of significant wheat leaf metabolite changes following inoculation  
782 with *B. graminis* f.sp. *tritici*. Wheat plants were mock infected (NI) or infected (I) with  
783 *Bgt*. Log2 of significant metabolite fold changes for I/NI pairwise comparisons at 24,

784 48, 72 and 96 hpi are given by shades of red or blue colors according to the scale bar.  
785 Metabolites were grouped according to their chemical family as amino acids (AA),  
786 benzoxazinoids (BZ), flavonoids (F), hormones (H), hydroxycinnamic acid amides  
787 (HCAA) and amines (N). Data represent mean values of nine biological replicates for  
788 each condition and time point. Statistical analysis was performed using Tukey's Honest  
789 Significant Difference method followed by a false discovery rate (FDR) correction, with  
790  $FDR < 0.05$ . For  $FDR \geq 0.05$ ,  $\log_2$  fold changes were set to 0.

791  
792  
793

794 **Figure 4.** Effects of *Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici* inoculation on histidine (a),  
795 glutamine (b), phenylalanine (c) and pipercolic acid (d) accumulation in wheat leaves.  
796 Infected (I) and non-infected (NI) leaves were collected at 24, 48, 72 and 96 hpi. The  
797 histograms represent mean values ( $\pm$  standard errors) obtained for nine samples per  
798 condition, from three experiments (three samples per experiment). Columns headed  
799 by different letters indicate statistically significant differences between the different  
800 conditions (ANOVA, test post-hoc multiple Bonferroni,  $P \leq 0.05$ ).

801  
802

803 **Figure 5.** Non-targeted analysis of wheat leaf metabolite changes following  
804 inoculation with *B. graminis* f.sp. *tritici* (*Bgt*).

805 Ions of interest were selected based on a significant differential accumulation between  
806 *Bgt*-infected and control wheat leaves at 48 hpi, with a fold change  $> 2$ .  $\log_2$  of  
807 significant ion fold changes for I/NI pairwise comparisons at 24, 48, 72 and 96 hpi are  
808 given by shades of red or blue colors according to the scale bar. Statistical analysis  
809 was performed using Tukey's HSD method followed by a FDR correction, with  $FDR <$

810 0.05. For  $FDR \geq 0.05$ ,  $\log_2$  fold changes were set to 0. Putative identification of the  
811 metabolites corresponding to the indicated ions are the following: 1: Hydroxytyrosine,  
812 2: Coumaroyl-hydroxyputrescine, 3: Feruloyl-hydroxyputrescine, 4: Coumaroyl-  
813 hydroxyagmatine, 5: Coumaroyl-hydroxy-dehydroagmatine, 6: Feruloylputrescine, 7:  
814 Feruloyl-hydroxyagmatine, 8: Feruloyl-hydroxydehydroagmatine, 9:  
815 Coumaroylagmatine, 10: Feruloylagmatine, 11: Coumaroyl-dehydroagmatine, 12:  
816 Sinapoylagmatine, 13: Dodecanamine. Characteristics of all ions are presented in  
817 Supplemental Table 3.

818

819

820

**Figure 6.** Biosynthetic pathway of the main HCAAs accumulating following inoculation of wheat cv. Pakito with *Bgt*, based on non-targeted analysis of major differentially accumulated ions. Metabolites indicated in red were putatively identified based expertized analysis of high-resolution mass spectra and comparison with published literature. For each metabolite, log<sub>2</sub> of significant ion fold changes for I/NI pairwise comparisons at 24, 48, 72 and 96 hpi are given by shades of red or blue colors according to the scale bar (data from Fig. 5).

		Exp.1		Exp.2		
		24H	48H	24H	48H	
PATHOGENESIS RELATED PROTEINS	PR1	7.52	11.08	2.92	9.09	> 9
	PR2	-0.01	0.46	0.11	0.49	7 to 9
	PR4	7.76	9.44	6.36	8.09	5 to 7
	PR5	7.73	9.35	3.56	7.93	3 to 5
	PR8	0.74	1.90	0.23	1.50	2 to 3
	PR14	-0.75	-2.56	-0.74	-0.93	1 to 2
PHENYLPROPANOID PATHWAY	PR15	1.83	2.85	2.26	2.94	-1 to 1
	PAL	6.50	2.74	5.35	2.32	-1 to -2
	CHS	-0.39	0.79	-0.11	0.02	-2 to -3
	FNS	0.71	-2.11	0.94	-0.07	< -3
ISOPRENOID PATHWAY	PPO	-0.68	-0.64	-0.01	-0.34	
	HMGR	2.47	1.50	2.09	0.74	
	FPP5	-1.07	-1.09	-0.33	-0.87	
CYSTEIN SULFOXID	FAR	-2.13	-3.16	-1.21	-2.60	
	CSL	-0.90	0.39	0.06	-0.41	
ANTIOXIDANT SYSTEMS	APOX	-0.46	-0.40	-0.22	0.17	
	GST	0.89	1.54	1.20	1.34	
	POX	11.03	10.12	8.64	11.53	
	WRKY53	6.06	3.30	5.32	2.49	
PARIETAL COMPOUNDS	CalS	-0.79	-0.19	-0.51	-0.11	
	CesA	0.09	0.40	-0.05	0.32	
	CAD	-0.84	0.54	-0.63	0.06	
SALICYLIC ACID SIGNALING	EDS1	-0.58	0.60	-0.40	0.35	
JASMONIC ACID SIGNALING	JAR	-0.74	0.05	-0.57	-0.23	
	ACC5	-1.13	-0.51	-1.18	-0.96	
	EIN3	-0.12	0.31	0.23	-0.07	

