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Abstract

Identification and characterisation of the E3 ligase, RAP1, in *Arabidopsis*

Changes in cellular redox status are implicated in the regulation of developmental and defence-related responses. The absence of S-nitrosogluthathione reductase (GSNOR) function in *Arabidopsis* leads to an accumulation of cellular S-nitrosogluthathione (GSNO), a mobile reservoir of nitric oxide (NO) which impacts the cellular redox tone. Consequently, the *GSNOR* knockout mutant, *atgsnor1-3* displays defects in growth, time to flowering and pathogen resistance. Although it is now well established that GSNO is a key redox signalling molecule, the molecular mechanisms that underpin GSNO function remains largely unknown.

RAP1 (REDOX-ASSOCIATED PROTEIN 1) was identified based on its dynamic changes of expression in *atgsnor1-3* and *sid2* plants upon avirulent *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. tomato (*Pst*) DC3000 (*avrB*) challenge. Pathogen-induced RAP1 expression was shown to be independent of the plant hormones salicylic acid, jasmonic acid, abscisic acid and ethylene. Recombinant RAP1 protein was shown to exhibit E3 ligase activity in vitro. Application of the NO donors (GSNO and Cysteine-NO (CysNO)) reduced the E3 ligase activity of RAP1 significantly. Biotin-switch analysis showed that RAP1 was S-nitrosylated and site-directed mutagenesis of RAP1 suggested that the S-nitrosylated site is the cysteine residue C325.

The *rap1* line does not show obvious developmental phenotypes, however, overexpressing *RAP1* enhanced lateral root branching in young seedlings. Overexpression of a truncated *RAP1* (*RAP1ΔRING*) led to a loss of apical dominance. In addition, *rap1/rap2* double mutants showed delayed flowering, suggesting *RAP1* might be involved in the regulation of plant growth and development. *RAP1* may also be involved in plant defence, as *rap1*, *rap2* and *rap1/rap2* mutants exhibited increased susceptibility to *PstDC3000* and *Arabidopsis* powdery mildew.

Interestingly, *rap1* plants showed enhanced resistance to methyl viologen (MV), which is in line with the phenotype of *atgsnor* mutants. Also, expression of *RAP1* was rapidly inducible by ultraviolet-B (UV-B) light. As *RAP1* expression and RAP1 E3 ligase activity are redox-related, it is speculated that RAP1 may be involved in redox-mediated regulation of a broad range of physiological responses.
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Chapter 1

1 Introduction

1.1 General Introduction

There is an unbreakable link between plants and prosperity in human history: The availability of soil and water for agriculture or animal husbandry has always been the main criteria for selecting the location of residency. Many developing countries predominantly depend on a single crop for calories (e.g. Southeast Asia on rice, Africa on sorghum, maize or cassava) and taking the world as a whole, 80% of human and livestock energy is coming from only four crops (Gressel 2010). However, the world population is expected to reach 9 billion from the current 6.7 billion by 2050, and the arable land and water supply are limited due to urbanization and desertification. In addition, crop losses due to diseases and pests are also expected to increase (Roland 2011). A new way to sustain those high food demands for human development will be essential and immediate action is required to prevent social instability.

Development of genetically modified (GM) crops could be a solution, if there are no alternative ways to increase arable land to enhance production. However, the aim of introducing GM crops should not be solely pursuing to increase the yearly production of certain crops, as those GM crops will rapidly consume the minerals in soil. The consequence would be similar to over-farming and the arable land would be further reduced. Therefore the important goal for GM or engineered crops is to make the existing crops more adaptive to abiotic and biotic stresses, for instance, more tolerant to changes in temperature, drought, flooding and more resistant to pathogens and pests. Farmers and consumers have been gradually accepting the benefits of GM crops despite the voices from the international anti-GM movement. The recent report from ISAAA, has shown that in 2010, the accumulated biotech (GM) crop planted land had exceeded 1 billion hectares. It took 10 years from 1995 to 2005 to reach 500 million hectares, but only half that time to gain another 500 million in 2010. More countries have approved the planting of GM crops, such as Pakistan and Myanmar to plant Bt cotton, Sweden - the first Scandinavian country to plant “Amflora” and Germany also resumed adoption of biotech crops (James 2010). Bt cotton secrets an
1 Introduction

insecticide originated form a Gram-positive bacterium *Bacillus thuringiensis* and amflora is a genetic engineered potato line that is unable to synthesize amylose (an undesired product for papermaking). These GM-lines are not normally consumed as food but the genetic modifications have significantly improved the cotton yield and the efficiency in papermaking respectively, therefore the use of these crops has been widely accepted by many countries.

However, as more GM crops will be available in the market, more adverse effects might be found in an expanding consumer group, such as the acute allergic effects and more seriously the chronic toxicity or carcinogenic effects upon accumulation of those foreign proteins or metabolites. Therefore new standards have to be introduced for evaluating the potential threats from the GM crops. The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has set up a set of risk assessments of GM crops by comparing with the counterpart non-GM crops in order to identify the intended and unexpected impacts on the environment, safety for humans, animals, and nutrition quality. Apart from the classic 90-day rodent feeding test, various *in silico* and *in vitro* methods have been introduced, for instance (i) *in silico* search of the structural similarity of novel proteins or their degradation products to known toxic or allergenic proteins. (ii) *in vitro* analysis of the stability of the novel proteins under heat or other processing conditions or digestive/intestine fluid. (iii) *in vitro* genotoxicity test methods for screening of point mutations, chromosomal aberrations and DNA damage (van Haver et al. 2008).

Understanding the molecular mechanisms of how plants cope with the abiotic and biotic stresses will help to engineer crops that are more adaptative to the less favourable environment. *Arabidopsis thaliana* (mouse-ear cress) has long been the tool for studying various molecular pathways and plant physiology. It has one of the smallest genomes (~157 Megabase pairs) (Johnston et al. 2005) and was the first fully sequenced plant genome. Other features such as short life-cycle, self-pollination, formation of numerous seeds and easy transformation are also important advantages in plant research. The knowledge and experience extracted from *Arabidopsis* is now being applied into other crops for yield improvement and enhancing resistance to abiotic and biotic stresses.
1.2 Disease Resistance in Plants

Plant diseases are caused by external agents, which can be infectious or non-infectious. A fungus, bacterium, mycoplasma, virus, viroid, nematode, protozoon or parasitic plant that is capable of reproducing and spreading on the host is known as an infectious agent, whilst a disease that is caused by physical factors like extreme temperature, extreme pH, excess or insufficient amount of minerals is non-infectious. Plants have developed various mechanisms to cope with diseases, most notable is the defence mechanism against pathogens which is a highly sophisticated system involving pathogen recognition, signalling and defence gene expression (*Plant Diseases, Encyclopaedia Britannica*).

1.2.1 Basal Disease Resistance

Plants do not have specified cell types to provide protection against pathogen invasions. To prevent entering and spreading of pathogens, plants have established a variety of barriers and inhibitions. The pre-entry protection is given by the physical and chemical barriers, and the observable first barrier is presented by the outer waxy cuticle and preformed antimicrobial compounds (Osborn 1996; Schulze-Lefert et al. 2008). Antimicrobial compounds can be produced as part of normal plant growth and development (i.e. phytoanticipins) or by transcriptional activation of some biosynthetic pathways in response to microbial attack (i.e. phytoalexins). For example, avenacin, a triterpene glycoside in oat roots and the tomato steroidal glycoalkaloid α-tomatine are constitutively produced. These products confer broad-spectrum disease resistance and pathogens that are capable of degrading these compounds are enhanced in pathogenicity (Bednarek and Osbourn 2009). Some compounds are inactive and stored in healthy tissues; upon tissue disruption, these compounds are converted to biologically active compounds and mobilized to the infection sites. For instance, the indole glucosinolates are stored inside the vacuoles of cells in *A. thaliana* (Ausubel et al. 2009), upon fungus penetration, its activating enzyme myrosinases accumulate at peripheral cells of fungal penetration sites to boost the local concentration of end products (i.e. bioactive isothiocyanate and simple nitrile)(Kim et al. 2008). The accumulation of these end products inhibits the pathogens as well as triggers the deposition of callose and consequently leads to a phytotoxicity and isolation of infected cells from healthy tissues (Bednarek and
Osborn 2009). Also, phytoalexins are synthesized upon microbial attack, which provide a broad range of disease resistance, possibly by helping the isolation of infected cells from healthy cells. Various phytoalexins have been identified, for example, the stilbenes in grapevine, rishitin and lubimin in potato, camalexin and bassinin in crucifers (e.g. camalexin in *Arabidopsis*), kievitone and phaseollidin in legumes (Morrissey and Osbourn 1999).

1.2.2 Pathogenesis-Related (PR) Genes

PR proteins are not produced, or only at basal concentration in healthy tissue, but are accumulated upon pathogen challenge. Early definitions of PR proteins had also included multifunction enzymes like phenylalanine ammonia lyase which are constitutively present but also increase during most infections. However, recently, the term “PR protein” refers to “inducible defence-related proteins”, with the functions that are specifically related to host defence. The molecular size of PR proteins is relatively small, ranging from 5kDa to 75kDa. Proteins of a size under 10kDa are often named “PR peptides” (Sels et al. 2008). The first PR protein (PR-1) was identified in the early 1980s from the virus infected tissue of tobacco and is associated with resistance of tobacco mosaic virus (TMV)(Carr et al. 1987). Later on, PR proteins with enzyme activities specifically targeted to pathogens were isolated, for instance PR-2 (β-1,3-Glucanase), PR-2, PR-3, PR-8, PR-11 (chitinases) and PR-5, PR-12, PR-13, PR-14 (membrane targeted). Smaller PR peptides, however, inhibit enzymes of pathogens such as PR-6 as a subclass of serine proteinase inhibitors (PIs), which may act by reducing the ability of the attacker to use its lytic enzymes for pathogenicity (Sels et al. 2008).
1.2.3 Induction of Plant Immunity

A key feature of plant innate immunity is the recognition of microbial- or pathogen-associated molecular patterns (MAMPS or PAMPs) such as flagellin, and lipopolysaccharides (Zipfel and Felix 2005). PAMPs are slowly evolved molecules on the surface of pathogens which are perceived by transmembrane pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) (Zipfel 2008). This is the first layer of plant innate immunity and is also referred to PAMPs-triggered immunity (PTI) (Figure 1.1). Upon recognition, rapid ion influx across plasma membrane leads to MAP kinase activation, ROS production, changes in gene expression and cell wall reinforcement in the plants. However, some successful pathogens are able to interfere with PTI to suppress the induction of defence mechanisms. In many cases, these pathogens secrete some virulence factors (effectors) to evade the recognition or inhibit the subsequent signalling steps (Zipfel 2008). In order to overcome the advancement of pathogens, some plants have evolved resistance proteins (R proteins) to recognize the effectors indirectly or directly by nucleotide binding and leucine rich repeat (NB-LRR) proteins, resulting in effector-triggered immunity (ETI). ETI is a rapid and stronger disease resistance response and is usually accompanied by local cell death known as hypersensitive response (HR) (Jones and Dangl 2006).
Figure 1.1 A zigzag model illustrates the different phases in plant defence.
Detection of pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) triggers the PAMPs-triggered immunity (PTI) to provide effective resistance against pathogens. PTI can be overcome by pathogen effectors, leading to enhanced disease susceptibility. R-gene products are then expressed in some adapted plants to neutralize the effects from the effectors and hypersensitive response (HR) is induced to limit pathogen growth in the site of infection by cell-death. However, advanced effectors may be produced to suppress ETI and leading to the competition between invasion and resistance. Adapted from Jones and Dangl, 2006.

1.2.4 PTI Induction and Suppression
PAMPs on bacteria such as flagellin (flg22) and Ef-Tu (elf18) are detected by PRRs FLS2 and EFR respectively, while fungal signature proteins xylanase and chitin are recognized by PRRs LeEIX 1/2 (tomato) and CEBiP respectively (Bittel and Robatzek 2007). However, PRRs do not signal alone, they require positive regulators such as BRI1-ASSOCIATED KINASE 1 (BAK1). Silencing BAK1 expression affects responses in tobacco to PAMPs Flg22, CSP22 and oomycete INF1 (Heese et al. 2007) and makes the plants extremely susceptible to necrotrophic fungi in Arabidopsis (Kemmerling et al. 2007).
Pathogenic bacteria are able to produce and inject effectors (15-30 effectors per strain) into host cells using a type III secretion system (TTSS) to interfere with PTI (Jones and Dangl 2006). Numerous effectors have been identified and studied; they alter the basal defence functions by suppressing papilla formation (AvrPto1, AvrE1, HopM1, AvrRpm1, and AvrRpt2); altering hormonal responses (AvrB1, AvrRpt2, and Hop(A1,D1, K1,X1 AO1) and suppression of cell death (AvrRpm1, AvrRpt2, AvrB2 and Hop(E1,F2,N1,G1, X1,AB2, AO1 XM1) (Grant et al. 2006). Some effectors have a rather simply mechanism to interfere with host defence, for example, HopM, targets ARF-GEF protein to manipulate host vesicle transport that could be important for bacterial colonization. However, some effectors work sophisticatedly, like the bipartite protein AvrProB of *Pseudomonas syringae*. The N-terminus of AvrPtoB contributes to virulence while the C-terminus is able to block cell death (Jones and Dangl 2006). Further studies have shown that the C-terminus folds into a functional E3 ligase domain, which was a surprise because there is no ubiquitination degradation pathway in prokaryotes. The AvrPtoB E3 ligase was found to interact with a protein kinase Fen in plant cells and targets Fen for degradation. While molecular mimicry of host proteins by bacterial pathogens is common, there is only a handful of bacterial proteins that are known to manipulate the host ubiquitination system (Rosebrock et al. 2007). The disease resistance (*R*) genes will be further discussed in the following section.

### 1.2.5 Disease Resistance (*R*) Genes

Although PTI can be overcome by effector interference, host resistance (*R*) genes have evolved to recognize effectors and trigger ETI to enhance resistance against pathogen invasion (Figure 1.1). The products of *R* genes are usually NB-LRR proteins and the recognized effectors are termed avirulence (Avr) proteins as ETI leads to immunity to the Avr protein secreting bacteria. However most NB-LRR proteins are known to detect the effectors indirectly and this indirect recognition is known as the “guard hypothesis”. NB-LRR proteins manipulate or alter the targets of effectors to reduce the success of interference by effectors. In addition, effectors create a ‘pathogen-induced modified self’ molecular pattern in host cells, which activates NB-LRR proteins, leading to ETI (Jones and Dangl 2006). For instance, AvrRpm1 and AvrRpt2 are TTSS effectors that target the host plasma membrane associated protein
RIN4 to suppress PTI by either phosphorylation or elimination of RIN4. Action of these effectors activates NB-LRR proteins RPM1 and RPS2 to trigger ETI and leads to hypersensitive response (HR). HR is a form of programmed cell death which confines pathogen in a restricted area (Day et al. 2006). Recent findings have demonstrated a sophisticate mechanism in plants to resist the effects of effector AvrPtoB. The E3 ligase domain of AvrPtoB degrades a protein kinase Fen to reduce PTI. While R protein PtoB shares 80% similarity with Fen but with stronger kinase activity. PtoB phosphorylates AvrPtoB to inactivate its E3 ligase activity. Furthermore, PtoB stabilizes the host protein Prf, which degradation of Prf leads to increased disease susceptibility (Ntoukakis et al. 2009).

1.3 The Roles of Plant Hormones in Defence

Following pathogen recognition, gene transcriptions are initiated, which leads to the shift of concentration of various plant hormones and chemicals. Plant hormones such as salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene are produced to trigger different physiological responses locally and systemically. Reactive oxygen intermediates (ROI) are rapidly produced after pathogen recognition and the process is also termed “oxidative burst”. It is a bi-phasic process, the initial peak of ROI production is seen about 1-2 hours post attempted infection and is followed by a second greater peak at 3-6 hours, but the second peak is only observed with an avirulent pathogen challenge (Grant and Loake 2000). ROIs have a broad role as signals that mediate responses to infection, the abiotic environment, developmental cues, and programmed cell death in different cell types. The subunit (RboH) of NADPH oxidase in plants is regarded as the source of ROI production following pathogen recognition and a variety of other processes (Torres and Dangl 2005). Evidence has also shown that there is a rapid burst of nitric oxide (NO) production in plants upon wounding and pathogen attack (Huang et al. 2004). NO is simple in structure, but its chemistry in biological systems leads to multiple secondary and tertiary reaction products (Ridnour et al. 2004). For instance, NO reacts with other ROIs to from reactive nitrogen intermediates (RNIs)(Hong et al. 2008), contributing the downstream signalling pathway in defence responses. Chapter 1.5 will further discuss the details regarding nitric oxide.
1.3.1 Salicylic Acid (SA) and Defence

Salicylic acid (SA) is an important phytohormone in plant defence against biotrophic pathogens. Pathogen-derived SA is synthesised from chorismate by isochorismate synthase (ICS1). Chorismate is synthesized through the shikimate pathway and components on the pathway are strongly upregulated following pathogen challenge. Pathogen-induced SA is often glycosylated by UDP-glucosyltransferase (UGT) to form non-toxic SA 2-O-β-D-glucoside (SAG), and other modifications such as methylation (MeSA, a volatile ester) and amino acid conjugation (SA-aa) are also thought to be important in plant defence (Loake and Grant 2007)(Fig 1.2). Over-accumulation of MeSA by expressing rice OsBSMT1 in Arabidopsis reduced SA, SAG and PR-1 contents, but surprisingly OsBSMT1 over-expressor triggered PR-1 induction in neighbouring wild-type plants (Koo et al. 2007). SA-binding protein 2 (SABP2) in tobacco appears to catalyse MeSA to SA. SABP2-silenced plants had attenuated local resistance to tobacco mosaic virus (TMV) and were compromised in systemic acquired resistance (SAR). In addition, jasmonic acid (JA)-induced AtBSMT1 in Arabidopsis explains how the JA pathways may antagonise SA pathways by depleting the SA pool in plants (Loake and Grant 2007). These data suggest MeSA may act as a mobile or volatile signal/inducer in SAR.

Perhaps the strongest evidence that SA plays a critical role in plant defence is the direct impact on defence if the endogenous SA levels are altered. A bacterial gene salicylate hydroxylase (nahG) was found to be able to degrade salicylic acid to catechol (You et al. 1991) and the gene was later expressed in tobacco and Arabidopsis to reduce endogenous SA levels. Following pathogen infection, these plants were unable to accumulate high SA levels, and they failed to develop SAR or express PR genes in the systemic leaves. In addition, these plants were more susceptible to virulent and avirulent pathogens, and the effects were reversible after treatment with synthetic SA. Supressing or mutating genes on the SA-synthesis pathway led to similar observations, for instance, phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL), ICS1 (sid2/eds16 mutant) and a MATE transporter for SA accumulation (sid1/eds2 mutant)(Vlot et al. 2009).

Another tobacco SA binding protein SABP3 was also identified from the stroma of chloroplasts, exhibiting carbonic anhydrase (CA) activity and antioxidant activity
when expressed in yeast. Silencing the CA activity of SABP3 suppressed the development of hypersensitive cell death (HR) by AvrPto. These findings demonstrate that SA may act through multiple effector proteins in plants (Slaymaker et al. 2002). A homologous *Arabidopsis* protein AtSABP3 was later identified and also possesses CA activity. The nitric oxide (NO) burst during attempted infection promotes increasing S-nitrosylation of AtSABP3 at cysteine 280. S-nitrosylation of AtSABP3 suppressed both binding of SA and CA activity, while the CA activity of AtSABP3 has shown to be required for resistance of *PstDC3000*(*avrB*). S-nitrosylation appears to be important at the later stage of plant defence response, which contributes to a negative feedback loop to the induced defence genes (Wang et al. 2009c).

The role of SA in monocotyledonous plants is less well understood and may be different to that in dicotyledonous plants. SA induces *PR* genes expression in maize, rice, barley and wheat. The endogenous SA level was elevated to resist the infection of *P. syringae* pv. *syringae* in barley. In contrast, in barley carrying the powdery mildew resistance genes *mlo5, Mlg,*or *Mla12,* defence responses (including HR development and H₂O₂ accumulation) were activated without a corresponding rise in SA levels. SA levels also failed to increase in rice inoculated with *P. syringae* or fungus *Magnaporthe grisea* or *Rhizoctonia solani* (Vlot et al. 2009).
SA is synthesized from either chorismate by isochorismate synthase (ICS) or phenylalanine by phenylalanine ammonia lyase (PAL). SA can be further converted to various SA-derivatives such as salicyloyl glucose ester (SGE), SA-\(O-\beta\)-glucoside (SAG), methyl salicylate (MeSA) and methyl salicylate \(O-\beta\)-glucoside (MeSAG).

Adapted from Vlot et al., 2009.

1.3.2 SA and Systemic Acquired Resistance (SAR)

SA was initially proposed to serve as a signal generated in the infected leaf and transmitted via the phloem to the uninfected portions and leading to resistance in distal tissues (termed “systemic acquired resistance” or SAR), because SA level rise coincidently with or just prior to SAR development and a significant amount of SA is found in the systemic leaves and phloem in pathogen-infected plants (Vlot et al. 2009). However, a classic experiment has reversed this hypothesis, \(nahG\) expressing plants were grafted onto wild-type tobacco and SAR was still able to be induced in the grafted plants by TMV in the SA-deficient leaves (Vernooij et al. 1994). Another possible mobile signal for SAR is MeSA (Park et al. 2007), which is biological inactive: SA-binding protein 2 (SABP2) converts SA to MeSA and grafting
experiments demonstrated that SABP2’s activity is required only in systemic tissues for SAR development. In addition, silencing of SA methyltransferase 1 (SAMT1) or overexpressing a mutant of SABP2 whose MeSA esterase activity is not inhibited by SA, depleted MeSA levels as well as SAR (Vlot et al. 2009).

It is worth noting that MeSA/SA-derivatives are only part of several likely long-distance signals for SAR. Evidence has suggested that SAR signals could be transmitted by JA, a yet undefined lipid-derived molecule, or a group of peptides. Plants possessing a mutation in the lipid-transfer protein DIR1 (DEFECTIVE IN INDUCED RESISTANCE 1) in Arabidopsis are incapable to transmit a functional SAR signal, but are not affected in resistance of the inoculated leaf. The lipid-derived molecule associated with DIR1 is unknown, while following the clues with other mutated genes (FAD7, SFD1, SFD2, MGD1) have shown that the candidate might be related to chloroplast galactolipid metabolism (Vlot et al. 2008). It was also hypothesized that JA or DIR1-JA could be the mobile signal of SAR, as numbers of JA-dependent gene expression in the systemic leaves of infected plants correlates with SAR and tobacco lipid-transfer protein 1 (LTP1) induces disease resistance only when it is conjugated to JA (Buhot et al. 2004). In addition, small peptides generated by apoplastic aspartic protease CDR1 (CONSTITUTIVE DISEASE RESISTANCE 1) could also be involved in SAR, as at least one receptor has been identified on cell surface. The level of S-nitrosylation (see Chapter 1.5b) could be related to SAR, since GSNOR is localized to phloem companion cells and xylem parenchyma and it was hypothesized that GSNOR plays a role in SAR signal transport through the vasculature (Vlot et al. 2008).

1.3.3 Jasmonic Acid (JA), Ethylene and Defence

SA-dependent defences are largely related to resistance against biotrophic pathogens, whereas jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene based responses are required for protection against necrotrophic pathogens (Thaler et al. 2012). Jasmonates are small lipid derivatives, and about 20 naturally occurring jasmonates have been described. In A. thaliana, JA is necessary for the expression of a number of genes and it can be conjugated to hydrophobic amino acids, usually isoleucine to form JA-Ile by an ATP-dependent JA-amino synthetase JASMONIC ACID RESISTANT 1 (JAR1). The jar1 mutation led to decreased sensitivity to exogenous JA and increased susceptibility to
certain opportunistic root pathogens without affecting male fertility (a process that requires JA synthesis), suggesting JA-Ile may be a regulator more specific in plant defence (Gfeller and Farmer 2004). Methyl jasmonate (MeJA) is a fragrant volatile compound and is formed by JA carboxyl methyltransferase (JMT) from JA. MeJA formation could be one of several important control points for jasmonate-regulated plant responses, overexpressing JMT in Arabidopsis, various jasmonate-responsive genes were constitutively expressed in the absence of wounding or jasmonate treatment (Cheong and Choi 2003).

Ethylene is a multifunctional, gaseous plant hormone, which is synthesized as one of the earliest detectable events during plant-pathogen interaction. Some early reports already showed that ethylene was able to induce genes related to phytoalexin and lignin synthesis (Ecker and Davis 1987). Also in certain cases, ethylene modulates programmed cell death (PCD) pathways (such as ethylene-induced leaf senescence) and hypersensitive response (HR). A large burst of ethylene is produced upon HR initiation and treatment of ethylene increased either susceptibility or resistance, depending on the conditions of plant-pathogen interaction (Wi et al. 2012). Also, in some cases, ethylene can act as a virulence factor of bacterial and fungal pathogens, and in contrast ethylene is involved in disease resistance. The role of ethylene in different stages of infection could be quite different, which might be due to the antagonistic interactions between SA and JA/ethylene or the synergistic action of SA and ethylene (Bouchez et al. 2007).

