

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a postprint version which may differ from the publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://repository.ubn.ru.nl/handle/2066/128060>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2018-01-22 and may be subject to change.

# Oecologia

## Consequences of combined herbivore feeding and pathogen infection for fitness of *Barbarea vulgaris* plants --Manuscript Draft--

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Manuscript Number:</b>    |   |
| <b>Full Title:</b>           | Consequences of combined herbivore feeding and pathogen infection for fitness of <i>Barbarea vulgaris</i> plants  |
| <b>Article Type:</b>         | Plant-microbe-animal interactions – original research   |
| <b>Corresponding Author:</b> | Thure Pavlo Hauser, Ph.D.<br><br>DENMARK  |
| <b>Order of Authors:</b>     | Tamara van Mølken<br>Vera Kuzina<br>Karen Rysbjerg Munk<br>Carl Erik Olsen<br>Thomas Sundelin<br>Nicole van Dam<br>Thure Pavlo Hauser, Ph.D.  |
| <b>Suggested Reviewers:</b>  | Arjen Biere<br>A.Biere@nioo.knaw.nl<br>One of the few researchers focusing on interactions of plants with both phytopathogens and arthropod herbivores. Guest editor on the subject in an recent volume of <i>Funct Ecol</i><br><br>Ayco Tack<br>ayco.tack@helsinki.fi<br>another ecologist who has published on three-way interactions<br><br>Valerie Fournier<br>valfourn@rci.rutgers.edu<br>has one of the best analyses of three way plant-microbe-arthropod interactions |
| <b>Opposed Reviewers:</b>    |   |

1       **Consequences of herbivore feeding and pathogen infection for fitness of**

2                               *Barbarea vulgaris* plants

3

4

5

6   Tamara van Mølken\*<sup>a</sup>, Vera Kuzina<sup>a</sup>, Karen Rysbjerg Munk<sup>a</sup>, Carl Erik Olsen<sup>a</sup>,  
7   Thomas Sundelin<sup>a</sup>, Nicole M. van Dam<sup>c</sup> & Thure P. Hauser<sup>a</sup>.

8

9   Except for the first and last author, all authors are listed in alphabetical order.

10

11   <sup>a</sup>Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Frederiksberg,  
12   Denmark

13   <sup>c</sup>Department of Ecogenomics, Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

14

15   \*Corresponding author: Thure P. Hauser, [tpha@life.ku.dk](mailto:tpha@life.ku.dk), mobile and sms: +45 20114469,  
16   no fax presently

17

18

19   **Declaration of Authorship:** TvM and TPH conceived and designed the experiments. TvM  
20   performed all the experiments with help from VK, KRM, TS and NMvD. TvM, VKP, and TS  
21   analysed the data. TvM and TPH wrote the manuscript; other authors provided editorial  
22   advice.

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Plants are often attacked by pathogens and insects. Their combined impact on plant  
26 performance and fitness depends on complicated three-way interactions and the plants ability  
27 to compensate for resource losses. Here, we evaluate the response of *Barbarea vulgaris*, a  
28 wild crucifer, to combined attack by the oomycete *Albugo* sp., causing white rust, and a flea  
29 beetle, *Phyllotreta nemorum*. Plants from two *B. vulgaris* types that differ in resistance to *P.*  
30 *nemorum* were exposed to *Albugo* and *P. nemorum* alone and in combination, and monitored  
31 for pathogen infection, herbivore damage, defence compounds, nutritional quality, biomass  
32 and seed production.

33 *Albugo* developed strong infections in the insect-resistant plants, whereas insect-  
34 susceptible plants were hardly infected. Concentrations of *Albugo* DNA were higher in plants  
35 also exposed to herbivory; likewise, flea beetle larvae caused more damage on *Albugo*-  
36 infected plants. Concentrations of saponins and glucosinolates strongly increased when plants  
37 were exposed to *P. nemorum*, when insect-susceptible plants were exposed to *Albugo*, and  
38 sometimes even more in the combined treatment. The biomass of young insect-susceptible  
39 plants was lower when exposed to flea beetles, and the number of leaves of both plant types  
40 was negatively affected by combined exposure. After flowering, however, adult plants  
41 produced similar numbers of viable seeds, irrespective of treatment.

42 Our study supports that pathogens and herbivores can benefit from each others presence  
43 on a host plant and that the plant reacts by inducing specific and general defences. However,  
44 plants may be able to compensate for biomass loss of single and combined attacks over time.

45  
46 **Key-words:** *Albugo* sp.; defence reactions, plant vigour; *Phyllotreta nemorum*; three-way  
47 interactions.

48

## 49 **Introduction**

50 Plants are often attacked simultaneously by phytopathogens and insect herbivores, and  
51 interactions between them are therefore common (Hatcher 1995; Hauser et al. 2013). The  
52 pathogens and insects may interact directly, e.g. if pathogen spores are transported by insects  
53 to suitable plant tissues, or indirectly through changes in the plant induced by one antagonist  
54 that also affect the other. Thus, pathogen infections can modify attractiveness of the host plant  
55 to herbivorous insects (Stout et al. 2006; van Molken et al. 2012) as well as their  
56 consumption, growth rate, survival and fitness (Hatcher 1995; Hatcher and Paul 2000; Paul et  
57 al. 2000; Rostas and Hilker 2002; Stout et al. 2006; Mouttet et al. 2011; Tack and Dicke  
58 2013).

59 Indirect interactions between plant antagonists may be caused by defence compounds  
60 induced by one antagonist that also affect the other; alternatively, one antagonist may  
61 suppress plant defence levels to the benefit of the other. Complex cross-talk between defence  
62 signalling pathways in the plant may also contribute to such interactions, as different  
63 functional groups of herbivores and pathogens induce different signal pathways that may  
64 interfere with each other (Pieterse and Dicke 2007; Koornneef and Pieterse 2008; Thaler et al.  
65 2012). Other causes of interactions may involve changes in resource partitioning or allocation  
66 as a consequence of attack (Hatcher 1995). Thus, the combined impact of pathogens and  
67 insect herbivores may differ significantly from the sum of impacts of each antagonist on its  
68 own (Hatcher 1995; Hauser et al. 2013).

69 The immediate resource losses incurred by combined attacks by pathogens and herbivores  
70 may to some extent be compensated for by re-growth, depending on the amount and  
71 distribution of losses, stored resources, integration and mobility among compartments,  
72 architecture, and environmental conditions (Paul et al. 2000; Nunez-Farfan et al. 2007;  
73 Fornoni 2011). Unfortunately, only few studies have evaluated how the proximate impacts of

74 pathogen-herbivore interactions translate into effects on plant performance and fitness (Morris  
75 et al. 2007; Hauser et al. 2013). Such knowledge is crucial for understanding the evolution of  
76 complex plant defences and for integrated pest management.

77 Here, we analyse interactions between the wild herbaceous crucifer *Barbarea vulgaris*  
78 (Brassicaceae), a flea beetle, and a pathogen. The subspecies ssp. *arcuata* (Opiz.) Simkovic  
79 of *Barbarea vulgaris* contains two divergent evolutionary types (Agerbirk et al. 2003b;  
80 Toneatto et al. 2010; Hauser et al. 2012; Toneatto et al. 2012) that differ in resistance to the  
81 flea beetle *Phyllotreta nemorum* and other important specialist herbivores (Nielsen 1997;  
82 Renwick 2002). One plant type is susceptible to all known *P. nemorum* genotypes and has  
83 Pubescent rosette leaves (and therefore designated P-type (Nielsen 1997)), whereas the other  
84 is resistant to most genotypes of *P. nemorum* and has Glabrous leaves (G-type). The two plant  
85 types co-exist in Denmark but predominantly in separate populations (Nielsen, unpublished).

86 *Barbarea vulgaris* is also attacked by an oomycete pathogen *Albugo* sp. (van Mølken,  
87 unpublished). *Albugo* (as it will be called here) can be observed in natural *B. vulgaris*  
88 populations in Denmark (van Mølken et al., unpublished), has frequently affected our  
89 experimental plants at the University, and has been detected in historical herbarium sheets  
90 (Choi et al. 2011). The P- and G-type of *B. vulgaris* have been suggested to differ also in  
91 susceptibility to *Albugo* (Toneatto 2009), based on observations of spontaneously infected  
92 plants in a greenhouse.

93 Possible interactions between *B. vulgaris*, flea beetles and *Albugo* could be caused by  
94 several different mechanisms. The resistance against flea beetles is caused especially by the  
95 saponin hederagenin cellobioside (3-O-cellobiosyl-hederagenin) (Shinoda et al. 2002; Kuzina  
96 et al. 2009; Nielsen et al. 2010; Augustin et al. 2011; Augustin et al. 2012), which is present  
97 in G-plants from spring to autumn (Agerbirk et al. 2003a). Putative saponins have also been  
98 discovered in P-plants (Kuzina et al. 2011), however it is unknown if these have a resistance

99 function against any antagonists. Saponins are known to affect many different herbivores and  
100 pathogens (Osbourn 1996; Augustin et al. 2011), and *Albugo* may possibly be sensitive to P-  
101 type saponins. If so, interactions between flea beetles and *Albugo* could result from increased  
102 production of saponins when both are present.