Figure 1. Profile of defense gene expression, monitored at 24h and 48h following the inoculation of wheat with *B. graminis* f.sp. *tritici* (Bgt). Average defense gene expression was obtained by the  $2^{(-\Delta\Delta Ct)}$  calculation method expressed in log2 fold change, using Bgt-infected plants compared to non-infected control plants for each time point, using 3 biological replicates corresponding to first leaves from 3 different plants. Defense gene expression fold changes are given by shades of red or blue colors according to the scale bar and two experiments (Exp.1 and Exp.2) were performed to confirm the results.

861x484mm (118 x 118 DPI)



Figure 2. Global wheat leaf metabolite changes following inoculation with *B. graminis* f.sp. *tritici*. Principal component analysis was performed on all compounds quantified in the targeted analysis, in all conditions and time points. Data represent nine biological replicates for each condition and time point. The shown principal components explain respectively 21.3% and 21.1% of the variance separating the six groups of plants.

1749x2475mm (72 x 72 DPI)




Figure 3. Heatmap of significant wheat leaf metabolite changes following inoculation with *B. graminis* f.sp. *tritici*. Wheat plants were mock infected (NI) or infected (I) with Bgt. Log<sub>2</sub> of significant metabolite fold changes for I/NI pairwise comparisons at 24, 48, 72 and 96 hpi are given by shades of red or blue colors according to the scale bar. Metabolites were grouped according to their chemical family as amino acids (AA), benzoxazinoids (BZ), flavonoids (F), hormones (H), hydroxycinnamic acid amides (HCAA) and amines (N). Data represent mean values of nine biological replicates for each condition and time point. Statistical analysis was performed using Tukey's Honest Significant Difference method followed by a false discovery rate (FDR) correction, with FDR < 0.05. For FDR ≥ 0.05, log<sub>2</sub> fold changes were set to 0.

1749x2475mm (72 x 72 DPI)






Figure 4. Effects of *Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici* inoculation on histidine (a), glutamine (b), phenylalanine (c) and pipecolic acid (d) accumulation in wheat leaves. Infected (I) and non-infected (NI) leaves were collected at 24, 48, 72 and 96 hpi. The histograms represent mean values ( $\pm$  standard errors) obtained for nine samples per condition, from three experiments (three samples per experiment). Columns headed by different letters indicate statistically significant differences between the different conditions (ANOVA, test post-hoc multiple Bonferroni,  $P \leq 0.05$ ).

524x400mm (59 x 59 DPI)




Figure 5. Non-targeted analysis of wheat leaf metabolite changes following inoculation with *B. graminis* f.sp. *tritici* (Bgt). Ions of interest were selected based on a significant differential accumulation between Bgt-infected and control wheat leaves at 48 hpi, with a fold change > 2. Log<sub>2</sub> of significant ion fold changes for I/NI pairwise comparisons at 24, 48, 72 and 96 hpi are given by shades of red or blue colors according to the scale bar. Statistical analysis was performed using Tukey's HSD method followed by a FDR correction, with FDR < 0.05. For FDR ≥ 0.05, log<sub>2</sub> fold changes were set to 0. Putative identification of the metabolites corresponding to the indicated ions are the following: 1: Hydroxytyrosine, 2: Coumaroyl-hydroxyputrescine, 3: Feruloyl-hydroxyputrescine, 4: Coumaroyl-hydroxyagmatine, 5: Coumaroyl-hydroxy-dehydroagmatine, 6: Feruloylputrescine, 7: Feruloyl-hydroxyagmatine, 8: Feruloyl-hydroxydehydroagmatine, 9: Coumaroylagmatine, 10: Feruloylagmatine, 11: Coumaroyl-dehydroagmatine, 12: Sinapoylagmatine, 13: Dodecanamine. Characteristics of all ions are presented in Supplemental Table 3.





Supplemental Table 1. Twenty-six wheat defense-related genes selected for real time qPCR analyses.