1.4 Defence Signalling Pathways

After recognition of pathogens, a complex genetic signalling network is switched on. Emerging evidence has given a better picture to show how these signals are being perceived, relayed and regulated. Salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene are the major plant hormones involved in defence responses. SA signalling is generally important for immunity against biotrophs or hemibiotrophs, while JA and ethylene signalling are generally important for immunity against necrotrophs and herbivores (Tsuda and Katagiri 2010).

NPR1 (NONEXPRESSOR OF PATHOGENESIS-RELATED GENES 1)(also known as NIM1 and SAI1) is a key regulator in the SA signalling pathway. NPR1 oligomers
are held together by disulphide bonds in the cytosol in the absence of pathogen challenge. Upon SA induction, NPR1 oligomers are dissociated to become monomers. NPR1 monomers are formed due to changes in the cellular redox state leading to reduction of two cysteine residues Cys82 and Cys216 by THIOREDOXIN (TRX)-H5 and/or TRX-H3 (Tada et al. 2008). The NPR1 monomers translocate to the nucleus where the monomers activate the expression of a variety of pathogenesis-related (PR) genes. In the nucleus, NPR1 interacts with several members of the TGA family of bZIP transcription factors, as well as with three other proteins, NIMIN1, 2, and 3 (Weigel et al. 2005). Interaction between NPR1 with TGA1 and TGA4 only occurs in SA-induced leaves, due to the reduction of two conserved cysteines of TGA1 and TGA4, while interaction between TGA2 and NPR1 can be detected in the absence of SA, but is enhanced by SA treatment of leaves (Durrant and Dong 2004). Reversely, S-nitrosylation (at Cys156) takes part in facilitating NPR1 to form back to oligomer, which could act as a negative feedback loop for SA mediated resistance (Tada et al. 2008). (Fig 1.3)

Figure 1.3 Salicylic acid (SA) signalling is regulated through the dynamic equilibrium between monomeric and oligomeric forms of NPR1. Pathogen recognition results in increased SA accumulation which favours the NPR1 monomer formation. The NPR1 monomers translocate to the nucleus where it binds TGA1 and functions as a transcriptional co-activator of SA-dependent gene expression. Conversely, S-nitrosylation of NPR1 at Cys 156 favours oligomer formation. Adapted from (Yu et al. 2012).
Jasmonates (JAs) are important in plant defence against pathogens and also have a significantly role in wounding and herbivore defence. The first key JA signalling component was isolated from a coil (coronatine insensitive I) mutant using a map-based strategy, and the COI1 locus was found to encode an F-box protein. The coil-1 mutant displays defects in many JA-dependent functions, such as fertility, secondary metabolite biosynthesis, pest and pathogen resistance, and wound responses (Xie et al. 1998). COI1 is one of the components of an integral part multi-protein complex called the SCF E3 ubiquitin ligase complex (SCF\textsuperscript{COI1}). The SCF complexes are found in all eukaryotes and consists of a Skp1 (S-phase kinase-associated protein)-related protein, a cullin, a RING-box protein, and an F-box protein. F-box proteins (i.e. COI1) are known to be responsible for the specificity of SCF complexes to target protein(s) for degradation through the 26S proteasome. In yeast cells, Arabidopsis COL1 and JAZ1 interact but only when JA-Ile is added to the growth medium and interestingly but not other jasmonate-derivatives such as jasmonate, 12-oxo-phytodienoic acid, or MeJA. (Thines et al. 2007). In Arabidopsis, two conserved signatures are found in JAZ proteins, ZIM (Zinc-finger inflorescence meristem) domain and Jas motif. Elimination of the Jas motif in JAZ3 protein in a jaz3 mutant, results in a dominant jasmonate-insensitive phenotype, and deletion of the JAZ1 Jas motif also disrupted jasmonate signalling in a dominant manner. JAZ proteins work as transcriptional repressors, therefore overexpression of JAZ proteins does not impact the normally repressed transcriptional state. Upon activation of JA-mediated signalling pathway, elevated JA-Ile level induces the interaction of JAZ protein (JAZ1) and COI1 and leads to the ubiquitin-mediated degradation of JAZ1. JAZ proteins are unlikely to bind DNA directly but through the interaction with transcription factor like MYC2, for instance JAZ3 physically interacts with MYC2, requiring the Jas motif, so MYC2 is probably regulated (inhibited) by JAZ3. MYC2 positively regulates a variety of genes involved in wound and/or insect responses, oxidative stress response and flavonoid synthesis, and negatively affects genes for pathogen defence and tryptophan metabolism; degradation of JAZ3, therefore releases MYC2 from inhibition, leading to transcription of JA response genes (Chico et al. 2008; Staswick 2008).

Ethylene is a volatile and gaseous molecule which is detected by a set of well-characterized ethylene receptors. In Arabidopsis, from structure analysis, ethylene receptors are categorized into two main subfamilies: Subfamily I, composed of ETR1
and ERS1, is characterized by the presence of three transmembrane domains and a C-terminus histidine kinase domain, whereas Subfamily II, which includes ETR2, EIN4, and ERS2 have four transmembrane regions and a C-terminus serine–threonine kinase domain (Kendrick and Chang 2008). Downstream of ethylene receptors is Raf-like protein kinase CTR1, which physically interacts with the kinase domain of ETR1 and ERS1 and co-localizes in the ER. Signals are further transduced by MKK9–, MPK3/6 MAP kinase cascade to reach EIN3 and EIL1 transcription factors (Stepanova and Alonso 2009). EIN3 binds to the 5'-upstream of the *Arabidopsis ERF1* gene and is considered as an immediate target of EIN3. EIN3 drives the expression of ERF1 and results in activation of several ethylene-inducible genes that contain the GCC box in the promoter (Ohme-Takagi et al. 2000). A variety of defence-related genes are ethylene responsive through the GCC-box element such as vacuolar β-1,3-glucanases (PR-2), vacuolar basic-chitinases (PR-3), acidic hevein-like proteins (PR-4), and plant defensins (PDFs; PR-12). In addition, the *Arabidopsis* defensin *AtPDF1.2* gene contains a GCC box promoter elements and is inducible by both ethylene and JA through activation of *AtERF1* but is repressed by SA. Therefore, *AtPDF1.2* has been regarded as a marker for ethylene/JA mediated defence responses (Broekaert et al. 2006).

### 1.4.1 Cross Talk between Hormones in Defence

SA and JA are responsible to combat different targets. SA is predominantly related to biotrophic pathogens and viruses, whereas JA protects against necrotrophic pathogens and insects (Tsuda and Katagiri 2010). The signalling between SA and JA is generally antagonistic to each other through the regulation on NPR1, SSI2, WRKY transcription factors, and MPK4, although synergism between both signalling pathways has been observed. Competition experiments using biotrophic and necrotrophic pathogens or insects revealed that SA has a higher priority over JA pathway in *Arabidopsis* (Vlot et al. 2009). Transcription of JA-responsive marker genes, such as *PDF1.2* and *VSP2*, is highly sensitive to suppression by SA. The SA-mediated suppression of JA signalling might be due to an increase in cellular glutathione levels, as inhibition of glutathione biosynthesis suppresses the antagonistic effect of SA on JA signalling (Koornneef et al. 2008). Furthermore, SA-inducible glutaredoxin 480 (GRX480) represses *PDF1.2* expression in *Arabidopsis*. 
Overexpression of GRX480 also abolished induction of PDF1.2 by MeJA in an NPR1-independent, TGA2/5/6-dependent manner (Vlot et al. 2009).

On the other hand, the ethylene- and JA- mediated signalling pathways act synergistically in defence responses. Microarray analysis has indicated that clusters of genes are induced by ethylene and JA. Furthermore, the AtERF1 binding GCC-box is also present in the promoter of the JA-induced AtPDF1.2 gene and has also been identified as a JA-responsive element. JA-induced transcription factor also interacts cooperatively with EIN3 in the promoter of AtERF1 (Broekaert et al. 2006). Similar to JA, ethylene pathway acts independently or antagonistically with respect to the SA-dependent pathway. Transgenic Arabidopsis plants that are impaired in accumulation and synthesis of SA (e.g. nahG-expressing, sid2 and eds5) or SA signalling (e.g., npr1/nim1) show an equal or even stronger induction of ethylene/JA-dependent PR-genes. In addition, enhanced resistance to B. cinerea by overexpression of AtERF1 reduced the SA-mediated resistance to P. syringae pv. tomato.
1.5 Nitric Oxide (NO)

1.5.1 Origin of NO

NO, a free radical, is a by-product of oxidative metabolism. Animal cells synthesise NO by the activity of NO synthase (NOS), which is a NADPH-dependent reaction (oxidation) of L-Arg to NO and L-citrulline. However, there have been only false clues after a long search for a plant NOS. Endogenous NO synthesis in plants was initially demonstrated by the application of the inhibitors of NO synthesis which resulted in compromised disease resistance (Delledonne et al. 1998). It has been shown that NO can be synthesised by the reduction of nitrite to NO by nitrite reductase (NR)(Yamasaki et al. 1999). However, the efficiency is low and NR is required during flowering, auxin-induced lateral root development and abscisic acid (ABA)-induced stomatal closure but not in many other responses (Gas et al. 2009). While other reports suggested various sources of nitrite-dependent NO synthesis and non-enzymatic synthesis, the origin of L-Arg dependent NOS activity in plant cells has not been uncovered.

Analysis of the full sequenced genome of Arabidopsis and rice have not retrieved any gene that is homologous to animal NOS, suggesting the NOS activity in plant cells comes from an enzyme distinct to the mammalian proteins. A protein, initially named At-NOS1 in Arabidopsis was identified based on its homology to a snail protein which coeluted with NOS activity and cross-reacted with antibodies against mammalian NOS enzymes (Huang et al. 1997). Mutant nos1 displayed decreased NO accumulation/burst in response to ABA, salicylic acid, salt, elicitor treatments. However, NOS1 protein fails to display NOS activity in vitro and does not reduce NO accumulation in some responses such as H2O2-induced NO accumulation in guard cells, suggesting NOS1 is not a NOS enzyme and consequently has been renamed nitric oxide associated protein1 (NOA1) or RIF1 (Resistant to Inhibition by fosmidomycin). Fosmidomycin inhibits 1-Deoxyxylulose 5-phosphate reductoisomerase (DXR) which results in a specific block in the biosynthesis of chlorophylls and carotenoids (Flores-Perez et al. 2008b). Further evidence has suggested that the GTPase activity of NOA1/RIF1 is unrelated to plant NO production (Moreau et al. 2008) but linked to plastid RNA binding/processing (Flores-Perez et al. 2008a).
1 Introduction

1.5.2 S-Nitrosylation

There is considerable evidence that NO and its metabolites play an essential role in signal transduction in plants and animals. For instance, the NO-related S-nitrosothiols (SNOs) have been shown to be involved in many physiological regulation pathways. In mammals, SNOs circulate in the blood as S-nitrosohaemoglobin (SNO-Hb), which is linked to hypoxic vasodilation (Reynolds et al. 2007). The free radical NO, however, is an unstable product, which requires to be stabilized in the cell to provide sustainable effects after synthesis. NO reacts rapidly with glutathione (GSH) to form S-nitrosglutathione (GSNO), the reaction is reversible and GSNO is considered to represent a functionally relevant signalling molecule that acts as an NO reservoir and donor. NO is also reactive with thiol group of cysteine residues in proteins through the donation of NO, a reaction known as S-nitrosylation, which often alters protein stability and activity. Protein S-nitrosylation in humans has been extensively studied and constitutes a large part of the ubiquitous influence of nitric oxide on cellular signal transduction both in normal physiology and in a broad spectrum of diseases (Foster et al. 2009). Although some proteins can transfer an NO group onto another protein (i.e. trans-nitrosylation), a specific enzyme to catalyse the S-nitrosylation of proteins is not yet described. S-nitrosylation of proteins is mainly regulated by the availability of NO or NO donors. The activity of NOS can be modulated through altered expression or activity of enzymes that control the availability of endogenous NOS substrates (e.g. l-Arg) or by endogenous NOS inhibitors. (Hess et al. 2005). Enzymes on the NO synthesis pathway are also regulated by S-nitrosylation. For instance arginase 1 (Arg1) is activated through enhanced multimerization resulting from S-nitrosylation at cysteine 303 (Santhanam et al. 2007). Arg1 competes with NOS for l-Arg and hence reduces the production of NO (Bronte and Zanovello 2005). Some enzymes promote S-nitrosylation, such as Cu/Zn superoxide dismutase (SOD) which catalyses the S-nitrosylation of haemoglobin by NO or (NO from GSNO) and Cu²⁺-containing protein ceruloplasmin which catalyses S-nitrosylation of the heparan-sulphate proteoglycan glypican, in situ (Hess et al. 2005). Protein-bound transition metals, in particular Cu²⁺ or Fe²⁺ bound near the thiol sites can also catalyse the transfer of NO-group from GSNO/nitrite to cysteine residues within serum albumin, haemoglobin and calbindin (Hess et al. 2005).
Protein conformation, electrostatic environment, hydrophobicity, contiguity and orientation of aromatic side chains, proximity of target thiols to transition metals, redox centres or other thiols (formation of disulphide bond) and protein-protein interaction determine the site of S-nitrosylation. Some common features of SNO sites are: electrostatic interactions that control thiol pKa (NUCLEOPHILICITY); hydrophobic compartmentalization; allosteric regulators (e.g. Ca\(^{2+}\), Mg\(^{2+}\) and O\(_2\)/redox) that can modulate thiol (solvent) accessibility or reactivity and interaction between NO and target proteins. Motifs that are likely to be S-nitrosylated, are termed SNO motifs. An example is the “acid-base” motif found on the \(\beta\)-Cys93 of haemoglobin (Hess et al. 2005). The acid–base motif comprises flanking acidic (Asp, Glu) and basic (Arg, His, Lys) residues, and it has been illustrated to catalyse GSNO-induced S-nitrosylation of hepatic methionine adenosyltransferase (Perez-Mato et al. 1999). High local hydrophobicity of a protein region (due to tertiary protein structure and protein–protein interactions) also promotes S-nitrosylation. The only one of ~50 free thiols (Cys3635) of the ryanodine receptor of skeletal muscle (RyR1) that is S-nitrosylated is intercalated within a hydrophobic region of calmodulin (CaM)-binding domain (Jourd'heuil et al. 2003).

1.5.3 Denitrosylation

The level of S-nitrosylation of cellular protein depends on the balance between nitrosylation and denitrosylation. Research has mainly focused on the mechanisms that promote S-nitrosylation, and work on denitrosylation has lagged behind. Recent reports suggest that in particular, two enzymatic systems are directly involved in the process of denitrosylation. They are important in protecting cells from nitrosative stress and regulate manifold NO-related cellular and systemic responses (Benhar et al. 2010). One enzyme system is the thioredoxin/thioredoxin reductase (Trx/TrxR). Thioredoxins (Trxs) are ubiquitous and have a conserved Cys-Gly-Pro-Cys redox active site that is essential for their function as oxidoreductases. The denitrosylase activities of Trxs are coupled to cognate Trx reductases (TrxR), flavin containing selenoenzymes that have been shown to safeguard microbial and mammalian organisms against nitrosative stress. Trx was shown to have caspase-3 denitrosylase activity in the presence of NADPH \textit{in vivo} (Benhar et al. 2008). The denitrosylase activity of Trx requires the activity of TrxR which catalyses NADPH to NADP\(^+\) to
recycle the oxidized thioredoxin (Trx-S\textsubscript{2}) to reduced thioredoxin (Trx-(SH)\textsubscript{2}) (Benhar et al. 2009; Holmgren 2008). A number of enzymes such as glutathione peroxidase, γ-glutamyl transpeptidase, and xanthine oxidase are able to decompose SNO in vitro, but none has been shown to regulate levels of endogenous SNO or to be involved in any NO or SNO-mediated response (Liu et al. 2001) (Fig 1.4).

Figure 1.4 Denitrosylation by Trx and GSNOR. (a) S-nitrosylated protein can be denitrosylated non-enzymatically with GSH, subsequently GSNOR rapidly and irreversibly metabolizes GSNO to GSNOH to drive the equilibrium from S-nitrosylated proteins towards GSNO. Trx denitrosylates S-nitrosylated proteins through its dithiol moiety, thereby forming a reduced protein thiol (-SH) and oxidized Trx. Oxidized Trx is “recycled” by ThxR in the presence of NADPH. (b) Alternative proposed mechanisms of Trx-mediated denitrosylation, suggesting that the formation of an intermolecular disulphide intermediate between S-nitrosylated protein and Trx or direct transnitrosylation from S-nitrosylated protein. Adapted from Benhar et al., 2009.
1.5.4 S-Nitrosoglutathione Reductase (GSNOR)

S-nitrosoglutathione (GSNO) serves as the NO reservoir and NO donor for S-nitrosylation, therefore the level of cellular GSNO directly impacts on NO bioactivity and consequently on transduction pathways in host defence. An *Escherichia coli* enzyme, glutathione-dependent formaldehyde dehydrogenase (GS-FDH) was firstly identified to have a robust activity of reducing GSNO to glutathione disulphide (GSSG) and ammonia (NH₃), and was NADH dependent. The activity of GS-FDH was also highly GSNO specific: no activity was seen towards S-nitrosocysteine (CysNO) and S-nitrosohomocysteine and only ~1 % with cysteiny1-glycine and g-glutamylcysteine. A mouse GS-FDH or alcohol dehydrogenase class III (ADH III) was also identified based on the GSNO-metabolizing activity of RAW 264.7 cell lysates. Mouse GS-FDH shares over 60% sequence identity with the yeast protein GS-FDH (*SFA1*) and deletion of this gene in yeast lead to 11-fold higher SNO. Moreover growth of yeast *sfa1* mutant cells was inhibited by a GSNO concentration that had little effect on wild-type Y190 cells, suggesting the GS-FDH is essential to protect against nitrosative stress from GSNO (Liu et al. 2001). GS-FDH was renamed as S-nitrosoglutathione reductase (GSNOR). Arabidopsis GSNOR was identified which was able to fully complement the GSNO hypersensitive in yeast *sfa1* mutant (Sakamoto et al. 2002). In addition, *Arabidopsis* GSNOR also contains glutathione-dependent formaldehyde dehydrogenase (FADLH) activity, which confers high resistance to formaldehyde when overexpressed in yeast *sfa1* mutant (Achkor et al. 2003). GSNOR is related to many physiological responses, and knocking out of *GSNOR* in *Arabidopsis* leads to a variety of developmental phenotypes such as delayed seed germination, reduced plant growth, loss of apical dominance, and increased numbers of highly branched shoots (Feechan et al. 2005; Holzmeister et al. 2011).

1.5.5 GSNOR and Defence

NO is ubiquitously produced in almost all mammalian immune cells and is recognized as an immunoregulatory molecule. NO and GSNO are able to induce apoptosis in macrophages, thymocytes, lymphocytes, and endothelial cells through S-nitrosylation/denitrosylation of proteins in the signalling pathway. There is evidence that NOS and GSNOR act as a double gate control of S-nitrosylation in the immune
response (Duan and Chen 2007). In *Arabidopsis*, loss of GSNOR function increases cellular SNO levels, disabling plant defence responses conferred by distinct resistance (*R*) gene subclasses and compromising basal and non-host disease resistance (Feechan et al. 2005). The knockout mutant *atgsnor1-3* exhibits 21% of GSNOR activity than in wild type plant, while gain-of-function mutants *atgsnor1-1* and *atgsnor1-2* have increased activity of 189% and 165% respectively. Challenging *atgsnor1-3* plant with avirulent pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. tomato (*Pst*) strain DC3000 (*avrB*) increased cellular SNO to 220% of wild type level, and the resistance was abolished. The *atgsnor1-3* plants were also more susceptible to avirulent *Pst* DC3000 (*avrRps4*), virulent *Pst* DC3000, *Hyaloperonospora parasitica* Noco2, *Blumeria graminis* f.sp. *tritici* (*Bgt*); and *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *phaseolicola* (*Psp*) (NPS3121) (Feechan et al. 2005).

A study in tobacco (*Nicotiana attenuata*) has showed that GSNOR is also involved in plant-herbivore defence. Silencing GSNOR decreased the herbivore-induced accumulation of jasmonic acid (JA) and ethylene (Wunsche et al. 2011).

### 1.6 Cellular Redox Status and Defence

Redox (reduction-oxidation) reactions refer to all chemical reactions which lead to the change in oxidation state of atoms. Reactive oxygen species (ROS) are produced during normal metabolism, certain development process and stress conditions. Formation of ROS changes the redox status of the cellular environment and ROS need to be detoxified as it can potentially damage DNA, RNA and proteins. In plants, ROS such as superoxide (O$_2^-$) can be produced at any location where an electron transport chain is present, including mitochondria, chloroplasts, microsomes, glyoxysomes, peroxisomes, apoplasts, and the cytosol. ROS can be removed enzymatically by superoxide dismutases (SODs) which catalyse the dismutation of superoxide into oxygen and hydrogen peroxide. In plants, SODs are classified into three groups: iron SOD, maganese SOD and copper-zine SOD which locate in difference compartment of the cells as the first line of defence against ROS (Alscher et al. 2002).

On the other hand, change in ROS levels can be exploited to redox signals that are important for the organisms to respond to different biotic and abiotic stresses. Glutathione (γ-glutamyl-L-cysteinly-glycine) is the most abundant low-molecular
weight thiol in the cellular redox system and is used for detoxification of ROS. Detoxification of ROS through the glutathione-ascorbate cycle (Noctor 2006) leads to a transient change in the cellular glutathione redox potential. The shift of glutathione redox potential can be sensed by glutaredoxins (GRXs), which transfer electrons between glutathione redox buffer and thiol groups of proteins. These target proteins might be transcription factors altering the expression of stress-related genes or metabolic enzymes. As a result, even minor deviation in glutathione redox potential due increase in oxidation can be exploited for fine tuning of the activity of target proteins (Meyer 2008). Apart from glutathione (GSH/GSSG), there are other redox-couples such as NAD(P)H/NAD(P)\(^+\) and reduced/oxidized ascorbate (ASC/DHASC) to detect the changes in cellular reduction potential. The gradually increasing redox potential in the cells leads to an electron flow from NAD(P)H to glutathione to ascorbate. Changes in the ratio between oxidised versus reduced of these redox-couples are detected by the reactive cysteines of redox sensor (target) proteins (Spoel and Loake 2011)(Fig 1.5).

ROS is produced upon infection and lead to a change in cellular redox potential. Also, application of defence-related hormones SA or JA changes the total amount of cellular glutathione as well as the ratio between oxidized and reduced forms of glutathione. NPR1, the SA-response coactivator contains at least 10 cysteine residues and serves as a redox sensor protein. Upon infection, oligomer NPR1 is monomerized through the reduction of two cysteine residues Cys82 and Cys216 by TrxH3 and TrXH5 and conversely, S-nitrosylation of Cys156 facilitates the oligomerization of NPR1(Mou et al. 2003). In addition, a subset of the NPR1-interacting TGA transcription factors is allowed to interact with NPR1 because of the reduction of disulphide bridge in the TGA proteins. Furthermore, S-nitrosylation of SABP3 inhibits its SA-binding and carbonic anhydrase activities, and S-nitrosylation of PrxIIIE and Metacaspase 9 (MC9) suppresses ONOO\(^-\) detoxification and cysteine protease activities, respectively, both of which may be involved in programmed cell death regulation (Spoel and Loake 2011).
Figure 1.5 Redox couplers detect changes in cellular redox potential. Upon infection the production of ROS and defence hormones leads to the change in cellular redox potential. The increasing redox potential establishes the flow of electron from NAD(P)H to glutathione to ascorbate. The reactive cysteines of redox sensor proteins detect the changes in the ratio between oxidised and reduced redox couples. Adapted from Spoel and Loake, 2011.
1 Introduction

1.7 Ubiquitination and Defence

1.7.1 Ubiquitination and 26S Proteasome Degradation

Cellular proteins turn over rapidly and the lysosomal compartment once was considered the principal site of protein degradation by acid-dependent protease. However, the observation that the half-lives of most cellular proteins are insensitive to alkalinisation of the lysosomes, led to the discovery of ubiquitin-proteasome degradation system as the major route to protein degradation. Proteins to be degraded (substrates) are modified with a polypeptide ubiquitin tag (i.e. ubiquitination) and directed to the large (26S) proteolytic complex known as the proteasome. Recent discoveries also revealed that ubiquitin tagging provides a signal to route endocytosed receptors to the lysosomal degradation pathway and by the third major cellular degradative pathway of autophagocytosis in organelles (Clague and Urbe 2010). Three enzymes are required for the ubiquitination of a substrate: ubiquitin-activating enzyme (E1), ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme (E2) and ubiquitin–protein ligase (E3). Ubiquitin’s C-terminal Gly is initially activated by linkage to a Cys residue of an E1 in the presence of ATP and then the activated ubiquitin is linked to an E2 through trans(thio)esterification and finally an E3 ligase catalyses the formation of an isopeptide bond between a Lys residue of a substrate and the C-terminal Gly residue of ubiquitin.