103 The same mechanism of interaction could potentially arise from induction of  
104 glucosinolates. The P-type mainly contains glucosibarin (the optical R-isomer of 2-hydroxy-  
105 2-phenylethyl-glucosinolate: 2R) whereas the G-type contains glucobarbarin (the optical S  
106 isomer: 2S) (Agerbirk et al. 2003a; Agerbirk and Olsen 2011). Glucosinolates are often toxic  
107 or deterrent to non-crucifer specialist insects, and play a role in host selection by crucifer  
108 specialists (Fahey et al. 2001; Griffiths et al. 2001; Renwick 2002). Glucosinolates may affect  
109 fungi and microorganisms (Fahey et al. 2001), including oomycete pathogens (Schlaeppli et al.  
110 2010; Wang et al. 2013), and possibly also *Albugo* species (Mathur et al. 2013). The strong  
111 resistance of G-type plants against flea beetles is not caused by their specific glucosinolates  
112 (Agerbirk et al. 2001, 2003b); however, glucosinolates may still affect the flea beetles to a  
113 lesser degree.

114 *Albugo* infection of *B. vulgaris* may affect oviposition preference of flea beetles, as has  
115 been shown for the specialist herbivorous butterfly *Pieris rapae* on the related crucifer  
116 *Lepidium oleraceum* (Hasenbank et al. 2011). *Albugo* sp. is able to suppress defences of  
117 *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Brassica juncea*, which enables otherwise incompatible downy  
118 mildew strains to infect the plants (Cooper et al. 2008); it is not known if this suppression also  
119 affects defence compounds active against herbivores.

120 Finally, antagonistic interactions may occur in *B. vulgaris* between the presumed salicylic  
121 acid-based signals triggered by the biotroph *Albugo* and jasmonic acid-based signals triggered  
122 by the chewing and mining flea beetles (Pieterse and Dicke 2007; Koornneef and Pieterse  
123 2008; Thaler et al. 2012). However, the specificity of signals in response to these two

124 antagonists has never been tested to our knowledge.

125       Here, we tested whether *Albugo* infection of the two *B. vulgaris* plant types modifies their  
126 interaction with flea beetles, and *vice versa*, and whether this leads to interactive impacts on  
127 plant growth and reproduction. We experimentally applied *Albugo* and *P. nemorum*, alone and  
128 in combination, to P- and G-plants in a glasshouse and analysed (i) the degree of herbivory  
129 and pathogen infection, (ii) levels of defence related compounds and nutritional quality of the  
130 plants, (iii) biomass accumulation and iv) production of viable seeds.

## 131 **Materials and methods**

### 132 Experimental design

133 *Barbarea vulgaris* plants for this experiment originated from a G-type population from  
134 Kværkeby and a P-type from Tissø, both Zealand, Denmark. Both populations are well  
135 studied and typical for the two plant types with respect to resistance, saponin and  
136 glucosinolate content (Agerbirk et al. 2001; de Jong et al. 2001; Agerbirk et al. 2003b).

137       In March 2010, seeds were sown in a greenhouse with 18 hours light and 6 hours dark.  
138 Two hundred seedlings of each plant type were one week later transplanted individually into  
139 plastic pots with standard potting soil. Metal halide lamps (Philips HPI-T plus 400W)  
140 supplemented daylight, as saponin production in *B. vulgaris* depends on light quality. When  
141 plants were three weeks old and had four to five true leaves, they were transferred to a 15 °C  
142 dark chamber and covered with plastic to keep a high humidity.

143       Next day, half of the plants were inoculated with *Albugo*, using a field isolate originating  
144 from naturally infected *B. vulgaris* G-plants from the university campus. A fresh source of  
145 inoculum was maintained through serial passage in G-plants. We have never found naturally  
146 infected P-plants, and strains adapted to this plant type (if any) thus could not be included.  
147 *Albugo* sporangia were collected by tapping leaves with mature pustules onto a glass slide.



148 Inoculum was prepared based on a protocol by Dangl et al. (1992): sporangia were hydrated  
149 for 90 min in deionised H<sub>2</sub>O at 15 °C, and adjusted to 7 x 10<sup>4</sup> sporangia per ml. The plants to  
150 be infected by *Albugo* were inoculated with 5 separate drops of 10 µl inoculum on each of  
151 their four youngest leaves, and were subsequently kept in plastic bags in darkness at 15 °C.  
152 The other half of the plants were given the same treatment, but without sporangia. After three  
153 days, all plants were transferred to 18 hours light, 6 hours dark at 17 °C. White rust began to  
154 develop ten days post inoculation (dpi); at 14 dpi the number of leaves with rust was counted  
155 (Fig 1d).

156 At 17 dpi, the plants were divided in two sets with pairwise matching individual sizes,  
157 and for infected plants with the same number of leaves with white rust; these sets were used  
158 for the first and second harvest, respectively (see below); each set included 66 P- and G-  
159 plants. Infected and non-infected plants were further assigned to the flea beetle treatment and  
160 a control. *Albugo* and *P. nemorum* were thus applied in a fully factorial design with 14  
161 replicate plants per plant type, treatment, and harvest. For logistic reasons we did not include  
162 a treatment where flea beetles were added before *Albugo*.

163 All plants were individually covered with mesh bags, and the first portion of flea beetles  
164 were added to the assigned plants. The flea beetles were taken from a susceptible line  
165 maintained at the university as described by Nielsen (1999). Adults used in our experiment  
166 were not older than seven days, and were not sexed before used. A total of nine beetles were  
167 added in three portions over 20 days. One month after the first beetles was added (56 dpi),  
168 mesh bags and beetles were removed, and the number of leaves counted. At this time, some of  
169 the beetles had mated and larval mines were observed in leaves of 91 % of the P-plants.

170 One of the two sets of plants was then used to analyse biomass and chemical composition  
171 (*first harvest*). A leaf disk (8 mm Ø) from the 5<sup>th</sup> youngest rosette leaf was frozen in liquid  
172 nitrogen, stored at -70 °C, and used for saponin analysis (see below). Five leaf disks (22-29

173 mm Ø) from the 4<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> youngest and the 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> oldest leaves were scanned on a  
174 flat bed scanner to quantify beetle damage, and analysed for *Albugo* infection and  
175 glucosinolate content; a disk from the 6<sup>th</sup> youngest leaf was analysed for carbon/nitrogen  
176 content (see below). The dry weight of leaves (including leaf disks) and roots were measured  
177 separately.

178 The other set of plants (for second harvest) was vernalized at 4 °C for three months, and  
179 transferred to a heated greenhouse with natural light in the beginning of August. When plants  
180 had started flowering after 4 weeks, plants from each treatment and plant type were placed in  
181 separate mesh tents, and male bumble bees were added as pollinators. A minimum of five  
182 bumble bees were present in each tent for one month, at which time flowering had ended.  
183 Plants were then transferred to a climate chamber for siliques to ripen.

184 At the *second harvest*, flowers, siliques, and seeds were dried and counted, and the  
185 flowering stalks weighed. Seed germination of 200 seeds per plant was tested on moist filter  
186 paper in two Petri dishes per plant at 14 h light/20°C, 10 h dark/ 12 °C. Seeds were considered  
187 as germinated if cotyledons emerged within 20 days.

#### 188 *Albugo* symptoms, infection and herbivore feeding

189 The development of white blister rust was visually estimated at the time of first harvest (56  
190 dpi) as the percentage leaf area covered by pustules. Each leaf was assigned to one of five  
191 damage categories: 0: no damage; 1: ≥ 0-20%; 2: 21-40%; 3: 41-60%; 4: 61-80%; and 5: 81-  
192 100% damage. The total percentage of leaf area with rust was estimated as the sum of the  
193 multiplum of the percentage of leaves of each damage class with the mean percentage damage  
194 of that class.

195 *Albugo* infection was estimated by quantitative PCR, using specific primers targeting the  
196 internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region (Ac\_F2: GCTTCGGCTTGACACATTAG; Ac\_R1:

197 TCCGTCTCCTTGATGACCTT; Van Mólken et al., in preparation). Briefly, the five dried  
198 leaf disks scanned for herbivore consumption (see below) were ground with a mixer mill  
199 (Tissuelyser II, Retsch GmbH) and the mix used for DNA and glucosinolate analyses. DNA  
200 was extracted with a DNeasy Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen), and quantitative PCR performed on a  
201 Mx3000P machine (Stratagene). The PCR reaction was set up in duplicate for each sample  
202 using Brilliant II SYBR Green QPCR mastermix (Agilent Technologies) following the  
203 manufacturer's instructions. Standards of serially diluted *Albugo* DNA in water of known  
204 concentrations were included. Another standard series was used to estimate the minimum  
205 amount of pure *Albugo* DNA that could be detected. After amplification, a melting curve  
206 analysis ensured that only one PCR product was amplified.

207 *P. nemorum* feeding was estimated as the average percentage of the area of the five leaf  
208 discs per plant consumed by adults (holes in leaves) and larvae (leaf-mines), using the  
209 software ImageJ (<http://rsbweb.nih.gov/ij/>).