DEFENSE MECHANISMS	GENE	ENZYME	FUNCTION
PATHOGENESIS RELATED PROTEINS	PR1	Pathogenesis-related protein 1	Involved in antimicrobial functions and plant defense signal intensification (Breen et al. 2016)
	PR2	Pathogenesis-related protein 2 (beta 1,3-glucanase)	Cleaves the $\alpha$ -1,3-glucan, one of the major cell wall polysaccharides in filamentous fungi (Sudisha et al. 2012; Yoshimi et al. 2017)
	PR4	Pathogenesis-related protein 4 (hevein-like)	Production of plant antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) acting on cell walls of pathogens (Sudisha et al. 2012)
	PR5	Pathogenesis-related protein 5 (thaumatin-like, osmotin)	Causes leakage of cell constituents from the fungal hyphae and increases the uptake of anti-fungal proteins (Sudisha et al. 2012)
	PR8	Pathogenesis-related protein 8 (class I chitinase)	Acts as a disruptor of fungi cell wall (Sudisha et al. 2012)
	PR14	Pathogenesis-related protein 14 (lipid transfer protein)	Associated to the cell wall, promotes lipid loading and transfer (Sudisha et al. 2012)
	PR15	Pathogenesis-related protein 15 (oxalate oxidase)	Contributes to reactive oxygen species production directly after pathogen infection (Sudisha et al. 2012)
PHENYLPROPANOID PATHWAY	PAL	Phenylalanine ammonia-lyase	Acts as a positive regulator of salicylic acid signalling to cope with microbial pathogens through its enzymatic activity in the phenylpropanoid pathway (Kim and Hwang 2014)
	CHS	Chalcone synthase	Involved in the salicylic acid defense pathway through its role in the flavonoid/isoflavonoid biosynthesis pathway (Dao et al. 2011)
	FNS	Flavone synthase	Serves as potential antioxidants with antimicrobial and insecticidal activities (phytoalexins) (Du et al. 2010)
	PPO	Polyphenol oxidase	Contributes to insect herbivore and pathogen resistance (Constabel and Barbehenn 2008)
ISOPRENOID PATHWAY	HMGR	Hydroxymethyl glutarate-CoA reductase	Involved in the mevalonate pathway that allows biosynthesis of terpenoid defense compounds (Block et al. 2019; Gu et al. 2015)
	FPFS	Farnesyl pyrophosphate synthase	Involved in sesquiterpenes biosynthesis that repel pests (Block et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2015)
	FAR	(E,E)-alpha-farnesene synthase	Role in defence against nematodes and insects (Lin et al. 2017)
CYSTEIN SULFOXID	CSL	Alliinase	Participates to inhibit the proliferation of both bacteria and fungi (Borlinghaus et al. 2014)
ANTIOXIDANT SYSTEMS	APOX	Ascorbate peroxidase	Protects plant cells against ROS accumulation during adverse environmental conditions (Caverzan et al. 2012)
	GST	Glutathion S-transferase	Role in plant responses during biotic stresses through regulating stress-related gene expression and early signaling events linked to plant defense (Dubreuil-Maurizi and Poinssot 2012)
	POX	Peroxidase	Participates to lignin and suberin formation, synthesis of phytoalexins, metabolism of ROS (reactive oxygen species) and RNS (reactive nitrogen species) acting on the hypersensitive response. (Almagro et al. 2009)
	WRKY	WRKY transcription factor 53	Involved in the regulation of oxidative responses to a wide array of stresses, such as biotic stress in wheat (Van Eck et al. 2014)
PARIETAL COMPOUNDS	CalS	Callose synthase	Takes part to papilla formation during microbial pathogen intrusion (Voigt 2014)
	CesA	Cellulose synthase A	Synthesizes cellulose at the primary cell wall adapting plant growth to environmental stresses and producing DAMPs (Kesten et al. 2017)
	CAD	Cinnamyl alcohol dehydrogenase	Contributes to plant resistance through its regulation of the expression of defense genes and monolignol biosynthesis-related genes (Rong et al. 2016)
SALICYLIC ACID SIGNALING	EDS1	Disease resistance protein EDS1	Mediates resistance response through salicylic acid signaling (Falk et al. 1999; Rust�rucci et al. 2001)
JASMONIC ACID SIGNALING	JAR	Jasmonate resistant 1	Involved in jasmonate synthesis to allow jasmonic acid signaling in response to biotic/abiotic stresses (Kazan and Manners 2008; Riemann et al. 2008)
ETHYLEN SIGNALING	ACCS	1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate synthase	Role in plant immunity through ethylene signaling (Yang et al. 2019)
	EIN3	EIN3-Binding F Box Protein 1	Mitigates the oxidative stress (Asensi-Fabado et al. 2012)

Almagro, L., G mez Ros, L. V., Belchi-Navarro, S., Bru, R., Ros Barcel , A., and Pedre o, M. A. 2009. Class III peroxidases in plant defence reactions. *J Exp Bot.* 60:377–390.