In *Arabidopsis*, there are 16 known ubiquitin, whereas 8 in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and 38 in humans. All these genes encode precursor proteins and ubiquitin specific proteases are required to release mature ubiquitin. Ubiquitin-activation by E1 is generally not considered to be involved in regulatory step during ubiquitination and there are only two E1 isoforms (UBA1 and UBA2) in *Arabidopsis* (Bachmair et al. 2001). On the other hand, there are 41 predicted E2s. Expression analysis in specific organs or under specific environmental conditions revealed that some E2s and E3s showing unique patterns of expression and may interact specifically (Kraft et al. 2005). In contrast to the numbers of E1 and E2 isoforms, more than 1,300 genes are predicted to encode for E3 components in *Arabidopsis*, accounting for the majority of the proteins involved in the 26S proteasome degradation. E3 ligases can be grouped into three classes based on the presence of the HECT, U-box, or RING domain, in addition RING-type protein can be subdivided into simple and complex E3s. The
simple RING E3s contain both the substrate-binding domain and the E2-binding RING domain in a single protein others act as a homodimer or heterocomplex with another RING protein. The multi-subunit Skp1-Cullin-F-box (SCF)-type ligase is an example of a complex RING E3s, in which the F-box protein is responsible for substrate recognition and the RING-containing protein, Rbx/Roc/Hrt, recruits the E2-ubiquitin intermediate to the SCF complex. The huge number of E3 ligases as well as about 700 predicted F-box genes in the Arabidopsis genome, reveals that E3 ligases play a significant/regulatory role in recognition of proteins for 26S proteasome degradation (Stone et al. 2005).

The ATP-dependent 26S proteasome is comprised of 31 subunits divided into two subcomplexes, the 20S core protease (CP) and 19S regulatory particle (RP), leading to a huge complex of 2MDa. The CP serves as a non-specific protease which is independent of ATP and ubiquitin. It has peptidylglutamyl, trypsin-like, and chymotrypsin-like activities to cleave most peptide bonds. The RP is composed of 17 subunits and associates with either end of the CP. It confers ATP dependence and poly-ubiquitin recognition to the proteasome. Two subcomplexes in RP termed Lid and Base work cooperatively to recognize the substrate-poly-ubiquitin chains, to remove covalently bound ubiquitin moieties, to unfold targeted substrates, to gate pore, and to import substrates into the proteasome (Craig et al. 2009).

1.7.2 E3 Ligases and Defence

Evidence for the role of E1 and E2 enzymes in plant defence is limited. A report has showed that the deletion of 15-bp of AtUBA1 (mos5) suppressed the constitutively activated defence responses of a mutant npr1-1 constitutive 1 (snc1) (Goritschnig et al. 2007). Conversely, there is emerging evidence that E3 ligases have regulatory roles in plant defence signalling. A well-characterized mechanism is the involvement SCF E3 ligase complexes are involved in the regulation of transcription factors of defence responsive genes. For instance, the stability of EIN3-type transcription factors is regulated by F-box proteins EBF1 or EBF2 (EIN3 binding F-box)(Delaure et al. 2008). Furthermore, the JA-mediated defence responses are regulated by JAZ proteins (i.e. JAZ1 and JAZ3). JAZ proteins are recognized by F-box protein COI1, and through the degradation of JAZ, MYC2 transcription factor is released to activate transcription of defence related genes. The F-box protein SON1 is involved in the SA
independent resistance to *Peronospora parasitica*. NPR1 mutant (*nim1-1*) is highly susceptible to *P. parasitica*, and *son1* mutation in *nim1-1* background fully restores *P. parasitica* resistance without the induction of SAR-associated genes (Kim and Delaney 2002). In tomato, F-box ACIF1 is important to trigger HR through effectors Avr9, Avr4, AvrPto, Inf1, and the P50 helicase of tomato mosaic virus (TMV). Silencing of ACIF1 leads to compromised resistance in many aspects, such as N gene-mediated responses to TMV infection, reduced confluent cell death induced by *Pseudomonas syringae* pv *tabaci* and R-gene Cf-9-dependent HR (but not Cf-9 resistance to *Cladosporium fulvum*). Expression profiling showed that ACIF1 homologs regulate defence responses via MeJA- and ABA-responsive genes. Apart from the SCF complexes, simple RING E3 ligases are involved in defence responses. For instance, *Arabidopsis* RIN2 and RIN3 are RING E3 ligases with 6 transmembrane domains and an ubiquitin-binding CUE domain. RIN2 is predominantly localized to the plasma membrane, as are R-gene proteins RPM1 and RPS2. The C-terminal regions of RIN2 and RIN3 interact strongly with an RPM1 N-terminal fragment and weakly with a similar domain from the RPS2 protein. A rin2/rin3 double mutant showed reduction in RPM1-/RPS2-dependent HR but no alteration of pathogen growth, suggesting RIN2/RIN3 may act on the substrate that regulates RPM1-/RPS2-dependent HR (Kawasaki et al. 2005).

U-box E3 ligases also play an important role in during plant defence. *Arabidopsis* U-box proteins PUB22, PUB23, and PUB24 are negative regulators of PTI in response to several distinct PAMPs. Single, double, and triple *pub22/pub23/pub24* mutants exhibited progressive loss of suppression in the flg22-induced ROI burst, and the triple mutant displayed derepression and impaired downregulation of responses triggered by PAMPs (Trujillo et al. 2008). Another U-box protein, tomato ACRE276, is involved in the R genes Cf-9 and N for efficient development of HR. Mutation of its orthologue PUC17 in *Arabidopsis* (*puc17*) was shown to have increased susceptibility against avirulent strains of *P. syringae* (Craig et al. 2009). The tobacco U-box protein CMPG1 mediates Cf-9-triggered HR. Recent research has shown that potato resistance protein R3a, strongly suppresses infestin 1 (INF1)-triggered cell death (ICD) through the recognition of effector AVR3a from potato blight pathogen *Phytophthora infestans*. AVR3a is required for virulence and it stabilized CMPG1 during infection to suppress PTI but CMPG1 activity is required for *P. infestans*
during the late, necrotrophic phase of infection. The stability of CMPG1 through the interaction with AVR3a is a key event to determine cell death (Bos et al. 2010).

The RAR1-SGT1-SCF complex has merged the relationship between ubiquitination and resistance mediated by multiple R genes in monocot and dicot plant species. RAR1 is conserved in all eukaryotes except yeast and was initially implicated in disease resistance against powdery mildew in barley. RAR1 interacts with SGT1 (SUPPRESSOR OF THE G2 ALLELE OF SKP1) through the C-terminal CS motif. SGT1 regulates SCF E3 ligase complexes with which it associates through the SKP1 subunit in yeast, Arabidopsis, barley, and Nicotiana benthamiana (Azevedo et al. 2002). F-box-mediated auxin- and JA-dependent signalling is disrupted in Arabidopsis sgt1b mutants and SGT1 is also required for R-gene mediated resistance against a variety of pathogens, suggesting that SGT1 is a key component of multiple SCF-regulated pathways (Craig et al. 2009). Furthermore, silencing SKP1 and subunits of the COP9 signalosome (CSN) in N. benthamiana, resulted in the loss of N-mediated TMV resistance. It is also proposed that RAR1 and SGT1 function as co-chaperones with HSP90 in close proximity to R proteins, possibly to assist in the maintenance of conformation-sensitive signalling states during R protein activation (Shirasu and Schulze-Lefert 2003).

1.7.3 S-Nitrosylation of E3 Ligases

Studies of redox regulation in ubiquitination in plants are rare, and to date, no reports of E3 ligase S-nitrosylation are published. Conversely, in mammals, there is emerging evidence that S-nitrosylation is a key regulatory mechanism in ubiquitination especially during nitrosative stress. Most neurodegenerative disorders are related to excess of reactive nitrogen and oxygen species (RNS/ROS) in neuronal cells, which can lead to cell injury and death. In general, accumulation of aberrant proteins such as misfolded and aggregated proteins in neuronal cell affect neuronal connectivity and plasticity and trigger cell death signalling pathways. For example, α-synuclein and synphilin-1 are involved in Parkinson's disease (PD), and β-amyloid (Aβ) and tau are involved in Alzheimer's disease (AD). In unstressed and healthy neurons, these aberrant proteins do not accumulate due to removal through ubiquitin-mediated degradation. Extreme nitrosative/oxidative stress can facilitate protein misfolding and aggregation. Recent studies have implied that NO-related species may significantly
contribute of protein misfolding through protein S-nitrosylation under degenerative conditions (Gu et al. 2010). In the case of PD, mutation in an E3 ligase, parkin, can simulate the sporadic phenotype, which is believed to be induced by oxidative/nitrosative stress to the ER and ubiquitin–proteasome systems (UPS). Nitrosative stress leads to S-nitrosylation of parkin and both *in vitro* and *in vivo*, and interestingly a dramatic increase was followed by a decrease in the parkin E3 ligase activity (Yao et al. 2004). The initial increase in activity leads to enhanced ubiquitination of parkin substrates. The subsequent decrease in parkin activity may allow misfolded proteins to accumulate, leading to neuronal cell death and PD (Nakamura and Lipton 2007). Another neuronal neurodegenerative disorders associated RING E3 ligase, XIAP (X-linked inhibitor of apoptosis), is regarded as an important regulator of apoptosis through the association with active caspases and repression of their catalytic activity. XIAP interacts with active caspases-3/-7/-9 in the cytosol and is thought to be the most potent endogenous caspase inhibitor. It has been reported that S-nitrosylation of the RING domain of XIAP decreases its E3 ubiquitin ligase activity both *in vitro* and in intact cells. In addition, SNO-XIAP formation is found in brains of patients with Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s, and Huntington’s diseases, implicating S-nitrosylation in the etiology of neuronal damage. An unexpected finding associated to XIAP is the transfer of NO groups (transnitrosylation) from SNO-caspase to XIAP to form SNO-XIAP (Nakamura et al. 2010). These findings provide insights that S-nitrosylation of E3 ligases is an important regulatory mechanism to protect against nitrosative stress in neuronal cells (Fig 1.6).
Figure 1.6 Two examples illustrate the regulation of E3 ligase activity through S-nitrosylation in neuronal cells.

a) S-nitrosylation increases parkin activity at the early stage of nitrosative stress, while later on, decreased activity leads to the accumulation of aberrant proteins and neuronal cell damage. b) Under normal conditions, caspases are efficiently blocked and guided to proteasomal degradation by XIAP. However under nitrosative stress, NO inactivates the XIAP E3 ligase activity via S-nitrosylation, thus stabilizing caspases and sensitizing neurons to apoptotic stimuli. Adapted from Nakamura et al., 2007 and Nakamura et al., 2010.
1.8 Aim of the study

It is now well studied that GSNOR is important in regulation of cellular SNO levels. Loss of function atgsnor1-3 mutant has shown compromised growth and disease resistant (Feechan et al. 2005). However, the signalling pathways between S-nitrosylation and the consequential phenotype of atgsnor1-3 remain largely unknown.

Arabidopsis RAP1 (Redox Associated Protein 1) was identified from microarray analysis which shows related expression profile with the atgsnor1-3 mutant (Chapter 3.2). Two conserved domains: RING and Ankyrin are found in the amino acid sequence of RAP1. RING domain is known to possess E3 protein ligase activity in the ubiquitin-dependent degradation pathway, while ankyrin domain mediates the attachment of integral membrane protein to the membrane. A previous report shows that RAP1 lacks of E3 ligase activity(Stone et al. 2005). Therefore, one of the main targets of this project is to demonstrate the molecular function of RAP1 (Chapter 4.3). If RAP1 contains the E3 ligase activity whether the activity can be regulated by S-nitrosylation (Chapter 4.4) and where is the S-nitrosylation site in RAP1(Chapter 4.5).

The other target of this project is to identify the roles of RAP1 in Arabidopsis, which is achieved by the study of RAP1 knockout mutants and RAP1 overexpressing line. The atgsnor1-3 mutant has a phenotype of retardation in growth and development, compromised disease resistant and enhanced resistant to methyl viologen. It is speculated that the RAP1 mutants also show the similar phenotype. Therefore, the RAP1 mutants will be analysed in three main aspects: the developmental phenotype (Chapter 6.1), disease-related phenotype (Chapter 6.2) and resistance to methyl viologen (Chapter 6.3).

Through this study, it is hopefully to show that RAP1 is involved in redox-mediated signalling pathway in Arabidopsis, which could also be a clue to identify novel redox-related regulators in other plant species.
Chapter 2

2 Methods and materials

2.1 Arabidopsis Seeds and Growth Conditions

Arabidopsis thaliana (Arabidopsis) ecotype Columbia (Col-0) was used. Seeds were soaked in water for 2 days at 4°C and were placed on potting medium consisting of peat moss, vermiculite and sand (4:1:1). And then were placed in a growth room and grown in long days (16 hours light, 8 hours night) with light intensity 110µmolm⁻²s⁻¹ at 20°C. Table 2.1 lists the Arabidopsis transgenic lines and mutant strains and their phenotypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strains</th>
<th>Phenotype</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col-0</td>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atgsnor1-3</td>
<td>Loss of apical dominance, resistance to methyl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabi-Kat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rap1</td>
<td>Semi-resistance to methyl viologen</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>NASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rap2</td>
<td>Semi-resistance to methyl viologen</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>NASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rap1/rap2</td>
<td>Reduced resistance to PstDC3000</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Yu &amp; Loake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35S::RAP1</td>
<td>Enhanced root branching</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Hong &amp; Loake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35S::RAP1-ΔRING</td>
<td>Dwarf and loss of apical dominance</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Hong &amp; Loake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pAgrikola-RAP1-RNAi</td>
<td>Enhanced resistance to methyl viologen</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Hong &amp; Loake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Cotyledons Development Assay with Methyl Viologen

Arabidopsis seeds were surfaced sterilized in 10% (v/v) bleach with a drop of Triton X-100 for 20 minutes. The seeds were washed at least 5 times with sterile water and placed on ½ MS agar plates with or without methyl viologen (1 μM final concentration) and incubated in long days at 20°C for 5 days.

2.3 Inoculation of Pseudomonas syringae Pv Tomato DC3000 (Avrb) and Trypan Blue Staining

Pseudomonas syringae pv tomato (Pst) DC3000 (avrB) was grown in LB medium supplemented with MgCl₂ (6 mM final concentration), 50 mgL⁻¹ rifampicin and 50 mgL⁻¹ kanamycin at 30°C at 250 rpm. Cells were harvested at cell density around
OD$_{600}$=0.2 by centrifugation at 3000 g for 10 minutes. Cell pellet was washed twice and re-suspended in 10mM MgCl$_2$ and the cell density were further adjusted to OD$_{600}$ = 0.002. Four week Arabidopsis plants were infiltrated with *Pst* DC3000 (*avrB*) on the abaxial side of the leave (half leaf) using a 1mL syringe.

Leaves after 1 day of inoculation with *Pst* DC3000 (*avrB*) were cut out from the plant and soaked in trypan blue solution (2.5 gL$^{-1}$ trypan blue, 25% (w/v) lactic acid, 23% (w/v) water saturated phenol, 25% (w/v) glycerol and water) and boiled at 100°C for 2 minutes. After cool down, the trypan blue solution was replaced by saturated choral hydrate solution (1 kgL$^{-1}$). After 24 hours, the leaves were taken out and mounted onto a microscopic slide.

### 2.4 *Pseudomonas syringae* pv Tomato DC3000 Resistance Assay

*Pst* DC3000 was grown in LB medium supplemented with MgCl$_2$ (6mM final concentration) and 50mgL$^{-1}$ rifampicin. Four week old plants were infected with a *Pst* DC3000 suspension (OD$_{600}$= 0.0002) in 10mM on the abaxial side of the leaf using a 1ml syringe. Three leaves per plant and three plants per line were infected. Leave were harvested at 3 day and 5 day after inoculation. Three leaf discs (0.5cm$^2$) from each plant were collected and ground in 500µL 6mM MgCl$_2$ solution in a 1.5mL eppendorf tube. Serial dilutions of bacterial suspension were made and 100 µL of each dilution was spread onto LB plates containing MgCl$_2$ (6mM final concentration) and 50mgL$^{-1}$ rifampicin. The plates were incubated for 2 days at 30°C and the number of bacterial colonies for each sample were counted and recorded.

### 2.5 Inoculation of *Erysiphe cichoracearum*

*Arabidopsis* powdery mildew, *Erysiphe cichoracearum* (*E. c.*) was maintained on Col-0 plants in the greenhouse. Leaves with infected *E.c.* were cut, and spores were collected from the infected leaves by a cotton bud. Spores were transferred on the healthy leaves via rubbing the cotton bud with spores from two infected leaves. At least six leaves were inoculated per plant line. The inoculated plants were left in the greenhouse (~25°C) and leaves were collected for either trypan blue staining (3 day post-inoculation) or protein extraction (10 day post-inoculation).
2.6 Extraction of Genomic DNA from *Arabidopsis*

A leaf of *Arabidopsis* plant was ground in 300µL of CTAB buffer in a 1.5mL eppendorf tube and incubated at 65°C for 20 minutes. The plant extract was mixed with 300µL of chloroform by vortex vigorously and centrifuged at 15,000 rpm for 5 minutes. The upper aqueous layer was transferred to a new eppendorf with 300µL of isopropanol followed by centrifugation at 15,000 rpm for 5 minutes. The supernatant was removed and the pellet was washed by 1mL 70% ethanol. The ethanol was then removed and the pellet was air-dried and dissolved in 50 µL of water.

2.7 RNA Extraction and Reverse-Transcription (RT)

Total RNA was extracted from 4 weeks old plant using TRI reagent (Sigma) according to the manufacturer’s protocol. Ominiscript RT Kit (Qiagen) was used for first-strand cDNA synthesis, which extracted total RNA (1µg) were mixed with 1x Buffer RT, oligo-dT (20 pmole), dNTP mix (100 nmole), RNase inhibitor (10 units), Ominiscript Reverse Transcriptase (4 units) and RNase-free water to 20µL in total. The reaction mix was incubated at 37°C for 60 minutes. The reaction product was stored at -20°C or immediately used in a PCR reaction.
2.8 Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) Based Methods

2.8.1 RT-PCR

RT-PCR was carried out in the following condition: 1μL of RT-product (cDNA), dNTP mix (5 nmole), forward and reverse primer (5 pmole each) (Table 2.2), 1X Buffer, *Taq* polymerase (1 unit) (Promega) at cycle 95°C (30s), 55°C (30s) and 72°C (2 min) for 25 cycles. Reaction product (5 μL) was taken out to analyze in agarose gel electrophoresis.

Table 2.2 Primers used in RT-PCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Forward</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Product size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSNOR</td>
<td>GAGGTTCCGGATCAAGATCCT</td>
<td>GTTGGAACGGACGAGTTGAT</td>
<td>826bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPI</td>
<td>GTATCAAATCCTTCACCATGAAG</td>
<td>CATTGCGTGGAACTCCTTT</td>
<td>767bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAGCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP2.1</td>
<td>GGATGAAAGAAACGAAGGGTCTG</td>
<td>AGGATATAGATAATCCCATTGTGTG</td>
<td>752bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TTGTTG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP2.2</td>
<td>GATAACTCCACAAAAACAGTCTT</td>
<td>AGGATATAGATAATCCCATTGTGTG</td>
<td>705bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TTGTTG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIN1</td>
<td>CATCAGGAAGGGACTTGATC</td>
<td>GATGGACCTGACTGTCATAC</td>
<td>240bp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8.2 Genotyping PCR

Genotyping PCR was carried out in the following condition: 1μL genomic DNA, dNTP mix (5 nmole), forward and reverse primer (5 pmole each) (Table 2.3), 1X Buffer, Taq polymerase (1 unit) (Promega) at cycle 95°C (30s), 52°C (30s) and 72°C (2 min) for 35 cycles. Reaction product (5 μL) was taken out to analyze in agarose gel electrophoresis.

Table 2.3 Primers used in genotyping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Forward</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Product size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSNOR</td>
<td>GGATCGATAAGGTCCAGTCTAG</td>
<td>CAGCAGCCTCATGACCTAGAATA</td>
<td>939bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTACGTA</td>
<td>CAAGGAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP1</td>
<td>GTATCAAATCACTTCACCATGAAG</td>
<td>CATTGGCTGTGGAACTCTTTT</td>
<td>1555bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAGCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP2</td>
<td>GGATGAAGAAACGAGGGTCTG</td>
<td>AGGATATAGATAATCCCATGTGGTTT</td>
<td>1038bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CATCAATAAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIN1</td>
<td>CATCAGGAAGGACTTGTACGG</td>
<td>GATGGACCTGACTCGTCATACG</td>
<td>351bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CATGGAATTTGGACTTCTGGAGTT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP1-</td>
<td>GCCCTTTTGAAGGATAAAAGCCTG</td>
<td>CATGGAATTTGGACCTTCTGGAGTT</td>
<td>~1200bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDNA</td>
<td>CTCC</td>
<td>CATCAATAAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP2-</td>
<td>GGATGAAGAAACGAGGGTCTG</td>
<td>GCGTGGACCGCTTGCTGCAAATC</td>
<td>~550bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8.3 PCR Reaction for Protein Expression

PCR reactions were carried out in the following conditions: 1μL of cDNA, dNTP mix (5 nmole), forward and reverse primer (5 pmole each) (Table 2.4), 1X Buffer, *Pfu* polymerase (1 unit) (Promega) at cycle 95°C (30s), 55°C (30s) and 72°C (2 min) for 35 cycles. *Taq* polymerase (0.5 unit) was added after the PCR reaction and incubated at 72°C for 10 minutes to add a 3’A overhang for TA cloning purpose. The desired PCR product was separated in agarose gel electrophoresis and purified in distilled water by a gel extraction kit (Qiagen).

The purified PCR product was cloned into pGEM-T Easy (Promega) for amplification and sequencing. Confirmed DNA fragment was then subcloned into an expression vector pGEX4T-1(GE Healthcare) through the designed restriction sites and transformed into *E. coli* BL21 for expression purpose.

Table 2.4 Primers used in protein expression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Forward</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Product size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIP8</strong></td>
<td>GGATCCATGTCCGATGCTCCGTC</td>
<td>CTCGAGTCAGTAACGAGAAGTTG</td>
<td>1005bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTCTGCCCG</td>
<td>AAGAAGAAGAAGAAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UBC1</strong></td>
<td>GGATCCATGTCCGCGCCGCAAGG</td>
<td>CTCGAGCTAGTCAGCTCCAGC</td>
<td>459bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAAGAGTT</td>
<td>TTTGCTCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAP1</strong></td>
<td>GGATCCATGGGGCAACACAAAT</td>
<td>GTCGACTCAACATGATAGCT</td>
<td>1131bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CACAGTCCA</td>
<td>TAATGACCTGATC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAP2.1</strong></td>
<td>GGATCCATGAGGACACAGCAAT</td>
<td>CTCGAGTCAGACACGCTACAGCT</td>
<td>1317bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAAAAGGG</td>
<td>TAATAACCTGATC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAP1-</strong></td>
<td>AAAAAGGATCCTCAAAGGATGCC</td>
<td>AAAAATCGAGTCAAACATGAT</td>
<td>315bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RING</strong></td>
<td>AAAAAGGATCCTCAAAGGATG</td>
<td>ATAGCTTTATGACCCTG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACAGCCAATG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8.4 Site-Directed Mutagenesis

Codon replacement in expression vectors was carried out by QuikChange® II XL Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene). Two complimentary primers containing the desired mutation were synthesized (see Table 2.5) and used in the PCR reaction in the following condition: 10× reaction buffer (5 μL), expression vector (pGEX-RAP1 or pGEX-RAP1-RING)(10 ng), complimentary primers (125 ng each), dNTP mix (1 μL), QuikSolution reagent (3 μL), *Pfu*Ultra HF DNA polymerase (2.5 U) and distilled water to a final volume of 50 μL. The cycling parameter was set as follow: 95°C (50 s), 52°C (50 s) and 68°C (5min) for 18 cycles. The parental plasmid was digested by *Dpn* I (10 U) at 37°C for 1 hour and the *Dpn* I-treated DNA was transformed into supplied XL10-Gold ultracompetent cells. The mutated expression plasmid was purified and the mutated site was confirmed by DNA sequencing.