## 210 Plant biochemical composition

211 Saponins were extracted from the 5<sup>th</sup> youngest leaf disk by the methods of Kuzina et al.  
212 (2009). They were then analysed by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) on  
213 an Agilent 1100 Series LC (Agilent Technologies) coupled to a Bruker HCT-Ultra ion trap  
214 mass spectrometer (Bruker Daltonics). A Gemini-NX column (Phenomenex; 3  $\mu$ M, C18,  
215 110A, 2 x 150 mm) was used at a flow rate of 0.2 ml  $\cdot$  min<sup>-1</sup>, preceded by a SecurityGuard  
216 (Phenomenex Gemini-NX C18 4x20 mm). Oven temperature was maintained at 35 °C. The  
217 mobile phases were: A: water with 0.02 % (v/v) trifluoro acetic acid (TFAA); B: acetonitrile  
218 with 0.02 % (v/v) TFAA. The gradient program was: 0 to 1 min, isocratic 12 % B; 1 to 33  
219 min, linear gradient 12 to 80 % B; 33 to 35 min, linear gradient 80 % to 99 % B; 35 to 38  
220 isocratic 99 % B; 38 to 45 min, isocratic 12 % B. The mass spectrometer was run in negative

221 electrospray mode, and the mass range  $m/z$  400-1400 acquired.

222 Five saponins were scored in G-plants: 3-O-cellobiosyl-hederagenin ( $m/z$  [M+TFA-] 909,  
223 RT 21.5), 3-O-cellobiosyl-oleanoic acid ( $m/z$  [M+TFA-] 893, RT 24.4), 3-O-cellobiosyl-  
224 gypsogenin ( $m/z$  [M+TFA-] 907, RT 22.5), 3-O-cellobiosyl-4-epihederagenin ( $m/z$  [M+TFA-]  
225 909, RT 22.6), and 3-O-cellobiosyl-cochalic acid ( $m/z$  [M+TFA-] 909, RT 20.7). Three  
226 putative saponin compounds were scored in P-plants; these correspond to the putative P-type  
227 saponins in Kuzina et al. (2011), based on their mass-to-charge ( $m/z$ ) ([M+TFAA-]=1073 for  
228 saponins 1 (RT 14.8) and 3 (RT 15.5) ; [M+TFAA-]=1159 for saponin 2 (RT 16.2). Peak  
229 areas of the saponins were used as estimates of relative saponin content, as exact  
230 concentrations could not be determined.

#### 231 Glucosinolates

232 Glucosinolates were extracted from 50-100 mg of ground leaf discs (same as used for  
233 estimation of herbivore consumption; see above), and analysed as described in van Leur et al.  
234 (2008). Additional standards of progoitrin, gluconapin, glucoiberin, glucobrassicinapin,  
235 glucotropeolin, gluconasturtiin, glucoraphanin, glucocoerucin, glucobrassicin, and sinalbin  
236 (Phytoplan, Heidelberg, Germany) were used. To calculate concentrations, the glucosinolate  
237 measurements were divided by the dry weight of the sample.

238 Total nitrogen and carbon was measured by mass spectrometry of 3.5 to 4.5 mg of leaf  
239 tissue, which was combusted in tin capsules, and analysed with an elemental analyser (20–20;  
240 Europa Scientific, Crewe, UK) according to the Dumas method (Schjoerring et al. 1993).

#### 241 Data analysis

242 Effects of *P. nemorum*, *Albugo* and their combination on the measured traits were analysed by  
243 ANOVA (proc GLM); all analyses were done for P- and G-plants separately, due to their  
244 difference in resistance to *P. nemorum*. If assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity did

245 not hold, data were transformed; otherwise we used GEE analysis (proc GENMOD) after tests  
246 of “Goodness of fit” in GENMOD to determine the appropriate distribution. Seed germination  
247 was analysed using events/trials data. Multiple comparisons were tested both in proc GLM  
248 (tdiff) and proc GENMOD (diff).

249 The leaf area with white rust was correlated to *Albugo* DNA levels (log); this was only  
250 done for inoculated G-plants, since P-plants hardly developed rust. Herbivore consumption  
251 was only analysed in treatments where flea beetles were applied, and only for P-plants (G-  
252 plants are resistant). Some non-inoculated plants developed white rust during the experiment  
253 and were excluded from all analyses. All tests were carried out with SAS, version 9.1 (SAS  
254 Institute Inc., Cary, USA).

## 255 **Results**

### 256 *Albugo* and flea beetle interactions

257 White blister rust developed on only 17 % of the P-plants as compared to 81 % of the G-  
258 plants (14 dpi; Fig. 1); a similar difference was found at first harvest (56 dpi; results not  
259 shown). Likewise, only very low levels of *Albugo* DNA were detected in leaf extracts of  
260 inoculated P-plants (without flea beetles), while the content in G-plants was much higher  
261 (Fig. 2).

262 Extracts of inoculated plants that were also exposed to flea beetles contained more  
263 *Albugo* DNA than inoculated plants without beetles (77 and 2.6 times more DNA in P- and G-  
264 plants, respectively, Fig. 2; Online Resource 1). Inoculated G-plants with flea beetles also  
265 developed more rust in younger parts of the plants (results not shown). The leaf area covered  
266 with rust was positively correlated with *Albugo* DNA content in G-plants (N= 28;  $r= 0.658$ ;  
267  $p= 0.0001$ ).

268 Flea beetle larvae consumed 56 % more leaf tissue of pathogen-exposed P-plants than of

269 non-inoculated plants (Fig. 2). However, the area consumed by adult flea beetles was not  
270 influenced by *Albugo* infection (Fig. 2, Online Resource 1).

271 G-plants were highly resistant to flea beetles, as expected, and only 10 out of 25 G-plants  
272 had more than 1 % leaf area damaged by adults, and only on old leaves. Only three plants  
273 were damaged by larvae, and this never exceeded 0.1 % of leaf area (data not shown).

#### 274 Biochemical changes in plants

275 The content of saponin 1 in P-plants increased with herbivore exposure and with pathogen  
276 infection (Fig. 3; Online Resource 1); there was a trend towards an even higher expression in  
277 the combined treatment (Table 1). Similar results were obtained for the other saponin  
278 compounds produced by P-plants (Table 1).

279 The resistance-causing saponin of G-plants, hederagenin cellobioside, increased in plants  
280 exposed to herbivores and even more in plants exposed also to *Albugo* (Fig. 3; Online  
281 Resource 1). In contrast, this saponin was not affected by pathogen infection alone. Similar  
282 results were obtained for the other saponins tested (Table 1; Online Resource 1).

283 Glucosinolates increased strongly in both P- and G-plants when exposed to flea beetles  
284 (Fig. 3). In P-plants there was an additional increase when also exposed to *Albugo*; in G-  
285 plants the glucosinolate concentration was lower in the combined treatment than when only  
286 exposed to herbivory (Online Resource 1; Fig. 3). The glucosinolates were not much affected  
287 by the pathogen treatment alone.

288 The carbon-nitrogen ratio of P-plants was negatively affected by flea beetles and  
289 decreased by 26 % and 29 % in the herbivore and combined treatments, respectively; this was  
290 caused by increased nitrogen concentrations (Table 1); pathogen infection did not affect the  
291 carbon-nitrogen ratio. In G-plants, the ratio was positively affected by pathogen infection, due  
292 to a decreased nitrogen concentration (Table 1); the other treatments had no effect.

293 Plant size after the herbivory and pathogen treatment

294 At the *first harvest*, herbivory had decreased both the root and shoot biomass of P- and G-  
295 plants (Table 1; 28 and 16% decrease in total weight, respectively), whereas there was no  
296 effect of *Albugo* or any interaction between flea beetles and *Albugo* (Table 1). Biomass  
297 allocation to shoots and roots did not differ between treatments (Table 1).

298 Plants exposed to both flea beetles and *Albugo* had a lower number of leaves, whereas  
299 there was only little, or no, effect of the herbivore and the pathogen on their own (Fig. 3). The  
300 reduction in number of leaves for G-plants was significant although the magnitude was small  
301 (Table 1; Online Resource 1).

302 Plant reproduction

303 At the *second harvest*, the number of flowers, siliques, and seeds did not differ between  
304 treatments (Table 1). There was a small positive effect of flea beetles on seed weight of P-  
305 plants, and a slightly negative effect of *Albugo* on seed weight of G-plants. Seed germination  
306 was higher for P-plants exposed to herbivory and for G-plants exposed to the pathogen; in  
307 addition, there was a significant interaction between the effects of herbivores and the  
308 pathogen in both plant types. However, the number of viable seeds per plant (number of seeds  
309 multiplied by germination rate) did not differ between treatments for neither P- or G-plants  
310 (Table 1).

## 311 **Discussion**

312 Our results show that the insect-resistant G-plants of *Barbarea vulgaris* are much more prone  
313 to *Albugo sp.* infection than the insect-susceptible P-plants. *Albugo* and flea beetles clearly  
314 affect each others performance on the plant, and induce enhanced levels of plant defence  
315 compounds in some of the combined treatments. However, plant biomass was affected only

316 by flea beetles in P-plants, and overall reproduction was not affected by any of the treatments,  
317 indicating that plants were able to compensate for resource losses to the pathogen and  
318 herbivores.

