THE UNIVERSITY OF

University of Warwick institutional repository

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Mahmut Tör, Michael T. Lotze and Nicholas Holton Article Title: Receptor-mediated signalling in plants: molecular patterns and programmes

Year of publication: 2009

Link to published version: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erp233 Publisher statement: This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in Journal of Experimental Botany following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version [Tor, M. et al. (2009). Receptor-mediated signalling in plants: molecular patterns and programmes. Journal of Experimental Botany is available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erp233.

1	Running title:
2	
3	Receptor-Mediated Signalling
4	
5	Corresponding author:
6	
7	Mahmut Tör
8	
9	Address:
10	Warwick HRI,
11	University of Warwick,
12	Wellesbourne Campus,
13	CV35 9EF, United Kingdom
14	Tel: +44 2476575026
15	Fax: +44-2476574500
16	E-mail: mahmut.tor@warwick.ac.uk
17	
18	Journal:
19	Journal of Experimental Botany
20	
21	
22	
23	

1 Receptor-Mediated Signalling in Plants – Molecular Patterns and Programs

- 2 Mahmut Tör^{*1}, Michael T. Lotze², and Nicholas Holton¹
- 3 1-Warwick HRI, University of Warwick, Wellesbourne Campus, CV35
- 4 9EF, United Kingdom
- 5 2-G. 27A Hillman Cancer Center, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213 USA

6 SUMMARY

7 A highly evolved surveillance system in plants is able to detect a broad range of 8 signals originating from pathogens, damaged tissues, or altered developmental 9 processes, initiating sophisticated molecular mechanisms that result in defense, 10 wound healing, and development. Microbe associated molecular pattern 11 molecules (MAMPs), damage associated molecular pattern molecules (DAMPs), 12 virulence factors, secreted proteins and processed peptides can be recognized 13 directly or indirectly by this surveillance system. Nucleotide binding-leucine rich 14 repeat proteins (NB-LRR) are intracellular receptors and have been targeted by 15 breeders for decades to elicit resistance to crop pathogens in the field. Receptor-16 like kinases (RLKs) or receptor like proteins (RLPs) are membrane bound 17 signalling molecules with an extracellular receptor domain. They provide an 18 early warning system for the presence of potential pathogens and activate 19 protective immune signalling in plants. In addition, they act as a signal amplifier 20 in the case of tissue damage, establishing symbiotic relationships, and effecting 21 developmental processes. The identification of several, important ligands for the 22 RLK-type receptors provided an opportunity to understand how plants 23 differentiate, how they distinguish beneficial and detrimental stimuli, and how 24 they coordinate the role of various types of receptors under varying 25 environmental conditions. Here we examine the diverse roles of extra-and 26 intracellular plant receptors, reviewing recent findings on how they promote 27 defense and development.

28 Keywords: RLK, RLP, DAMPs, MAMPs, defense, development

It is humankind's duty to respect all life, not only animals have feelings but also
 trees and plants. Michel de Montaigne (French Philosopher and Writer. 1533 1592)

4 INTRODUCTION

5 Plants are immobile organisms, capable of receiving and responding to 6 endogenous and exogenous signals. Discriminating beneficial or detrimental 7 stimuli and initiating an appropriate response has emerged over a long 8 evolutionary history. Endogenous stimuli, generally derived from stressed, 9 damaged or malfunctioning cells (damage associated molecular pattern 10 molecules; DAMPs) (Lotze et al., 2007) promote responses in both animal and 11 plant cells. Exogenous stimuli comprise a) pathogen- or microbe associated 12 molecular pattern molecules (PAMPs or MAMPs); virulence factors such as 13 toxins (Friesen et al., 2008), enzymes (Beliën et al., 2006) and effector molecules 14 (Kamoun, 2006; Tör, 2008), and b) non-microbial or abiotic stress inducers such 15 as toxic compounds, pollutants, UV-B light, injury, or ozone.

16 Receptors that have an affinity within the low nM range for ligands (Ogawa et 17 al., 2008) exist across the individual kingdom, play a significant role in the 18 detection of stimuli and activation of programs that direct development and 19 defense. Animals rely on a limited number of Pattern Recognition Receptors 20 (PRRs) including membrane bound Toll-like receptors (TLRs), cytoplasmic 21 NOD-like proteins (NLRs) and RIG-I-like receptors (RLRs) for the activation of 22 innate immunity (Lotze et al., 2007), which promotes the development of an 23 adaptive immune response. Plants, however, lack an adaptive immune system 24 and rely solely on innate immune mechanisms. In addition, each plant cell is 25 surrounded by the cell wall matrix that acts as a barrier as well as nutrient source 26 for would-be pathogens. Pathogens overcoming this barrier are under molecular 27 surveillance by the plant cell, usually by receptors that reside at the cell surface 28 or within the cytoplasm. Membrane bound plant PRRs include receptor-like 29 kinases (RLKs) (Shiu et al., 2003) that have an extracellular domain such as 30 leucine rich repeats (LRRs), lectin, lysine motif (LysM) or wall associated 31 kinases (WAK) with a single transmembrane spanning region and a cytoplasmic 32 kinase domain; receptor-like proteins (RLPs) (Wang, G et al., 2008) that posses

1 an extracellular LRR domain and a C-terminal membrane anchor but lack the 2 cytoplasmic kinase domain, and polygalacturanase inhibiting proteins (PGIP) (Di 3 Matteo et al., 2003) that have only an extracellular LRR domain. Intracellular 4 plant PRRs are NB-LRR proteins (nucleotide binding site-leucine-rich repeats) 5 (Meyers et al., 2003) that are encoded by the so-called disease resistance genes 6 (Figure 1). Functions for several PRRs have been assigned for a number of 7 plants including rice, tomato and Arabidopsis thaliana. Recent findings have 8 increased our understanding of the role of PRRs in diverse biological settings 9 and we have focused on these more novel findings in the studies reviewed below.

10 **RLP-type receptors rely on others to communicate the message**

11 The number of RLP-type receptors predicted from genomic sequences varies 12 according to the plant species studied. Arabidopsis has 57 while rice has more 13 than 90 (Wang G et al., 2008; Fritz-Laylin et al., 2005). Some of these receptors 14 also contribute to development or defense. For example, Arabidopsis 15 CLAVATA2 (CLV2, AtRLP10) and Too Many Mouths (TMM, AtRLP17) 16 proteins play a significant role in meristem and stomatal development, 17 respectively (Jeong et al., 1999; Nedeau et al., 2002). Conversely, in the tomato, 18 the RLP-encoding Cf and Ve genes confer race specific resistance to 19 Cladosporium fulvum and Verticillium spp isolates, respectively (Kruijt et al., 20 2005; Kawchuk et al., 2001). Recently, in collaboration with several other 21 laboratories, we have identified homozygous T-DNA insertion lines for all the 22 Arabidopsis RLP-encoding genes. These were subjected to a wide range of stress 23 inducers including adapted and non-adapted pathogens, MAMPs and abiotic 24 stimuli. We have also investigated if the mutation in these RLP-type receptors 25 causes altered plant growth or development (Wang G et al., 2008). A number of 26 novel developmental phenotypes were observed for the *clv2* and *tmm* insertion 27 mutants. These were slow growth, more rosette leaves, shorter stems and late 28 flowering for the Atrlp10-1 T-DNA insertion line, and chlorosis and reduced 29 growth for the Atrlp17-1 and tmm-1 mutants upon abscisic acid (ABA) treatment 30 (Wang G et al., 2008). Atrlp30 and, in addition, Atrlp18 were found to be more 31 susceptible to the non-adapted bacterial bean pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* 32 pv. phaseolicola. Similarly, we confirmed that AtRLP52 confers resistance to 33 the non-adapted fungal pathogen Erysiphe cichoracearum (Ramonell et al.,