Table 2.5 Primers used in site-directed mutagenesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Forward</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C325H</td>
<td>GAAGATGGACTGCATGTGATTTGTGTG</td>
<td>CACACAAATCACATGCAGTCCCATCTTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C328H</td>
<td>CTGTGTGTGTATCATGATGGATG</td>
<td>TGGTCATCCACATGAATCACACACAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C337H</td>
<td>TCTGAACGCGATGCATGTGCCGTGGTA</td>
<td>TCCACACGCCCATGTCACTGCTTCAGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C340H</td>
<td>GTGTGTGTGGCATGACATGTGGC</td>
<td>GGCGACATGTCCAGTGCGGCACACACAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9 Expression and Purification of Recombinant Proteins in E. coli BL21

E. coli BL21 cells harbouring expression plasmid were grown in 5mL LB medium supplemented with ampicillin (50 mg·L\(^{-1}\)) at 37°C for overnight. The overnight culture was subcultured into 100 mL LB medium with ampicillin (50 mg·L\(^{-1}\)) at 1:100 ratio in 500 mL conical flask and incubated at 37°C, 250 rpm until cell density OD\(_{600}\)=0.5-0.6. The culture was chilled on ice for 10 min and IPTG was added to the cell culture to a final concentration of 0.1 mM and further incubated for 8 hours. The cells were harvested by centrifugation at 3000 g for 20 minutes, washed twice with phosphate-buffer saline (PBS) and resuspended in 1mL PBS or stored at –80°C without PBS.

Lysozyme (final 2 mg mL\(^{-1}\)), protease-inhibitor cocktail (Roche) were added to the cells that were resuspended in 1 mL PBS and incubated on ice for 30 minutes. Sonication was applied at 10 times at 10s intervals and immediately centrifuged at 20,000 g at 4°C for 20 minutes. The supernatant was mixed with 100 μL of PBS washed glutathione-sepharose 4B matrix (GE Healthcare) and incubated at 4°C (with shaking) for 30 minutes. The protein-bound matrix was washed 4 times with ice-cold PBS and the fusion proteins were eluted in elution buffer (100 μL of 50mM TrisCl, 100mM NaCl, 10mM glutathione, pH 8.0). The fusion protein was analyzed in a SDS-PAGE gel and mass spectrometry.

The GST-tag of the fusion protein was removed by application of thrombin protease (1U)(GE Healthcare) into 100 μL of protein solution at room temperature for 16 hours. Gluthathione-sepharose 4B matrix (30 μL) was added and incubated at room temperature at room temperature for 1 hour with shaking. The GST-tag bound matrix was removed by centrifugation at 13,000 g for 5 minutes. The cleaved protein in supernatant was analyzed in a SDS-PAGE gel.

2.10 In-Gel Digestion and Mass Spectrometry Analysis

Protein band with expected size was excised from a SDS-PAGE gel and was shrunk in methanol (200 μL) for 10 minutes and the methanol was replaced by ammonium bicarbonate (ABC) solution (50mM) and incubated for 10 minutes. This procedure (methanol/ABC exchange) was repeated at least 3 times and the gel was finally shrunk in methanol and dried in a laminar flow hood. The dried gel was then soaked in trypsin solution (0.4 μg in 20 μL ABC solution) at 37°C for 16 hours. The solution
with digested peptides was transferred to a new eppendorf and the remaining peptides in the gel were further extracted by 0.5% formic acid and 50% methanol. The peptide solution was dried completely in a speedvac concentrator. Capillary-HPLC-MSMS analysis was performed on an on-line system consisting of a micro-pump (1200 binary HPLC system, Agilent, UK) coupled to a hybrid LTQ-Orbitrap XL instrument (Thermo-Fisher, UK). Samples were reconstituted in 10 µl loading buffer before injection, and analyzed on a 1 hour gradient for data dependent analysis. MSMS data were searched using MASCOT Versions 2.2 and 2.3 (Matrix Science Ltd, UK).

2.11 In vitro S-Nitrosylation

The original buffer in the expressed proteins (Chapter 2.8) was exchanged to 100 µL of HEN buffer (250 mM HEPES-NaOH pH7.1, 1m EDTA and 0.1 mM neocuproine) by a Zeba spin desalting column (Thermo Scientific). NO donor (GSNO or CysNO) or GSH (control) was added to the protein solution (final concentration from 0.1 mM to 1 mM) and incubated in dark for 20 minutes at room temperature. The unreacted NO donor was removed by HEN-pretreated Zeba spin desalting column. The NO donor treated protein was then ready for a biotin-switch assay or an E3 ligase activity assay.

2.12 Biotin-Switch Assay

Protein solution (100 µL) was mixed thoroughly with 300 µL of blocking solution (HEN buffer, 2.5% SDS and 20 mM S-methylmethanethiosulfonate (MMTS)) in dark at 50°C for 20 minutes. Ice-cold acetone (800 µL) was then added and incubated at -20°C for 1 hour. The protein was then pelleted by centrifugation (10,000 x g, 10 minutes), air-dried and resuspended in 50 µL HEN-S buffer (1% SDS in HEN buffer). The protein solution was incubated with 13 µL of Biotin-HPDP (N-[6-(Biotinamido)hexyl]-3’-(2’-pyridylidithio)-propionamide) (5 mM in DMSO) and 3 µL of sodium ascorbate (100mM) for 1 hour at room temperature. Biotinylated protein was detected by anti-biotin antibody or pulled down by streptavidin.

Pulldown of biotinylated proteins by streptavidin was performed as previously described (Forrester et al. 2009). The buffer solution in protein samples were exchanged to neutralization buffer (20mM Hepes pH7.7, 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA and 0.5% Triton) by a Zeba desalting column. Streptavidin agarose (Fluka) was added
to the protein samples in 1:10 ratio and incubated at 4°C for 12 hours. Avidin beads were collected by centrifugation at 200 g for 10 seconds, followed by washing with wash buffer (neutralization buffer containing 600 mM NaCl) for four times. The washed protein was resuspended in non-reducing protein loading buffer and boiled at 95°C for 5 minutes. The boiled protein solution was analyzed in a SDS-PAGE or a western blot (detection by anti-GST or anti-biotin).

2.13 Protein Extraction from Arabidopsis

Tissue of Arabidopsis (100mg) was ground in liquid nitrogen into fine powder. Ice-cold extraction buffer (1x PBS, 1mM PMSF and 5mM DTT) was added to the leaf powder and vortex vigorously for 1 minutes. Samples were centrifuged for 20 minutes at 13,000 x g in 4°C and supernatant was collected. The protein concentration was determined by Bradford analysis (Bradford 1976).
2.14 SDS-PAGE and Western Blot Analysis

SDS-PAGE and western blot analysis were carried out as described by Sambrook & Russell (Molecular Cloning, 3rd edition, CSHL Press) with following adjustments. Proteins were separated in a 10% SDS-PAGE (without SDS for in-gel activity assay) at 120V for 1 hour. Blotting was carried out in a tank transfer using the Mini Trans-Blot cell (Bio-Rad) in transfer buffer (25mM Tris, 200mM glycine and 20% Methanol) at 80°C, 4°C for 1 hour. Proteins were then transferred onto a PVDF membrane (GE Healthcare). The membrane was then blocked with 5% (w/v) of skimmed-milk powder in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and 0.1% Tween (PBS-T). The blocked membrane was incubated with antibody as described (Table 2.6) and followed by 3 times washing with PBS-T. Protein was detected by an ECL Plus Western Blotting Detection System (GE Healthcare). The blot was incubated with 1 mL of solution A and 25 μL of solution B for 1 minute. The illuminant signal was detected by exposure of the blot to an X-ray film (Thermo Scientific).

Table 2.6 Western blot condition for different targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>1° antibody</th>
<th>dilution</th>
<th>2° antibody</th>
<th>dilution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GST</td>
<td>Mouse monoclonal anti-GST HRP-conjugated antibody (GE Healthcare)</td>
<td>1:5000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotin</td>
<td>Monoclonal anti-biotin HRP-conjugated antibody (Cell Signaling Technology)</td>
<td>1:5000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP1</td>
<td>Rabbit polyclonal anti-RAP1 antiserum</td>
<td>1:250</td>
<td>Goat monoclonal anti-rabbit IgG HRP-conjugated antibody (Promega)</td>
<td>1:5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AtGSN OR</td>
<td>Rabbit polyclonal anti-AtGSNOR antiserum</td>
<td>1:1000</td>
<td>Goat monoclonal anti-rabbit IgG HRP-conjugated antibody (Promega)</td>
<td>1:5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubiquitin</td>
<td>Mouse monoclonal anti-ubiquitin antibody (Sigma-Aldrich)</td>
<td>1:5000</td>
<td>Monoclonal anti-mouse IgG HRP-conjugated antibody (Cell Signaling Technology)</td>
<td>1:5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.15 E3 Ligase Activity Assay

E3 ligase activity assay was carried out as described (Kawasaki et al. 2005; Stone et al. 2005) with modifications. Expressed recombinant E3 ligase (100 ng) was co-incubated with 50 ng of recombinant human E1 enzyme (Sigma-Aldrich), 5 μL of E2 enzyme extract (AtUBC1) (This study) and 2 μg of ubiquitin (Sigma-Aldrich) in a reaction mixture containing 50mM TrisCl, 10mM MgCl₂ and 0.05mM ZnSO₄. The reaction mixture was incubated at 30°C for 2 hours and stopped by adding of 4X SDS loading buffer. The proteins in the reaction were separated by a SDS-PAGE and transferred to a PVDF membrane by tank transfer system. Polymerization of ubiquitin was detected by a western blot using anti-ubiquitin antibody as the primary antibody and HRP-conjugated anti-mouse IgG (Cell Signaling Technology) as the secondary antibody.

2.16 GSNOR In-Gel Enzyme Activity Assay

GSNOR activity was detected as previously reported (Barroso et al. 2006). Extracted proteins from *Arabidopsis* were separated in a native polyacrylamide gel 7.5% (w/v) at 4°C. The gel was incubated in 0.1 M sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7.4) containing 2 mM NADH for 15 minutes at 4°C. The gel was covered with filter paper soaked in 3 mM GSNO (freshly prepared) for 10 minutes. The filter paper was removed and the gel was illuminated under ultraviolet light in an UV illuminator. The GSNOR activity was detected referring to the disappearance of the NADH fluorescence.
Chapter 3

3 Identification of RAP1 in Arabidopsis

3.1 Introduction

S-nitrosoglutathione reductase (GSNOR) catalyses the conversion of S-nitrosoglutathione (GSNO) into oxidized glutathione (GSSG). GSNOR is also the key enzyme in regulation of S-nitrosylation in Arabidopsis and previously, a loss-of-function mutant atgsnor1-3 was isolated which shows distinct phenotypes such as slow growth, loss of apical dominance, reduced fertility and increased susceptibility to pathogen (Feechan et al. 2005). Compared to WT plants, atgsnor1-3 plants display higher SNO levels upon pathogen infection, suggesting SNOs produced during infection are not effectively removed due to the loss of GSNOR. Excess NO or GSNO shifts the equilibrium towards S-nitrosylation of a variety of proteins, thereby leading to changes of protein function and structure. Activities of certain proteins may be altered due to S-nitrosylation, these proteins could be important regulators of plant development, resistance to abiotic stress as well as defence against pathogens. The cross-talk between SA and GSNO has been described in some reports, for instance, both WT and atgsnor1-3 plants were able to respond to SA treatment to trigger PR-1 expression in 6 hours, however PR-1 mRNA transcript accumulation was substantially reduced in atgsnor1-3 plants. Thus, the SA-signalling pathway is affected due to accumulation of GSNO (Feechan et al. 2005). Further, the SA binding protein 3 (SABP3) in Arabidopsis has been shown to be S-nitrosylated, and atsabp3 mutants were found to be more susceptible to bacterial infection (Wang et al. 2009c), revealing that S-NO/redox-regulation is actively involved in the control of defence responses. However, the precise regulatory mechanism (such as NO perception, signal relaying and transcription activation) against nitrosative stress remains unclear, and some uncharacterized genes may be specifically involved in pathogen responses under nitrosative stress.

The availability of atgsnor1-3 mutants has provided a convenient tool to study the role of NO/GSNO in plant defence. Previously, a microarray analysis was carried out to explore differential gene expression upon PstDC3000(avrB) treatment of plant lines with different genetic backgrounds (i.e. Col-0, atgsnor1-1, atgsnor1-3 and sid2).
Through the analysis of the microarray data, pathogen-induced genes that are directly regulated by SNO levels could be identified by eliminating genes that were controlled by SA accumulation.

S-nitrosylation is known to regulate both SA signalling and accumulation (Feechan et al., 2005). Therefore, pathogen-induced genes differentially expressed in *sid2* mutants, which are defective in SA accumulation, were removed from the analysis. Following the analysis, one gene, *At4g14365*, was strikingly differentially regulated, consequently this gene was selected for further study. In this chapter, the rationale for choosing *At4g14365* will be explained. Furthermore, unpublished works from a previous lab member, Jeum-kyu Hong, has been included in this chapter to provide supporting data in addition to the presented *in silico* analysis.

### 3.2 The RAP1 (REDOX-ASSOCIATED PROTEIN 1) Gene in *Arabidopsis*

Identification of *At4g14365* was based on the Affymetrix microarray data through the analysis of the transcript levels of genes in *Arabidopsis* genome upon avirulent pathogen *Pst*DC3000(*avrB*) inoculation. Microarray data for four plant lines; wild-type Columbia (WT, Col-0), the *GSNOR* overexpression mutant (*atgsnor1-1*), the *GSNOR* knock out mutant (*atgsnor1-3*) and the SA-biosynthesis impaired mutant (*sid2*) were analysed. *GSNOR* transcripts were accumulated in *atgsnor1-1* plants due to the T-DNA insertion in the *GSNOR* promoter (probably disrupting the repressor binding site), whereas no *GSNOR* transcripts was detected in *atgsnor1-3* plants as T-DNA was inserted in the exon just after the start codon (Feechan et al. 2005). The difference of the *GSNOR* transcript levels between *atgsnor1-1* and *atgsnor1-3* plants results in the variation in the SNO levels especially upon pathogen infection. Upon pathogen infection, excessive SNOs are normally removed by GSNOR, however loss of the *GSNOR* gene (i.e. *atgsnor1-3*) leads to the accumulation of GSNO and compromises defence responses. The SA-induction-deficient *sid2* has a mutation to a gene encoding isochorismate synthase (ICS1) which is an important enzyme in SA biosynthesis. The level of SA after infection in *sid2* mutants is only 5–10% of the wild-type levels and disease resistance is also compromised (Abreu and Munne-Bosch 2009).
The microarray analysis included 4 sets of experiments (Col-0, atgsnor1-1, atgsnor1-3 and sid2) with duplication. Each set of the experiment detected the transcripts of a plant line during uninduced condition and pathogen-induced condition (6 hour PstDC3000(avnB) treatment). Among the up-regulated genes upon PstDC3000(avnB) treatment, only a small proportion of them were able to show the same extent of induction level in sid2 mutant. Genes that showed reduced differential expression in the sid2 mutant were regarded as SA-dependent, while genes that were still differentially regulated regardless of SA could be controlled by other signalling pathways. Table 3.1 shows genes that were sorted according to the fold induction in the sid2 background. Expression of a gene with unknown function (At1g19020) increased dramatically both in atgsnor1-3 (136.2 fold) and sid2 (80.1 fold), while a putative aminotransferase (At2g24850) shows 38.9 fold induction in atgsnor1-3 and 72.7 fold in sid2, a plastocyanin-like domain-containing protein (At5g20230) shows 96.8 fold in atgsnor1-3 and 59.5 fold in sid2 and a heat shock cognate 70 kDa protein 2 (HSC70-2) (HSP70-2)(At5g02490) was upregulated 99.2 fold in atgsnor1-3 and 44.5 fold in sid2. The last candidate among the top five is a zinc finger (C3HC4-type RING finger) family protein / ankyrin repeat family protein (A4g14365) which shows increased expression of 80.6 fold in atgsnor1-3 and 34.8 fold the in sid2. This gene is named RAP1 (REDOX-ASSOCIATED PROTEIN 1) in this study. The five candidates showed significant up-regulated gene expression in the sid2 mutant, suggesting the regulation of expression is fully/partially independent of SA. Coincidently, the basal expression of these genes in atgsnor1-3 mutant (when comparing to WT) was highly suppressed, for instance, RAP1 basal expression was 25.8 fold lower in atgsnor1-3 mutant than in wildtype.

Due to this interesting expression pattern, the RAP1 gene was selected for further analysis. The full genomic sequence of RAP1 is 2302 bp including 9 introns to give a full cDNA of 1407 bp after splicing. The coding sequence of RAP1 is 1131 bp that encoded a peptide with 376 amino acids. Two conserved domains are found in RAP1, which are ankyrin repeats in the N-terminus and a RING domain in the C-terminus (Figure 3.1a). A paralog of RAP1 is also presented in the Arabidopsis genome which is named RAP2 in this study (At3g23280). The full genomic sequence of RAP2 is 3079 bp which gives two splicing variants RAP2.1 and RAP2.2 with coding sequence of 1389 bp (462aa) and 1317 bp (439bp) respectively. Both conserved domains of
RAP1 are found in RAP2, and significant sequence similarities are located at the N-terminal and C-terminal ends.

Table 3.1 shows the averaged raw microarray hybridisation signal values for comparing the expression of Rap1, Rap2 and Actin1. The expression behaviour of RAP2 was very different from RAP1. In this context, RAP2 was constitutively expressed with similar levels in WT, atgsnor1-1, atgsnor1-3 and sid2 plants and in addition, RAP2 was not induced by PstDC3000(avrB) upon 6 hour treatment. On the other hand, RAP1 was highly induced in all the tested plants with the similar maximum level of induction across WT, atgsnor1-1 and sid2. The induced level was lower in atgsnor1-3 plants, although the fold of induction was still the highest at 30 fold. It is also worth noting that the basal expression level of RAP1 in sid2 was also suppressed, while the induced level was similar to that in WT and atgsnor1-1 plants.
Table 3.1 Normalised microarray hybridisation signal of selected candidates that displays strong transcript induction upon challenge with *Ps/DC3000* (*avrB*).

Data is sorted in descending order by the ratio of sid2 6hr/sid2 0hr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENE NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Col-0 0h average</th>
<th>Col-0 6h average</th>
<th>ratio</th>
<th>altpcor1-1 0h average</th>
<th>altpcor1-1 6h average</th>
<th>ratio</th>
<th>altpcor1-3 0h average</th>
<th>altpcor1-3 6h average</th>
<th>ratio</th>
<th>atgsnor 1-1 0h average</th>
<th>atgsnor 1-1 6h average</th>
<th>ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At1g19200</td>
<td>expressed protein</td>
<td>255.5</td>
<td>2171.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>2143.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>5961.0</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>4819.1</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g34650</td>
<td>aminotransferase, putative</td>
<td>1646.3</td>
<td>7727.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>989.0</td>
<td>8732.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>2028.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>4319.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g20230</td>
<td>plastocyanin-like domain-containing protein</td>
<td>1582.3</td>
<td>12130.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>709.9</td>
<td>11717.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>15048.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>224.1</td>
<td>13323.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g24900</td>
<td>heat shock cognate 70 kDa protein 2 (HSC70-2) (HSP70-2)</td>
<td>381.8</td>
<td>3042.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>221.6</td>
<td>3235.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>2874.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>3385.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g14365</td>
<td>zinc finger (C3HC4-type RING finger) family protein / atelin repeat family protein</td>
<td>1056.1</td>
<td>3866.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>736.3</td>
<td>3705.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>2296.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>153.9</td>
<td>5349.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g50090</td>
<td>AAA-type ATPase family protein</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>673.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>688.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1207.1</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>1298.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g39505</td>
<td>transferase family protein</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>961.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>1092.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>1936.6</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>970.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g28030</td>
<td>FAD-binding domain-containing protein</td>
<td>301.7</td>
<td>1960.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>181.7</td>
<td>2258.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>3652.2</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>2995.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g23050</td>
<td>calmodulin-binding family protein</td>
<td>695.4</td>
<td>2259.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>470.0</td>
<td>2352.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>4411.1</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>123.7</td>
<td>3158.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g01290</td>
<td>band 7 family protein</td>
<td>773.2</td>
<td>3344.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>624.0</td>
<td>3225.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>3120.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>174.1</td>
<td>3661.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g17000</td>
<td>chitinase, putative</td>
<td>464.7</td>
<td>1245.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>200.7</td>
<td>1422.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>211.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>762.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g60460</td>
<td>broad-spectrum mildew resistance RPW8 family protein</td>
<td>1949.6</td>
<td>6187.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1492.0</td>
<td>6448.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>2559.4</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>196.7</td>
<td>3779.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g94700</td>
<td>WRKY family transcription factor</td>
<td>187.5</td>
<td>808.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>674.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2344.2</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>1442.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g47220</td>
<td>prephenate dehydratase family protein</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>445.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>592.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>1064.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>779.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g07030</td>
<td>lysine and histidine specific transporter, putative</td>
<td>1101.1</td>
<td>3240.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>795.9</td>
<td>4007.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>2798.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>2659.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g13490</td>
<td>ADP. ATP carrier protein 2, mitochondrial / ADP: ATP translocase 2 / adenosine nucleotide translocator 2 (ANT2)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>742.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>503.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>2628.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>796.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g4310</td>
<td>arabinogalactan-protein (AGP1)</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>463.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>332.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>2344.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>1093.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g51100</td>
<td>touch-responsive protein / calmodulin-related protein 2, touch-induced (TOC1)</td>
<td>1831.9</td>
<td>6873.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1656.5</td>
<td>6221.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>206.9</td>
<td>9637.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>760.4</td>
<td>9631.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g27680</td>
<td>cinnamyl-alcohol dehydrogenase, putative</td>
<td>249.7</td>
<td>601.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>193.4</td>
<td>778.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>1070.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>483.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g19240</td>
<td>expressed protein</td>
<td>1447.8</td>
<td>3916.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>774.5</td>
<td>5225.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>2457.7</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>240.2</td>
<td>2861.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g48900</td>
<td>disease resistance protein (EDS1)</td>
<td>315.3</td>
<td>688.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>244.4</td>
<td>491.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>616.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g43930</td>
<td>extra-long guanine nucleotide binding protein, putative / G-protein, putative</td>
<td>258.1</td>
<td>785.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>206.4</td>
<td>788.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>850.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>972.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g35290</td>
<td>ammonium transporter 2 (AMT2)</td>
<td>144.0</td>
<td>651.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>132.9</td>
<td>497.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>969.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>819.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g08840</td>
<td>phosphoglycerate bisphosphoglycerate mutase family protein</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>229.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>166.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>523.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>217.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g61410</td>
<td>calmodulin, putative</td>
<td>1022.0</td>
<td>2772.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>676.9</td>
<td>2256.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>158.7</td>
<td>2664.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>401.0</td>
<td>3554.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g3810</td>
<td>senescence-associated family protein</td>
<td>652.8</td>
<td>1950.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>435.4</td>
<td>2273.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>4106.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>443.4</td>
<td>3792.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1 *In silico* analysis of RAP1 and RAP2 amino acid sequences.
(a) Two conserved domains are found in RAP1 and RAP2: Ankyrin (for protein binding) and RING (for E3 ligase activity).
(b) Sequence alignment of RAP1 and RAP2, wherein the peptide “IP5RRMKRRCASHGRRRPQVRQ” is absent in RAP2.2.
3.3 Expression Profiling of RAP1

Analysis of microarray data suggests that RAP1 is highly inducible upon PstDC3000(avrB) infection. To verify this, the expression of RAP1 was monitored by RT-PCR upon PstDC3000(avrB) treatment. It was found that RAP1 was induced after 2 hours treatment and reached a maximum at 6 hours, followed by the reduction of transcripts for 12 hours and 24 hours (Figure 3.2b). In the mock treatment, RAP1 also up-regulated after 2 hours, however the levels of transcript returned to the basal level after 6 hours. This up-regulation in transcripts suggested due to a wounding effect by infiltration. On the other hand, the expression of both RAP2s, RAP2.1 and RAP2.2, did not showed any significantly changes as RAP1 in both mock and pathogen treated samples at all time-points.

RAP1 was induced in both atgsnor1-3 and sid2 plants in microarray data, suggesting the induction of RAP1 might be independent of SA. Plant hormones such as jasmonic acid (JA), ethylene and abscisic acid (ABA) are known to be involved in plant defence; mutants that are insensitive to these hormones were used to determine whether expression of RAP1 was also independent of these hormonal pathways. These mutants were NONEXPRESSOR OF PATHOGENESIS-RELATED GENES 1(npr1-1), JASMONATE-INSENSITIVE1 (jin1-1), ETHYLENE-INSENSITIVE 2 (ein2), ABSCISIC ACID INSENSITIVE 3 (aba3-1) and SALICYLIC ACID INDUCTION DEFICIENT 2 (sid2). Fig 3.3a shows that the expression of RAP1 was induced by PstDC3000(avrB) upon 6 hours in all these mutant backgrounds.