319 Different responses to *Albugo* of the two plant types

320 A difference in susceptibility to *Albugo* between P- and G-plants was originally suggested by  
321 Toneatto (2009), based on spontaneously infected plants in a crossing experiment. Here we  
322 found the same difference between plant types: less than 20% of the P-plants developed white  
323 rust and hardly any plants contained *Albugo* DNA, while more than 80% of the G-plants  
324 developed white rust and contained *Albugo* DNA. Other inoculation experiments by our  
325 group have shown equivalent differences in white rust development, using other P- and G-  
326 type populations of *B. vulgaris* (Christensen, Heimes, Laybourn, Van Mólken and Hauser,  
327 unpublished). Furthermore, we have found white blister rust in natural populations of G-  
328 plants, but never in P-populations (Van Mólken et al., in prep). The difference in  
329 susceptibility to *Albugo* between P- and G-plants thus seems to be associated with the overall  
330 divergence between the two plant types of *B. vulgaris* (Agerbirk et al. 2003a; Hauser et al.  
331 2012).

332 Leaf extracts of a few P-plants contained *Albugo* DNA but no white rust was observed on  
333 the plants. This may be caused by asymptomatic endophytic infections of the plants by  
334 *Albugo*, as suggested by Jacobson et al. (1998) and Ploch and Thines (2011).

335 Interactions between *Albugo* and flea beetles

336 *Albugo* and flea beetles clearly facilitated each other, with more white rust and *Albugo* DNA  
337 in plants also exposed to flea beetles and a higher consumption of larvae in plants also  
338 exposed to *Albugo*. Flea beetles probably spread sporangia among leaves and thereby  
339 enhanced dispersal and reinfection. *Albugo* usually enter the plant via the stomata and has to



340 grow actively through plant tissue to spread beyond the point of initial infection. Physical  
341 movement of inoculum could thus increase spread and infection success.

342 The higher consumption by larvae in *Albugo*-infected P-plants, despite the low infection  
343 success of *Albugo* in these plants, could be caused by a lower food quality or palatability that  
344 forces larvae to feed more to obtain the necessary nutrients. Especially glucosinolates  
345 increased in plants exposed to both *P. nemorum* and *Albugo*, and even though the P-type  
346 glucosinolates (and saponins) do not confer resistance to the beetles they may decrease  
347 digestibility. Alternatively, *Albugo* could have suppressed unknown defence component that  
348 otherwise restricts larval feeding.

349 Changes in plant biochemistry

350 Saponins and glucosinolates were strongly upregulated upon flea beetle attack. Induction of  
351 the saponins is new to us, as we have so far considered them to be constitutively produced  
352 during the growing season (but see van Leur et al. (2006)). The increased production of  
353 hederagenin cellobioside upon flea beetle attack, as well as other G-type saponins, fit their  
354 function in resistance against these (Nielsen 1997; Agerbirk et al. 2003a; Kuzina et al. 2009;  
355 Kuzina et al. 2011). However, the increased production of saponins by P-plants exposed to  
356 flea beetles does not seem adaptive as these saponins clearly do not impede flea-beetle  
357 feeding.

358 Saponins were also upregulated by *Albugo* exposure in P-plants and in the combined  
359 treatments of both P- and G- plants (however, only significant in G-plants). As most P-plants  
360 did not develop white rust upon *Albugo* inoculation, this could suggest a role of P-type  
361 saponins in resistance. Indeed, some saponins are known to confer resistance against  
362 pathogens (Osborn 1996). Preliminary results, however, suggest that this is not the case  
363 (Christensen et al, unpublished). Szakiel et al. (2011) suggested that induction of saponins is

364 part of an overall plant defence system, and especially P-type saponins may thus be induced  
365 inspecifically by pathogens and herbivores, even by species on which they have no effect.

366 The strong induction of glucosinolates by flea beetles is in agreement with several other  
367 studies (reviewed by Hopkins et al. (2009)); however, another study of *B. vulgaris* did not  
368 find increased concentrations when exposed to the root fly *Delia radicum*, even though  
369 glucosinolates were induced by jasmonic acid application (van Leur et al. 2006; van Leur et  
370 al. 2008), and concentrations in *Brassica nigra* were not increased by the flea beetle *P.*  
371 *cruciferae* (Traw 2002; Traw and Dawson 2002). Glucosinolate induction by herbivores may  
372 thus depend on the species pairs involved. However, glucosinolates are not responsible for the  
373 strong resistance of *B. vulgaris* G-plants against flea-beetles (Agerbirk et al. 2003b; Kuzina et  
374 al. 2011), suggesting that their induction is triggered as part of a general response to insect  
375 damage, as for the saponins.

376 In P-plants, *Albugo* induced higher glucosinolate concentrations when together with  
377 beetles, but not on its own. Glucosinolates may protect plants against fungal pathogens  
378 (Halkier and Gershenzon 2006), but to our knowledge it has not been studied if they also  
379 affect oomycetes. The defensive effect of glucosinolates requires cell damage, and *Albugo*  
380 infection may not cause enough damage to trigger this.

381 In most of the combined treatments the content of saponins and glucosinolates was  
382 approximately additive (i.e. equal to the sum of induced concentrations of the single  
383 treatments), or perhaps slightly synergistic. This does not support recent hypotheses on  
384 antagonistic interactions between different plant defence signalling systems (Koorneef and  
385 Pieterse 2008; Thaler et al. 2012). *Albugo*, as a biotroph pathogen, is expected to trigger a  
386 salicylic acid-based defence signalling, which may antagonise the jasmonic acid-based  
387 signalling triggered by the cell-damaging flea beetles. Only for glucosinolates in G-plants did  
388 we find an antagonistic interaction, where the content of glucobarbarin was significantly

389 lower in the combined treatment than in the treatment with only flea beetles. We have no  
390 reasonable explanation for why the plant types differ in this respect.

391 Flea-beetles increased the amount of nitrogen relative to carbon in P-plants, but not in G-  
392 plants. This was measured as total nitrogen, and may reflect the increase in glucosinolate  
393 content when exposed to herbivory. Gomez et al. (2010) have shown that nitrogen may be re-  
394 allocated to other parts of the plant upon herbivory as a strategy to preserve nitrogen for re-  
395 growth. Whether this was the case for *B. vulgaris* we cannot determine as roots were not  
396 analysed.

#### 397 Plant performance and reproduction

398 Plants that had been exposed to both *Albugo* and flea beetles had fewer leaves at first harvest  
399 than those exposed to only one of them. This may be explained by the increased damage by  
400 larvae in *Albugo* infected plants and the increased *Albugo* infection in plants with flea beetles.  
401 Surprisingly, *Albugo* has a negative effect on the number of leaves in the P-plants, even  
402 though most of these plants are resistant to *Albugo* (i.e. do not develop white blister rust upon  
403 inoculation), but only if the plants were also affected by flea beetles. Similarly, flea beetles  
404 decreased biomass also in the flea-beetle resistant G-plants, and had a negative impact on the  
405 number of leaves in those plants when together with *Albugo*. This indicates that even when  
406 plants are resistant they have to spend resources on defences (Agrawal et al. 1999), which  
407 may otherwise have been used for producing leaves and biomass. Our observation that  
408 saponins and glucosinolates were strongly upregulated by flea beetles in both resistant and  
409 susceptible plants supports this.

410 At maturity, plants did not differ in reproductive output among the four treatments,  
411 despite the differences in pathogen infection, herbivore feeding, leaf number and biomass at  
412 first harvest. Likewise, there were no differences in total biomass of the flowering stalks.

413 Between first and second harvest, plants grew enormously, branched prolifically, and have  
414 most likely outgrown the earlier differences. Thus, plasticity in growth-related traits may  
415 allow plants to compensate for resource losses from an early attack (Paul et al. 2000; Nunez-  
416 Farfan et al. 2007; Fornoni 2011). This is in agreement with recent meta-analyses that  
417 pathogens and herbivores can strongly influence each other and the plant parts they attack, but  
418 that plant biomass and reproduction is on average less affected by such interactive impacts  
419 (Morris et al. 2007; Hauser et al. 2013).

## 420 Implications

421 A growing number of studies have shown that arthropod herbivores and plant-associated  
422 microorganisms can seriously affect each other while on the same plant, either directly or  
423 mediated by the plant (Hatcher 1995; Hatcher and Paul 2000; Mouttet et al. 2011; Paul et al.  
424 2000; Rostas and Hilker 2002; Stout et al. 2006; Tack and Dicke 2013). Our study shows  
425 clear examples this, both for antagonist success and induced changes in the plant that may  
426 subsequently affect both (and other) antagonists. However, while these immediate plant-  
427 pathogen-herbivore interactions may be interesting and important, their impact on plant  
428 performance, fitness and yield may be strongly moderated by compensatory growth (Fournier  
429 et al. 2006; Hauser et al. 2013), as also shown by our results. Unfortunately, very little is  
430 known about this; in the meta-analysis of Hauser et al. (2013), only 35 data sets could be  
431 found that had estimated combined impacts of herbivores and pathogens on plant  
432 performance, despite its clear relevance for ecologists and agronomists alike.

433 An interesting aspect from our study is that plant chemical defences may be upregulated  
434 upon combined attack by pathogens and herbivores, even when plants are resistant to one of  
435 the antagonists. In *B. vulgaris* this may be due to the induction of a generalized defence  
436 response by both *Albugo* and flea beetles, but this may however differ among plant species,

437 specificity of the defence systems, and which antagonist they encounter.