1 2005). Mutation in the *AtRLP41* gene leads to enhanced sensitivity to ABA, the

2 plant hormone that integrates and fine-tunes abiotic and biotic stress-response

3 signalling networks both in plants and animals (Asselbergh et al., 2008;

4 Nagamune et al., 2008).

5 It is surprising that a biological role has been found for only a few of the defined 6 AtRLP genes. This may be attributed to several factors; a) the approach taken 7 may have been biased towards the pathogens and mainly race-specific resistance 8 may have been investigated, b) no insects or nematodes were included in our 9 screen, c) the assay used may not have been sensitive enough to discover some of 10 the roles that these proteins may play, d) these receptors may be involved in the 11 recognition of DAMPs, which were not addressed in our study, or e) there may 12 be functional redundancy. In many ways, this is similar to the abundance of 13 NLRs in the animal genome without known functions. The Arabidopsis genome 14 harbours 24 loci containing a single AtRLP gene and 13 loci comprising multiple 15 AtRLP genes (Wang G et al., 2008; Fritz-Laylin et al., 2005). Most homologous 16 AtRLP genes reside at the same locus and the identification of a T-DNA insertion 17 mutation in one gene may, because of the functional redundancy, not be enough 18 to uncover the role of those genes. In addition, generation of double mutants by 19 crossing individual T-DNA lines would be impossible. In order to overcome the 20 problem of functional redundancy and further investigate the role of RLP-type 21 proteins in Arabidopsis, Ellendorf et al (2008) used an RNA interference (RNAi) 22 approach and confirmed some of the phenotypes observed before. However, no 23 new phenotype has been identified.

24 Since RLP-type receptors lack a cytoplasmic catalytic domain, one of the 25 intriguing questions concerning RLP-mediated signalling is how the message is 26 transmitted from the extracellular matrix to the intracellular space. Although 27 RLP-type receptors in tomato recognize some pathogen effectors indirectly, it is 28 not known how this message is internalized. The most facile explanation could 29 be similar to that suggested for CLV2 and TMM where these RLPs may function 30 in combination with RLK-type receptors CLAVATA1 and ERECTA, 31 respectively, thus relaying the message (Waites et al., 2000; Shpak, 2005). 32 Although it has not been reported, it is tempting to speculate that AtRLP41 may

- 1 also interact with an RLK such as RPK1 (Osakabe et al., 2005) to regulate
- 2 abscisic acid signalling in *Arabidopsis*.

3 RLK-type receptors are the primary communicators

4 RLK-type receptors comprise the largest family of receptors in plants. The 5 Arabidopsis thaliana genome is predicted to contain >600 of such members 6 while rice (Oryza sativa) has more than 1100 (Shiu et al., 2004) The structural 7 features of the extracellular domain of plant RLKs have been used to classify 8 them into subfamilies including LRR, Lectin, self-incompatibility locus (S-9 Locus), lysine motif (LysM), wall associated kinase (WAK), tumour necrosis 10 factor receptor (TNFR), PR5-like receptor kinase (PR5K) and receptor-like 11 cytoplasmic kinase (RLCK, Figure 1). The majority of these RLKs 12 phosphorylate serine or threonine residues of the cytoplasmic kinase domains 13 (Torii et al., 2000; Walker, 2004; Narusaka et al., 2007). 14 The diverse structures in the receptor domains suggest that there are likely to be

several biological functions of these proteins (**Table 1**). The roles of some of
these receptors in the perception of self or non-self molecules are described
below.

18 **Perception of MAMPs and virulence factors**: Despite the large numbers of 19 bacterial, viral, fungal and oomycete plant pathogens, only limited numbers of 20 MAMPs have been discovered. By contrast, hundreds of virulence factors 21 including effectors from pathogens have been identified, and some of their 22 functions have been uncovered. The reason for the discrepancy between the 23 number of MAMPs and effectors could be attributed to a) the conserved nature 24 of MAMPs, b) radical impact of effectors on agriculture where they suppress 25 immune system of host plant, c) amenability of effectors to rapid evolutionary 26 change, and d) delivery of the effectors by the pathogen into plant cells, all of 27 which may have contributed to identification and characterisation of a wide 28 range of effectors (Tör, 2008).

Chitin, xylanase, and ergesterol from fungi, transglutaminase (Pep-13) from
oomycete, lipopolysaccharide (LPS), flagellin (flg22), cold shock protein (CSP)
and elongation factor Tu (EF-Tu) from bacteria have been studied as MAMPs in

plant pathogen interactions (Ingle et al., 2006; Tör, 2008). FLS2 (Flagellin 1 2 Sensing 2) and EFR (Ef-Tu receptor), LRR-RLKs, have been identified as 3 receptors for flg22 and Ef-Tu, respectively, and their physical interactions with 4 the receptors have been demonstrated (Zipfel et al., 2004; Zipfel et al., 2006). 5 The FLS2 and flg22 interaction has become one of the best-characterised 6 systems in the activation of innate immunity in plants. Although flagellin has 7 been portrayed as an invariant MAMP, data are accumulating to suggest that 8 variation occurs within species as well as within pathovars limiting defense 9 eliciting activity of flagellin (Sun et al., 2006). Therefore, we would expect to 10 see further co-evolutionary studies in MAMP-receptor interactions. 11 Race-specific pathogen-encoded virulence factors (effectors) are secreted from 12 the bacterial pathogens into host cells via the Type III secretion system (TTSS), 13 bind to a protein and thereby alter the activity of that protein (Mudgett, 1998). 14 This finding helped the establishment of a common link between the mechanisms 15 of pathogenicity of the plant and animal pathogens. In addition, it has also 16 brought a change in our thinking. Rather than killing the host cell from outside, 17 pathogens delivers effector proteins as virulence factors into the host cell to 18 adapt to a particular niche (Medzhitov, 2007) and manipulate it for its own 19 purpose (Xiao et al., 2007). When these effectors are recognized by the 20 cytoplasmic receptors (described below), they are termed avirulence (AVR) 21 proteins (Jones and Dangl, 2006). Although there are studies on apoplastic 22 effectors from *Cladosporium fulvum* (syn. *Passalora fulva*) (Kruijt et al., 2005), 23 the majority of effectors from this pathogen are recognized indirectly by RLP-24 type receptors (Shabab et al., 2008). The rice LRR-RLK-type protein Xa21 25 functions similarly to cytoplasmic receptors in that they confer race-specific 26 resistance to secreted molecules including in this instance the AvrXa21 from 27 Xanthomonas oryzae, the causal agent of bacterial blight disease of rice (Lee et 28 al., 2008). 29 The effector protein (Dsp)A/E of Erwinia amylovora (causal agent of fire blight 30 on apple, pear and other Rosaceae plant) is absolutely required for its 31 pathogenicity (Gaudriault et al., 1997). It is delivered by TTSS inside the cell 32 and interacts specifically and directly with the cytoplasmic kinase domain of at 33 least 4 different LRR-RLK-type receptors, DIPM1 to 4, (DspA/E-interacting 34 proteins of Malus x domestica) to induce disease (Meng et al., 2006). This