There is an intergenic region of 629bp between RAP1 and the upstream gene (At4g14368) which should include the promoter of RAP1 for regulation of expression. This DNA fragment was fused with a reported gene β-glucuronidase (GUS) and transformed into WT (Col-0) plants. GUS catalyses the substrate X-Gluc (5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl-β-D-glucuronic acid) to blue precipitate of chloro-bromoindigo and colourless glucuronic acid. In Figure 3.2c, only a weak blue colour developed in Col-0 in untreated condition after X-Gluc staining, indicating that the GUS enzyme was expressed but in low extent. As the leaves were treated with cutting (wounding), a stronger blue colour was developed near the wounding sites. In addition, pathogen treatments with PstDC3000(avrB) and Blumeria graminis f.sp. tritici (Bgt) were also
able to induce GUS expression in leaves which displayed a more intense colour than the untreated sample.

Figure 3.2 Transcriptional level of *RAP1* and *RAP2* after the infection by *Pst3000 (avrB)* as determined by RT-PCR and GUS. 

a) In different genetic backgrounds; b) in Col-0 in different time points; and c) GUS staining of WT plants harbouring a construct of *Rap1* promoter-GUS. (Work of Jeum-Kyu Hong)
3.4 Bioinformatic Analysis of RAP1

Bioinformatic analysis is a powerful tool for studying a gene, especially if a gene has not been formerly characterized like RAP1. There are public microarray databases providing data of individual gene expression in various conditions such as developmental, biotic and abiotic stresses, hormone treatments and light exposure. In this study two databases were used, which are “The Bio-Array Resource for Plant Biology” (BAR) (http://esc4037-shemp.csb.utoronto.ca/welcome.htm) and “AtGenExpress Visualization Tool” (AVT) (http://jsp.weigelworld.org/expviz/expviz.jsp). BAR is a multifunctional database, which enables visualization of expression data in a graphical representation. For instance, the Arabidopsis eFP Browser is able to show the location of a particular gene expression projecting on a picture of an Arabidopsis plant (expression atlas) (Winter et al. 2007). Figure 3.3 shows the relative expression of RAP1 and RAP2 in different developmental stages. Referring to the expression atlas of RAP1, the basal expression was around signal 100-200, and the signal in some particular tissues was slightly higher (orange) such as in cotyledon, cauline leaves and mature flower. The expression of RAP1 increased gradually during leaf development until leaf maturation (red) and then reduced to basal level but increased again during leaf senescence. RAP2 shares a similar developmental expression pattern as RAP1, for instance, more signal in cotyledons, cauline leaves, and during leaf development. RAP2 was also slightly up-regulated during embryo development.

Another available feature in BAR is Expression Angler, which allows comparison of expression profiles of all expressed genes in Arabidopsis and picking up genes that have similar pattern as the query gene (Toufighi et al. 2005). When using RAP1 as the query gene, the top 24 genes with similar expression to RAP1 were identified in Expression Angler. The X-axis of Figure 3.4a shows the expression of these 25 genes in about 400 experiments, while the Y axis shows the gene IDs. From yellow to red, displays the increase in intensity of transcript signals. The 25 genes share a similar regulation pattern, suggesting their expression might be regulated by similar mechanisms. The identified genes can be divided into 5 categories which are ankyrin repeat, camodulin/calcium binding, defence-related, kinases and proteins with unknown function (Figure 3.4b). The majority of genes were placed in the defence-related category, suggesting that RAP1 may be related to defence mechanisms.
To further understand the relationship of RAP1 expression and defence, the AVT database was used to analyse RAP1 expression upon treatments with a variety of pathogens and pathogen effectors (Figure 3.5). Similar induction patterns of RAP1 expression are observed upon the treatments by MgCl₂, PstDC3000 and PstDC3000(avarRpm1), with signals increasing from 2 hours to 6 hours and decreasing at 12 hours. However, the overall level of RAP1 expression in PstDC3000(avarRpm1)-challenged plants was higher than the plants challenge with PstDC3000(avarB) and induction lasted for 12 hours. Challenge with the PstDC3000 hrcC deletion mutant or Pseudomonas syringae pv. phaseolicola (Psp) led to overall higher induction levels that lasted for 24 hours. The induction level Psp at 6 hours was among the highest in the whole set of experiments. RAP1 expression was also induced following fungal infection by Phytophthora infestans.

Effectors and PAMPs could also induce RAP1 expression, however the effects were diversified. In the experiment (Figure 3.5b), infiltration of either water or MgCl₂ solution only slightly induced the RAP1 expression, while the RAP1 expressions were significantly induced by HrpZ, NPP1 and Flg22 infiltrations. Induction by HrpZ and NPP1 infiltration could last for 4 hours while the detected signals of Flg22-induction was rapidly decreased at the fourth hour. In contrast, no induction of RAP1 expression was observed by LPS-infiltration.
Figure 3.3 Relative expression of RAP1 and RAP2 in different stage of development as visualized in the Arabidopsis eFP Browser.
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**Figure 3.4** Genes that share similar expression profile with RAPI.

**a)** Microarray analysis (from BAR database) to show the top 24 genes that were co-expressed with RAP1; **b)** Classification of identified genes according to their nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ankyrin repeat</td>
<td>cellular_component_unknown</td>
<td>ankyrin repeat family protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camodulin/calcium binding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g10340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g33050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At3g01830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g26920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g48380</td>
<td>protein amino acid phosphorylation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g31880</td>
<td>protein amino acid phosphorylation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g28380</td>
<td>biological_process_unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g41740</td>
<td>transmembrane receptor protein serine/threonine kinase activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g13790</td>
<td>SNARE complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At3g1820</td>
<td>integral to membrane of membrane fraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g61210</td>
<td>regulation of transcription, DNA-dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g23810</td>
<td>response to other organism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At3g50480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g4490</td>
<td>protein amino acid phosphorylation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g76970</td>
<td>protein amino acid phosphorylation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g23220</td>
<td>cellular_component_unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g1890</td>
<td>kinase activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others / Unknown functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At3g19010</td>
<td>cellular_component_unknown</td>
<td>oxidoreductase, 2OG-Fe(II) oxygenase family protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At5g52760</td>
<td>metal ion binding</td>
<td>heavy-metal-associated domain-containing protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g07000</td>
<td>vesicle docking during exocytosis</td>
<td>ATEX070B2 (exocyst subunit EXO70 family protein B2); protein binding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At1g76970</td>
<td>intracellular protein transport</td>
<td>VHS domain-containing protein / GAT domain-containing protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g18960</td>
<td>biological_process_unknown</td>
<td>unknown protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At4g36500</td>
<td>mitochondrion</td>
<td>unknown protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At2g25735</td>
<td>molecular_function_unknown</td>
<td>unknown protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.5 Expression of RAP1 in response to various treatments.
a) Various pathogens and b) various effectors. With the exception of Phytophthora, inoculations were done by leaves infiltration. (Data from AVT database)
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3.5 Discussion

Although there is emerging evidence that NO is taking part in many regulatory mechanisms, the component(s) of NO signalling have long been a missing link. NO production, S-nitrosoylation and denitrosoylation are all contributing to the homeostasis of NO as well as redox-based regulation, but it is still questionable whether a global regulator is present to coordinate NO signals. NO is actively involved in plant defence responses, and identification of GSNOR and its loss of function mutant atgsnor1-3 has provided a platform to investigate the possible regulator(s) integral to control of nitrosative stress. Under unchallenged condition, loss of GSNOR activity does not have sufficient impact as cellular redox balance as NO production in healthy tissue is relatively low (although the developmental phenotype of atgsnor1-3 is still very distinguishable). It has been reported that SNO levels are rapidly increased upon pathogen inoculation and this effect is even amplified in atgsnor1-3 plants due to the absence of GSNOR (Feechan et al. 2005). The microarray data in Table 3.1 compares multiple gene expression in Col-0, atgsnor1-1, atgsnor1-3 and sid2 plants, and RAP1 was selected based on its dynamic change of expression in atgsnor1-3 and sid2 plants. Although RAP1 was inducible by pathogens in all tested plant lines, its transcriptions were lowered in atgsnor1-3 and sid2 than in wild-type. This suggests that high NO or low SA may down-regulate expression of RAP1 and it could also be possible that suppression was due to the lowered SA content in atgsnor1-3 plants (Feechan et al. 2005) rather than due to the elevated SNO level. However, the pathogen induction of RAP1 is independent to SA, as the expression of RAP1 in sid2 plants could reach the maximum level seen in Col-0 and atgsnor1-1 plants. This observation was also verified by RT-PCR of RAP1 (Figure 3.2a). Furthermore, the induction in npr1-1 also reveals that impairment of SA-signalling did not affect up-regulation of RAP1 in response to pathogen challenge. Neither JA nor ethylene or abscisic acid had a significant effect in RAP1 induction. Data from the Arabidopsis eFP Browser showed that RAP1 was not induced by ACC (ethylene precursor), zeatin, IAA (auxin), ABA, MeJA and GA-3 but was slightly inducible by brassinolide (data not shown). In conclusion, RAP1 may be involved in plant defence mechanisms that could be parallel but independent to other known defence pathways.

It is also clearly observable that RAP1 is induced by wounding. Wounds caused by infiltration or cutting can activate RAP1 expression (Figure 3.2b & c and Figure 3.4).
Infiltration is a common practice to allow effective contact between pathogens and host cells, however it will also lead to cell damage and leakage of electrolytes. According to previous research, electrolytes such as calcium ions can activate wounding-related gene expression in the adjacent cells (Dombrowski and Bergey 2007); from the co-expression data (Figure 3.4), three calmodulin/calcium binding genes share a similar expression pattern with RAP1 that indicating RAP1 may involve in wounding. In particular, CBP60g (At5g26920) is also related to disease resistance against Pseudomonas syringae and MAMP-induced SA accumulation (Wang et al. 2009a). Furthermore, a calmodulin-binding family protein (At4g33050) and a putative calmodulin (At4g33050) were arrayed together in Table 3.1. These two genes show significant induction in both atgsnor1-3 and sid2 plants after challenge by PstDC3000(avrB). Especially At4g33050 that is also known as EDS39 (EMBRYO SAC DEVELOPMENT ARREST 39) was induced 106.6 fold and 25.5 fold in atgsnor1-3 and sid2 plants respectively. EDS39 transcripts had a much lower basal level in atgsnor1-3 than Col-0, and was placed in the top 24 gene candidates that share similar expression pattern with RAP1 (Figure 3.4). This suggests there might be a close relationship between EDS39 and RAP1.

Two predicted conserved domains are found in RAP1, which are ankyrin repeats and RING domain. Ankyrin repeats is one of the most widely existing protein motifs in nature, consists of 30–34 amino acid residues and exclusively functions to mediate protein–protein interactions. The intra- and inter-repeat hydrophobic and hydrogen bonding stabilizes the global structure of the repeat and the repetitive and elongated nature of ankyrin repeat proteins helps in protein stability, folding and unfolding, and determines binding specificity (Li et al. 2006). The RING domain was initially named after a newly discovered gene RING1 (really interesting new gene 1) and the RING finger motif can be defined simply as Cys-X2-Cys-X(9-39)Cys-X(1-3)His-X(2-3)Cys-X2-Cys-X(4-48)Cys-X2-Cys, where X is any amino acid. The RING finger domain comprises 8 potential metal ligands that binds two zinc atoms with each zinc atom ligated tetrahedrally by either 3 or 4 Cys residues and a His residue (Borden and Freemont 1996). The RING domain proteins are classified as a sub-class of E3 ligases for specific recognition of target proteins leading to their 26S proteasome degradation. Therefore RAP1 may act as an E3 ligase to recognize target proteins for degradation. As expression of RAP1 is upregulated during pathogen inoculation and wounding, the
potential target protein(s) could be a negative regulator in plant defence. Removal of this target protein may result in relieving the suppression of certain defence responses. For instance, *Arabidopsis* KEG (Keep on Going) is an E3 ligase which shows high similarity in peptide sequence with RAP1 and targets the degradation of ABI5 (ABSCISIC ACID-INSENSITIVE 5) which encodes an ABA-responsive transcription factor. KEG therefore regulates ABA-mediated signalling by controlling the amount of ABI5 in *Arabidopsis* (Stone et al. 2006).

**RAP2** (At3g23280) is a paralog of **RAP1**. Both ankyrin repeats and the RING domain are found in RAP2 and a previous study has shown E3 ligase activity of RAP2 (Stone et al. 2005). An additional ~80 amino acids in RAP2 do not align with RAP1 and the expression behaviour between **RAP1** and **RAP2** is very different. The expression of RAP2 across Col-0, atgsnor1-1, atgsnor1-3 and sid2 plants was consistent in the microarray data (data not shown). Also, RAP2 expression seems to be independent of pathogen challenge, as no induction was detected by *PstDC3000*(avrB) (Figure 3.2b).

However, the expression atlas of **RAP1** and **RAP2** overlaps (Figure 3.3), suggesting that there could be some functional redundancy. Both **RAP1** and **RAP2** have been referred to the studies of **XBAT32** (Nodzon et al. 2004) and **KEG** (Stone et al. 2006) based on the homology in protein sequence. *Arabidopsis* XBAT32 encodes an E3 ligase involved in lateral root development and like RAP1/RAP2, XBAT32 also contains an ankyrin repeat domain at the N-terminal half and a RING finger motif. XBAT32 was expressed abundantly in the primary root but not in newly formed lateral roots, suggesting XBAT32 may degrade a key regulator during the initiation of the lateral root development. KEG also contains a RING domain and ankyrin repeats but with the addition of HERC-2 repeats in the N-terminus. Phylogenetic analysis showed that RAP1 and RAP2 share the most similar ankyrin repeats with KEG in *Arabidopsis*. KEG as an E3 ligase, targets transcription factor ABI5 for degradation and it could be possible that RAP1/RAP2 also regulate physiological effects by mediating degradation of certain transcription factors. **RAP1** is also one of the 25 most correlated expressed genes with **AtPNP-A** (Meier et al. 2008). PNPAs (Plant natriuretic peptides) are a class of systemically mobile molecules distantly related to expansins. Ontology analysis of **AtPNP-A** and these 25 genes revealed a significant over representation of genes annotated as part of the systemic acquired resistance (SAR) pathway. These genes are also strongly inducible by SA or BTH and **AtPNP-A** expression is also
related to the SAR annotated transcription factor, WRKY 70, indicating RAP1 may also take part in the SAR.

Further bioinformatics analysis revealed that RAP1 is closely related to plant defence responses. The online analysis program Expression Angler in BAR picked up 24 genes that are showing the most similar expression profiles with RAP1. A large proportion of these 24 genes are defence-related, which includes three leucine-rich repeat (LRR) family proteins (At5g48380 (BIR1), At2g31880 and At5g41740), NSL1 (At1g28380), proteins involved in SNARE complex (At2g13790 and At3g11820), transcription factor WRKY53 (At4g23810), a homolog of RPW8 (At3g50480) and CBP60g (At5g26920), which functions in SA signalling (Wang et al. 2011). These proteins are important in pathogen-perception, signalling as well as defence gene activation. Interestingly, the LRR-protein BIR1, NSL1 and SNARE complex are associated with programmed-cell death (PCD) (Gao et al. 2009; Noutoshi et al. 2006; Zhang et al. 2007a), and NSL1, SNARE and RPW8 are related to defence against fungal pathogens (Dou et al. 2011; Eckardt 2009; Noutoshi et al. 2006), suggesting RAP1 may be involved in PCD during attempted fungal infection. Also, a number of kinases were co-expressed with RAP1, most of which are uncharacterized proteins. This suggests RAP1 may be involved in other unidentified signalling pathway.

Induction of RAP1 also carries certain specificity in response to various pathogens or effectors. As previously discussed, RAP1 is wound (by cutting and infiltration) inducible, however the activation decreases after 6 hours. The same was found when plants were inoculated with PstDC3000 and PstDC3000(avrRpm1) but not when they were inoculated with PstDC3000 hrcC (Figure 3.5a), suggesting the knockout of type III-secretion system is required for the suppression of RAP1 expression. Further, strong and sustainable induction was also observed during Pseudomonas syringae pv. phaseolicola (Psp) and Phytophthora infestans infection. These results revealed that RAP1 induction may function in non-host resistance. Thus, NPP1 (necrosis-inducing Phytophthora protein 1) and HrpZ from Psp caused a longer lasting effect than Flg22, and LPS (Figure 3.5b).

Pathogen-related induction of RAP1 is likely to be part of the early phase defence responses, as transcription occurs rapidly after 1-2 hour of pathogen/effectort
inoculation. Early-production of RAP1 may be required for degradation of a negative regulator(s) to trigger defence responses.

In summary, this chapter identified an uncharacterized gene RAP1 based on its specific expression behaviour towards high SNO levels (atgsnor1-3 plants) and pathogen challenge. The expression profiles also show that RAP1 may be involved in responses to wounding, pathogens and cell death. The presence of a putative RING domain has provided a functional hint that RAP1 could be an E3 ligase to mediate degradation of a negative regulator(s) in defence responses. RAP1 may also be involved in redox-based signalling, as RAP1 was strongly induced in high SNO levels.
4 Molecular Characterisation of RAP1

4.1 Introduction

Two conserved domains are found in RAP1 protein, which are ankyrin repeats and RING finger motif. Ankyrin repeats are involved in protein binding and protein stability and RING finger is a key signature of an E3 ligase. E3 ligases cause the attachment of ubiquitin to a lysine on a target protein and also catalyse the polymerization of ubiquitin. Therefore RAP1 may function as an E3 ligase to recognize a target protein (substrate) for degradation through ubiquitin–proteasome systems (UPS). However, a previous comprehensive analysis of E3 ligases in *Arabidopsis* had stated that RAP1 did not have any E3 ligase activity. Interestingly, although RAP1 and RAP2 share high homology in protein sequence, RAP2 has been shown to carry E3 ligase activity (Stone et al. 2005). It is also worth noting that among the tested HCa type E3 ligases with 3.a.a between metal ligands 4 and 5, three out of five proteins could not demonstrate the E3 ligase activity, which is much higher than the total average 18 out of 64. Therefore, the E3 ligase activity assay for RAP1 might have to be optimized. Four proteins (E1, E2, E3 and ubiquitin) are essential for the assay. While E1 and ubiquitin are relatively conserved and universally reactive across species, alternative E2 enzymes could be used. It has been reported that E2s have specificity towards E3s (Kraft et al. 2005), so selection of a proper E2 for the activity assay could be critical. The use of an *Arabidopsis* E2 enzyme AtUBC1 has been described in the activity assay of a disease related RING protein RIN2 (Kawasaki et al. 2005), therefore instead of UBC8 used in the previous study (Stone et al. 2005), UBC1 was used in this study for the activity assay of RAP1.

The cysteine-rich RING domain has been shown to be a reactive site for S-nitrosylation. For instance, E3 ligase XIAP in neuronal cells is S-nitrosylated at C450 in the RING domain and S-nitrosylation of the RING domain inhibits E3 ligase activity of XIAP (Nakamura et al. 2010). RAP1 could also be S-nitrosylated, as RAP1 contains 14 cysteine residues and 8 of them are located in the RING domain in the C-terminus (position 325-363). Furthermore, expression profiling suggests RAP1 is
highly related to S-nitrosylation and there could be a possibility that the activity of RAP1 is regulated by S-nitrosylation.

The *in vivo* E3 ligase activity of RAP1 (Figure 4.1) will be demonstrated in this chapter. RAP1 is shown to be S-nitrosylated and S-nitrosylation regulates the activity of RAP1.

**Figure 4.1 Schematic diagram shows the E3 ligase activity assay in this study.**
Monomer ubiquitins (Ub) are activated by E1 (UBA1), conjugated by E2 (UBC1) and polymerized by E3 to form a series of ubiquitin-polymers. The ubiquitin-polymers are then detected by anti-Ub antibody, while absence of any of the E1, E2 or E3 enzymes fails to polymerize ubiquitin and only single size monomer can be detected.
4.2 Expression and Purification of RAP1

Apart from RAP1, three other proteins E1, E2 and ubiquitin are essential to carry out the E3 ligase activity assay. The ubiquitin activating activity of E1 is found to be universal and compatible across species and human E1 has also been commonly used in Arabidopsis-based assays (Liu et al. 2011). The molecular size of E1 is relatively large, for instance, the cDNA of AtUBA1 is 3243 bp and encodes a protein of 120 kDa. In addition, ubiquitin is also highly conserved. In this study commercial available human E1 and ubiquitin were used. As previously discussed, a comprehensive E3 ligase activity study had demonstrated no E3 ligase activity for RAP1(Stone et al. 2005) using E2 (AtUBC8). Here, a disease related E2 (AtUBC1) was used instead. A RING E3 ligase, Arabidopsis COP1 interacting protein 8 (CIP8) (Hardtke et al. 2002) was employed as a positive control for the experiment.

The full coding cDNA fragments of RAP1, RAP2, CIP8 and Ubc1 were amplified by PCR from the cDNA library of WT plants (Col-0) with sizes of 1131 bp (RAP1), 1389 bp (RAP2), 459 bp (Ubc1) and 1005 bp (CIP8) (Figure 4.2). The fragments were then cloned into expression vector pGEX-4T1 for expression in E. coli. A fragment of glutathione-S-transferase (GST) is present at the 5’-end of the cloning sites to generate fusion proteins with GST at the N-terminus. The molecular size of GST is 28kDa, which leads to the expected fusion proteins size of GST-RAP1 (28kDa + 41.4kDa=69.4kDa), GST-RAP2 (28kDa+50kDa=78kDa), GST-CIP8 (28kDa + 37kDa=65kDa) and GST-UBC1 (28kDa+17.4kDa=41.4kDa). Figure 4.3 shows the expression of GST-UBC1, GST-RAP1 and GST-CIP8 in E. coli BL21(DE3). With the exception of GST-UBC1 extract, no dominant bands were observed in the total soluble extract, suggesting the expression level or solubility of GST-RAP1 and GST-CIP8 was much lower than that of GST-UBC1. The GST fusion proteins were then purified by Glutathione-Sepharose-4B (GSH-SE-4B) and eluted in elution buffer with glutathione. After elution, an intense and thick band of GST-UBC1 was observed between 30-46kDa, while weaker bands were observed in GST-RAP1 and GST-CIP8 eluents. However distinct bands were still present in the eluents of GST-RAP1 and GST-CIP8 between 58kDa-80kDa, which were likely to be the desired proteins.

As the efficiency of RAP1 purification was rather low, the protein identity had to be further confirmed. The distinct band in the GSH-SE-4B eluent of GST-RAP1...
(arrowed in Figure 4.3) was excised and verified by mass spectrometry (MS). Figure 4.4a showed the peptide sequences that were identified by Mascot after the excised protein was digested by trypsin. Trypsin is a serine protease that specifically cleaves the carboxyl terminus of amino acid residues lysine (K) and arginine (R), resulting in digested peptides with K or R at the C-terminal ends. Masses of 28 peptides were found to match the predicted cleavage products of a zinc-finger (C3HC4-type RING finger) family protein (gi|18414200), which is RAP1 in *Arabidopsis*. Peptides with same sequence but with different masses were due to the modification during preparation. Methionine residues are normally oxidized to give two different masses, for example in peptides “GVPQPMNPPR” and “AIESHICLFGSCMR”. Alkylation was required for effective identification of cysteine containing peptides and carbamidomethyl modifications were found in “CDDSVMIIDDSDR”, “AIESHICLFGSCMR” and “TPLILACTNDDLYDVAK”. Figure 4.4b shows the coverage of identified peptides in RAP1 protein. The coverage was much better at the N-terminus which could be due to the ideal size of cleaved peptides for identification. Peptides that are either too big or too small are difficult to be picked up by MS, for instance “LYHV” (373-376) and “EDGLCVICVDAPSEAVCVPCHVAGCISCLK” (321-351). However, there is still a significant coverage for the expressed GST-RAP1, suggesting RAP1 was properly expressed and purified. In addition, high coverage of peptides from GST were also found (data not shown) which indicates that the purification of RAP1 was due to the fusion to GST.
Figure 4.2 RT-PCR of full length cDNAs of RAP1, RAP2, Ubc1 and CIP8. Fragments were amplified by using proof-reading enzyme Pfu and subsequently cloned into expression vector pGEX-4T1.