- Asensi-Fabado, M. A., Cela, J., Müller, M., Arrom, L., Chang, C., and Munné-Bosch, S. 2012. Enhanced oxidative stress in the ethylene-insensitive (ein3-1) mutant of *Arabidopsis thaliana* exposed to salt stress. *J Plant Physiol.* 169:360–368.
- Block, A. K., Vaughan, M. M., Schmelz, E. A., and Christensen, S. A. 2019. Biosynthesis and function of terpenoid defense compounds in maize (*Zea mays*). *Planta.* 249:21–30.
- Borlinghaus, J., Albrecht, F., Gruhlke, M. C. H., Nwachukwu, I. D., and Slusarenko, A. J. 2014. Allicin: chemistry and biological properties. *Molecules.* 19:12591–12618.
- Breen, S., Williams, S. J., Winterberg, B., Kobe, B., and Solomon, P. S. 2016. Wheat PR-1 proteins are targeted by necrotrophic pathogen effector proteins. *The Plant Journal.* 88:13–25.
- Caverzan, A., Passaia, G., Rosa, S. B., Ribeiro, C. W., Lazzarotto, F., and Margis-Pinheiro, M. 2012. Plant responses to stresses: Role of ascorbate peroxidase in the antioxidant protection. *Genet Mol Biol.* 35:1011–1019.
- Constabel, C. P., and Barbehenn, R. 2008. Defensive Roles of Polyphenol Oxidase in Plants. In *Induced Plant Resistance to Herbivory*, ed. Andreas Schaller. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, p. 253–270. Available at: [http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4020-8182-8\\_12](http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4020-8182-8_12) [Accessed August 26, 2022].
- Dao, T. T. H., Linthorst, H. J. M., and Verpoorte, R. 2011. Chalcone synthase and its functions in plant resistance. *Phytochem Rev.* 10:397–412.
- Du, Y., Chu, H., Wang, M., Chu, I. K., and Lo, C. 2010. Identification of flavone phytoalexins and a pathogen-inducible flavone synthase II gene (SbFNSII) in sorghum. *Journal of Experimental Botany.* 61:983–994.
- Dubreuil-Maurizi, C., and Poinssot, B. 2012. Role of glutathione in plant signaling under biotic stress. *Plant Signal Behav.* 7:210–212.
- Falk, A., Feys, B. J., Frost, L. N., Jones, J. D., Daniels, M. J., and Parker, J. E. 1999. EDS1, an essential component of R gene-mediated disease resistance in *Arabidopsis* has homology to eukaryotic lipases. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 96:3292–3297.
- Gu, W., Geng, C., Xue, W., Wu, Q., Chao, J., Xu, F., et al. 2015. Characterization and function of the 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-CoA reductase gene in *Alisma orientale* (Sam.) Juz. and its relationship with protostane triterpene production. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry.* 97:378–389.
- Kazan, K., and Manners, J. M. 2008. Jasmonate Signaling: Toward an Integrated View. *Plant Physiol.* 146:1459–1468.
- Kesten, C., Menna, A., and Sánchez-Rodríguez, C. 2017. Regulation of cellulose synthesis in response to stress. *Curr Opin Plant Biol.* 40:106–113.
- Kim, D. S., and Hwang, B. K. 2014. An important role of the pepper phenylalanine ammonia-lyase gene (PAL1) in salicylic acid-dependent signalling of the defence response to microbial pathogens. *J Exp Bot.* 65:2295–2306.
- Lin, J., Wang, D., Chen, X., Köllner, T. G., Mazarei, M., Guo, H., et al. 2017. An (E,E)- $\alpha$ -farnesene synthase gene of soybean has a role in defence against nematodes and is involved in synthesizing insect-induced volatiles. *Plant Biotechnol J.* 15:510–519.
- Riemann, M., Riemann, M., and Takano, M. 2008. Rice JASMONATE RESISTANT 1 is involved in phytochrome and jasmonate signalling. *Plant Cell Environ.* 31:783–792.
- Rong, W., Luo, M., Shan, T., Wei, X., Du, L., Xu, H., et al. 2016. A Wheat Cinnamyl Alcohol Dehydrogenase TaCAD12 Contributes to Host Resistance to the Sharp Eyespot Disease. *Frontiers in Plant Science.* 7 Available at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpls.2016.01723> [Accessed August 26, 2022].
- Rustérucci, C., Aviv, D. H., Holt, B. F., Dangl, J. L., and Parker, J. E. 2001. The disease resistance signaling components EDS1 and PAD4 are essential regulators of the cell death pathway controlled by LSD1 in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell.* 13:2211–2224.
- Sudisha, J., Sharathchandra, R. G., Amruthesh, K. N., Kumar, A., and Shetty, H. S. 2012. Pathogenesis Related Proteins in Plant Defense Response. In *Plant Defence: Biological Control*, , p. 379–403. Available at: <https://app.dimensions.ai/details/publication/pub.1036536464>.
- Van Eck, L., Davidson, R. M., Wu, S., Zhao, B. Y., Botha, A.-M., Leach, J. E., et al. 2014. The transcriptional network of WRKY53 in cereals links oxidative responses to biotic and abiotic stress inputs. *Funct Integr Genomics.* 14:351–362.