1 finding suggests that a) these putative receptors may act as compatibility factors 2 or b) pathogens may use their effectors to target these receptors to block the 3 signal transmission and evade recognition. Recent findings with the AvrPto and 4 AvrPtoB from *Pseudomonas syringae* support the anti-receptor strategy of the 5 pathogens (Xiang et al., 2008). Shan et al (2008) demonstrated that when 6 expressed in Arabidopsis, AvrPto and AvrPtoB interact with BAK1 7 (brassinosteroid-receptor 1 associated kinase 1) (He et al., 2007), which acts as 8 an adaptor or co-receptor with FLS2 and EFR (Chinchilla et al., 2007; Heese et 9 al., 2007), and interferes with the ligand promoted association of FLS2 with 10 BAK1. 11

12 **Perception of DAMPs**: Mechanical injury, insect or herbivore damage releases 13 specific signals, which have been known as wound inducing proteins in plants. 14 However, these molecules are also released during programmed cell death 15 (PCD), or hypersensitive reaction (HR), or trailing necrosis, the term "damage 16 associated molecular pattern molecules (DAMPs)" would be more precise. 17 DAMPs are generated at the damage site and signals arising from them are 18 delivered to other undamaged part of the plant in a systemic manner. PRRs at 19 the cell surface of the healthy cells can then recognize these DAMPs in a similar 20 fashion to MAMPs and activate the defense signalling cascade. 21 DAMP molecules differ according to the plant species investigated. For 22 example, systemin is only found in solaneceous species such as tomato. In 23 damaged tomato leaf, systemin, an 18-aa peptide, derived from a 200-aa 24 precursor protein, can travel over long distances activating a defense response 25 (Pearce et al., 1991; Scheer et al., 2002). Systemin binds the LRR-RLK, 26 SR160/BRI1 (Systemin receptor 160kDa/ brassinosteroid insensitive 1), 27 however, SR160/ BRI1 mutant plants are still capable of eliciting a systemin 28 induced defense response (Holton et al., 2007), suggesting that additional 29 systemin receptor(s) are present. Indeed, other systemin binding proteins 30 including SBP50 (systemin binding protein 50kDa) have been identified 31 (Schaller et al., 1994). BRI1 also binds and participates in brassinosteroid (BR) 32 signalling through BRI1, in a synergistic interaction with other LRR-RLKs

33 including BAK1 and BKK1 (BAK1-LIKE1) (He et al., 2000). It should be noted

1 that BAK1 and BKK1 have been reported to have dual physiological roles:

2 positively regulating a BR-dependent plant growth pathway, and negatively

regulating a BR-independent cell-death pathway (Kemmerling et al., 2007; He et
al., 2007).

5 Arabidopsis has six PROPEP proteins that are precursors for peptides that act as 6 DAMPs. AtPep1, a 23-aa peptide derived from PROPEP1, can be found in the 7 apoplast. PEPR1 is an LRR-RLK-type PRR, which directly interacts with 8 AtPep1 and initiates defense signalling (Yamaguchi et al., 2006). Interestingly, 9 the PROPEP proteins can be induced by their own peptides, MAMPs such as 10 flg22 and elf18, salicylic acid, jasmonic acid or ethylene. AtPep1 has been 11 suggested to act as a signal amplification loop for the innate immune response in 12 plants (Ryan et al., 2007). In the animal systems, High mobility group box1 13 (HMGB1) protein is the best-characterized DAMP molecule and binds to 14 receptors (TLR2/4, RAGE) on the cell membrane or inside the cell (TLR9) and 15 triggers innate immunity (Lotze et al., 2007). There are several orthologues of 16 HMGB1 in Arabidopsis but it is not known if they activate the immune system in 17 plants by binding to the PRRs, in a similar fashion to that observed in animals. 18 Their role in regulating autophagy in response to stressors is also under 19 investigation.

Perception of developmental cues: Brassinosteroids (BRs) are one of the bestcharacterized examples of hormones in plants that regulate growth processes
such as cell expansion, cell elongation, vascular differentiation, pollen tube
formation, and acceleration of senescence (Gendron et al., 2007) and the
receptors, BRI, BAK1, and BKK1 involved in the BR signalling (Karlova et al.,
2006; Albrecht et al., 2008) are discussed above.

Plant cells can be dedifferentiated and proliferate *in vitro* as totipotent cells,
called calli. Phytosulfokine (PSK), a five-residue peptide, is the growth factor
that induces the dedifferentiation and callus growth with the help of auxin and
cytokinin, two well-studied hormones in plants that regulate root and shoot
formations (Matsubayashi et al., 1996). PSK triggers cell proliferation by
binding directly to an LRR-RLK-type receptor, PSKR (Phytosulfokine receptor)
(Matsubayashi et al., 2002).

1 Mutation in the Arabidopsis CLAVATA1 (CLV1) gene causes a variety of 2 morphological phenotypes, including club-shaped gynoecia. Mutation in two 3 other genes, CLV2 and CLV3 also produce similar phenotypes. CLV1 is an 4 LRR-RLK, CLV2 is an LRR-RLP and CLV3 is a secreted protein that acts as a 5 ligand for CLV1. Interactions of these three proteins regulate the size of the 6 meristem (Clark et al., 1997; Fletcher et al., 1999). Recently, a novel receptor 7 kinase, CORYNE, has been shown to act synergistically with CLV2 but 8 independently of CLV1 to transmit CLV3 signalling (Muller et al., 2008; Miwa

9 et al., 2008).

10 INFLORESCENCE DEFICIENT IN ABSCISSION (IDA) is another secreted

11 protein that acts as a potential ligand for LRR-RLK-type receptors, HAESA

12 (HAE) and HAESA-LIKE2 (HSL2) in Arabidopsis. These receptors and the

13 putative ligand are involved in the regulation of abscission of the floral organs

14 (Stenvik et al., 2008; Cho et al., 2008).

15 There are other RLK-type receptors such as members of *Arabidopsis* ERECTA

16 (Shpak et al., 2005) and STRUBBELIG family proteins (Eyüboglu et al., 2007)

17 that are involved in plant development. However, the ligands for these receptors

18 are not yet known. Their roles and orthologues in other plants have been

19 reviewed extensively by others (Morillo and Tax, 2006).

20 **Recognition of signals that determine self-incompatibility:** Many plants have 21 the capacity to recognize pollen from close relatives, and reject these nominally 22 to prevent inbreeding and maintain genetic diversity within a species, a system 23 that is known as self-incompatibility (SI). In Brassica species, a soluble 24 extracellular protein, the S-locus glycoprotein (SLG), and a membrane bound 25 receptor SRK (S-locus receptor kinase), an RLK with an S-locus extracellular 26 domain at the stigma surface have been identified (Stein et al., 1991; Yamakawa 27 et al., 1994). Further studies led to the identification of SCR/SP11 (S-locus 28 cysteine rich protein or S-locus protein 11) that is expressed predominantly in the 29 anther and interacts directly with SRK resulting in SI (Shiba et al., 2001). When 30 pollen and pistil share the same allele, a ligand-receptor interaction induces a 31 signalling cascade in the female papillar cell, which then signals back to the 32 pollen and inhibits its germination. Some other S-locus RLKs are up-regulated

1 in response to pathogen recognition, MAMPs and wounding, indicating a

2 similarity between perception of self and non-self molecules and activation of

3 downstream signalling (Sanabria et al., 2008).