Figure 4.3 SDS-PAGE analysis for the expression of GST fused UBC1, RAP1 and CIP8 in E. coli BL21(DE3) cells. Soluble cell extracts were extracted in PBS after cell bursting by sonication. Glutathione-sepharose 4B (GSH-SE-4B) was added to the extracts to bind GST fusion proteins and followed by elution in 10mM GSH. Arrowed bands indicate the desired proteins with expected sizes.
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Figure 4.4 Mass spectrometry analysis of expressed GST-RAP1. 

a) Result of identified peptides with predicted masses of trypsin cleaved RAP1. b) Alignment of the identified peptides to the RAP1 protein sequence.
4.3 E3 ligase activity assay of RAP1

E3 ligases catalyse the polymerization of ubiquitins (Figure 4.1) and leading to a mixture of ubiquitin chains with various numbers of ubiquitins. As the monomeric size of ubiquitin is 10kDa, so a “ladder” of bands with 10kDa differences are observed in a western blot if anti-ubiquitin antibody is used to detect ubiquitin. Figure 4.5a shows that the polymerization of ubiquitin occurred only if E1, E2 and E3 (RAP1 or CIP8) were present in the reaction mixture. Both RAP1 and CIP8 were able to demonstrate E3 ligase activity, which generated ladders of ubiquitin, but the activity of RAP1 was significantly lower than that of CIP8. The E3 ligase activity of RAP1 (polymerization of ubiquitin) could be demonstrated when the time of incubation was longer or more RAP1 was added into the reaction mixture (data no shown). As RING domains are found to be essential for E3 ligase activity (Lorick et al. 1999), mutation of the RING domain may abolish the E3 ligase activity of RAP1. To test this cysteine residue C340 in the RING domain of RAP1 was replaced by a serine residue (C340S). This resulted in no detectable RAP1 E3 ligase activity (Figure 4.5b), indicating that the E3 ligase activity of RAP1 is dependent on the RING domain.
Figure 4.5 E3 ligase activity assay of RAP1.

a) Monomeric ubiquitin were mixed with E1 (HsUBA1), E2(AtUBC1) and E3 (AtCIP8 or AtRAP1) in the presence of ATP. Polymerization of ubiquitin was visualized via western-blot analysis using ubiquitin antibodies.

b) RAP1 proteins with mutated RING domain (C340S) was expressed and included in an E3 ligase activity assay. Polymerization of ubiquitin occurred only when WT RAP1 was used and no activity was detected with the mutated RAP1(C340S).
4.4 Biotin-switch analysis of RAP1

The recombinant GST-RAP1 proteins were treated with the NO-donors (GSNO or CysNO) prior to the activity assay to explore the potential impact of NO on RAP1 E3 ligase activity. When a low concentration (0.1mM or 0.25mM) of GSNO was applied, no reduction of RAP1 activity was observed. However, when 1mM of GSNO was used, the polymerization of ubiquitin was significantly reduced, revealing that the E3 ligase activity was inhibited by a high GSNO concentration (Fig 4.6a). As GSNO is composed of glutathione (GSH), addition of GSH was utilised as a control to check for specificity (Dalle-Donne et al. 2009). In the presence of 1mM GSH, there was no damage of E3 ligase activity, suggesting NO might modulate the E3 ligase activity of RAP1. The idea was reinforced because 1mM CysNO (S-nitrosocysteine) also reduced the activity of RAP1 significantly.

To further study the relationship between NO and the E3 ligase activity of RAP1, different concentrations of CysNO were applied (Fig 4.6b). The activity was gradually reduced from as the concentration of applied CysNO increased from 0.25mM to 1mM, as less polymerization of ubiquitin was observed. The lowered activity is also reflected by the increased accumulation of monomeric ubiquitin (mono-Ub). Interestingly, the activity was slightly higher at a low CysNO concentration (0.1mM), an effect also observed at 0.1-0.25mM. The effects of GSNO and CysNO seem to be different, as applying GSNO at 0.25mM enhanced RAP1 E3 ligase activity, whereas in the presence of 0.25mM CysNO, the activity of RAP1 was gradually declining. Thus, CysNO is likely to be a more effective NO-donor than GSNO in these experiments.

The presence of NO-donor affected the E3 ligase activity of RAP1. It was speculated that the E3 ligase activity was regulated through the S-nitrosylation of reactive cysteine residues in RAP1 by the NO-donors. In the following contents, RAP1 was shown to be S-nitrosylated and the site of S-nitrosylation site in RAP1 was also identified.
Figure 4.6 Effects of NO-donors on the E3 ligase activity of RAP1.
E3 ligase activity assay of: a) Purified GST-RAP1 that was pre-treated with GSH, GSNO (0.1mM, 0.25mM or 1mM) or CysNO (1mM). b) Similar to (a), GST-RAP1 was pre-treated with various concentrations of CysNO (0mM, 0.1mM, 0.25mM, 0.5mM and 1mM). Pre-treated GST-RAP1 proteins were purified by Zeba desalting columns and mixed with E1/E2/Ub. Polymerization of ubiquitin was detected by ubiquitin antibodies in a western blot. c) Relative E3 ligase activity after CysNO treatment. The relative activity was calculated by the signal of monomeric ubiquitin normalized with the signal of GST-RAP1.
4.5 Identification of S-nitrosylation sites of RAP1

Results in chapter 4.3 have shown that application of NO donors altered E3 ligase activity of RAP1. The impact of NO on RAP1 E3 ligase activity may be due to the S-nitrosylation of one or more cysteine residues in RAP1. To verify whether RAP1 is S-nitrosylated, a technique known as biotin-switch was used (Forrester et al. 2009) (Figure 4.7). Initially, RAP1 proteins were treated with NO donors (GSNO or SNO) which potentially can S-nitrosylate reactive cysteines. Application of methylmethane thiosulfonate (MMTS) blocked cysteine residues without S-nitrosylation and the S-NO group of S-nitrosylated cysteines were reduced by ascorbate and replaced by a biotin group that could be detected by anti-biotin antibodies or pulled-down by streptavidin.

Figure 4.7 A schematic diagram to illustrate the mechanism of biotin-switch for detection of S-nitrosylation of proteins.

A strong signal was detected by anti-biotin antibody upon the application of GSNO to recombinant GST-RAP1, whereas a much weaker band was observed if no GSNO was added (Figure 4.8a). Cysteine-rich (29 Cys residues) bovine serum albumin (BSA) was also used as a control. BSA was S-nitrosylated, but it was less readily S-nitrosylated, as the intensity of signal was lower and more protein was required when comparing with GST-RAP1. The biotin-switched GST-RAP1 could also be pulled down by streptavidin and detected by anti-GST antibody (Figure 4.8b), indicating the signal detected by anti-biotin antibody in Fig 4.8a was from GST-RAP1. This result suggests that RAP1 is S-nitrosylated.

Due to the secondary structure of a protein, cysteine residues can be hindered and not readily be S-nitrosylated by NO donors. There are 14 cysteine residues in RAP1, in order to verify how easy of these residues are being accessed. SDS was applied to
relax the secondary structure of GST-RAP1 and expose all the cysteine residues to GSNO. Figure 4.8b showed that more GST-RAP1 was pulled down by streptavidin if SDS was added together with GSNO prior to the biotin-switch, indicating that some cysteine residues are obscured in native RAP1 proteins. Similarly, RAP1 was shown to be S-nitrosylated upon CysNO treatment and applying SDS also increased the intensity of signal (Figure 4.9a). As from the previous results (Fig 4.6b), increasing the applied concentration of CysNO altered the E3 ligase activity of RAP1. In order to explore if alternation in RAP1 E3 ligase activity following exposure to NO donors was due to S-nitrosylation of RAP1, various concentrations of CysNO were used to treat GST-RAP1 prior to the biotin-switch. It was observed that no signal was detected when 0mM or 0.1mM of CysNO was applied. The signal was gradually increasing with 0.25mM and 0.5mM CysNO applied and dramatically enhanced if 1mM CysNO was applied.

Treatment of SDS to RAP1 (Figure 4.8b & Figure 4.9a) indicated that not all cysteine residues in native RAP1 are exposed and readily S-nitrosylated. In order to identify the sites of S-nitrosylation, mass spectrometry was carried out. The sites of S-nitrosylation in RAP1 proteins were replaced by a biotin through the biotin-switch. The biotinylated RAP1 proteins were subsequently digested by trypsin into peptide fragments and peptides with increase of mass due to the addition of a biotin group could be detected by a mass spectrometer. Figure 4.10 shows the comparison of peptide coverage between untreated and CysNO-treated RAP1 and it was observed that the CysNO-treated samples had a reduced coverage from 87% to 77%. Most of the unidentified peptides were cysteine containing peptides which could be due to the lack of alkylation procedures by DTT and iodoacetamide. In addition, the key peptide, RING containing peptide “EDGLCVICVDAPSEAVCVPCHVAGCISCLK” could be too heavy to be identified, and the situation would be even more challenging if more than one cysteine residue (total of 6 residues) were biotinylated. Several attempts with various adjustments including double-digestion with trypsin and LysC, use of lighter labelling method (MMTS/Iodoacetamide) (Chen et al. 2007) and use of truncated RAP1 protein were undertaken. However, the S-nitrosylated cysteine(s) could not be identified.
A truncated form of RAP1 (237-376 a.a.) was expressed in *E. coli* which lacks of the ankyrin repeats but includes the RING domain with 8 cysteine residues. Comparing to the full-length RAP1, the expression level of the truncated RAP1 (RAP1-RING) was significantly improved (Figure 4.11a), suggesting the poor expression of full length RAP1 could be due to the N-terminal ankyrin repeats. Site-directed mutagenesis was carried out to generate four mutated proteins (RAP1-RING-C325H, RAP1-RING-C328H, RAP1-RING-C337H and RAP1-RING-C340H), each of which has a single replacement of a cysteine residue in the RING domain. The mutated proteins were expressed and purified with similar expression levels as the wild type RAP-RING protein (Figure 4.11b).

Biotin-switch analysis showed that the truncated RAP1 (GST-RAP1-RING) was S-nitrosylated and there was no significant difference in signals between the wild-type and mutated proteins, suggesting either the S-nitrosylated (target) cysteine might not have been mutated or multiple cysteine residues were S-nitrosylated. Mass spectrometry data suggested that some cysteine residues in the GST were also biotinylated (S-nitrosylated), therefore the GST part of the fusion proteins was removed. A thrombin cleavage site was located in between GST and RAP1-RING, so GST was removed by GSH-Sepharose-4B after thrombin digestion. Fig 4.12b showed the unbound proteins after thrombin digestion and incubation with GSH-Sepharose-4B, RAP1-RING proteins were purified with a size around 12kDa, which should be below the 25kDa marker band whereas the size of GST is 26kDa.

Collectively, the biotin-switch results showed that WT and all mutated RAP1-RING apart from C325H were S-nitrosylated (Fig 4.12c). Therefore, the site of SNO formation within RAP1 is C325 which is located in the RING domain. In addition, RAP1 C340 could also be another SNO site as the weak signal could be detected. Coincidently, the identified SNO site of RAP1 could be aligned with the SNO site of human XIAP (C450)(Nakamura et al. 2010).

A mutant form of RAP1 (C325H) was also expressed and purified with the replacement of the cysteine residue C325 with a histidine residue. As both cysteine and histidine are similar in chemical properties (Nakamura et al. 2010; Romero-Isart et al. 1999; Yi et al. 1999) but histidine cannot be S-nitrosylated due to the absence of a thiol group. The C325H mutant could be useful to study the role of C325 in protein
function \textit{in vivo}. However, no E3 ligase activity was detected if C325 was replaced (Fig 4.13), suggesting the chemistry of cysteine for C325 is essential for the E3 ligase activity of RAP1.

**Figure 4.8 S-nitrosylation of RAP1 by GSNO.**
\textbf{a)} BSA and GST-RAP1 were treated with GSNO and the S-nitrosylated sites were replaced by a biotin-group that was subsequently detected by anti-biotin antibodies. \textbf{b)} Biotinylated GST-RAP1 protein were pulled down by streptavidin and detected by anti-GST antibody. CBS –Coomassie Blue Staining.
Figure 4.9 S-nitrosylation of RAP1 by CysNO.

a) GST-RAP1 proteins were shown to be S-nitrosylated by CysNO and proteins pretreated with SDS enhanced the level of S-nitrosylation. b) GST-RAP1 proteins were pretreated with various concentration of CysNO before Biotin-switch. Protein loading was detected by anti-GST antibodies.
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Figure 4.10 Mass spectrometry analysis of biotin-switched RAP1.
The upper result was the untreated sample and the below result was sample treated with CysNO. Both samples were biotin-switched and digested with trypsin.
Figure 4.11 Expression of GST-RAP1-RING proteins. 

a) A truncated form of RAP1 (C-terminal RING domain) was expressed and purified by GSH-Sepharose-4B (arrowed bands). b) A single cysteine residue in the RING domain of the GST-RAP1-RING protein was replaced by a histidine residue (C325H, C328H, C337H and C340H). These proteins were expressed in *E. coli* and purified.
Figure 4.12 Biotin-switch analysis of the mutated RAP1-RING proteins.

a) Biotinylated GST-RAP1-RING proteins were detected by anti-biotin antibodies.  
b) GST-tag of GST-RAP1-RING proteins were removed by cleavage of thrombin and RAP1-RING proteins were purified by exclusion from GSH-sepharose-4B.  
c) Biotin-switch of RAP1-RING proteins, no signal was detected in the mutant C325H, 
suggesting C325 is the site of S-nitrosylation. The C325 of RAP1 can be aligned with 
the C450 in human XIAP, which has shown to be S-nitrosylated.
Figure 4.13 Replacement of the cysteine residue to histidine (C325H) abolished the E3 ligase activity of RAP1. Full length RAP1 (WT, C325H and C340S) proteins were expressed, purified and mixed with E1/E2/Ub. Polymerization of ubiquitin was detected only in WT RAP1. The loading of RAP1 was shown by coomassie blue staining.
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4.6 Discussion

Recombinant zinc-finger containing proteins are known to be recalcitrant to express (Casademunt et al. 1999; Geng and Carstens 2006) due to their poor solubility and their protein/DNA binding property may be toxic to host cells (e.g. E. coli). However RING proteins are zinc-finger E3 ligases, and the protein binding property of E3 ligases could also cause problems in expression. The RAP1 cDNA was also fused to a His-tag sequence and attempted to be expressed in E. coli, but the outcome was unsatisfactory (data not shown). Glutathione S-transferase (GST) has been commonly used as a fusion protein to enhance solubility of zinc-finger/RING protein expression (Geng and Carstens 2006; Stone et al. 2005). Furthermore, GST-fusion proteins can be effectively purified by glutathione-conjugated-resin, which is more specific than His-tag based purification. GST fusion proteins of RAP1, RAP2 and CIP8 were successfully expressed and purified, but the levels of expression were much lower than those of GST alone or GST-UBC1 (Fig 4.3, 4.11a). Due to the poor expression, non-specific proteins were also purified by GSH-Sepharose-4B. Interestingly, the poor expression of RAP1 seems to be due to the presence of the ankyrin repeat rather than the zinc-finger containing RING domain, as the expression was much improved after removal of the ankyrin repeat. The ankyrin repeat is often associated with the binding of membrane proteins, for instance, Arabidopsis ankyrin repeat protein, AKR2A binds to the chloroplast outer envelope membrane (OEM) and functions as a cytosolic mediator for sorting and targeting of nascent chloroplast OEM proteins to the chloroplast (Bae et al. 2008). The ankyrin repeat of RAP1 may also bind to membrane proteins in E. coli which result in difficulty in extracting proteins from the cell. Mild extraction approaches (no detergent and reducing agent) were used in this study to minimize the damage of expressed proteins, therefore the amount of purified E3 proteins was relatively low. As the predicted band of RAP1 was not as strong as that of UBC1, in order to confirm the protein identity, the protein band was excised for mass spectrometry (MS). The MS result showed a high coverage of protein identity of RAP1, suggesting the RAP1 was properly expressed.

After optimization, the expressed RAP1 showed strong E3 ligase activity, confirming that RAP1 is a functional E3 ligase. This contradicts a previous study which had shown no E3 ligase activity for RAP1 (Stone et al. 2005). This might be due to the use of an alternative E2 enzyme AtUBC1, instead of AtUBC8 used in the previous
AtUBC1 has previously been successfully used in an E3 ligase assay for a disease-related RING protein RIN2 (Kawasaki et al. 2005). In addition, as AtUBC1 was strongly expressed, the resulting cell extract was directly used in the E3 ligase activity assay. It was observed that the activity of RAP1 was much better if cell extract was used rather than purified AtUBC1 (data not shown), suggesting cofactors or ions in the cell extract might be required for the activity of RAP1. In addition, no ubiquitin polymerization was detected in the absence of E1, E2 or E3 (RAP1), revealing that all three enzymes are essential for the RAP1-dependent E3 ligase activity, which is in line with findings of other E3 ligase studies.

The RING domain of RAP1 belongs to a class of RING-HCa C3HC4, which is composed of 8 cysteine residues. The characteristic of HCa type RING domain is the presence of a glycine (G341) residue just before the conserved histidine (H342) residue (Stone et al. 2005). Metal ligand (zinc-binding) residues of C3HC4 are the three cysteine residues in front of the H342 (C328, C337 and C340), H342 and the four cysteine residues after H342 (C346, C349, C360 and C363), therefore the first cysteine (C325) is probably not involved in zinc binding. A single mutation of C340 to a serine (C340S) abolished the E3 ligase activity of RAP1, which is probably due to the loss of zinc binding. This indicates that the E3 ligase activity of RAP1 is dependent on the RING domain.

The activity of RAP1 was also affected by NO donors. Prior to an activity assay, RAP1 was treated with GSNO or CysNO and the unreacted NO donors were removed by desalting columns. Results showed that the activity of RAP1 was significantly reduced if RAP1 was pre-treated with 1mM of GSNO or 0.5mM-1mM of CysNO. Application of NO donors may lead to S-nitrosylation of cysteine residues in RAP1, and studies in neuronal cells have demonstrated that nitrosative stress promotes S-nitrosylation of E3 ligases (Nakamura et al. 2010; Yao et al. 2004), which subsequently reduce the activity of these E3 ligases. Interestingly, a study of a Parkinson’s disease related E3 ligase parkin has shown that S-nitrosylation initially led to a dramatic increase, followed by a decrease in the E3 ligase-ubiquitin-proteasome degradative pathway. The study claimed that the initial increase in parkin’s E3 ubiquitin ligase activity could lead to autoubiquitination of parkin and subsequent inhibition of its activity. However, the observation in this study
demonstrates that pre-treatment of RAP1 with low concentration of GSNO (0.25mM) /CysNO (0.1mM) slightly increases E3 ligase activity (Fig 4.6). Biotin-switch data points out that RAP1 was only weakly S-nitrosylated at a low concentration of CysNO (0.1mM-0.25mM) (Figure 4.9b), suggesting RAP1 may also be S-nitrosylated at low concentrations but this may be was rather transient. However, S-nitrosylation could still lead to changes in protein structure, resulting in the increase in E3 ligase activity. On the other hand, the site of this transient S-nitrosylation could be different from the S-nitrosylated site (C325) under high CysNO concentration (1mM). These findings provide clues that RAP1 may be able to resist nitrosative stress at the early stage if the levels of reactive NO are not high enough to shut down the activity of RAP1 and hence RAP1 could function as a “buffer protein” of nitrosative stress. However, in the later stage of nitrosative stress, higher GSNO concentrations might abolish activity of RAP1 through the stable S-nitrosylation of cysteine residue C325 (Figure 4.12c).

The secondary structure of RAP1 also affects the efficiency of S-nitrosylation. Application of SDS tremendously promoted biotinyliation (S-nitrosylation) of RAP1 through GSNO (Figure 4.8b) and CysNO (Figure 4.9a). SDS exposed all cysteine residues where access of NO donors was used to be prohibited due to the hindrance of secondary structure, suggesting the difficulty of S-nitrosylation in low concentration of GSNO/CysNO could be due to the structure of native RAP1.

Although evidence clearly indicated that RAP1 is S-nitrosylated, the identification of the target site was a relatively a complicated task. Two similar studies for parkin (Yao et al. 2004) and XIAP (Nakamura et al. 2010) in neuronal cells used mass spectrometry (MS) to identify the sites of S-nitrosylation. However, the results of these studies were quite different. Five of seven cysteine residues in the RING I domain of parkin were candidates to be S-nitrosylated, but there was only one cysteine (C450) that was S-nitrosylated in XIAP. The methods used in these studies were direct detection of SNO-groups in the RING domains, but this requires relatively stable SNO formation because SNO-groups are routinely highly unstable and can be easily removed during trypsin digestion and protein purification. Therefore, instead of direct detection of the SNO-group, the S-nitrosylated site(s) of RAP1 were replaced by a more stable biotin group, which could also be detected by MS due to the mass
difference. Unfortunately, the tryptic peptide including all the important cysteines in the RING domain was too heavy to be detected and the problem increased further following biotinylation. In addition, it has been commonly observed that the peptide coverage of CysNO treated samples was lower which could be due to unknown modification of cysteines (e.g. disulphide bonds). Adjustments such as double digestion with LysC/Trypsin, use of truncated RAP1 or MMTS/IAM labelling method did not provide strong evidence to conclude which cysteine is S-nitrosylated, suggesting MS may not be an ideal approach to identify S-nitrosylation sites in RAP1.

As the cysteine residues of the RING domain are the potential target for S-nitrosylation, a truncated form of RAP1 (RAP1-RING) was expressed to exclude cysteines (6 out of 14) that were not in the RING domain. In addition, the individual cysteine residue in the RAP1-RING was replaced by a histidine residue and biotin-switched, the expressed protein with a mutated site for S-nitrosylation would therefore not be biotinylated. The biotin-switch data showed that all WT and mutated GST-RAP1-RING proteins were S-nitrosylated (Figure 4.12a), but MS data revealed that some of the cysteine residues in the GST-tag were also biotinylated upon treatment with 1mM CysNO. Therefore the GST-tagged the fusion proteins might not be able to reflect the actual situation. As a result, the GST-tag was removed by thrombin and further, a lower concentration of CysNO (0.5mM) was used to increase specificity towards the S-nitrosylation of the reactive cysteine. It can be clearly observed that the RAP1-RING mutant C325H was not biotinylated (Figure 4.12c), indicating that C325 could be the site of S-nitrosylation in RAP1. The C325 in RAP1 can also be aligned with the C450 of XIAP which is the site of S-nitrosylation in XIAP. NMR spectra revealed that formation of S-nitrosothiol on the RING domain of XIAP induced minor conformational perturbations to proximate amino acid residues (e.g., K448, L449, I458, and L468) but not unfolding of the RING domain (Nakamura et al. 2010). While L449 and L468 of XIAP match the position of L324 and V343 in RAP1, an identical region VPCGH is found and aligned in both RAP1 (338-342 a.a.) and XIAP (463-467 a.a.), suggesting RAP1 may also show similar shift as XIAP upon S-nitrosylation. In contrast, C450 of XIAP is involved in zinc binding but C325 of RAP1 may not bind zinc as it is the fourth cysteine in front of the conserved histidine (H342). However, the cysteine residue C337 of RAP1 may not be involved in zinc binding as it does not aligned with XIAP (F462). Thus, RAP1 could still have similar
chemical/structural properties as XIAP. In summary, the reduction in E3 ligase activity of both RAP1 and XIAP is probably due to the inhibition of zinc binding by S-nitrosylation at C325.

To study the effect of S-nitrosylation of C325 in RAP1 *in vivo* and *in vitro*, the C325 of full length RAP1 was replaced by a histidine residue. As histidine shares some similar properties with cysteine such as zinc coordination but cannot be modified by NO donor due to the absence of a thiol group, it was proposed that this mutant may be able to resist S-nitrosylation by CysNO at high concentration (1mM) and still be able to maintain its E3 ligase activity. However, no E3 ligase activity was detected in the mutant C325H, revealing that the chemistry of cysteine for C325 is critical for the activity. It would be therefore, be difficult to unveil the role of S-nitrosylation in the regulation of RAP1 E3 ligase function *in vivo*. Nonetheless, our results suggest that RAP1 is S-nitrosylated at residue C325 and that the E3 ligase activity of RAP1 is regulated by S-nitrosylation.
Chapter 5

5 Identification of RAP1 and RAP2 Mutant Lines

5.1 Introduction

The expression profiles of RAP1 indicate that RAP1 is related to wounding and defence. RAP1 can also be S-nitrosylated in vitro and its E3 ligase activity can be regulated by S-nitrosylation. However, the physiological importance of RAP1 was yet to be defined. In order to study the physiological importance of RAP1, a knock-out mutant line of RAP1 (rap1) was identified. In addition, as RAP2 is also very similar to RAP1 in protein sequence, the RAP2 mutant (rap2) was also isolated. The T-DNA insertion sites of rap1 and rap2 were confirmed using gene-specific PCR reaction. Although the T-DNA insertion sites of rap1 and rap2 were both located in introns, no transcripts of RAP1 or RAP2 were detected. This suggested that the T-DNA insertions have knockout the target gene in the mutant lines. The confirmed rap1 and rap2 mutants were crossed to generate the rap1/rap2 double mutants. Two double mutant lines (A14 and A91) were identified by genotyping PCR. In addition, RAP1 was also overexpressed in a Col-0 background driven by a cauliflower mosaic virus 35S promoter (i.e. 35S::RAP1/Col-0). Lines with significantly elevated RAP1 transcript levels were selected for further analysis.