Voigt, C. A. 2014. Callose-mediated resistance to pathogenic intruders in plant defense-related papillae. *Front Plant Sci.* 5:168.

Yang, B., Wang, Y., Guo, B., Jing, M., Zhou, H., Li, Y., et al. 2019. The *Phytophthora sojae* RXLR effector Avh238 destabilizes soybean Type2 GmACSs to suppress ethylene biosynthesis and promote infection. *New Phytologist.* 222:425–437.

Yoshimi, A., Miyazawa, K., and Abe, K. 2017. Function and Biosynthesis of Cell Wall  $\alpha$ -1,3-Glucan in Fungi. *Journal of Fungi.* 3:63.

Zhang, Y., Li, Z.-X., Yu, X.-D., Fan, J., Pickett, J. A., Jones, H. D., et al. 2015. Molecular characterization of two isoforms of a farnesyl pyrophosphate synthase gene in wheat and their roles in sesquiterpene synthesis and inducible defence against aphid infestation. *New Phytol.* 206:1101–1115.

Supplemental Table 2. List of the 53 metabolites from wheat leaves selected for targeted metabolomic analyses. Metabolites were classified according to KEGG (Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes; <http://www.genome.ad.jp/kegg>) and PubChem (<http://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>) databases. Id: identifier;  $m/z$ : mass-to-charge ratio;  $m/z$  error (difference between the measured  $m/z$  and the calculated  $m/z$  of an ion, in ppm); RT: retention time. Metabolites in bold were confirmed with authentic standards.