## 438 **Acknowledgements**

439 We are grateful to the Barbarea group at University of Copenhagen for fruitful discussions  
440 and support. We thank L. Munck and E.B. Holub for advice on *Albugo* inoculation. M-B.  
441 Sauer, C. Heimes, S. Christensen and H. Olsen helped with practical work, J.K. Schjoerring  
442 and A.H. Ivø with nitrogen analyses, and R.A. de Graaf with glucosinolate analyses. This  
443 work was funded by the Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation (grant no.  
444 274-08-0462); the authors declare that they have no conflict of interest with this Agency. All  
445 experiments comply with current Danish laws.

446

447 **References**

- 448 Agerbirk N, Olsen CE, Nielsen JK (2001) Seasonal variation in leaf glucosinolates and insect  
 449 resistance in two types of *Barbarea vulgaris* ssp *arcuata*. *Phytochemistry* 58:91-100.
- 450 Agerbirk N, Olsen CE, Bibby BM, Frandsen HO, Brown LD, Nielsen JK, Renwick JAA  
 451 (2003a) A saponin correlated with variable resistance of *Barbarea vulgaris* to the  
 452 diamondback moth *Plutella xylostella*. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* 29:1417-1433.
- 453 Agerbirk N, Ørgaard M, Nielsen JK (2003b) Glucosinolates, flea beetle resistance, and leaf  
 454 pubescence as taxonomic characters in the genus *Barbarea* (Brassicaceae).  
 455 *Phytochemistry* 63:69-80.
- 456 Agerbirk N, Olsen CE (2011) Isoferuloyl derivatives of five seed glucosinolates in the  
 457 crucifer genus *Barbarea*. *Phytochemistry* 72:610-623.
- 458 Agrawal AA, Strauss SY, Stout MJ (1999) Costs of induced responses and tolerance to  
 459 herbivory in male and female fitness components of wild radish. *Evolution* 53:1093-  
 460 1104.
- 461 Augustin JM, Kuzina V, Andersen SB, Bak S (2011) Molecular activities, biosynthesis and  
 462 evolution of triterpenoid saponins. *Phytochemistry* 72:435-457.
- 463 Augustin JM, Drok S, Shinoda T, Sanmiya K, Nielsen JK, Khakimov B, Olsen CE, Hansen  
 464 EH, Kuzina V, Ekstrøm CT, Hauser T, Bak S (2012) UDP-glycosyltransferases from  
 465 the UGT73C subfamily in *Barbarea vulgaris* catalyze saponin 3-O-glucosylation in  
 466 saponin-mediated insect resistance. *Plant Physiology* 160:1881-1895.
- 467 Choi Y-J, Shin H-D, Ploch S, Thines M (2011) Three new phylogenetic lineages are the  
 468 closest relatives of the widespread species *Albugo candida*. *Fungal Biology* 115:598-  
 469 607.
- 470 Cooper AJ, Latunde-Dada AO, Woods-Tor A, Lynn J, Lucas JA, Crute IR, Holub EB (2008)  
 471 Basic compatibility of *Albugo candida* in *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Brassica juncea*  
 472 causes broad-spectrum suppression of innate immunity. *Molecular Plant-Microbe*  
 473 *Interactions* 21:745-756.
- 474 Dangl J, Holub E, Debener T, Lehnackers H, Ritter C, Crute I, Koncz C, Chua N, Schell J  
 475 (1992) Genetic definition of loci involved in Arabidopsis-pathogen interactions. In:  
 476 Koncz CC, N. H.;Schell, J. (ed) *Methods in Arabidopsis research*. World Scientific  
 477 Publishing Co, Singapore, pp 393-418
- 478 de Jong PW, de Vos H, Nielsen JK (2001) Demic structure and its relation with the  
 479 distribution of an adaptive trait in Danish flea beetles. *Molecular Ecology* 10:1323-  
 480 1332.
- 481 Fahey JW, Zalcmann AT, Talalay P (2001) The chemical diversity and distribution of  
 482 glucosinolates and isothiocyanates among plants. *Phytochemistry* 56:5-51.
- 483 Fornoni J (2011) Ecological and evolutionary implications of plant tolerance to herbivory.  
 484 *Functional Ecology* 25:399-407.
- 485 Fournier V, Rosenheim JA, Brodeur J, Diez JM, Johnson MW (2006) Multiple plant  
 486 exploiters on a shared host: Testing for nonadditive effects on plant performance.  
 487 *Ecological Applications* 16:2382-2398.
- 488 Gomez S, Ferrieri RA, Schueller M, Orians CM (2010) Methyl jasmonate elicits rapid  
 489 changes in carbon and nitrogen dynamics in tomato. *New Phytologist* 188:835-844.
- 490 Griffiths DW, Deighton N, Birch ANE, Patrian B, Baur R, Stadler E (2001) Identification of  
 491 glucosinolates on the leaf surface of plants from the Cruciferae and other closely  
 492 related species. *Phytochemistry* 57:693-700.
- 493 Halkier BA, Gershenzon J (2006) Biology and biochemistry of glucosinolates. *Annual*

494 Review of Plant Biology, vol 57, pp 303-333

495 Hasenbank M, Brandon A, Hartley S (2011) White butterfly (*Pieris rapae*) and the white rust

496 *Albugo candida* on Cook's scurvy grass (*Lepidium oleraceum*). New Zealand Journal

497 of Ecology 35:69-75.

498 Hatcher PE (1995) Three-way interactions between plant-pathogenic fungi, herbivorous

499 insects and their host plants. Biological Reviews 70:639-694.

500 Hatcher PE, Paul ND (2000) On integrating molecular and ecological studies of plant

501 resistance: variety of mechanisms and breadth of antagonists. Journal of Ecology

502 88:702-706.

503 Hauser T, Toneatto F, Nielsen J (2012) Genetic and geographic structure of an insect resistant

504 and a susceptible type of *Barbarea vulgaris* in western Europe. Evolutionary Ecology

505 26:611-624.

506 Hauser TP, Christensen S, Heimes C, Kiær LP (2013) Combined effects of arthropod

507 herbivores and phytopathogens on plant performance. Functional Ecology in press.

508 Hopkins RJ, van Dam NM, van Loon JJA (2009) Role of glucosinolates in insect-plant

509 relationships and multitrophic interactions. Annual Review of Entomology, vol 54, pp

510 57-83

511 Jacobson DJ, LeFebvre SH, Ojerio RS, Berwald N, Heikkinen E, Qi (1998) Persistent,

512 systemic, asymptomatic infections of *Albugo candida*, an oomycete parasite, detected

513 in three wild crucifer species. Canadian Journal of Botany-Revue Canadienne De

514 Botanique 76:739-750.

515 Koornneef A, Pieterse CMJ (2008) Cross talk in defense signaling. Plant Physiology 146:839-

516 844.

517 Kuzina V, Ekstrom CT, Andersen SB, Nielsen JK, Olsen CE, Bak S (2009) Identification of

518 defense compounds in *Barbarea vulgaris* against the herbivore *Phyllotreta nemorum*

519 by an ecometabolomic approach. Plant Physiology 151:1977-1990.

520 Kuzina V, Nielsen JK, Augustin JM, Torp AM, Bak S, Andersen SB (2011) *Barbarea*

521 *vulgaris* linkage map and quantitative trait loci for saponins, glucosinolates, hairiness

522 and resistance to the herbivore *Phyllotreta nemorum*. Phytochemistry 72:188-198.

523 Mathur P, Sharma E, Singh SD, Bhatnagar AK, Singh VP, Kapoor R (2013) Effect of

524 elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on infection of three foliar diseases in oilseed *Brassica juncea*. Journal

525 of Plant Pathology 95:135-144.

526 Morris WF, Hufbauer RA, Agrawal AA, Bever JD, Borowicz VA, Gilbert GS, Maron JL,

527 Mitchell CE, Parker IM, Power AG, Torchin ME, Vazquez DP (2007) Direct and

528 interactive effects of enemies and mutualists on plant performance: A meta-analysis.

529 Ecology 88:1021-1029.

530 Mouttet R, Bearez P, Thomas C, Desneux N (2011) Phytophagous arthropods and a pathogen

531 sharing a host plant: evidence for indirect plant-mediated interactions. PLoS One

532 6:e18840.

533 Nielsen J, Nagao T, Okabe H, Shinoda T (2010) Resistance in the plant, *Barbarea vulgaris*,

534 and counter-adaptations in flea beetles mediated by saponins. Journal of Chemical

535 Ecology 36:277-285.

536 Nielsen JK (1997) Variation in defences of the plant *Barbarea vulgaris* and in

537 counteradaptations by the flea beetle *Phyllotreta nemorum*. Entomologia

538 Experimentalis et Applicata 82:25-35.

539 Nielsen JK (1999) Specificity of a Y-linked gene in the flea beetle *Phyllotreta nemorum* for

540 defences in *Barbarea vulgaris*. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 91:359-368.

541 Nunez-Farfan J, Fornoni J, Valverde PL (2007) The evolution of resistance and tolerance to

542 herbivores. Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics 38:541-566.



543 Osbourn A (1996) Saponins and plant defence - A soap story. *Trends in Plant Science* 1:4-9.

544 Paul ND, Hatcher PE, Taylor JE (2000) Coping with multiple enemies: an integration of  
545 molecular and ecological perspectives. *Trends in Plant Science* 5:220-225.

546 Pieterse CMJ, Dicke M (2007) Plant interactions with microbes and insects: from molecular  
547 mechanisms to ecology. *Trends in Plant Science* 12:564-569.