5.2 Identification of the RAP1 Mutant Line

Several T-DNA insertion lines of RAP1 were found in the Arabidopsis Information Resource (TAIR), which were FLAG_357A03, ossowski_1161734, SALK_056294 and SAIL_395_E02 and GK-708C04-022874. SALK_056294 and GK-708C04-022874 were unlikely to be used as the insertions are located before and after the ORF respectively. As it has been reported that T-DNA insertion into an intron can also effectively knock-out the gene (Wang 2008), the three intron insertion lines (FLAG_357A03, ossowski_1161734 and SAIL_395_E02) could still be usable. FLAG_357A03 and ossowski_1161734 were lines where T-DNA had inserted into the 6th intron which could probably knock-out the RING domain but not the ankyrin repeat at the N-terminus. The SAIL_395_E02 line has an insertion in the second intron, which could terminate the transcription of a large proportion of the RAP1 ORF.
Further, the SAIL_395_E02 line has been included in a recent study of lateral root development (Prasad et al. 2010), revealing the line is promising for further study. The line SAIL_395_E02 was selected for further analysis and disruption of *RAP1* in this line was through the insertion of a vector pCSA110. Two pairs of primers (LB1, LB3/QB1, QB3) were designed based on the sequence of pCSA110 which should be able to amplify DNA fragments by PCR when combined with the gene specific primers of *RAP1* (Start-F, 474R and 684R). DNA fragments with various sizes were amplified when using different combinations of pCSA110 and *RAP1* specific primers (Figure 5.1), in which fragments amplified by primer pairs Start-F/QB1, LB1/684R and LB3/474R were selected for further analysis. Sequencing results from the fragment LB1/684R (Figure 5.2) has identified the DNA sequences from both *RAP1* and pCSA110, the site of T-DNA insertion was found to be 397bp after ATG which was located in the second intron.

The parental line of SAIL_395_E02 is CS8846 (*qrt1-2*) which has a mutation in the gene At5g55590 by fast neurons. At5g55590 (*QRT*) encodes a protein with pectin methylesterase activity, which is required for pollen separation during normal development (Francis et al. 2006; Preuss et al. 1994). The line CS8846 does not have other significant phenotypes apart from the pollen grains are released as tetrads, therefore this genetic background should not affect the phenotypic study of *RAP1*. The homozygousity of T-DNA insertion was further proven by genotyping PCR. Figure 5.3a shows the PCR amplification of genomic DNA using *RAP1* gene specific primer pair Start-F/684R to give an expected size of 1377 bp. PCR reactions using genomic DNA of Col-0 and *qrt1-2* plants were able to show a band with expected size, while no PCR products were found in 4 out of 5 of the SAIL_395_E02 plants. This suggested that these 4 plants have T-DNA insertion in both copies of the gene (homozygous). Further, total RNA of the homozygous mutant plants was extracted for RT-PCR assay (Figure 5.3b). A pair of *RAP1* gene-specific primers (180F/831R) flanking the insertion site was able to amplify a fragment (651bp) from *qrt1-2* but not in all the tested insertion lines, indicating the T-DNA insertion was a successful knock-out of the *RAP1* gene and the homozygous line is named *rap1* in this study.
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**Figure 5.1** Identification of the T-DNA insertion site of SAIL_395_E02 (*rap1*).

*RAP1* gene specific primers and pCSA110 specific primers were used to identify the site of T-DNA insertion in SAIL_395_E02 line. Genomic PCR reactions were carried out by using different combinations of the primers, which the positions of the primers were shown in the upper panel. The lower panel shows the results for agarose gel analysis of the PCR product, which the PCR products corresponded to the predicted size (a, b and c). The PCR products were further cloned and sequenced.

**Figure 5.2** Sequencing result of the PCR fragment amplified by LB1/684R.

The size of the DNA fragment amplified by LB1/684R (as “b” in Fig 5.1) is ~1.2 kb. T-DNA insertion site was found to be 397bp after the start codon (ATG) of *RAP1*. 
Figure 5.3 Confirmation of *RAP1* T-DNA insertion by genomic PCR and RT-PCR.

a) Genomic PCR results of Col-0, *qrt1*-2 and the T-DNA insertion line SAIL_E395_E02. b) RT-PCR to detect RAP1 transcripts in *qrt1*-2 and SAIL_395_E02 homozygous plants.
5.3 Identification of the RAP2 Mutant Line

Similarly, identification of RAP2 knock-out line was based on the information in TAIR and SALK Institute Genomic Analysis Laboratory (SIGnAL). Only two potential lines have the T-DNA insertion in the ORF region, which are GK-407F09-017953 and SALK_104813. The insertion site of GK-407F09-017953 is located in the third intron of RAP2, which should disrupt a large proportion of the downstream region of the gene. However, instead of the intron insertion line GK-407F09-017953, SALK_104813 was preferred due to the predicted exon insertion site. The line SALK_104813 has a predicted insertion site in the last exon which could knock-out the important RING domain of RAP2. In addition, as RAP2 has an alternative transcript (RAP2.2), this insertion was likely to disrupt both transcript forms. The T-DNA insertion plasmid for SALK_104813 was pROK2. Specific primers of pROK2 (LB1b/RB1) were used to determine the location and orientation of the insertion. The RAP2 gene specific primer Rap2F was only able to amplify a band with LB1b, suggesting the orientation of LB1b is towards the 5’-end of the gene (Figure 5.4). Some non-specific bands were amplified in common between rap1 and rap2 lines by using this pair of primers, but the specific band about 650 bp was missing in the rap1 samples. The sequencing result of this 650 bp fragment revealed that the insertion was located at 1883 bp downstream of start codon “ATG” of RAP2 gene. However, instead of the last exon as expected, the actual T-DNA insertion site was located in the last intron. Nonetheless, the homozygous insertion was still effectively knocking out the RAP2 gene in the RT-PCR result (Figure 5.10a) and the line is named rap2 in this study.
Figure 5.4 Identification of the T-DNA insertion site of SALK_104813 (rap2). A 650 bp fragment was amplified in the rap2 mutant with primer pair (Rap2F and LB1b) but not in the rap1 mutant.

Figure 5.5 Sequencing result of the PCR fragment amplified by LB1b/Rap2F. The T-DNA insertion site was found to be 1883 bp after the start codon (ATG) of RAP2 gene.
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5.4 Generation of the $rap1/rap2$ Double Mutant Lines

The $rap1$ and $rap2$ single mutants were crossed to generate the $rap1/rap2$ double mutant. The $rap1$ line was employed as a pollen donor to $rap2$ plants and hence the next generation will acquire the $RAP1$ insertion as well as basta resistance from the T-DNA of $rap1$. The $rap1$ and $rap2$ heterozygous plants (i.e. $rap1$ +/-; $rap2$ +/-) were screened by spraying basta and the resistance plants were further verified by genotyping PCR. Figure 5.6 showed that both the T-DNA insertion from $rap1$ and $rap2$ were found in the heterozygous $rap1/rap2$ mutant as both the specific bands from $RAP1$-pCSA110 (LB1/474R) and $RAP2$-pROK2 (LB1b/Rap2F) were observed. In contrast, only one of the bands was amplified from the single knock-out mutant ($rap1$ or $rap2$). The heterozygous $rap1/rap2$ plants were self-pollinated and the F2 generation should have a chance of 1/16 for homozygous $rap1/rap2$. Genomic DNA of about a hundred plants were tested by PCR, samples that were unable to show both $RAP1$ and $RAP2$ bands were suggested to be homozygous $rap1/rap2$ plants (Figure 5.7). Three plants (A14, A91 and B41) were found to show the absence of both bands and were isolated for further analysis.

![Genomic PCR of the rap1, rap2 and the heterozygous rap1/rap2 lines](image)

**Figure 5.6 Genomic PCR of the rap1, rap2 and the heterozygous rap1/rap2 lines**
The T-DNA insertion in $RAP1$ gene and $RAP2$ gene was verified by primer pair LB1/Rap1-474R or LB1b/Rap2F respectively.
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Figure 5.7 Screening for homozygous *rap1/rap2* plants.
Gene specific primers of *RAP1* and *RAP2* flanking the T-DNA insertion sites were used. Plants A14, A91 and B41 showed absence of both *RAP1* and *RAP2* bands (arrowed), indicating that they were the homozygous *rap1/rap2* double mutant.
5.5 Screening of RAP1 Overexpression Lines

The full length RAP1 gene was also fused with a strong constitutive CaMV 35S promoter and transformed into wild-type Arabidopsis plants (Col-0) (i.e. 35S::RAP1/Col-0). The T-DNA insertion plasmid pGreen0229 was used to confer basta resistance in the transformed plants. There were 17 lines with basta resistance and seed were collected and sowed (work of Jeum-Kyu Hong). Expression of RAP1 in these plants was tested by RT-PCR (Figure 5.8a), five lines (#1-1, #2-1, #3-1, #5-1 and #11-1) showed strong expression of RAP1 and were selected for further analysis. Subsequently, two lines #1 and #3 have demonstrated stable transformation and strong RAP1 expression. Genomic PCR reaction using RAP1 specific primers (103F/831R) amplified two specific bands from genomic DNA (1531 bp) and from cDNA (729bp). Figure 5.8b showed that all tested 35S::RAP1/Col-0 #1 and #3 plants were able to show two PCR products, while WT (Col-0) only gave the genomic PCR product.

Figure 5.8 Screening for RAP1 overexpression line.

a) RT-PCR of RAP1 transcripts for plants that were resistance to basta after transformation of the plasmid pGreen0229-35S::RAP1 into WT plants (Col-0).
b) Genomic PCR of two lines 35S::RAP1/Col-0 #1 and #3 using the RAP1 specific primer pair (103F/831R).
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5.6 Molecular Characterization of rap1 and RAPI Overexpression Lines

The genetically verified plant lines (rap1, rap2, rap1/rap2 and 35S::RAP1/Col-0) were further analysed with molecular approaches. Anti-RAP1 antiserum was produced from rabbit to detect the RAP1 protein in vivo. However, only a very weak signal at the expected size (41kDa) was detected in unchallenged Col-0 plants (Figure 5.9a). Interestingly, strong signals were detected in high molecular size of Arabidopsis powdery mildew (Erysiphe cichoracearum) infected Col-0 and atgsnor1-3 leaves, but this was significantly reduced in the rap1 mutant. This suggested that the T-DNA insertion in rap1 also disrupted RAP1 protein synthesis and accumulation. However, a weak signal was also detected in the rap1 (infected) samples, which could be due to the cross activity of RAP1 antibody or the intron-insertion in rap1 did not completely remove the transcripts of RAP1.

The transcript levels of RAP1 and RAP2 were verified in the rap1/rap2 double mutant and RAP1 overexpression (35S::RAP1/Col) lines. Figure 5.10a showed that neither RAP1 nor RAP2 transcripts were detected in the rap1/rap2 double mutant. Conversely, the 35S::RAP1/Col (R#3) showed a significant increase of RAP1 transcripts. In addition, the expression levels of GSNOR and PR-1 in the RAPI overexpression line were tested (Figure 5.10b). The expression of GSNOR gene increased dramatically in the RAPI overexpression line and PR-1 expression was also increased. The increase of GSNOR transcript levels in R#3, however did not extend to an increase of GSNOR protein or activity as determined by western blot analysis and GSNOR in-gel activity assay (Figure 5.11). Accumulation of GSNOR signals at a high molecular weight in Col-0 was observed, while the signals were significantly reduced in atgsnor1-3 and R#3.
Figure 5.9 Accumulation of RAP1 proteins as a high molecular form upon *Arabidopsis* powdery mildew (*Erysiphe cichoracearum*) infection. 

**a)** Western blot analysis by using anti-RAP1 antiserum, arrow indicates the monomeric size of RAP1. **b)** Appearance of leaves that were uninfected (U) or infected (I) by *Erysiphe cichoracearum.*
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Figure 5.10 Overexpressing RAP1 induced GSNOR and PR-1 expression in Arabidopsis leaves.

a) Expression of RAP1 and RAP2 in WT (Col-0), the rap1/rap2 double knockout mutant and the RAP1 overexpressor 35S::RAP1/Col-0 (R#3). b) Expression of RAP1, RAP2, GSNOR, PR-1 and ACTIN1 in Col-0 and the RAP1 overexpressor (R#3)(arrows indicated the expected size of PCR products).
Figure 5.11 Overexpressing RAP1 did not accumulate GSNOR proteins in Arabidopsis leaves. Western blot and GSNOR activity assay of Col-0, atgsnor1-3 and the RAP1 overexpressor 35S::RAP1/Col-0 (R#3) plants. GSNOR proteins were detected by anti-GSNOR antibody; and the enzymatic GSNOR activity was detected by the UV-luminance after treatment of NADH/GSNO in a native gel.
5.7 Discussion

In order to study the physiological roles of RAP1, obtaining a good RAP1 knockout/knockdown mutant line would be essential. Although there are several T-DNA insertion lines available in the public seed stocks (e.g. SALK, SAIL and INRA), none of them were shown to have insertion into the exon of RAP1. A report has shown that insertion in an intron could still effectively knock out a gene, where only 0.7% (2/263) of intron insertion did not affect gene transcription which is comparable with exon insertion of 1.1% (7/609). In addition, 82% of intron insertions have no protein expression (Wang 2008). Therefore, a T-DNA insertion line of RAP1 (SAIL_E395_E02) was chosen, which has an insertion in the third intron. A homozygous RAP1 insertion line (rap1) was isolated and verified by RT-PCR which showed no detectable RAP1 transcript (Figure 5.3). Furthermore, a significant reduction of RAP1 protein signal was observed in the E. cichoracearum infected leaves (Figure 5.9) and the same T-DNA line has been used in a recent publication (Prasad et al. 2010). These results showed that the rap1 plant line would be reliable for further analysis.

However, the rap1 plants did not show any obvious developmental phenotype. Two individual reports have already mentioned that RAP1 is associated with four other family genes (Nodzon et al. 2004; Stone et al. 2006), in which RAP1 and one of the genes At3g23280 (RAP2) was clustered together due to the similarities in amino acid sequence and gene structure (Figure 3.1). A T-DNA insertion line of RAP2 (SALK_104813) was identified and the homozygous RAP2 insertion line (rap2) was isolated. However, sequencing results indicated that the T-DNA was inserted into the last intron of RAP2 (Figure 5.5). Nonetheless, the rap2 plant line was also found to have no full-length transcript of RAP2 and was included for further analysis.

Similarly, rap2 plants did not show obvious developmental phenotype. Therefore, the rap1 and rap2 mutant lines were crossed to generate the double knockout mutant. The F1 was found to carry both of the T-DNA insertions of RAP1 and RAP2 (heterozygous rap1/rap2) (Figure 5.6) and were self-pollinated. The seeds of F2 were collected and sowed. Since RAP1 and RAP2 are located on different chromosomes, the expected ratio of segregation to obtain homozygous rap1/rap2 double mutant should be 1:16. PCR results showed that among the tested ~100 plants, only two of
them appeared to be homozygous double mutants (Figure 5.7), which was lower than the expected segregation ratio (1:16). The realistic ratio (~2/100) was lower than expected, which could be due to the reduced in germination rate and poor growth of seedlings (data not shown) The bioinformatic data also showed that RAP1 and RAP2 expression were increased in hypocotyl and cotyledons (Figure 3.3). These suggested that knocking out both RAP1 and RAP2 could be unfavourable in the early stage of development.

In the previous chapter (Chapter 4.3), RAP1 was shown to be a functional E3 ligase. Theoretically, overexpression of RAP1 could significantly reduce the amount of substrate (target protein) through proteasomic degradation. A transgenic line harbouring the RAP1 overexpression construct (35S::RAP1) in WT (Col-0) was generated. It has been shown that overexpression of RAP1 increased the expression of GSNOR (Figure 5.10b), suggesting RAP1 may be involved in regulating of GSNOR expression. However, although higher amount of GSNOR transcripts in 35S::RAP1/Col-0 was detected, there was no significant increase in the amount of GSNOR proteins nor GSNOR activity between Col-0 and 35S::RAP1/Col-0 (Figure 5.11). Perhaps the overproduced GSNOR proteins have been rapidly degraded in 35S::RAP1/Col-0 plants. RAP1 may induce the mechanism for degradation of GSNOR possibly through the 26S proteasome. PR-1 expression was increased in 35S::RAP1/Col-0. Increased PR-1 expression is an indicator of enhanced disease resistance, suggesting that RAP1 could be a positive regulator in defence responses. Nonetheless, the basic molecular data has already revealed that RAP1 may be involved in a complicated gene expression network (Figure 5.12).
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Figure 5.12 A schematic diagram to show the gene regulation network in 35S::*RAP1*/Col-0 line. Overexpression of *RAP1* induced the expression of *GSNOR* and *PR-1*. However, no significant increase of GSNOR protein was detected, which was probably due to the enhanced proteasomically degradation of GSNOR. Furthermore, double mutation of *SNARE* genes *syp121/syp122* enhanced *PR-1* expression (Zhang et al. 2007a). *SYP121* was co-expressed with *RAP1* in microarray data, which *RAP1* may be involved in the downregulation of *SYP121* or/and *SYP122*.
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6 Phenotypic analysis of RAP1 and RAP2 Mutants

6.1 Development Phenotypes

6.1.1 Introduction

Knocking out RAP1 or RAP2 individually did not show any significant development phenotype. As RAP1 and RAP2 are very similar in protein sequence (93% coverage and 72% identity), knocking out both RAP1 and RAP2 could be an essential approach to display the physiological importance of RAP1 and RAP2 in growth and development. In chapter 5.4, three plants (A14, A91 and B41) have been isolated due to the genomic screening results. Further confirmation has shown that only A14 and A91 were homozygous RAP1 and RAP2 double knockout lines (rap1/rap2), while B41 is a heterozygous RAP1 and homozygous RAP2 knockout (rap1+/-, rap2-/-) (data not shown). The double mutants (A14 and A91) have demonstrated delay in emergence of primary bolt and flowering. This supported the expectation of functional redundancy between RAP1 and RAP2. In addition, overexpression of full length and truncated RAP1 had direct impacts on root and secondary bolt development respectively.

6.1.2 Delayed Flowering in the rap1/rap2 Double Mutant Plants

The F2 homozygous rap1/rap2 double mutant lines (A14/A91) showed delay in flowering, while the heterozygous rap1 and homozygous rap2 plant (rap1 +/-; rap2 -/-) (B41) as well as rap1 and rap2 plants displayed similar flowering behaviour as WT (Col-0) (Fig 6.1a & c). Flowering time can be measured by the number of leaves developed at flowering (Teper-Bammolker and Samach 2005). Figure 6.1b showed the comparison of Col-0 and rap1/rap2. The number of leaves in rap1/rap2 was significantly more than Col-0, revealing that the initiation of flowering in rap1/rap2 plants was delayed. Also, there was a reduction of bolt height and number of bolts in the later stage of development in rap1/rap2 plants (Figure 6.1d).
6 Phenotypic analysis of *RAP1* and *RAP2* mutants

Figure 6.1 Delay in flowering in the F2 *rap1/rap2* double mutant plants.

a) Heterozygous *RAP1* knockout in *rap2* background (B41) did not show delay in flowering.
b) Increased numbers of leaves during flowering in the *rap1/rap2* double mutant plant.
c) Knocking out of *RAP1* or *RAP2* did not show delay in flowering.
d) The *rap1/rap2* double mutant showed reduced height and number of bolts at later stages of development.
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6.1.3 Loss of Apical Dominance in Lateral Bolts of 35S::RAP1ΔRING Mutant Line

A truncated form of RAP1 (RAP1ΔRING) was overexpressed in WT (Col-0). The RING domain was removed so that the expressed proteins might be able to compete with endogenous RAP1 protein, but could not express E3 ligase activity. There were 17 transgenic lines generated, in which 6 lines had demonstrated alternation in phenotypes. Among the tested lines, line #16 showed the highest expression level of RAPI transcripts (WT RAPI expression is suppressed in unchallenged condition). Line 16 has showed WT timing of primary bolt formation but the growth of secondary bolts was affected. The secondary (lateral) bolts were shorter (dwarf) and there was a loss of apical dominance relative to wild type plants (Figure 6.2).

![Figure 6.2 Phenotypes of mutant with the overexpression of truncated RAP1 proteins.](image)

Overexpression of truncated RAP1 proteins (RAP1ΔRING) in WT plants affected the growth of secondary bolts. (Work of Jeum-Kyu Hong).
6 Phenotypic analysis of *RAP1* and *RAP2* mutants

### 6.1.4 Enhanced Branching of Roots in the 35S::*RAP1* Mutant Line

It has also been reported that, *XBAT32*, a gene in the same E3 ligase clade to *RAP1* and *RAP2*, has been implicated in lateral root development (Nodzon et al. 2004). Therefore, root development was also assessed in *rap1* lines. There was no significant difference in root morphology in Col-0, *rap1*, *rap2* and *rap/rap2* lines (data not shown). However, a distinguishable variation in root development was observed in 35S::*RAP1*/Col-0 seedlings. Roots in this line were more branched from the origin of the primary root and in addition the branched roots were also longer than those of Col-0 (Figure 6.3).

![Figure 6.3 Overexpression of *RAP1* enhanced lateral root development in young seedlings.](image)

10 days old seedlings were grown in half-strength MS agar plates. A single main root was developed in wild type Col-0 and *rap1* seedlings, while two main roots developed in 35S::*RAP1*/Col-0 seedlings, which were branched from the proximal zone of the primary root.
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6.1.5 Discussion: Developmental Phenotypes

It has been commonly observed that knock out of a single member of a gene family often does not produce a strong phenotype. Similarly, no obvious developmental phenotype was identified if *RAP1* or *RAP2* were knocked out individually. Due to time constraints, the *RAP1*-related developmental phenotype has not been well-studied in this study. Nonetheless, preliminary data has shown three observable effects due to the alternation of *RAP1* expression or overproduction of truncated RAP1: (1) the flowering time was delayed in *rap1/rap2* plants (Fig 6.1). (2) Overexpression of a truncated RAP1 protein (RAP1ΔRING) led to a loss of apical dominance (Figure 6.2). (3) And, the *RAP1* overexpressor (35S::RAP1/Col-0) affected root development (Figure 6.3).

There is still insufficient data to discuss the roles of *RAP1* or *RAP2* during plant development and growth. The tissue expression profiles (Figure 3.3) have indicated high expression of *RAP1* and *RAP2* in first node and cauline leaves, suggesting *RAP1* and *RAP2* may take part in the initiation of the primary bolt. Either knocking out *RAP1/RAP2* or overproducing the truncated RAP1 proteins (RAP ΔRING) may lead to the accumulation of RAP1-substrate proteins. This suggests that the substrate protein(s) could be a potential negative regulator of bolt development.

It is worth noting that the findings were in line with a report of *XBAT32* (a *RAP1* family gene) (Figure 6.4). *XBAT32* was shown to affect lateral root development (Nodzon et al. 2004; Prasad et al. 2010; Prasad and Stone 2010). *XBAT32* has been shown to interact with the ethylene biosynthesis enzymes AMINOCYCLOPROPANE-1-CARBOXYLIC ACID SYNTHASE4 (ACS4) and ACS7 *in vitro*. Loss of *XBAT32* may promote the stabilization of ACSs and lead to increased ethylene synthesis and suppression of lateral root formation (Prasad et al. 2010). It is speculated that RAP1 and RAP2 may not be the key players in root development. However, due to the sequence similarity between RAP1/RAP2 and XBAT32, overexpression of *RAP1* promoted lateral root development which is similar to the inhibition effect of lateral root development in *XBAT32* knockout mutant. In summary, the *RAP1* and *RAP2* could be involved in plant growth and development. There are also function overlaps between individual members in the gene family.
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Figure 6.4 The RAP1 family genes (RAP1, RAP2, XBAT31, XBAT32 and XBAT33) in Arabidopsis.
Homologs sharing similar protein structure (ankyrin repeats and RING domain) were identified in different plant species and found to be involved in various physiological responses. (Adapted from Prasad & Stone 2010)
6.2 Defence-Related Phenotypes

Expression profiles indicated that RAP1 may be actively involved in the defence mechanism. In order to verify the role of RAP1 in defence, the RAP1-related mutant plants (rap1, rap2, rap1/rap2 and 35S::RAP1/Col-0) were challenged with different type of pathogens: avirulent Pseudomonas syringae pv tomato (Pst)DC3000 (avrB), virulent PstDC3000 and obligate biotrophic (E. cichoracearum). In addition, the atgsnor1-3 plants were known to show enhanced disease susceptibility to various pathogens and therefore were included in the experiments as a positive control.