4 Perception of beneficial microbes: Nitrogen is essential for plant growth and 5 certain plant species such as legumes can utilise gaseous N₂ in the atmosphere 6 symbiosing with nitrogen fixing bacteria of the Rhizobiaceae family. In the 7 interaction between plants and nitrogen fixing bacteria, flavonoid compounds 8 from plants attract rhizobial bacteria, which are triggered to produce nodulation 9 (Nod) factors, lipochito-oligosacharides. When the plant detects this signal, a 10 series of events, especially in root development, occur leading to encapsulation 11 of bacteria and formation of nodules where the bacteria fix nitrogen in return for 12 nutrients derived from the plant (Trevaskis et al., 2002). Receptors that play a 13 significant role in the regulation of nodule formation include LRR-RLK-type 14 receptors such as the nodulation receptor kinase (NORK) in alfalfa (Endre et al., 15 2002), symbiosis receptor-like kinase (SYMRK) in lotus and pea (Stracke et al., 16 2002) and hypernodulation receptor (HAR1) in Lotus (Nishimura et al., 2002) 17 and LysM-RLK-type receptors, such as Nod-factor receptor kinase (NFR1 and 18 NFR5) in lotus (Madsen et al., 2003; Radutoiu et al., 2003). 19 What happens to the MAMP-activated immunity in symbiotic relations? Lipopolysaccharide (LPS), a MAMP that triggers innate immunity in animals 20 21 and plants, plays a positive role in the establishment of symbiosis by suppressing 22 the oxidative burst. Alterations in the LPS structure result in delayed nodulation, 23 abortion of infection threads, formation of nonfixing nodules, and induction of 24 plant defense reactions (Tellström et al., 2007), suggesting a necessity for 25 bacterial LPS for the bacteria to form its symbiotic relation with the host plant. 26 Not a dissimilar response is noted in the setting of NK (Natural killer) 27 recognition of paternal allogantigens in implantation of the mammalian fetus 28 (Eastabrook et al., 2008).

29 Conveying the message: ligand binding activates RLKs: Since there are 30 several RLKs with known ligands, the question as to how these receptors are 31 activated and transmit the message from the extracellular space into the cell 32 arises. From recent studies on several RLK-type PRRs described above, it has 33 become clear that ligand binding a) promotes heterodimerization among

1 members of CLAVATA, ERECTA and BRI family proteins as well as between 2 FLS2 and BAK1; b) increases activating phosphorylation of these proteins; c) 3 promotes conformational changes that generate docking sites for adaptor 4 molecules such as BAK1 for BRI1; d) promotes phosphorylation of residues at 5 the juxta-membrane domain, the region between kinase domain and the 6 transmembrane, which act as docking sites for downstream signalling or 7 regulatory molecules such as membrane bound receptors including cytoplasmic 8 kinases (RLCK), which in turn may also promote phosphorylation (Waites et al., 9 2000; Shiu et al., 2003; Russinova et al., 2004; Shpak et al., 2005; Wang et al., 10 2005; Wang X et al., 2008; Karlova et al., 2008). Once cytoplasmic signalling 11 molecules, such as Rho GTPase in the case of CLV1, receive the message from 12 RLKs, it is distributed further within the cell via a canonical MAPK signalling 13 cascade (Trotochaud et al., 2004).

14 It should be noted that these receptors are under strict regulation of

15 phosphorylation inhibitors, phosphatases such as KAPP (kinase associated

16 protein phospatase), endocytosis, ubiquitin-mediated protein degradation and

17 possibly of autophagy (Tör et al., 2003; Robatzek et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2006;

18 Park et al., 2008; Trujillo et al., 2008; Todde et al., 2009). Once the message is

19 conveyed, they are downregulated by some of the same mechanisms.

20 Intracellular receptors.

21 Plant NB-LRR proteins (nucleotide-binding site-leucine-rich repeats) have been 22 studied in detail and some members are well characterized as immune receptors. 23 They are traditionally referred to as disease resistance proteins or *R*-genes and 24 form the bridge between molecular cell biology in plant immunity and plant 25 breeding for agriculture. They form one of the largest gene families in plants. 26 There are more than 140 predicted members in Arabidopsis and more than 400 in rice. Their gene products promote resistance to viral, bacterial, fungal and 27 oomycete pathogens.⁵ Their tripartite structure is very similar to the mammalian 28 29 CLR, a central nucleotide binding site, carboxyl LRR domain (hence NB-LRR) 30 and a variable, TIR or coiled-coil N-terminal domain (DeYoung et al., 2008).

31 NB-LRR proteins recognize pathogen specific signals, most often effector

32 molecules responsible for virulence, either directly or indirectly. Recognition of

1 either modified host protein or a pathogen-derived protein leads to 2 conformational changes in the amino-terminal and LRR domains of these 3 receptor proteins. Such conformational alterations promote the exchange of ADP 4 for ATP by the NB domain, which activates a signalling cascade in turn, 5 promoting resistance to the pathogen (DeYoung et al., 2006). Although these 6 proteins reside within the cytoplasm, they are also mobile and can translocate 7 into the nucleus, chloroplast or mitochondria. For example, barley MLA, 8 tobacco N and Arabidopsis RPS4 translocate into the nucleus. In such cases, it 9 has been proposed that these NB-LRR proteins de-repress basal defense by 10 associating with WRKY transcription factors in the nucleus (Shen et al., 2007). 11 Activation of defense responses by extracellular and intracellular PRRs have 12 been defined as primary and secondary immune responses, respectively (Shen et 13 al., 2007). In both cases, a localized hypersensitive response (HR, a kind 14 programmed cell death of the infected cell) has been reported (Naito et al., 15 2008), and the main differences between these responses have been reviewed 16 (Jones and Dangl, 2006; Tör, 2008;). Recent studies demonstrated that 17 individual effectors could be recognized by the same intracellular receptor, 18 especially by those that recognize incoming effectors indirectly (de Wit, 2007). 19 In addition, not only do some NB-LRR proteins act additively to provide a 20 resistance response (Marathe and Dinesh-Kumar, 2003; Sinapidou et al., 2004), 21 but also some NB-LRR type receptors are required for RLP-mediated defense 22 responses (Gabriëls et al., 2007). 23 Nearly all NB-LRRs proteins have been reported to function as disease resistance 24 proteins, however, exceptions do occur. Recently Sweet et al (2008) reported 25 that LOV1 (LOCUS ORCHESRATING VICTORIN EFFECTS1), a CC-NB-LRR 26 gene, show natural and induced variation and confer victorin sensitivity and 27 disease susceptibility in Arabidopsis indicating that the NB-LRR genes could 28 also have diverse roles. 29 NB-LRR proteins are also strictly regulated by mechanisms including repression 30 by the chromosomal structure, feedback amplification from the receptor protein, 31 and repression by their negative regulators at the transcriptional level (Li et al.,

32 2007) or ubiquitin-mediated degradation (Tör et al., 2003).