548 Ploch S, Thines M (2011) Obligate biotrophic pathogens of the genus *Albugo* are widespread  
549 as asymptomatic endophytes in natural populations of Brassicaceae. *Mol Ecol*  
550 20:3692-3699.

551 Renwick JAA (2002) The chemical world of crucivores: lures, treats and traps. *Entomologia*  
552 *Experimentalis et Applicata* 104:35-42.

553 Rostas M, Hilker M (2002) Asymmetric plant-mediated cross-effects between a herbivorous  
554 insect and a phytopathogenic fungus. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology* 4:223-231.

555 Schjoerring JK, Kyllingsbaek A, Mortensen JV, ByskovNielsen S (1993) Field investigations  
556 of ammonia exchange between barley plants and the atmosphere. 1. Concentration  
557 profiles and flux densities of ammonia. *Plant Cell Environ.* 16:161-167.

558 Schlaeppi K, Abou-Mansour E, Buchala A, Mauch F (2010) Disease resistance of  
559 *Arabidopsis* to *Phytophthora brassicae* is established by the sequential action of  
560 indole glucosinolates and camalexin. *Plant Journal* 62:840-851.

561 Shinoda T, Nagao T, Nakayama M, Serizawa H, Koshioka M, Okabe H, Kawai A (2002)  
562 Identification of a triterpenoid saponin from a crucifer, *Barbarea vulgaris*, as a  
563 feeding deterrent to the diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella*. *Journal of Chemical*  
564 *Ecology* 28:587-599.

565 Stout MJ, Thaler JS, Thomma BPHJ (2006) Plant-mediated interactions between pathogenic  
566 microorganisms and herbivorous arthropods. *Annual Review of Entomology* 51:663-  
567 689.

568 Szakiel A, Paczkowski C, Henry M (2011) Influence of environmental biotic factors on the  
569 content of saponins in plants. *Phytochemistry Reviews* 10:493-502.

570 Tack AJM, Dicke M (2013) Plant pathogens structure arthropod communities across multiple  
571 spatial and temporal scales. *Functional Ecology* 27:633-645.

572 Thaler JS, Humphrey PT, Whiteman NK (2012) Evolution of jasmonate and salicylate signal  
573 crosstalk. *Trends in Plant Science* 17:260-270.

574 Toneatto F (2009) Genetics and distribution of insect resistance polymorphism in *Barbarea*  
575 *vulgaris*. PhD, University of Copenhagen, Frederiksberg

576 Toneatto F, Nielsen JK, Ørgaard M, Hauser TP (2010) Genetic and sexual separation between  
577 insect resistant and susceptible *Barbarea vulgaris* plants in Denmark. *Molecular*  
578 *Ecology* 19:3456-3465.

579 Toneatto F, Hauser TP, Nielsen JK, Ørgaard M (2012) Genetic diversity and similarity in the  
580 *Barbarea vulgaris* complex (Brassicaceae). *Nordic Journal of Botany* 30:506-512.

581 Traw MB (2002) Is induction response negatively correlated with constitutive resistance in  
582 black mustard? *Evolution* 56:2196-2205.

583 Traw MB, Dawson TE (2002) Reduced performance of two specialist herbivores  
584 (Lepidoptera : Pieridae, Coleoptera : Chrysomelidae) on new leaves of damaged black  
585 mustard plants. *Environmental Entomology* 31:714-722.

586 van Leur H, Raaijmakers CE, van Dam NM (2006) A heritable glucosinolate polymorphism  
587 within natural populations of *Barbarea vulgaris*. *Phytochemistry* 67:1214-1223.

588 van Leur H, Raaijmakers CE, van Dam NM (2008) Reciprocal interactions between the  
589 cabbage root fly (*Delia radicum*) and two glucosinolate phenotypes of *Barbarea*  
590 *vulgaris*. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 128:312-322.

591 van Molken T, de Caluwe H, Hordijk CA, Leon-Reyes A, Snoeren TAL, van Dam NM,



592 Stuefer JF (2012) Virus infection decreases the attractiveness of white clover plants  
593 for a non-vectoring herbivore. *Oecologia* 170:433-444.  
594 Wang Y, Bouwmeester K, Van de Mortel JE, Shan WX, Govers F (2013) A novel  
595 Arabidopsis-oomycete pathosystem: differential interactions with *Phytophthora*  
596 *capsici* reveal a role for camalexin, indole glucosinolates and salicylic acid in defence.  
597 *Plant Cell Environ.* 36:1192-1203.  
598  
599  
600

601 **Figure legends**

602 **Fig. 1.** Species used in this study: (a) *Barbarea vulgaris* in the rosette and flowering stage.

603 Inserts show a pubescent P-type leaf in the lower left corner and a glabrous G-type leaf in the  
604 lower middle part; (b) *Phyllotreta nemorum* adult (left) and larva (right); (c) white blister rust  
605 (pustules) caused by the *Albugo sp.*; (d) number of P- and G-plants showing symptoms 14  
606 days post inoculation.

607

608 **Fig. 2.** *Albugo* DNA content and flea beetle damage after infestation with flea beetles (Herb),  
609 *Albugo* (Path) and both (H&P). Mean values  $\pm$  SE are shown for (a) ng *Albugo* DNA (out of  
610 10 ng total) in leaves of P- and G-plants; insert shows a DNA melting curve (temperature ( $^{\circ}$ C)  
611 x fluorescence) demonstrating that only one PCR product was amplified; (b) percentage of  
612 leaf area consumed by beetles and larvae in flea beetle susceptible P-plants; G-plants are  
613 resistant and not damaged. Columns with different letters of the same case are significantly  
614 different at  $p < 0.05$ .

615

616 **Fig. 3.** Plant traits affected by interactions between flea beetles (Herbivore) and *Albugo*  
617 (Pathogen): (a) saponin content, (b) glucosinolate concentrations (micromoles per gram dry  
618 mass); (c) number of leaves; shown for P- and G-plants separately. Columns indicate mean  
619 values  $\pm$  SE; note that y-axes differ. Columns with different letters are significantly different  
620 at  $p < 0.05$ .

## Tables

**Table 1.** Mean values ( $\pm$  SE) of traits measured on plant of the two plant types in the control, herbivore, pathogen, and combined treatments. Significant differences between a treatment and the control are indicated by bold types; significance levels for interaction terms are indicated by asterisks ((\*):  $p < 0.1$ ; (\*):  $p < 0.05$ ; (\*\*):  $p < 0.01$ ; (\*\*\*) :  $p < 0.001$ ). Results from statistical analyses in Online Resource 1.

