

Brassinosteroids modulate the efficiency of plant immune responses to microbe-associated molecular patterns

Youssef Belkhadir^{a,b,1}, Yvon Jaillais^{a,b,1}, Petra Eppele^c, Emilia Balsemão-Pires^{a,b,2}, Jeffery L. Dangl^{c,d,3}, and Joanne Chory^{a,b,3}

^aPlant Biology Laboratory and ^bHoward Hughes Medical Institute, Salk Institute for Biological Studies, La Jolla, CA 92037; and ^cHoward Hughes Medical Institute, Department of Biology, and ^dDepartment of Microbiology and Immunology, Curriculum in Genetics, Carolina Center for Genome Sciences, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Contributed by Joanne Chory, August 6, 2011 (sent for review June 16, 2011)

Metazoans and plants use pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) to sense conserved microbial-associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) in the extracellular environment. In plants, the bacterial MAMPs flagellin and elongation factor Tu (EF-Tu) activate distinct, phylogenetically related cell surface pattern recognition receptors of the leucine-rich repeat receptor kinase (LRR-RK) family called FLS2 and EF-Tu receptor, respectively. BAK1 is an LRR-RK coreceptor for both FLS2 and EF-Tu receptor. BAK1 is also a coreceptor for the plant brassinosteroid (BR) receptor, the LRR-RK BRI1. Binding of BR to BRI1 primarily promotes cell elongation. Here, we tune the BR pathway response to establish how plant cells can generate functionally different cellular outputs in response to MAMPs and pathogens. We demonstrate that BR can act antagonistically or synergistically with responses to MAMPs. We further show that the synergistic activities of BRs on MAMP responses require BAK1. Our results highlight the importance of plant steroid homeostasis as a critical step in the establishment of plant immunity. We propose that tradeoffs associated with plasticity in the face of infection are layered atop plant steroid developmental programs.

brassinosteroid signaling | plant immune system signaling | signaling crosstalk

Innate immune systems of plants and animals rely on pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) to produce an appropriate physiological response upon detection of nonself molecules (1, 2). PRRs respond to conserved microbe-associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) (1, 2). In *Arabidopsis*, the majority of PRRs are leucine-rich repeat (LRR)-receptor kinases (RKs). MAMPs often play no role in pathogenesis, but rather are indispensable for core microbial functions (1). MAMPs are typically conserved among diverse sets of pathogens. Well studied MAMPs in plant immune system studies include a 22-aa peptide derived from flagellin (flg22) and a bioactive 18-aa peptide derived from the translational elongation factor Tu (elf18), peptidoglycans (PGNs), and chitin, a component of fungal cell walls. MAMPs elicit a suite of defense responses including the accumulation of reactive oxygen intermediates, deposition of callose, large-scale transcriptional reprogramming, and biosynthesis of microstatic and/or microcidal secondary metabolites. This response constitutes MAMP-triggered immunity (MTI), which is sufficient to slow or halt microbial proliferation (1–3).

Recent studies have unveiled a web of interactions between the plant immune system and growth regulating hormones like auxin, gibberellins, and ethylene (2). However, there is little evidence for direct physical convergence points linking hormone and defense response signaling systems (4). One convergence point that could link growth-promoting hormone responses to MAMP signaling is the LRR-RK BRI1-Associated Kinase 1 (BAK1) (2, 5). BAK1 was identified as an interactor of the LRR-RK Brassinosteroid (BR)-Insensitive 1 (BRI1), which binds brassinolide (BL), the most potent steroid hormone in plants. Upon BL binding, BRI1 autophosphorylates and activates BAK1 by transphosphorylation,

thereby enhancing signaling competency through reciprocal BRI1 transphosphorylation (6). Similarly, Flagellin-Sensitive 2 (FLS2), the receptor for the bacterial flagellum peptide flg22, associates with BAK1 immediately upon ligand binding (7). BAK1 recruitment to specific cell surface signaling systems involve its extracellular LRRs and differential phosphorylation-dependent events for proper signal transduction (7–9). Hence, BAK1 is an adapter recruited downstream of ligand perception for several cell surface signaling pathways. To date, BAK1 function in innate immunity appears to be genetically independent from its function in BR signaling (10). Here, we revisit the interplay between the plant immune system and plant steroids and demonstrate that BR biosynthesis and signaling can be rate-limiting modulators of BAK1-mediated MAMP responses.