1 Conclusions

2 Plants have many proteins that act as pattern recognition receptors [PRRs] at the 3 cell surface or within the cytoplasm. They have a crucial role in the plant's life 4 and its response to stress elicited by microorganisms or damage; the means of 5 transmitting the signal is exceedingly complex and equally fascinating. Whether 6 primary or secondary defense responses, wound healing or developmental 7 processes ensue, the outcome is dictated by the presence and type of exogenous 8 and endogenous inducers including MAMPs, DAMPs, effectors, secreted 9 proteins and processed peptides. Despite large numbers of receptor proteins 10 having been identified at the cell surface, only a small numbers of ligands have 11 been identified. Recent studies on effectors that are delivered inside the cell 12 uncovered a vast number of putative virulence molecules. Although a few 13 examples of effectors that are delivered into the apoplast are known, more information on these type of molecules are needed to develop a clearer picture of 14 15 their recognition at the cell surface. 16 Homo- or hetero-dimerization of RLK-type receptors to initiate an appropriate

response is currently known for only a few members and we expect additional
candidates to be identified. Similarly, the mobility of NB-LRR proteins within
several intracellular locations brought attention to the convergence of MAMPtriggered and effector-triggered immunity.

DAMPs have been regarded as wound inducing proteins in plants and have not received the same attention as their counterparts in animal systems. Although, plants can easily dispense with dying or dead cells, there is still a lot to learn from the process of responding to damage or injury and there may be ancient prototypical recognition systems such as the hydrophobic portions of molecules (Hyppos) that unify some aspects of plant and animal immunity (Seong et al., 2004).

28 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

29 We would like to thank Professor John Mansfield for his constructive

- 30 suggestions and Dr Alison Woods-Tör for critically reading the manuscript.
- 31 Related research in our laboratory has been supported by grants, BB/C509490/1

- 1 and BB/E02484X/1 (M. Tör) from the UK Biotechnology and Biological
- 2 Sciences Research Council. Research in the DAMP laboratory in Pittsburgh was
- 3 funded by a grant from the NIH 1 PO1 CA 101944-04 (Lotze, Michael T)
- 4 Integrating NK and DC into Cancer Therapy National Cancer Institute; and a
- 5 grant with the Pennsylvania Department of Health. The Department specifically
- 6 disclaims responsibility for any analyses, interpretations or conclusions derived
- 7 from this work.

8 **REFERENCES**

9	Albrecht C, Russinova E, Kemmerling B, Kwaaitaal M, de Vries, SC. 2008.
10	Arabidopsis SOMATIC EMBRYOGENESIS RECEPTOR KINASE
11	proteins serve brassinosteroid-dependent and -independent signaling
12	pathways. Plant Physiol. 148 : 611-9.
13	Asselbergh B, De Vleesschauwer D, Höfte M. 2008. Global switches and fine-
14	tuning-ABA modulates plant pathogen defense. Mol Plant Microbe
15	Interact. 21 : 709-719.
16	Becraft PW, Stinard PS, McCarty DR. 1996. CRINKLY4: A TNFR-like
17	receptor kinase involved in maize epidermal differentiation. Science 273:
18	1406-1409.
19	Beliën T, Van Campenhout S, Robben J, Volckaert G. 2006. Microbial
20	endoxylanases: effective weapons to breach the plant cell-wall barrier or,
21	rather, triggers of plant defense systems? Mol Plant Microbe Interact 19:
22	1072-81.
23	Chinchilla D, Zipfel C, Robatzek S, Kemmerling B, Nurnberger T, Jones JD.
24	2007. A flagellin-induced complex of the receptor FLS2 and BAK1
25	initiates plant defence. Nature 448 : 497-500.
26	Cho SK, Larue CT, Chevalier D, Wang H, Jinn TL, Zhang S, Walker JC. 2008.
27	Regulation of floral organ abscission in Arabidopsis thaliana. Proc Natl
28	Acad Sci U S A 105 : 15629-15634.
29	Clark SE, Williams RW, Meyerowitz EM. 1997. The CLAVATA1 gene
30	encodes a putative receptor kinase that controls shoot and floral meristem
31	size in Arabidopsis. Cell 89: 575-585.
32	De Wit PJGM. 2007. How plants recognize pathogens and defend themselves. Cell Mol
33	Life Sci. 64 : 2726-2732.
34	DeYoung BJ, Innes RW. 2006. Plant NBS-LRR proteins in pathogen sensing
35	and host defense. Nat Immunol. 7: 1243-1249.
36	Di Matteo A, Federici L, Mattei B, Salvi G, Johnson KA, Savino C, De Lorenzo
37	G, Tsernoglou D, Cervone F. 2003. The crystal structure of
38	polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP), a leucine-rich repeat protein
39	involved in plant defense. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 100 : 10124-8.
40	Dodds PN, Lawrence GJ, Catanzariti AM, Teh T, Wang CI, Ayliffe MA, Kobe
41	B, Ellis JG. 2006. Direct protein interaction underlies gene-for-gene
42	specificity and coevolution of the flax resistance genes and flax rust
43	avirulence genes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 103: 8888-8893.

1	Eastabrook G, Hu Y, von Dadelszen P. 2008. The role of decidual natural killer
2	cells in normal placentation and in the pathogenesis of preeclampsia. J
3	Obstet Gynaecol Can. 30 : 467-476.
4	Ellendorff U, Zhang Z, and Thomma BPHJ. 2008. Gene silencing to investigate the roles
5	of receptor-like proteins in Arabidopsis. Plant Signaling and Behaviour 3: 893-
6	896.
7	Endre G, Kereszt A, Kevei Z, Mihacea S, Kaló P, Kiss GB. 2002. A receptor kinase
8	gene regulating symbiotic nodule development. Nature 417 : 962-966.
9	Eyüboglu B, Pfister K, Haberer G, Chevalier D, Fuchs A, Mayer KF, Schneitz K.
10	2007. Molecular characterisation of the STRUBBELIG-RECEPTOR
11	FAMILY of genes encoding putative leucine-rich repeat receptor-like
12	kinases in Arabidopsis thaliana. BMC Plant Biol. 7: 16.
13	Fletcher JC, Brand U, Running MP, Simon R, Meverowitz EM, 1999, Signaling
14	of cell fate decisions by CLAVATA3 in <i>Arabidopsis</i> shoot meristems.
15	Science 283 : 1911-1914.
16	Friesen TL Faris ID, Solomon PS, Oliver RP, 2008, Host-specific toxins:
17	effectors of necrotrophic nathogenicity Cell Microbiol 10: 1421-8
18	Fritz-Lavlin I K Krishnamurthy N Tör M Siölander KV Jones IDG 2005
19	Phylogenomic analysis of the recentor-like proteins of rice and Arabidonsis
20	reveals four major super-clades of resistance proteins and new candidate
20	developmental genes. Plant Physiol 138 : 611-623
21	Gabriëls SH Vossen IH Ekengren SK van Ooijen G Abd-El-Haliem AM van den
22	Berg GC Rainey DV Martin GB Takken FL de Wit PL Joosten MH 2007 An
23	NB-I RR protein required for HR signalling mediated by both extra- and
25	intracellular resistance proteins. Plant I 50 : 1/2-28
26	Gaudriault S. Malandrin I. Paulin IP. Barny MA 1997 DanA an essential
20	pathogenicity factor of <i>Erwinia anyloyora</i> showing homology with AvrE
27	of <i>Pseudomonas syringag</i> is secreted via the Hrp secretion pathway in a
20	DepB dependent way Mol Microbiol 26 :1057-1069
20	Candron IM Wang ZV 2007 Multiple mechanisms modulate brassinosteroid
21	signaling Curr Opin Plant Biol 10: 436-441
32	He K Gou X Vuan T Lin H Asami T Voshida S Russell SD Li I 2007
22	BAK1 and BKK1 regulate brassingsteroid dependent growth and
37	brassingsteroid independent cell death pathways. Curr. Biol. 17: 1100
25	1115
32	He 7 Wang 7V Li I 7by O Lamb C Ponald P Chory I 2000 Derception of
27	brossingstaroids by the extracellular domain of the recentor kinese PDI1 Science
37 20	288 , 2260, 2262
30 20	200 : 2500-2505.
39	He ZH, Fujiki M, Konorn BD. 1996. A cell wall-associated, receptor-like
40 41	protein kinase. J Biol Chem 2/1: 19/89-19/93.
41 42	Heese A, Hann DR, Gimenez-Ibanez S, Jones AM, He K, Li J, Schröder JI,
42	Peck SC, Rainjen JP. 2007. The receptor-like kinase SEKKS/BAKT is a
43	central regulator of innate immunity in plants. Proc Nati Acad Sci U S A
44	104: 12217-12222.
45	Herve C, Dabos P, Galaud JP, Rouge P, Lescure B. 1996. Characterization of an
40	Arabiaopsis thaliana gene that defines a new class of putative plant
4/	receptor kinases with an extracellular lectin-like domain. J Mol Biol. 258:
48 40	
49 50	Holton N, Cano-Delgado A, Harrison K, Montoya T, Chory J, Bishop GJ. 2007.
50	Tomato BRASSINOSTEROID INSENSITIVE1 is required for systemin-