| Traits  | P- plants          |                                   |                                   |  | G-plants           |                                   |                                   |   |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
|   | Control            | Herbivore                         | Pathogen                          | Herbivore + pathogen                   | Control            | Herbivore                         | Pathogen                          | Herbivore + pathogen                    |
| Percentage adult flea beetle damage                               |                    | 2.8 $\pm$ 0.6                     |                                   | 3.0 $\pm$ 0.6                          |                    |                                   |                                   |   |
| Percentage flea beetle larvae damage                              |                    | 7 $\pm$ 3                         |                                   | <b>12 <math>\pm</math> 3 *</b>         |                    |                                   |                                   |   |
| <i>A. candida</i> DNA (ng)  | 0.000 $\pm$ 0.0000 | 0.000 $\pm$ 0.0001                | 0.006 $\pm$ 0.0014                | <b>0.461 <math>\pm</math> 0.4474 *</b> | 0.000 $\pm$ 0.0001 | 0.000 $\pm$ 0.0001                | 0.626 $\pm$ 0.3518                | <b>1.662 <math>\pm</math> 0.6611 **</b> |
| Saponin 1   Hederagenin cellobioside <sup>a</sup>                 | 138 $\pm$ 26       | <b>278 <math>\pm</math> 46</b>    | <b>283 <math>\pm</math> 65</b>    | 361 $\pm$ 66 (*)                       | 134 $\pm$ 6        | <b>183 <math>\pm</math> 8</b>     | 128 $\pm$ 5                       | <b>206 <math>\pm</math> 8 *</b>         |
| Saponin 2   Cochalic acid cellobioside <sup>a</sup>               | 225 $\pm$ 36       | <b>403 <math>\pm</math> 52</b>    | <b>451 <math>\pm</math> 102</b>   | 496 $\pm$ 76 (*)                       | 15 $\pm$ 3         | <b>50 <math>\pm</math> 7</b>      | <b>12 <math>\pm</math> 4</b>      | <b>73 <math>\pm</math> 6 *</b>          |
| Saponin 3   Oleanolic acid cellobioside <sup>a</sup>              | 93 $\pm$ 23        | <b>214 <math>\pm</math> 41</b>    | <b>242 <math>\pm</math> 61</b>    | 355 $\pm$ 73 (*)                       | 78 $\pm$ 5         | <b>134 <math>\pm</math> 8</b>     | 78 $\pm$ 7                        | 165 $\pm$ 11 (*)                        |
| Glucosinolates ( $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}$ ) <sup>b</sup> | 19 $\pm$ 2         | <b>39 <math>\pm</math> 5</b>      | <b>26 <math>\pm</math> 3</b>      | 56 $\pm$ 3                             | 25 $\pm$ 4         | <b>56 <math>\pm</math> 3</b>      | <b>25 <math>\pm</math> 2</b>      | <b>40 <math>\pm</math> 2 **</b>         |
| Percentage nitrogen   | 2.0 $\pm$ 0.2      | <b>2.4 <math>\pm</math> 0.2</b>   | 2.4 $\pm$ 0.3                     | 2.7 $\pm$ 0.2                          | 2.1 $\pm$ 0.1      | 2.1 $\pm$ 0.2                     | <b>1.8 <math>\pm</math> 0.2</b>   | 1.9 $\pm$ 0.1                           |
| Percentage carbon   | 42.0 $\pm$ 0.4     | <b>40.9 <math>\pm</math> 0.4</b>  | <b>43.2 <math>\pm</math> 0.3</b>  | 41.6 $\pm$ 0.4                         | 42.2 $\pm$ 0.2     | 42.0 $\pm$ 0.3                    | 42.0 $\pm$ 0.3                    | 42.4 $\pm$ 0.4                          |
| Carbon-nitrogen ratio   | 23.5 $\pm$ 1.7     | <b>17.5 <math>\pm</math> 1.0</b>  | 21.6 $\pm$ 2.8                    | 16.6 $\pm$ 1.3                         | 21.4 $\pm$ 1.4     | 20.8 $\pm$ 1.2                    | <b>26.1 <math>\pm</math> 2.2</b>  | 23.5 $\pm$ 1.1                          |
| Root biomass (g)  | 1.96 $\pm$ 0.08    | <b>1.35 <math>\pm</math> 0.11</b> | <b>2.24 <math>\pm</math> 0.09</b> | 1.46 $\pm$ 0.15                        | 1.66 $\pm$ 0.11    | <b>1.48 <math>\pm</math> 0.11</b> | 1.66 $\pm$ 0.09                   | 1.40 $\pm$ 0.07                         |
| Shoot biomass (g)   | 6.32 $\pm$ 0.16    | <b>4.55 <math>\pm</math> 0.27</b> | 6.81 $\pm$ 0.15                   | 4.53 $\pm$ 0.39                        | 6.61 $\pm$ 0.22    | <b>5.90 <math>\pm</math> 0.27</b> | 6.88 $\pm$ 0.28                   | 6.05 $\pm$ 0.23                         |
| Root-shoot ratio  | 0.31 $\pm$ 0.01    | 0.29 $\pm$ 0.02                   | 0.33 $\pm$ 0.01                   | 0.32 $\pm$ 0.02                        | 0.25 $\pm$ 0.02    | 0.25 $\pm$ 0.02                   | 0.24 $\pm$ 0.01                   | 0.23 $\pm$ 0.01                         |
| Number of leaves  | 37.4 $\pm$ 1.8     | <b>35.7 <math>\pm</math> 1.6</b>  | 37.6 $\pm$ 1.1                    | 34.1 $\pm$ 1.1                         | 40.6 $\pm$ 1.7     | <b>40.8 <math>\pm</math> 1.7</b>  | 41.8 $\pm$ 2.0                    | <b>36.5 <math>\pm</math> 1.4 *</b>      |
| Biomass per leaf (g)  | 0.18 $\pm$ 0.01    | <b>0.13 <math>\pm</math> 0.01</b> | 0.19 $\pm$ 0.01                   | 0.13 $\pm$ 0.01                        | 0.17 $\pm$ 0.01    | <b>0.14 <math>\pm</math> 0.01</b> | 0.17 $\pm$ 0.01                   | 0.17 $\pm$ 0.01                         |
| Total number of flowers   | 719 $\pm$ 81       | 819 $\pm$ 92                      | 803 $\pm$ 77                      | 851 $\pm$ 98                           | 599 $\pm$ 132      | 676 $\pm$ 113                     | 533 $\pm$ 63                      | 470 $\pm$ 53                            |
| Total number of seed pods   | 230 $\pm$ 30       | 286 $\pm$ 40                      | 278 $\pm$ 26                      | 265 $\pm$ 29                           | 404 $\pm$ 75       | 379 $\pm$ 63                      | 319 $\pm$ 30                      | 322 $\pm$ 33                            |
| Number of seeds   | 1596 $\pm$ 290     | 1970 $\pm$ 495                    | 2221 $\pm$ 356                    | 1692 $\pm$ 200                         | 4252 $\pm$ 745     | 3899 $\pm$ 828                    | 3550 $\pm$ 325                    | 3135 $\pm$ 377                          |
| Biomass per seed (mg)   | 0.32 $\pm$ 0.02    | <b>0.38 <math>\pm</math> 0.02</b> | 0.32 $\pm$ 0.02                   | 0.34 $\pm$ 0.03 (*)                    | 0.52 $\pm$ 0.02    | 0.51 $\pm$ 0.02                   | <b>0.51 <math>\pm</math> 0.01</b> | 0.48 $\pm$ 0.02                         |
| Biomass flowering stalks (g)                                      | 6.4 $\pm$ 0.4      | 7.1 $\pm$ 0.6                     | 7.0 $\pm$ 0.4                     | 5.8 $\pm$ 0.4                          | 6.5 $\pm$ 0.9      | 6.9 $\pm$ 0.8                     | 6.1 $\pm$ 0.5                     | 5.5 $\pm$ 0.5                           |
| Seed germination (%)  | 79 $\pm$ 5         | <b>87 <math>\pm</math> 3</b>      | 82 $\pm$ 4                        | <b>87 <math>\pm</math> 3 *</b>         | 73 $\pm$ 11        | 66 $\pm$ 7                        | <b>76 <math>\pm</math> 5</b>      | <b>79 <math>\pm</math> 7 ***</b>        |
| Total number of germinating seeds                                 | 1311 $\pm$ 268     | 1765 $\pm$ 482                    | 1792 $\pm$ 330                    | 1455 $\pm$ 187                         | 3407 $\pm$ 814     | 2504 $\pm$ 465                    | 2887 $\pm$ 321                    | 2838 $\pm$ 445                          |

<sup>a</sup> P-plants produce saponins 1-3, only, G-plants produce hederagenin, cochalic acid, and oleanolic acid cellobioside; values show peak areas. <sup>b</sup> P-plants produce mainly glucosibarin, G-plants glucobarbarin.

# Figs

Figure 1




Figure 2





Figure 3





**Supplementary Table 1.** Statistical analysis (ANOVA: F, or Genmod:  $X^2$ ) of the consumption by flea beetles (herbivore), *Albugo candida* (pathogen) and their combination, and their effects on biochemical, growth, and reproductive traits in P- and G-plants of *Barbarea vulgaris*. Traits with a mean square for the error term were tested by ANOVA, traits without by proc GENMOD. Significant effects are indicated in bold.