Id	Metabolite	Formula	Class <sup>a</sup>	Detected $m/z$	$m/z$ error (ppm)	RT (min)	KEGG ID	PubChem CID	family
1	Spermidine	C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>19</sub> N <sub>3</sub>	Amines	146.1653	0.54	0.85	<a href="#">C00315</a>	1102	N
2	Agmatine	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>14</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	Amines	131.1292	0.91	0.89	<a href="#">C00179</a>	199	N
3	<b>Pipecolic acid</b>	C <sub>8</sub> H <sub>11</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	Amines	130.0863	0.7	1.35	<a href="#">C00408</a>	849	N
4	Methyl-pipecolic acid	C <sub>9</sub> H <sub>13</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	Amines	144.1019	0.31	1.17			N
5	<b>Arginine</b>	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>14</sub> N <sub>4</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	175.1190	0.20	0.95	<a href="#">C00062</a>	6322	AA
6	<b>Asparagine</b>	C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>8</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Amino acids	133.0609	0.86	1.17	<a href="#">C00152</a>	6267	AA
7	<b>Aspartic acid</b>	C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>7</sub> NO <sub>4</sub>	Amino acids	134.0449	0.69	1.09	<a href="#">C00049</a>	5960	AA
8	<b>Glutamic acid</b>	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>4</sub>	Amino acids	148.0604	-0.58	1.17	<a href="#">C00025</a>	4525487	AA
9	<b>Glutamine</b>	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>10</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Amino acids	147.0764	0.09	1.08	<a href="#">C00064</a>	5961	AA
10	<b>Histidine</b>	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>9</sub> N <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	156.0769	0.68	1.00	<a href="#">C00135</a>	6274	AA
11	<b>Hydroxyproline</b>	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>3</sub>	Amino acids	132.0656	0.70	1.27	<a href="#">C01157</a>	5810	AA
12	<b>Isoleucine</b>	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>13</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	132.1020	0.76	2.96	<a href="#">C00407</a>	6306	AA
13	<b>Leucine</b>	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>13</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	132.1020	0.76	2.76	<a href="#">C00123</a>	6106	AA
14	<b>Lysine</b>	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>14</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	147.1129	0.44	0.84	<a href="#">C00047</a>	5962	AA
15	<b>Methionine</b>	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>11</sub> NO <sub>2</sub> S	Amino acids	150.0584	0.36	2.04	<a href="#">C00073</a>	6137	AA
16	<b>Phenylalanine</b>	C <sub>9</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	166.0862	-0.53	4.30	<a href="#">C00079</a>	6140	AA
17	<b>Proline</b>	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	116.0708	1.69	1.23	<a href="#">C00148</a>	145742	AA
18	<b>Threonine</b>	C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>3</sub>	Amino acids	120.0657	1.22	1.08	<a href="#">C00188</a>	6288	AA
19	<b>Tryptophan</b>	C <sub>11</sub> H <sub>12</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	205.0973	0.51	4.75	<a href="#">C00078</a>	6305	AA
20	<b>Tyrosine</b>	C <sub>9</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>3</sub>	Amino acids	182.0813	0.54	3.20	<a href="#">C00082</a>	6057	AA
21	<b>Valine</b>	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>11</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	Amino acids	118.0863	0.48	1.14	<a href="#">C00183</a>	6287	AA
22	DHBOA-Glc-Glc	C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>28</sub> NO <sub>14</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	523.1773	0.59	4.48			BZ
23	DHBOA-Glc-Rh	C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>28</sub> NO <sub>13</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	490.1557	0.59	4.71			BZ
24	DHBOA_Glc	C <sub>14</sub> H <sub>17</sub> NO <sub>9</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	344.09767	0.19	4.29		592555	BZ
25	DIMBOA	C <sub>9</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>5</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	212.0555	0.62	5.40	<a href="#">C04720</a>	2358	BZ
26	HBOA	C <sub>8</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>3</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	166.0499	0.34	5.92	<a href="#">C15769</a>	322636	BZ
27	HBOA-Glc	C <sub>14</sub> H <sub>17</sub> NO <sub>8</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	328.1027	0.09	4.71		14605136	BZ
28	HMBOA-Glc	C <sub>15</sub> H <sub>19</sub> NO <sub>9</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	358.1241	-0.61	5.06			BZ
29	HMBOA	C <sub>9</sub> H <sub>9</sub> NO <sub>4</sub>	Benzoxazinoids	196.0605	0.42	5.42		152213	BZ
30	<b>Apigenin-6-C-glucoside</b>	C <sub>21</sub> H <sub>30</sub> O <sub>10</sub>	Flavonoids	433.1129	-0.16	5.18	<a href="#">C01714</a>	162350	F
31	Apigenin-O-glucoside-O-pentoside	C <sub>26</sub> H <sub>38</sub> O <sub>14</sub>	Flavonoids	565.1553	0.27	5.05	<a href="#">C04858</a>	5280746	F
32	Chrysoeriol	C <sub>16</sub> H <sub>12</sub> O <sub>6</sub>	Flavonoids	301.0707	0.05	6.42	<a href="#">C04293</a>	5280666	F
33	Chrysoeriol-6-C-glucoside	C <sub>22</sub> H <sub>25</sub> O <sub>11</sub>	Flavonoids	463.1237	0.43	5.35	<a href="#">C05990</a>	442611	F
34	Chrysoeriol-C-hexosyl-O-deoxyhexoside	C <sub>28</sub> H <sub>32</sub> O <sub>15</sub>	Flavonoids	609.1817	0.50	5.24			F
35	Chrysoeriol-C-hexosyl-O-hexoside	C <sub>28</sub> H <sub>32</sub> O <sub>16</sub>	Flavonoids	625.1766	0.42	5.17		72193674	F
36	Luteolin-C-hexosyl-deoxyhexoside	C <sub>27</sub> H <sub>30</sub> O <sub>15</sub>	Flavonoids	595.1660	0.45	5.02			F
37	Chrysoeriol-Caffeoyl-hexosyl-hexoside	C <sub>15</sub> H <sub>10</sub> O <sub>6</sub>	Flavonoids	287.0549	-0.40	6.05	<a href="#">C01514</a>	5280445	F
38	Luteolin-C-pentosyl_C_hexoside	C <sub>26</sub> H <sub>28</sub> O <sub>15</sub>	Flavonoids	581.1504	0.51	4.97		44258081	F
39	Luteolin-6-C-glucoside	C <sub>21</sub> H <sub>30</sub> O <sub>11</sub>	Flavonoids	449.1080	0.30	5.00	<a href="#">C01750</a>	5280459	F
40	Tricin	C <sub>17</sub> H <sub>14</sub> O <sub>7</sub>	Flavonoids	331.0812	-0.07	6.45	<a href="#">C10193</a>	5281702	F
41	Tricin-glucoside	C <sub>23</sub> H <sub>30</sub> O <sub>12</sub>	Flavonoids	493.1343	0.58	5.56		5322022	F
42	Tricin 7-(6-malonylglucoside)	C <sub>26</sub> H <sub>26</sub> O <sub>15</sub>	Flavonoids	579.1348	0.55	5.68		122391240	F
43	Feruloylputrescine	C <sub>15</sub> H <sub>23</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	307.1765	-0.05	4.57	<a href="#">C18325</a>	46173376	HC
44	Feruloylputrescine	C <sub>14</sub> H <sub>20</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	265.1548	0.32	4.70	<a href="#">C10497</a>	5281796	HC
45	Caffeoylputrescine	C <sub>13</sub> H <sub>18</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	251.1390	0.07	4.47	<a href="#">C03002</a>	5911	HC
46	Coumaroylputrescine	C <sub>13</sub> H <sub>18</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	235.1441	0.21	4.50			HC
47	Caffeoylputrescine	C <sub>14</sub> H <sub>20</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	293.1608	0.06	4.52			HC
48	Sinapoylputrescine	C <sub>15</sub> H <sub>22</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	295.1653	0.22	4.56			HC
49	Sinapoylputrescine	C <sub>16</sub> H <sub>24</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	337.187	0.09	4.65			HC
50	Coumaroylputrescine	C <sub>14</sub> H <sub>20</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	277.166	0.35	4.66	<a href="#">C04498</a>	5280691	HC
51	Feruloylcadaverine	C <sub>15</sub> H <sub>23</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Hydroxycinnamic acid amides	279.1702	0.42	4.85			HC
52	<b>Jasmonic acid</b>	C <sub>12</sub> H <sub>18</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Phytohormones	211.1329	0.23	6.27	<a href="#">C08491</a>	5281166	H
53	<b>Methyl jasmonate</b>	C <sub>13</sub> H <sub>20</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Phytohormones	225.14855	0.13	7.07	<a href="#">C11512</a>	13682	H