1	induced root elongation in Solanum pimpinellifolium but is not essential
2	for wound signaling. Plant Cell 19 : 1709-1717.
3	Ingle RA, Carstens M, Denby KJ. 2006. PAMP recognition and the plant-
4	pathogen arms race. Bioessays 28: 880-889.
5	Jia Y, McAdams SA, Bryan GT, Hershey HP, Valent B. 2000. Direct interaction
6	of resistance gene and avirulence gene products confers rice blast
7	resistance. EMBO J; 19 : 4004-4014.
8	Jeong S, Trotochaud AE, Clark SE. 1999. The Arabidopsis CLAVATA2 gene encodes a
9	receptor-like protein required for the stability of the CLAVATA1 receptor-like
10	kinase. Plant Cell 11 : 1925-1933.
11	Jones JD, Dangl JL. 2006. The plant immune system. Nature 444: 323-329.
12	Kamoun S. 2006. A catalogue of the effector secretome of plant pathogenic
13	oomycetes. Ann Rev Phytopathol. 44: 41-60.
14	Karlova R, Boeren S, Russinova E, Aker J, Vervoort J, de Vries S. 2006. The
15	Arabidopsis SOMATIC EMBRYOGENESIS RECEPTOR-LIKE
16	KINASE1 protein complex includes BRASSINOSTEROID-
17	INSENSITIVE1. Plant Cell 18: 626-638.
18	Karlova R, Boeren S, van Dongen W, Kwaaitaal M, Aker J, Vervoort J, de Vries
19	S. 2008. Identification of in vitro phosphorylation sites in the
20	Arabidopsis thaliana somatic embryogenesis receptor-like kinases.
21	Proteomics 12: 24
22	Kawchuk LM, Hachey J, Lynch DR, Kulcsar F, van Rooijen G, Waterer DR, Robertson
23	A, Kokko E, Byers R, Howard RJ, Fischer R, Prufer D. 2001. Tomato Ve
24	disease resistance genes encode cell surface-like receptors. Proc Natl Acad Sci U
25	S A 98 : 6511-6515.
26	Kemmerling B, Schwedt A, Rodriguez P, Mazzotta S, Frank M, Qamar SA,
27	Mengiste T, Betsuyaku S, Parker JE, Müssig C, Thomma BP, Albrecht C,
28	de Vries SC, Hirt H, Nürnberger T. 2007. The BRI1-associated kinase 1,
29	BAK1, has a brassinolide-independent role in plant cell-death control.
30	Curr. Biol. 17 : 1116-1122.
31	Kruijt M, Kip DJ, Joosten MH, Brandwagt BF, de Wit PJ. 2005. The Cf-4 and Cf-9
32	resistance genes against <i>Cladosporium fulvum</i> are conserved in wild tomato
33	species. Mol Plant Microbe Interact 18: 1011-1021.
34	Lee SW, Jeong KS, Han SW, Lee SE, Phee BK, Hahn TR, Ronald P. 2008. The
35	Xanthomonas oryzae pv. oryzae PhoPQ two-component system is
36	required for AvrXA21 activity, hrpG expression, and virulence. J
37	Bacteriol 190 : 2183-2197.
38	Li J, Chory J. 1997. A putative leucine-rich repeat receptor kinase involved in
39	brassinosteroid signal transduction. Cell 90 : 929-938.
40	Li Y, Yang S, Yang H, Hua J. 2007. The TIR-NB-LRR gene SNC1 is regulated at the
41	transcript level by multiple factors. Mol Plant Microbe Interact. 20: 1449-1456.
42	Lotze MT, Zeh HJ, Rubartelli A, Sparvero LJ, Amoscato AA, Washburn NR, Devera
43	ME, Liang X, Tor M, Billiar T. 2007. The grateful dead: damage-associated
44	molecular pattern molecules and reduction/oxidation regulate immunity.
45	Immunol Rev. 220: 60–81.
46	Madsen EB, Madsen LH, Radutoiu S, Olbryt M, Rakwalska M, Szczyglowski K, Sato S,
47	Kaneko I, Tabata S, Sandal N, Stougaard J. 2003. A receptor kinase gene of the
48	LysM type is involved in legume perception of rhizobial signals. Nature
49	425 :637-640.