| P-plants<br>Traits                | Error |        | Herbivore |       |            |                   | Pathogen |       |            |               | Herbivore x pathogen |       |            |               |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------|-------|------------|-------------------|----------|-------|------------|---------------|----------------------|-------|------------|---------------|
|                                   | df*   | MS†    | df*       | MS†   | F/ $X^2$ ‡ | p                 | df*      | MS†   | F/ $X^2$ ‡ | p             | df*                  | MS†   | F/ $X^2$ ‡ | p             |
| % Adult flea beetle consumption   |       |        |           |       |            |                   | 1        |       | 0.00       | 0.9802        |                      |       |            |               |
| % Flea beetle larvae consumption  |       |        |           |       |            |                   | 1        |       | 4.54       | <b>0.0331</b> |                      |       |            |               |
| % Total flea beetle consumption   |       |        |           |       |            |                   | 1        |       | 0.69       | 0.4050        |                      |       |            |               |
| <i>A. candida</i> DNA             |       |        | 1         |       | 7.58       | <b>0.0059</b>     |          |       |            |               |                      |       |            |               |
| P-type saponin 1                  |       |        | 1         |       | 6.36       | <b>0.0117</b>     | 1        |       | 8.65       | <b>0.0033</b> | 1                    |       | 3.65       | 0.0561        |
| P-type saponin 2                  |       |        | 1         |       | 4.94       | <b>0.0262</b>     | 1        |       | 7.74       | <b>0.0054</b> | 1                    |       | 3.26       | 0.0711        |
| P-type saponin 3                  |       |        | 1         |       | 6.95       | <b>0.0084</b>     | 1        |       | 9.57       | <b>0.0020</b> | 1                    |       | 2.77       | 0.0959        |
| Glucosibarin                      |       |        | 1         |       | 39.8       | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        |       | 13.71      | <b>0.0002</b> | 1                    |       | 1.75       | 0.1859        |
| % Nitrogen                        | 50    | 0.020  | 1         | 0.110 | 5.55       | <b>0.0224</b>     | 1        | 0.038 | 1.91       | 0.1730        | 1                    | 0.004 | 0.20       | 0.6547        |
| % Carbon                          | 50    | 1.832  | 1         | 26.74 | 14.6       | <b>0.0004</b>     | 1        | 12.61 | 6.88       | <b>0.0115</b> | 1                    | 0.715 | 0.39       | 0.5349        |
| Carbon-nitrogen ratio             | 50    | 0.019  | 1         | 0.148 | 7.97       | <b>0.0068</b>     | 1        | 0.025 | 1.33       | 0.2542        | 1                    | 0.003 | 0.16       | 0.6885        |
| Root biomass                      | 50    | 5.401  | 1         | 223.3 | 41.4       | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 33.85 | 6.27       | <b>0.0156</b> | 1                    | 7.998 | 1.48       | 0.2294        |
| Shoot biomass                     |       |        | 1         |       | 41.5       | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        |       | 0.85       | 0.3553        | 1                    |       | 0.98       | 0.3213        |
| Total biomass                     |       |        | 1         |       | 42.1       | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        |       | 1.58       | 0.2085        | 1                    |       | 0.97       | 0.3238        |
| Root-shoot ratio                  | 50    | 0.003  | 1         | 0.003 | 0.81       | 0.3729            | 1        | 0.006 | 1.74       | 0.1936        | 1                    | 0.000 | 0.02       | 0.8753        |
| % Biomass allocation to shoot     |       |        | 1         |       | 0.15       | 0.6938            | 1        |       | 0.24       | 0.6222        | 1                    |       | 0.00       | 0.9606        |
| % Biomass allocation to roots     |       |        | 1         |       | 0.50       | 0.4779            | 1        |       | 0.79       | 0.3751        | 1                    |       | 0.01       | 0.9111        |
| Number of leaves                  |       |        | 1         |       | 4.86       | <b>0.0275</b>     | 1        |       | 0.43       | 0.5136        | 1                    |       | 0.63       | 0.4286        |
| Biomass per leaf                  | 50    | 0.002  | 1         | 0.040 | 26.2       | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 0.001 | 0.36       | 0.5527        | 1                    | 0.000 | 0.15       | 0.7004        |
| Total number of flowers           | 51    | 108372 | 1         | 85958 | 0.79       | 0.3773            | 1        | 38844 | 0.36       | 0.5520        | 1                    | 5914  | 0.05       | 0.8162        |
| Total number of seed pods         | 51    | 14185  | 1         | 8096  | 0.57       | 0.4534            | 1        | 1574  | 0.11       | 0.7404        | 1                    | 13622 | 0.96       | 0.3317        |
| Total seed weight                 |       |        | 1         |       | 0.49       | 0.4855            | 1        |       | 0.00       | 0.9443        | 1                    |       | 2.22       | 0.1361        |
| Number of seeds                   |       |        | 1         |       | 0.00       | 0.9662            | 1        |       | 0.10       | 0.7497        | 1                    |       | 1.37       | 0.2418        |
| Biomass per seed                  | 51    | 0.006  | 1         | 0.027 | 4.44       | <b>0.0400</b>     | 1        | 0.009 | 1.41       | 0.2399        | 1                    | 0.003 | 0.47       | 0.4942        |
| Biomass flowering stalks          | 51    | 2.692  | 1         | 0.206 | 0.08       | 0.7831            | 1        | 3.298 | 1.22       | 0.2736        | 1                    | 9.396 | 3.49       | 0.0675        |
| Seed germination                  |       |        | 1         |       | 70.5       | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        |       | 1.76       | 0.1851        | 1                    |       | 4.10       | <b>0.0428</b> |
| Total number of germinating seeds |       |        | 1         |       | 0.06       | 0.8052            | 1        |       | 0.25       | 0.6202        | 1                    |       | 1.01       | 0.3145        |

*Continued on next page*



Continued

| G-plants                          | Error |                 | Herbivore |                 |                     |                   | Pathogen |                 |                     |                   | Herbivore x pathogen |                 |                     |                   |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
|                                   | df*   | MS <sup>†</sup> | df*       | MS <sup>†</sup> | F/ X <sup>2</sup> ‡ | p                 | df*      | MS <sup>†</sup> | F/ X <sup>2</sup> ‡ | p                 | df*                  | MS <sup>†</sup> | F/ X <sup>2</sup> ‡ | p                 |
| <i>A. candida</i> DNA             |       |                 | 1         |                 | 6.81                | <b>0.0091</b>     |          |                 |                     |                   |                      |                 |                     |                   |
| Hederagenin cellobioside          | 50    | 561.4           | 1         | 53540           | 95.4                | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 975.6           | 1.74                | 0.1934            | 1                    | 2821            | 5.02                | <b>0.0295</b>     |
| Cochalic acid cellobioside        | 50    | 320.7           | 1         | 30462           | 95.0                | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 1375            | 4.29                | <b>0.0436</b>     | 1                    | 2221            | 6.93                | <b>0.0113</b>     |
| Oleanolic acid cellobioside       | 50    | 0.011           | 1         | 1.089           | 103.0               | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 0.021           | 1.95                | 0.1684            | 1                    | 0.031           | 2.95                | 0.0923            |
| Gypsegenin cellobioside           | 50    | 169.7           | 1         | 11389           | 67.1                | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 48.19           | 0.28                | 0.5964            | 1                    | 330.4           | 1.95                | 0.1691            |
| 4-Ephihederagenin cellobioside    | 50    | 66.34           | 1         | 6742            | 101.6               | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 191.3           | 2.88                | 0.0957            | 1                    | 273.5           | 4.12                | <b>0.0476</b>     |
| Glucobarbarin                     | 47    | 62.76           | 1         | 6745            | 107.5               | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1        | 784.5           | 12.5                | <b>0.0009</b>     | 1                    | 753.5           | 12.0                | <b>0.0011</b>     |
| % Nitrogen                        | 50    | 0.013           | 1         | 0.006           | 0.46                | 0.5021            | 1        | 0.059           | 4.59                | <b>0.0370</b>     | 1                    | 0.003           | 0.24                | 0.6234            |
| % Carbon                          | 50    | 1.141           | 1         | 0.246           | 0.22                | 0.6444            | 1        | 0.246           | 0.22                | 0.6444            | 1                    | 1.380           | 1.21                | 0.2768            |
| Carbon-nitrogen ratio             | 50    | 0.012           | 1         | 0.005           | 0.44                | 0.5086            | 1        | 0.061           | 5.30                | <b>0.0256</b>     | 1                    | 0.002           | 0.17                | 0.6851            |
| Root biomass                      | 50    | 0.251           | 1         | 0.680           | 5.43                | <b>0.0239</b>     | 1        | 0.022           | 0.17                | 0.6782            | 1                    | 0.020           | 0.16                | 0.6902            |
| Shoot biomass                     | 50    | 0.831           | 1         | 7.835           | 9.42                | <b>0.0035</b>     | 1        | 0.572           | 0.69                | 0.4108            | 1                    | 0.041           | 0.05                | 0.8262            |
| Total biomass                     | 50    | 1.274           | 1         | 13.13           | 10.3                | <b>0.0023</b>     | 1        | 0.370           | 0.29                | 0.5921            | 1                    | 0.118           | 0.09                | 0.7624            |
| Root-shoot ratio                  | 50    | 0.004           | 1         | 0.001           | 0.28                | 0.5978            | 1        | 0.006           | 1.38                | 0.2458            | 1                    | 0.000           | 0.11                | 0.7441            |
| % Biomass allocation to shoot     |       |                 | 1         |                 | 0.02                | 0.8746            | 1        |                 | 0.13                | 0.7226            | 1                    |                 | 0.02                | 0.8856            |
| % Biomass allocation to roots     |       |                 | 1         |                 | 0.11                | 0.7419            | 1        |                 | 0.53                | 0.4684            | 1                    |                 | 0.09                | 0.7631            |
| Number of leaves                  |       |                 | 1         |                 | 4.66                | <b>0.0309</b>     | 1        |                 | 1.84                | 0.1749            | 1                    |                 | 5.16                | <b>0.0232</b>     |
| Biomass per leaf                  | 49    | 0.001           | 1         | 0.003           | 4.27                | <b>0.0440</b>     | 1        | 0.005           | 5.66                | <b>0.0213</b>     | 1                    | 0.001           | 1.75                | 0.1915            |
| Total number of flowers           |       |                 | 1         |                 | 0.00                | 0.9649            | 1        |                 | 1.00                | 0.3171            | 1                    |                 | 0.58                | 0.4470            |
| Total number of seed pods         | 35    | 21862           | 1         | 477.1           | 0.02                | 0.8834            | 1        | 19487           | 0.89                | 0.3516            | 1                    | 2819            | 0.13                | 0.7217            |
| Total seed weight                 | 35    | 0.781           | 1         | 0.562           | 0.72                | 0.4018            | 1        | 1.143           | 1.46                | 0.2343            | 1                    | 0.000           | 0.00                | 0.9865            |
| Number of seeds                   |       |                 | 1         |                 | 0.29                | 0.5918            | 1        |                 | 0.82                | 0.3640            | 1                    |                 | 0.00                | 0.9739            |
| Biomass per seed                  | 35    | 0.003           | 1         | 0.003           | 1.07                | 0.3090            | 1        | 0.013           | 4.27                | <b>0.0463</b>     | 1                    | 0.001           | 0.38                | 0.5430            |
| Biomass flowering stalks          | 35    | 4.737           | 1         | 0.089           | 0.02                | 0.8916            | 1        | 1.845           | 0.39                | 0.5366            | 1                    | 1.862           | 0.39                | 0.5348            |
| Seed germination                  |       |                 | 1         |                 | 1.97                | 0.1604            | 1        |                 | 52.8                | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> | 1                    |                 | 18.7                | <b>&lt;0.0001</b> |
| Total number of germinating seeds |       |                 | 1         |                 | 0.76                | 0.3838            | 1        |                 | 0.01                | 0.9248            | 1                    |                 | 0.55                | 0.4579            |

Degrees of freedom. † Mean square. ‡ F-statistics or Chi-square statistics respectively.