6.2.1 Hypersensitive Response Towards PstDC3000 (avrB)

The leaves of the various plant lines were inoculated with avirulent PstDC3000 (avrB). This pathogen injects effectors into the host cells through type III secretion system, leading to the induction of the hypersensitive response (HR). HR is a form of cell death which might limit the further spread of pathogens. HR-induced cell death was stained by trypan blue, which marks dead or dying cell blue (Figure 6.5). The atgsnor1-3 (Feechan et al. 2005) showed more severe and rapid cell death upon PstDC3000 (avrB) treatment than wild type (Yun et al. 2011). Leaves of wild-type Col-0 developed HR but staining was less intense than in atgsnor1-3 plants. The rap1/rap2 double mutant (A14/A91) and 35S::RAP1/Col-0 showed similar results as Col-0. The HR in the rap1 and rap2 single mutants might be slightly upregulated, but the results were rather ambiguous and therefore no conclusion could be drawn to suggest the role of RAP1 or RAP2 in the HR.
Figure 6.5 Hypersensitive response (HR) analysis after infection of avirulent *PstDC3000*(*avrB*).
Cell death was determined by trypan blue staining upon treatment of *PstDC3000*(*avrB*) at OD$_{600}$=0.002 for 72 hours.  
**a)** Appearance of trypan blue stained leaves.  
**b)** Ratio of trypan blue intensity of treated over untreated leaf area, average of two individual trials.
6.2.2 Enhanced Susceptibility towards PstDC3000 in RAP1 and RAP2 Mutants

The rap1 and rap2 lines were challenged with virulent PstDC3000 and leaf extracts were collected 3 days after inoculation. Diluted leaf extracts were then spread on agar plates and bacterial growth determined from the numbers of colonies on the agar plates. The atgsnor1-3 line was known to be very susceptible to PstDC3000 (Feechan et al. 2005), and accordingly showed a significant increase bacterial growth relative to wild-type (Figure 6.6a). At 3 days post inoculation (dpi), enhanced susceptibility to this pathogen was found in the rap1 and rap2 single mutants. The phenotype was further amplified in rap1/rap2 double mutants (A14/A91). At 5 dpi, the difference in susceptibility was further increased, leading to a large increase in the number of colonies found in the rap1, rap2 and rap1/rap2 compared to Col-0. Similar to the results at 3 dpi, the rap1/rap2 mutants were more susceptible than the single mutants. The reliability of the data was also verified by a Student’s t-test as the enhanced in susceptibility in rap1 and rap2 mutants was not as obvious as the atgsnor1-3 mutant. The p-value of the averages between Col-0 and the atgsnor1-3 mutant (3 dpi and 5 dpi) were well below 0.05, indicating that the atgsnor1-3 mutant was significantly more susceptible towards PstDC3000. The p-values of the rap1, rap2 and rap1/rap2 mutants at 3 dpi failed to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting the early resistance of these mutant lines was only slightly compromised. On the other hand, the p-values at 5dpi showed that the rap1 and rap1/rap2 (A14) mutants were significantly more susceptible than Col-0.

The variation of resistance in the plant lines could also be reflected in the appearance of the leaves (Figure 6.6b). The most susceptible atgsnor1-3 plants showed complete leaf chlorosis. Leaves of the rap1/rap2 double mutant (A14/A91) also became chlorotic. The rap1 and rap2 single mutants were also more susceptible than Col-0 as chlorosis also developed in their leaves.
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Figure 6.6 Pathogenicity test of infection with PstDC3000.

a) Number of colonies recorded upon 3 days and 5 days post inoculation (dpi). A Student’s t-test was used to compare the average values between Col-0 and the mutants. b) Appearance of leaves after 5 days of inoculation.
6.2.3 Enhanced Susceptibility towards *Arabidopsis* Powdery Mildew in *RAP1* and *RAP2* Mutants

Previous results have shown that RAP1 proteins were accumulated upon infection of *Arabidopsis* powdery mildew (*Erysiphe cichoracearum*) (Figure 5.9), therefore the plant lines were challenged with *Arabidopsis* powdery mildew. The time after inoculation was shortened to 3 days to allow the observation of early stage resistance in different plant lines. The infected leaves were then stained with trypan blue for visualising the fungal structures (Figure 6.7). Identification of spores was the first approach to assay fungal development, as non-germinated spores were usually washed away during the boiling procedure in staining. After 3 days of inoculation, no spores could be found on the leaf surface of wild-type Col-0, *atgsnor1-3* and *35S::RAP1/Col-0*, whereas spores were found in the *rap1* mutant. The *rap2* mutant was shown to be more susceptible to *E. cichoracearum*, which secondary structures such as hyphae was identified. There was an additional effect in the *rap1/rap2* double mutants (A14 and A91), where most of the early fungal structure (i.e. primary germtube, conidia) were developed into mature structures. Networks of hyphae were well-developed in the A14 line.
Figure 6.7 Inoculation with *Erysiphe cichoracearum*.
Four week old leaves were infected with *Arabidopsis* powdery mildew via rubbing of infected leaves and inoculated for 3 days. Fungus structure was stained with trypan blue. Images were taken in 200 x magnification under a light microscope.
6.2.4 Discussion: Defence-Related Phenotypes

The disease-related phenotype of \textit{RAP1} was one of the key interests in this study, as \textit{RAP1} was identified based on the SA-independent induction follow \textit{PstDC3000(\textit{avrB})} treatment. In addition, \textit{RAP1} was found to be co-expressed with many disease-related genes (Figure 3.4) that were highly inducible by pathogens (Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.5). The \textit{RAP1} promoter was responsive to pathogen/wounding induction (Figure 3.2) and \textit{RAP1} proteins accumulated follow infection by \textit{Erysiphe cichoracearum} (Figure 5.9). In, addition, the \textit{RAP1} related protein \textit{XB3} in rice (\textit{Oryza sativa}) (Figure 6.4) interacts with a receptor-like kinase \textit{XA21} that confers gene-for-gene resistance to \textit{Xanthomonas oryzae pv oryzae}. Reduced expression of the \textit{Xb3} gene compromised resistance to \textit{X. oryzae pv oryzae} (Wang et al. 2006).

In order to analyse the role of \textit{RAP1} in plant defence, the \textit{RAP1} mutant lines were challenged with avirulent (Figure 6.5) and virulent (Figure 6.6) \textit{Pseudomonas syringae pv tomato} (\textit{Pst}) DC3000 strain and the biotrophic pathogen mildew \textit{Erysiphe cichoracearum} (Figure 6.7). Inoculation of avirulent strain \textit{PstDC3000 (avrB)} induces hypersensitive response (HR) which leads to local cell death proximal to the inoculation site. HR is a key defence response to limit pathogen growth and defence-compromised plant lines are often shown to have reduction in HR (Brodersen et al. 2005). It was speculated that \textit{RAP1} could be involved in programmed-cell death (PCD). \textit{RAP1} was co-expressed with PCD related genes such as LRR-protein \textit{BIR1}, \textit{NSL1} and \textit{SNARE} complex (Figure 3.4). Knocking out \textit{BIR1} leads to extensive cell death and activation of constitutive defence responses (Gao et al. 2009). As \textit{RAP1} is co-expressed with \textit{BIR1}, knocking out \textit{RAP1} might impact PCD. HR in the \textit{rap1} and \textit{rap2} mutant was enhanced but no obvious difference was observed in the \textit{rap1/rap2} and \textit{35S::RAP1/Col-0} lines (Figure 6.5). One of the earliest events observed in HR is an oxidative burst due to the enhanced production of reactive oxygen intermediates (ROI) such as superoxide (\textit{O$_2^-$}) and its dismutation product, hydrogen peroxide (\textit{H$_2$O$_2$}). Nitric oxide (NO) is also generated and has been shown to serve as a signalling molecule in plant defence (Malik et al. 2011). It has been previously reported that loss of \textit{GSNOR} led to an elevated HR which could be due to the accumulation of NO. However, as there was no clear difference between the mutant lines, this suggests that \textit{RAP1} and \textit{RAP2} might not be actively involved in AvrB-mediated HR. Although E3 ligase activity has been shown to be essential in
AvrPtoB-mediated-HR (Jones and Dangl 2006), RAP1 and RAP2 may not function in HR. Nonetheless, it would be worth testing other effectors to analyse the role of RAP1/RAP2 in HR.

Virulent PstDC3000 does not produce effectors (e.g. avrB) to trigger HR and therefore defence is dependent on basal resistance. The atgsnor1-3 plants were found to be very susceptible to PstDC3000 (Feechan et al. 2005) and therefore this plant line was used as the positive control for enhanced susceptibility to PstDC3000. As expected, there was a striking increase in the number of colonies in atgsnor1-3 leaves relative to wild-type (Figure 6.5). The rap1 or rap2 lines exhibited reduced resistance, suggesting that RAP1 and RAP2 were involved in disease resistance. The resistance to PstDC3000 was further compromised in the rap1/rap2 double mutants. There are examples in Arabidopsis of redundant gene function, for instance, the U-box family E3 ligases PUB22/23/24 (Trujillo et al. 2008) and the SNARE family SYP121/SYP122 (Zhang et al. 2007a). Robust disease-related phenotypes were observed only when all of the family members have been knocked out. Our finding suggested that RAP1 and RAP2 also function redundantly. However, there was still a significant difference in PstDC3000 susceptibility between atgsnor1-3 and rap1/rap2 plants. It is speculated that the disease-related phenotype could be further enhanced if a triple/quadruple mutant of potential family members (i.e. XBAT31, XBAT32 and XBAT 33) (Prasad and Stone 2010) is generated.

RAP1 proteins were found to be accumulated as a high molecular weight species upon E. cichoracearum infection (Figure 5.9). Therefore, it was speculated that RAP1 may be involved in resistance against this pathogen. This has been verified in Chapter 6.2c (Figure 6.7) which shows that knockout of RAP1, RAP2 or both had a significant impact on E. cichoracearum resistance. The strain of E. cichoracearum used here does not induce host defence responses in Arabidopsis (Vogel and Somerville 2000). It is still uncertain what mechanism Arabidopsis inhibits the germination of spores in young leaves. Interestingly, RAP1 and RAP2 expression is higher in young leaves (Figure 3.3) than in older leaves. Knockout of both RAP1 and RAP2 significantly increased susceptibility to E. cichoracearum, therefore these genes may be involved in the regulation of resistance against this pathogen. This assumption is supported by a report implicating a SNARE-protein in resistance to E. cichoracearum. The
corresponding gene *SYP121 (PEN1)* shares a similar expression profile with *RAP1* (Figure 3.4). Knockout of SNARE components *SYP121* and *SYP122* activated SA-independent powdery mildew resistance through the induction of a hypersensitive-like cell-death response which inhibited the penetration of the fungus (Zhang et al. 2007b). In addition, the *PR-1* expression level was also upregulated in *syp121-1/syp122-1* double mutant. Interestingly, SYP121 was shown to work as a negative regulator in the defence response, while RAP1 positively regulated the resistance against *E. cichoracearum*. Reduction of SYP121/SYP122 levels benefits the defence against *E. cichoracearum*, therefore it is speculated that RAP1 could be involved in the degradation of SYP121/SYP122 probably through proteasomic degradation. RAP1 could directly recognize SYP121/SYP122 for ubiquitin-mediated degradation or mediate the degradation of a positive regulator(s) of *SYP121/SYP122* (Fig 5.12). A report shows that *RAP1* expression was reduced when SHINE transcription factors (SHNs) were knocked down. SHNs control cuticle permeability by regulating the expression of cutin biosynthesis genes and wax formation in leaves (Shi et al. 2011). Germination and penetration are critical events for the successful invasion of a fungal pathogen (Mendgen et al. 1996), which these events are largely dependent on the interaction between hosts and pathogens. As the expression of *RAP1, PEN1* and *SHNs* are linked, it is speculated that *RAP1* mutants could have an altered physical barrier which favours the entry of powdery mildew.
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6.3 Methyl Viologen (MV)

6.3.1 Enhances MV Resistance in rap1 and rap2 Plants

It has been reported that ATGSNOR mutants (atgsnor1-3 and par2-1) were highly resistant to methyl viologen (MV, other name: paraquat) (Chen et al. 2009). Methyl viologen accepts electrons from photosystem I and transfers them to oxygen and leads to the formation of the superoxide anion (·O$_2^-$). MV has been shown to be an efficient inducer of cell death and has been used as a herbicide (Suntres 2002). RAP1 and RAP2 related mutant plants were also tested with MV. Figure 6.8 showed that above 90% of cotyledons in all tested lines were developed when plants were grown in half MS medium. Addition of 1µM of MV completely inhibited the germination of Col-0 seeds, but about 60% of atgsnor1-3 seeds could still form green cotyledons. Single mutants of RAP1 or RAP2 were also able to resist the effect of MV, where around 30% of seed germinated, however, developed cotyledons was typically slightly chlorotic. The resistance to MV was not apparent in rap1/rap2 double mutants (A14/A91), only very few of them (<5%) were able to develop into seedlings and the seedlings were much smaller than the atgsnor1-3, rap1 or rap2 seedlings. Germination of 35S::RAP1/Col-0 seeds was completely inhibited similar to that of wild-type.

The online microarray database NASCArrays (http://affymetrix.arabidopsis.info/) has provided expression profiles of individual gene. Noteworthy data (Figure 6.9) showed that RAP1 expression was highly inducible by UV-B illumination. RAP1 was induced rapidly within 30 minutes of treatment and after 1 hour RAP1 transcript level were induced 13 fold higher than at time 0. RAP1 expression was also sensitive to MV. Basal RAP1 expression was rapidly suppressed after 30 minutes of MV treatment and further reduced to a very low level after 3 hours.
Figure 6.8 Enhanced resistance to MV for *atgsnor1-3, rap1* and *rap2* plants. Seeds were sowed in either half MS with or without MV (1 μM final concentration) for 5 days. Percentage of cotyledon development was a result of two individual trials.
Figure 6.9 Expression of RAP1 in response to UV-B and methyl viologen. Arabidopsis shoots (from 16 days old plants) were treated with UV-B (15 min. 1.18 W/m2 Philips TL40W/12) or methyl viologen at final concentration of 10 µM. (data from NASCArrays)
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6.3.2 Discussion: Methyl Viologen

The GSNOR loss-of-function mutants (atgsnor1-3 and par2-1) in Arabidopsis had been reported to be resistant to methyl viologen (MV) or paraquat (Chen et al. 2009). MV has been used as a herbicide to kill green plant tissue by catalysing the formation of reactive oxygen species (ROS). In the germination test (Figure 6.8), enhanced resistance was observed in atgsnor1-3 seedlings, and rap1 and rap2 seedlings also displayed resistance to MV with a level between wild-type and atgsnor1-3. Downregulation of RAP1 also seems to have advantage to cope with the oxidative stress from MV in wild-type, as expression of RAP1 was rapidly suppressed upon MV treatment (Figure 6.9). However, even though the RAP1 expression was suppressed, the wild-type plants were killed by MV. It may suggest that anticipated reduction in RAP1 expression would be required for the plants to acquire resistance to MV.

The mechanism behind the MV resistance in GSNOR knockout mutants is still uncertain. It has been suggested that S-nitrosylation of peroxiredoxin II E inhibited its activity in hydroperoxide reduction and peroxynitrite detoxification. Enhanced S-nitrosylation in GSNOR mutants may lead to accumulation of hydroperoxide and peroxynitrite that could be favourable condition against MV. Also, Arabidopsis METACASPASE9 activity is regulated by S-nitrosylation (Chen et al. 2009). The increase in S-nitrosylation may suppress the cell death induced by MV. On the other hand, the MV resistant phenotype in GSNOR knockout mutants could be simply due to a direct biochemical explanation that excess NO may accept the ROS generated from MV transforming into peroxynitrite (i.e. ·O₂⁻ + ·NO → ONO₂⁻). Peroxynitrite is thought to be relatively less toxic to plants (Peto et al. 2011).

It has been reported that an Arabidopsis mutant ozone-sensitive radical-induced cell death1-1 (rcd1-2) was more resistant to MV and exhibits a higher tolerance to short-term ultraviolet-B (UV-B) treatments than the wild type. The report suggested that MV resistance of rcd1-2 was due to the enhanced activities of the active oxygen species (AOS)-scavenging enzymes in chloroplasts and that the acquired tolerance to short-term UV-B exposure results from a higher accumulation of sunscreen pigments such as phenolic compounds (Fujibe et al. 2004). Interestingly, microarray data from NASCArarrays has indicated that RAP1 expression was highly induced by UV-B but suppressed by MV (Fig 6.9). This suggests that RAP1 could be an important factor in
the homeostasis of cellular ROS. UV-B attacks DNA and photosystem II (PSII) and photoproducts are usually formed that can act as in situ sensors for UV penetration. UV-B is also known to induce stomatal closure via hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$), and to affect ethylene biosynthesis. The mechanism was believed to be via ethylene-mediated H$_2$O$_2$ generation (He et al. 2011). The difference in chemistry between H$_2$O$_2$ (from UV-B) and ·O$_2^-$ (from MV) could lead to a significant variation in cellular redox balance and RAP1 might be involved in these redox signals (Figure 7.1). Additionally, it has been reported that UV-B triggered the generation of nitric oxide (NO) in plants (Zhang et al. 2011) and animals (Wu et al. 2010). An exposure of keratinocytes to UV-B led to the immediate generation of peroxynitrite (ONOO’), with different kinetics from nitric oxide synthase (NOS) produced NO/ONOO’-·O2-. These findings also suggested that NO might be involved in redox balancing. Although there is a lack of evidence to establish the complex relationships of UV-B, ROS, NO and MV, understanding the properties of RAP1 towards MV has at least provided some hints of how these potentially hazardous agents may be significantly involved in the regulation of many physiological pathways.
7 General Discussion

Through the identification and analysis of mutant lines, certain physiological roles of RAP1 have been implied in this study. RAP1 might be involved in the defence against a variety of pathogens and regulation of various physiological responses (Figure 7.1). Our findings suggest that RAP1 is an E3 ligase integral to the ubiquitin-mediated degradation pathway. Further, the E3 ligase activity of RAP1 may be regulated by S-nitrosylation. RAPI together with RAP2 were shown to belong to a gene family of E3 ligases. Evidence has also suggested that RAPI may be involved in the control of resistance/homeostasis towards various kinds of ROS. In summary, RAP1 could be a global regulator of many physiological pathways through the adjustment of cellular redox status.

Figure 7.1 A schematic diagram to show the potential roles of RAP1 in various physiological responses.
7 General Discussion

7.1 RAP1 and RAP2 Function Redundantly

As RAP1 and RAP2 are similar in protein sequence, it was speculated that these proteins may function redundantly. Neither rap1 nor rap2 demonstrated strong phenotypes in development or disease resistance. However, rap1/rap2 double mutants showed delayed flowering and enhanced susceptibility to PstDC3000 and Arabidopsis powdery mildew. In contrast, the expression profiles of RAP1 and RAP2 are significantly different. Also, rap1 and rap2 showed enhanced resistance to methyl viologen but not in the rap1/rap2 double mutants. This suggests that RAP1 and RAP2 have overlapping functions but are components of different signalling pathways.

7.2 RAP1 is Involved in Basal Defence

RAP1 was rapidly induced by wounding and a variety of pathogens. However, experimental data suggested that RAP1 was more related to the defence required for basal resistance. Loss of RAP1 led to enhanced susceptibility to PstDC3000 and the effects were further amplified if both RAP1 and the closely related RAP2 were knocked out. RAP1 proteins were accumulated during Arabidopsis powdery mildew infection and the rap1 mutants were more susceptible to Arabidopsis powdery mildew. On the other hand, RAP1 may be less important for R-gene mediated resistance as there was no significant difference in the hypersensitive response between the rap1 mutants and wild type plants. In addition, microarray data has shown that induction effect by PstDC3000 (avrRpm1) was weaker than induction by PstDC3000 (hrcC), P. phaseolicola and Phytophthora infestans.

RAP1 may regulate defence responses through redox-related regulation. Expression of GSNOR was highly sensitive to RAP1 transcript levels, in particular overexpression of RAP1 significantly upregulated the expression of both GSNOR and PR-1. Also, RAP1 expression was regulated by ROS-generating stresses such as UV-B and methyl viologen. Furthermore, RAP1 showed SA-independent upregulation upon pathogen challenge and co-expressed with the SNARE encoding gene SYP121. This gene together with the closely related SYP122 were shown to be involved in SA-independent resistance against Arabidopsis powdery mildew, suggesting RAP1 may be involved in a hormone-independent defence pathway which could be redox-dependent.
It was also observed that, in general, knockout of RAP1 did not lead to a dramatic reduction in disease resistance of pathogens. It is speculated that RAP1 is involved in a broad range of pathogen resistance. Similarly, redox-related GSNOR gene was also involved in a broad-range of pathogen resistance but gsnor mutants exhibited greater susceptibility. There is only one GSNOR gene in Arabidopsis but at least 4 genes in the RAP1-family (Nodzon et al. 2004; Prasad and Stone 2010). Loss of RAPI and RAP2 may still be insufficient to uncover the full extent of functional redundancy in the RAP1 gene family. In this context, generation of a triple mutant of PUB22/23/24 (U-box E3 ligases) was required to demonstrate the full role of these proteins in PAMP triggered immunity (Trujillo et al. 2008). In fact, PUB24 was also one of the top 50 candidates that was co-expressed with RAP1 (data not shown). It is suggested that a triple or even a quadruple mutant of RAP genes may be required to display the true importance of this gene family in plant defence responses.

7.3 S-Nitrosylation of RAP1 May Uncover the Relationship Between E3 Ligases and Cellular Redox Regulation

Published examples have mentioned that RING-type E3 ligases in neuronal cells can be S-nitrosylated and S-nitrosylation also inhibits the activity of the E3 ligases (Nakamura et al. 2010; Yao et al. 2004). In this study, a RING-type E3 ligase RAP1 was also shown to be S-nitrosylated and its activity was regulated by the concentration of applied NO-donors. The correlation between an E3 ligase and S-nitrosylation has provided an insight that physiological activities could be regulated by S-nitrosylation. There are 469 predicted RING-containing proteins in Arabidopsis (Stone et al. 2005) and the cysteine-rich domain of these proteins can be potentially modified by S-nitrosylation. The activities of these E3 ligases could be up-/down-regulated upon S-nitrosylation. As E3 ligase activity (ubiquitin-mediated degradation) is critical to determine the abundance of certain key regulators (e.g. transcription factors and kinases), S-nitrosylation of E3 ligases may therefore indirectly control a wide range of physiological responses.

Unlike other post-translational modifications such as phosphorylation and glycosylation, the regulatory mechanism of S-nitrosylation can be relatively transient because the S-NO bond is less stable and redox sensitive. E3 ligase activity could be readily adjusted by S-nitrosylation in response to the change in cellular redox status. It
is possible that E3 ligases could be a new type of redox sensor taking part in various physiological responses comparable to those identified in mammalian cells (Aracena-Parks et al. 2006; Nakamura and Lipton 2011; Wang et al. 2009b).

### 7.4 RAP1 Could Be a Global Regulator of Redox-Mediated Responses

Apart from the defence-related phenotypes, *RAP1* was shown to be involved in a variety of developmental responses, such as root branching, time to flowering and development of secondary bolts. It is proposed that *RAP1* could be a global regulator controls these responses through redox-mediated mechanisms. It has been suggested that reactive oxygen species (ROS) could also be regulators of various physiological responses. However, only limited reports have commented on how plants detect and respond to the change in redox status (Spoel and Loake 2011). *RAP1* expression was shown to be independent of SA and other hormones but rapidly responsive to UV-B and methyl viologen (MV). As previously discussed (Chapter 6.3a), UV-B and MV could generate various kinds of ROS/RNS. Transcription factors that bind the *RAP1* promoter may be able to detect the change in redox status and control the levels of expression. It has been shown that RAP1 positively regulated the expression of *GSNOR*, therefore RAP1 may adjust the cellular redox environment through the regulation of *GSNOR*. Changes in GSNOR levels indirectly and directly control a variety of responses through S-nitrosylation/denitrosylation of proteins and the chemical reactions with other ROS/RNS. The substrate protein(s) of RAP1 could also be critical regulators that work cooperatively with RAP1 in the regulation of a variety of redox-mediated responses.
7.5 Conclusion

In this study, several questions about RAP1 have been answered: (1) RAP1 is an E3 ligase; (2) RAP1 can be S-nitrosylated in vitro and its E3 ligase activity can be regulated through the S-nitrosylation of cysteine residue C325 and; (3) RAP1 could be involved in growth and development and there is also evidence to suggest that RAP1 is a positive regulator in defence responses.

However, the complete roles of RAP1 are yet to be uncovered. None of the upstream (RAP1 activator/repressor) and downstream (substrate proteins) components of RAP1 have been isolated. For instance, identification of the substrate proteins of RAP1 will be one of the key experiments to be carried out in the future. Knowing the substrates of RAP1 will definitely help to figure out in which signalling pathways is RAP1 involving. Besides, there is no in vivo data to demonstrate the relationship between S-nitrosylation and RAP1, which can be achieved by studying of RAP1 mutants in the presence of various NO donors or NO inhibitors. It is believed that many redox-related regulators exist in the Arabidopsis genome. Therefore, the continued identification of redox-related components will be a promising direction to help understand how cells regulate signals dynamically through changes in cellular redox status.
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