1 2	Marathe R, Dinesh-Kumar SP. 2003. Plant defense: one post, multiple guards? Mol Cell 11 : 284-286.
3	Matsubayashi Y. Sakagami Y. 1996 Phytosulfokine, sulfated peptides that
4	induce the proliferation of single mesophyll cells of <i>Asparagus officinalis</i>
5	L. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 93: 7623-7627
6	Matsubayashi Y. Ogawa M. Morita A. Sakagami Y. 2002 An LRR recentor
7	kinase involved in perception of a pentide plant hormone phytosulfokine
, 8	Science 296 : 1470-1472
9	Medzhitov R. 2007. Recognition of microorganisms and activation of the
10	immune response. Nature 449 : 819-826
11	Meng X, Bonasera JM, Kim JF, Nissinen RM, Beer SV, 2006. Apple proteins
12	that interact with DspA/E, a pathogenicity effector of <i>Erwinia amylovora</i>
13	the fire blight pathogen. Mol. Plant Microbe Interact 19 : 53-61
14	Meyers BC, Kozik A, Griego A, Kuang H, Michelmore RW, 2003, Genome-wide
15	analysis of NBS-LRR-encoding genes in <i>Arabidonsis</i> . Plant Cell 15 : 809-34.
16	Miwa H. Betsuyaku S. Iwamoto K. Kinoshita A. Fukuda H. Sawa S. 2008. The
17	receptor-like kinase SOL2 mediates CLE signaling in Arabidopsis. Plant
18	Cell Physiol. 49 :1752-1757.
19	Mudgett MB, Staskawicz BJ, 1998. Protein signaling via type III secretion
20	pathways in phytopathogenic bacteria. Curr. Opin. Microbiol. 1: 109-
21	114.
22	Muller R, Bleckmann A, Simon R. 2008. The receptor kinase CORYNE of
23	Arabidopsis transmits the stem cell-limiting signal CLAVATA3
24	independently of CLAVATA1. Plant Cell 20 : 934-46.
25	Morillo SA, Tax FE. 2006. Functional analysis of receptor-like kinases in monocots and
26	dicots. Curr. Opin. Plant Biol. 9: 460-469.
27	Nadeau JA, Sack FD. 2002. Control of stomatal distribution on the Arabidopsis leaf
28	surface. Science 296 : 1697-700.
29	Nagamune K, Hicks LM, Fux B, Brossier F, Chini EN, Sibley LD. 2008. Abscisic acid
30	controls calcium-dependent egress and development in Toxoplasma gondii.
31	Nature 451 : 207-210.
32	Naito K, Taguchi F, Suzuki T, Inagaki Y, Toyoda K, Shiraishi T, Ichinose Y.
33	2008. Amino acid sequence of bacterial microbe-associated molecular
34	pattern flg22 is required for virulence. Mol Plant Microbe Interact. 21:
35	1165-1174.
36	Nam KH, Li J. 2002. BRI1/BAK1, a receptor kinase pair mediating
37	brassinosteroid signaling. Cell 110 : 203-212.
38	Narusaka Y, Kawakami N, Kaku H, Shibuya N. 2007. CERK1, a LysM receptor kinase,
39	is essential for chitin elicitor signaling in Arabidopsis. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
40	104 : 19613-19618.
41	Nishimura R, Hayashi M, Wu GJ, Kouchi H, Imaizumi-Anraku H, Murakami Y,
42	Kawasaki S, Akao S, Ohmori M, Nagasawa M, Harada K, Kawaguchi M. 2002.
43	HAR1 mediates systemic regulation of symbiotic organ development. Nature
44	420 : 426-429.
45	Ogawa M, Shinohara H, Sakagami Y, Matsubayashi Y. 2008. Arabidopsis
46	CLV3 peptide directly binds CLV1 ectodomain. Science 319 : 294.
47	Osakabe Y, Maruyama K, Seki M, Satou M, Shinozaki K, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki
48	K. 2005. Leucine-rich repeat receptor-like kinasel is a key membrane-
49	bound regulator of abscisic acid early signaling in <i>Arabidopsis</i> . Plant Cell
50	1 7: 1105-1119.

1	Park CJ, Peng Y, Chen X, Dardick C, Ruan D, Bart R, Canlas PE, Ronald PC.
2	2008. Rice XB15, a protein phosphatase 2C, negatively regulates cell
3	death and XA21-mediated innate immunity. PLoS Biol. 6: e231
4	Pearce G, Strydom D, Johnson S, Ryan CA. 1991. A Polypeptide from tomato
5	leaves induces wound-inducible proteinase inhibitor proteins. Science
6	253 : 895-897.
7	Radutoiu S, Madsen LH, Madsen EB, Felle HH, Umehara Y, Gronlund M, Sato S,
8	Nakamura Y, Tabata S, Sandal N, Stougaard J. 2003. Plant recognition of
9	symbiotic bacteria requires two LysM receptor-like kinases. Nature 425 :585-592.
10	Ramonell K, Berrocal-Lobo M, Koh S, Wan J, Edwards H, Stacey G, Somerville S.
11	2005. Loss-of-function mutations in chitin responsive genes show increased
12	susceptibility to the powdery mildew pathogen Erysiphe cichoracearum. Plant
13	Physiol. 138 : 1027-1036.
14	Robatzek S, Chinchilla D, Boller T. 2006. Ligand-induced endocytosis of the
15	pattern recognition receptor FLS2 in Arabidopsis. Genes Dev. 20: 537-
16	542.
17	Russinova E, Borst JW, Kwaaitaal M, Cano-Delgado A, Yin Y, Chory J, de
18	Vries SC. 2004. Heterodimerization and endocytosis of Arabidopsis
19	brassinosteroid receptors BRI1 and AtSERK3 (BAK1). Plant Cell 16:
20	3216-3229.
21	Ryan CA, Huffaker A, Yamaguchi Y. 2007. New insights into innate immunity
22	in Arabidopsis. Cell Microbiol. 9: 1902-1908.
23	Sanabria N, Goring D, Nürnberger T, Dubery I. 2008. Self/nonself perception and
24	recognition mechanisms in plants: a comparison of self-incompatibility and
25	innate immunity. New Phytol. 178: 503-514.
26	Schaller A, Ryan CA. 1994. Identification of a 50-kDa systemin-binding protein
27	in tomato plasma membranes having Kex2p-like properties. Proc Natl
28	Acad Sci U S A 91 : 11802-11806.
29	Scheer JM, Ryan CA Jr. 2002. The systemin receptor SR160 from Lycopersicon
30	peruvianum is a member of the LRR receptor kinase family. Proc Natl
31	Acad Sci U S A 99 : 9585-9590.
32	Seong SY, Matzinger P. 2004. Hydrophobicity: an ancient damage-associated
33	molecular pattern that initiates innate immune responses. Nat Rev
34	Immunol. 6 : 469-478.
35	Shabab M, Shindo T, Gu C, Kaschani F, Pansuriya T, Chintha R, Harzen A,
36	Colby T, Kamoun S, van der Hoorn RA. 2008. Fungal effector protein
37	AVR2 targets diversifying defense-related cys proteases of tomato. Plant
38	Cell 20 : 1169-1183.
39	Shan L, He P, Li J, Heese A, Peck SC, Nürnberger T, Martin GB, Sheen J. 2008.
40	Bacterial effectors target the common signaling partner BAK1 to disrupt
41	multiple MAMP receptor-signaling complexes and impede plant
42	immunity. Cell Host Microbe 4 : 17-27.
43	Shen QH, Schulze-Lefert P. 2007. Rumble in the nuclear jungle:
44	compartmentalization, trafficking, and nuclear action of plant immune
45	receptors. EMBO J. 26 : 4293-4301.
46	Shiba H, Takayama S, Iwano M, Shimosato H, Funato M, Nakagawa T. 2001. A pollen
47	coat protein, SP11/SCR, determines the pollen S-specificity in the self-
48	incompatibility of Brassica species. Plant Physiol. 125 : 2095-2103.