<sup>a</sup> Class was classified according to KEGG (Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes; <http://www.genome.ad.jp/kegg>) and PubChem (<http://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>) databases. Id: identifier;  $m/z$ : mass-to-charge ratio;  $m/z$  error (difference between the measured  $m/z$  and the calculated  $m/z$  of an ion, represented in ppm); RT: retention time. Compounds indicated in bold were confirmed with authentic standards.



Supplemental Table 3. Non-targeted analysis of differentially accumulated ions between I and NI leaves at 48 hpi. Ions were selected based on a comparison of I and NI leaves at 48 hpi, with p-value threshold < 0.05 (two-group Welch t-test) and a fold change threshold  $\geq 2$ . Ions were sorted by retention time (RT) in order to group ions potentially originating from the same molecule. Putative molecular formulas were proposed based on the precise mass of the ions, isotopic ratios, adducts and loss of neutrals, as well as by comparison with published literature.

Group	Identifier	fold I / NI	pvalue	m/z	RT (sec)	Molecular formula	Name / Chemical structure
NA	M214T66	16,80	4,24E-03	214,05893	66,1		
NA	M419T78	4,54	3,60E-02	419,15893	78,3	isotope	
NA	M418T79	2,93	2,45E-02	418,15552	79,1	C14 H28 O13 N	
NA	M256T116	3,28	1,61E-03	256,08156	115,8		
1	M198T130	6,84	4,55E-04	198,07616	129,5	C9 H12 O4 N	Hydroxytyrosine
NA	M151T245	4,59	1,24E-05	151,04239	245,2	C5 H11 O3 S	
NA	M304T247	2,48	3,60E-02	304,05185	247,4		
2	M251T249	5,49	3,20E-02	251,13897	248,5	C13 H19 O3 N2	Coumaroyl-hydroxyputrescine
3	M281T254	8,32	9,86E-03	281,14954	253,7	C14 H21 O4 N2	Feruloyl-hydroxyputrescine
4	M293T254	22,63	1,32E-02	293,16074	253,9	C14 H21 O3 N4	Coumaroyl-hydroxy- <i>agmatine</i>
4	M294T254	24,36	1,41E-02	294,16406	254,3	C13 <sup>13</sup> C H21 O3 N4	isotope of M293T254
5	M147T255	7,96	1,35E-02	147,04400	254,9	C9 H7 O2	coumaroyl fragment of M291T255
5	M291T255	12,98	6,13E-03	291,14510	254,9	C14 H19 O3 N4	Coumaroyl-hydroxydehydro- <i>agmatine</i>
5	M292T255	28,09	7,35E-03	292,14835	255,3	C13 <sup>13</sup> C H19 O3 N4	isotope of M292T255
5	M273T256	13,70	1,03E-02	273,13456	255,7	C14 H17 O2 N4	fragment of M291T255
5	M274T256	22,65	9,83E-03	274,13788	255,8	C13 <sup>13</sup> C H17 O2 N4	isotope of M273T256
6	M266T257	2,50	9,32E-03	266,15799	257,1		isotope du M265T258
6	M265T258	2,91	3,03E-04	265,15466	258,0	C14H21O3N2	feruloylputrescine
7	M323T258	11,25	7,23E-04	323,17138	258,0	C15 H23 O4 N4	Feruloyl-hydroxy- <i>agmatine</i>
7	M324T258	3,05	2,83E-03	324,17467	258,5		isotope du M323T258
8	M321T259	5,20	6,32E-03	321,15574	259,1	C15 H21 O4 N4	Feruloyl-hydroxydehydro- <i>agmatine</i>
NA	M178T260	2,02	3,18E-05	178,05327	259,8	C6 H12 O3 N S	
NA	M346T260	2,46	4,84E-05	346,07911	259,9	isotope	
NA	M344T260	2,17	1,47E-04	344,08327	260,0	C11 H22 O7 N S2	
NA	M345T260	2,27	4,97E-04	345,08687	260,0	isotope	
NA	M144T261	4,49	2,84E-02	144,08085	261,2	C10 H10 N	