1	Shiu SH, Bleecker AB. 2003a. Expansion of the receptor-like kinase/Pelle gene
2	family and receptor-like proteins in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol. 132: 530-
3	543
4	Shiu SH, Karlowski WM, Pan R, Tzeng YH, Mayer KF, Li WH. 2004.
5	Comparative analysis of the receptor-like kinase family in Arabidopsis
6	and rice. Plant Cell 16: 1220-34.
7	Shpak ED, McAbee JM, Pillitteri LJ, Torii KU. 2005. Stomatal patterning and
8	differentiation by synergistic interactions of receptor kinases. Science 309: 290-
9	293.
10	Sinapidou E, Williams K, Nott L, Bahkt S, Tör M, Crute I, Bittner-Eddy P, Beynon J.
11	2004. Two TIR:NB:LRR genes are required to specify resistance to
12	Peronospora parasitica isolate Cala2 in Arabidopsis. Plant J. 38: 898-909.
13	Stein JC, Howlett B, Boyes DC, Nasrallah ME, Nasrallah JB. 1991. Molecular cloning
14	of a putative receptor protein kinase gene encoded at the self-incompatibility
15	locus of Brassica oleracea. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 88: 8816-8820.
16	Stenvik GE, Tandstad NM, Guo Y, Shi CL, Kristiansen W, Holmgren A, Clark
17	SE, Aalen RB, Butenko MA. 2008. The EPIP peptide of
18	INFLORESCENCE DEFICIENT IN ABSCISSION is sufficient to
19	induce abscission in arabidopsis through the receptor-like kinases
20	HAESA and HAESA-LIKE2. Plant Cell 20: 1805-1817
21	Stracke S, Kistner C, Yoshida S, Mulder L, Sato S, Kaneko T, Tabata S, Sandal N,
22	Stougaard J, Szczyglowski K, Parniske M. 2002. A plant receptor-like kinase
23	required for both bacterial and fungal symbiosis. Nature 417 : 959-962.
24	Sun W, Dunning FM, Pfund C, Weingarten R, Bent AF. 2006. Within-species
25	flagellin polymorphism in Xanthomonas campestris pv campestris and its
26	impact on elicitation of Arabidopsis FLAGELLIN SENSING2-dependent
27	defenses. Plant Cell 18 : 764-779.
28	Sweat TA, Lorang JM, Bakker EG, Wolpert TJ. 2008. Characterization of natural and
29	induced variation in the LOV1 gene, a CC-NB-LRR gene conferring victorin
30	sensitivity and disease susceptibility in Arabidopsis. Mol Plant Microbe
31	Interact. 21 : 7-19.
32	Swiderski MR, Innes RW. 2001. The Arabidopsis PBS1 resistance gene encodes
33	a member of a novel protein kinase subfamily. Plant J. 26: 101-112.
34	Tellström V, Usadel B, Thimm O, Stitt M, Küster H, Niehaus K. 2007. The
35	lipopolysaccharide of Sinorhizobium meliloti suppresses defense-associated gene
36	expression in cell cultures of the host plant Medicago truncatula. Plant Physiol;
37	143 : 825-837.
38	Todde V, Veenhuis M, der Klei, IJ. 2009. Autophagy: principles and
39	significance in health and disease. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta 1792:
40	3-13.
41	Torii KU, and Clark SE. 2000. Receptor-like kinases in plant development. In Callow
42	JA, ed. Advances in Botanical Research: Incorporating Advances in Plant
43	Pathology 32 : 226-268.
44	Tör M. 2008. Tapping into molecular conversation between oomycete pathogens
45	and their host plants. Eur. J. Plant Pathol. 122: 57–69
46	Tör M, Yemm A, Holub E. 2003. Role of proteolysis in <i>R</i> -gene mediated defence
47	in plants. Mol Plant Pathol. 4: 287-296.
48	Trevaskis B, Colebatch G, Desbrosses G, Wandrey M, Wienkoop S, Saalbach G,
49	Udvardi M. 2002. Differentiation of plant cells during symbiotic nitrogen
50	fixation. Comparative and Functional Genomics 3 : 151-157.

1	Trotochaud AE, Hao T, Wu G, Yang Z, Clark SE. 1999. The CLAVATA1
2	receptor-like kinase requires CLAVATA3 for its assembly into a
3	signaling complex that includes KAPP and a Rho-related protein. Plant
4	Cell 11 : 393-406.
5	Trujillo M, Ichimura K, Casais C, Shirasu K. 2008. Negative Regulation of
6	PAMP-Triggered Immunity by an E3 Ubiquitin Ligase Triplet in
7	Arabidopsis. Current Biology 18: 1396-1401
8	Ueda H, Yamaguchi Y, Sano H. 2006. Direct interaction between the tobacco
9	mosaic virus helicase domain and the ATP-bound resistance protein, N
10	factor during the hypersensitive response in tobacco plants. Plant Mol
11	Biol. 61 : 31-45.
12	Waites R, Simon R. 2000. Signaling cell fate in plant meristems: Three clubs on one
13	tousle. Cell 103 : 835-838.
14	Walker J. 2004. Structure and function of the receptor-like protein kinases of higher
15	plants. Plant Mol. Biol. 26: 1599-1609.
16	Wang G, Ellendorff U, Kemp B, Mansfield JW, Forsyth A, Mitchell K, Bastas
17	K, Liu CM, Woods-Tör A, Zipfel C, de Wit PJ, Jones JD, Tör M,
18	Thomma BP. 2008. A genome-wide functional investigation into the
19	roles of receptor-like proteins in Arabidopsis. Plant Physiol. 147: 503-17.
20	Wang X, Zafian P, Choudhary M, Lawton M. 1996. The PR5K receptor protein
21	kinase from Arabidopsis thaliana is structurally related to a family of
22	plant defense proteins. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A; 93: 2598-2602.
23	Wang X, Goshe MB, Soderblom EJ, Phinney BS, Kuchar JA, Li J, Asami T,
24	Yoshida S, Huber SC, Clouse SD. 2005. Identification and functional
25	analysis of in vivo phosphorylation sites of the Arabidopsis
26	BRASSINOSTEROID-INSENSITIVE1 receptor kinase. Plant Cell 17:
27	1685-1703.
28	Wang X, Kota U, He K, Blackburn B, Li J, Goshe MB, Huber SC, Clouse SD.
29	2008. Sequential Transphosphorylation of the BRI1/BAK1 Receptor
30	Kinase Complex Impacts Early Events in Brassinosteroid Signaling.
31	Developmental Cell 15: 220-235.
32	Wang YS, Pi LY, Chen X, Chakrabarty PK, Jiang J, De Leon AL, Liu GZ, Li L,
33	Benny U, Oard J, Ronald PC, Song WY. 2006. Rice XA21 binding
34	protein 3 is a ubiquitin ligase required for full Xa21-mediated disease
35	resistance. Plant Cell 18 : 3635-3646.
36	Xiang T, Zong N, Zou Y, Wu Y, Zhang J, Xing W, Li Y, Tang X, Zhu L, Chai J,
37	Zhou JM. 2008. Pseudomonas syringae effector AvrPto blocks innate
38	immunity by targeting receptor kinases. Curr Biol. 18: 74-80.
39	Xiao F, Giavalisco P, Martin GB. 2007. Pseudomonas syringae type III effector
40	AvrPtoB is phosphorylated in plant cells on serine 258, promoting its
41	virulence activity. J Biol Chem. 282 : 30737-30744.
42	Yamaguchi Y, Pearce G, Ryan CA. 2006. The cell surface leucine-rich repeat
43	receptor for AtPep1, an endogenous peptide elicitor in Arabidopsis, is
44	functional in transgenic tobacco cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 103:
45	10104-10109.
46	Yamakawa S, Shiba H, Watanabe M, Shiozawa H, Takayama S, Hinata K, Isogai A.
47	1994. Suzuki A. The sequences of S-glycoproteins involved in self-
48	incompatibility of <i>Brassica campestris</i> and their distribution among
49	Brassicaceae. Biosci Biotechnol Biochem. 58: 921-925.

- Zipfel C, Robatzek S, Navarro L, Oakeley EJ, Jones JD, Felix G, Boller T. 2004. Bacterial disease resistance in Arabidopsis through flagellin perception. Nature **428**: 764-767. Zipfel C, Kunze G, Chinchilla D, Caniard A, Jones JD, Boller T, Felix G. 2006.
- Perception of the bacterial PAMP EF-Tu by the receptor EFR restricts *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation. Cell **125**: 749-760.