10	M307T262	6,60	1,18E-02	307,17652	261,5	C15 H23 O3 N4	Feruloyl <i>agmatine</i>
9	M278T262	42,76	1,15E-02	278,16922	261,7	C13 <sup>13</sup> C H21 O2 N4	isotope of Coumaroyl <i>agmatine</i>
10	M308T265	13,91	3,27E-04	308,17977	264,5	C14 <sup>13</sup> C H23 O3 N4	isotope of Feruloyl <i>agmatine</i>
12	M337T266	2,83	8,24E-04	337,18705	265,7	C16 H25 O4 N4	sinapoyl <i>agmatine</i>
11	M275T266	67,35	1,25E-02	275,15028	266,4	C14 H19 O2 N4	Coumaroyl-dehydro- <i>agmatine</i>
NA	M314T268	3,10	7,52E-06	314,07264	267,7	C10 H20 O6 N S2	
NA	M422T271	3,33	1,13E-02	422,15921	270,8		
NA	M227T279	2,18	2,25E-04	227,17533	279,4	C12 H23 O2 N2	
NA	M262T299	2,17	2,91E-02	262,18016	299,2		
NA	M201T299	2,21	2,79E-03	201,11215	299,5		
13	M186T301	5,27	6,12E-04	186,22169	300,9	C12 H28 N	Dodecanamine
NA	M360T302	2,94	3,28E-02	360,12892	302,1		
NA	M163T313	2,30	6,14E-03	163,13289	313,2		
NA	M363T313	8,04	2,32E-02	363,14159	313,3	C15 H19 O5 N6	
NA	M342T313	7,04	5,15E-04	342,21231	313,3	C14 H32 O8 N	
NA	M370T313	6,13	1,97E-05	370,24360	313,4	C16 H36 O8 N	
NA	M371T314	3,59	3,12E-05	371,24702	313,7		
NA	M395T317	2,34	1,95E-02	395,26402	317,2		
NA	M222T324	3,20	3,11E-03	222,07610	323,8		
NA	M143T325	3,40	1,37E-02	143,10673	324,7		
NA	M467T325	3,64	8,35E-05	467,24892	325,1		
NA	M426T330	2,38	2,21E-04	426,23350	329,9		
NA	M391T330	2,36	8,08E-05	391,19633	330,2	C18H30O9	
NA	M462T330	2,21	1,64E-02	462,11847	330,4		
NA	M409T331	2,19	7,90E-05	409,20694	331,0		
NA	M422T331	4,62	1,12E-04	422,20216	331,3		
NA	M463T334	3,27	2,12E-03	463,25397	334,1		
NA	M481T334	2,91	2,06E-03	481,26456	334,2		
NA	M482T334	4,17	6,03E-05	482,26807	334,3		
NA	M215T334	4,08	2,08E-03	215,20057	334,4	C13H27O2	
NA	M405T343	6,44	3,67E-04	405,21203	342,7		
NA	M423T343	4,10	2,01E-03	423,22260	343,4		
NA	M730T361	2,07	8,39E-03	730,34945	361,4		
NA	M742T365	2,42	8,03E-03	742,47383	365,1		
NA	M469T367	6,71	2,54E-06	469,23679	367,1		
NA	M410T376	24,37	2,55E-02	410,20214	376,2	C17 H32 O10 N	
NA	M290T377	12,07	1,95E-02	290,08695	376,6	C11 H16 O8 N	
NA	M416T377	10,48	4,36E-02	416,16087	376,7	C24 H22 O4 N3	
NA	M127T377	2,82	1,03E-03	127,03909	376,8		
NA	M429T383	4,20	3,93E-04	429,24839	383,0		
NA	M482T384	3,33	3,98E-04	482,29616	383,5		
NA	M430T384	5,27	2,44E-03	430,25176	383,5		
NA	M518T384	5,98	7,16E-03	518,18102	383,8		
NA	M411T385	3,79	1,42E-03	411,23773	384,5		
NA	M466T385	3,36	1,21E-03	466,27332	385,3		
NA	M231T387	4,27	3,17E-04	231,04993	386,5		
NA	M465T387	7,90	6,59E-04	465,27000	386,6	C18 H37 O8 N6	
NA	M396T387	2,51	1,48E-03	396,22292	386,7		
NA	M447T387	5,84	1,31E-03	447,25908	386,8	C22 H37 O8	
NA	M448T387	2,61	4,81E-03	448,26248	387,3	isotope	
NA	M143T392	2,39	3,05E-04	143,10670	391,6		
NA	M429T395	2,51	2,72E-02	429,21198	395,1	C22H35O7	
NA	M482T402	2,48	1,55E-03	482,25980	402,0		
NA	M447T403	2,08	3,93E-03	447,22256	402,6		
NA	M465T403	2,60	1,40E-03	465,23331	402,6		



Supplemental Figure 1. Mass spectrum of the putative p-coumaroyl-3-hydroxydehydroagmatine (M291T255). The fragmentation giving rise to the main fragments is indicated.