Results

Maintenance of BR Homeostasis Is Critical for flg22-Induced MTI Signaling. Exogenous application of extremely high concentrations of BL unmasked a role for BRs in the control of a range of weak immune responses (11). This function of BR as a modulator of plant immunity is uncharacterized to our knowledge. We used transgenic *Arabidopsis* plants ectopically overexpressing *DWARF4* (*35S::DWF4*) to investigate whether PRR signaling is altered under conditions of excess BR biosynthesis (12). *DWF4* encodes a C-22 hydroxylase, which is a rate-limiting step of BL biosynthesis. *35S::DWF4* plants display elongated organ phenotypes, and dramatically reduced responses to flg22 (Fig. 1 *A* and *B* and Fig. S1). Thus, increasing the endogenous pool of bioactive BR antagonizes flg22-induced responses. Loss-of-function BR biosynthetic or signaling mutants display dramatic changes in cell elongation, resulting in severe dwarfism (13), complicating assays for immune system function. We therefore transiently reduced BR biosynthesis by using brassinazole (BRZ), a triazole compound that reversibly and specifically blocks DWF4 activity (14). To monitor flg22 output in the root, we used a *CYP71A12* gene-GUS reporter transgenic line (*pCYP71A12::GUS*) (15) (Fig. 1C). We subjected *pCYP71A12::GUS* seedlings to BRZ treatment and monitored *GUS* reporter gene activation upon flg22 treatment. In

Author contributions: Y.B., Y.J., P.E., E.B.-P., J.L.D., and J.C. designed research; Y.B., Y.J., P.E., and E.B.-P. performed research; Y.B., Y.J., P.E., E.B.-P., J.L.D., and J.C. analyzed data; and Y.B., Y.J., P.E., J.L.D., and J.C. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

See Commentary on page 7.

¹Y.B. and Y.J. contributed equally to this work.

²Present address: Department of Genetics, Laboratório de Genômica Funcional e Transdução de Sinal, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 21944-970, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

³To whom correspondence may be addressed. E-mail: chory@salk.edu or dangl@e-mail.unc.edu.

This article contains supporting information online at www.pnas.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1073/pnas.1112840108/-DCSupplemental.




Fig. 1. BR biosynthesis modulates MAMP signaling. (A) *Top:* Images representative of *Arabidopsis* WT Col-0, *fls2*, and *35S::DWF4*. *Middle:* Microsomal protein extracts prepared from genotypes listed at the top were subjected to anti-BRI1 immunoblot analysis. *Bottom:* Aniline blue-stained callose deposits in the leaves of the genotypes listed at the top treated with 1 μ M flg22. (B) Oxidative burst triggered by 1 μ M flg22 in WT Col-0 (blue), *fls2* (red), and *35S::DWF4* (yellow) leaf discs measured in relative luminescence units. (C) GUS stains of *CYP71A12::GUS* line. Seedlings grown in the presence or absence of 5 μ M BRZ were left untreated or treated with 1 μ M flg22 for 12 h before GUS staining. Washout indicates removal of BRZ during flg22 treatment. Numbers at the bottom indicate the number of roots tested that fell into each category among the 32 roots assayed when BRZ was used in conjunction with flg22. In this assay, 20 roots of 32 displayed a highly attenuated response in the form of small blue spots. (D) Subcellular dynamics of BK11 upon BL treatment is not affected by flg22 treatments. Subcellular localization of BK11mCIT is shown in root meristem epidermal cells. BK11mCIT is localized to the PM and cytosol in the absence of BL treatment (i.e., DMSO) and relocates rapidly from the PM to the cytosol following BL application. Note that BK11 relocation to the cytosol after BL treatment is not affected by flg22 treatment even when low concentrations of BL are used (10 nM and 1 nM). This experiment was repeated two times with similar results.

the presence of BRZ, *pCYP71A12* response to flg22 was greatly diminished (Fig. 1C). Removal of BRZ before flg22 treatment (i.e., washout) restored full induction of *pCYP71A12-GUS* (Fig. 1C). Thus, transient depletion of endogenous BR pools strongly suppresses flg22 signaling in root cells. We tested whether flg22 signaling can also modulate BR responses. We used displacement of the BRI1 inhibitory protein BK11 from the plasma membrane (PM) as a readout of early BR activation (16). Our results show that sustained activation of the FLS2 pathway could not block BK11 displacement from the PM, even at low doses of BL (Fig. 1D). Thus, sustained FLS2 signaling does not modulate early BR signaling outputs. Collectively, our results suggest the existence of

one-way cross-talk between the balanced activities of BR biosynthesis and FLS2 signaling.

Overexpression of BRI1 Antagonizes BAK1-Mediated PRR Signaling and Cell Death. Next, we tested whether BR signaling could be limiting for MTI responses when signaling is activated via BRI1. Plants expressing BRI1 under the control of the strong CaMV 35S promoter (*35S::BRI1*) failed to respond to flg22 treatment, similar to *bak1* and *fls2* plants (Fig. 2A and B and Figs. S2 and S3). We extended these findings to signaling pathways activated by two additional MAMPs (elf18 and PGN), which also require BAK1 for signaling (Fig. 2B). Conversely, a MAMP that triggers BAK1-independent responses. Hence, only BAK1-mediated MTI is impaired in *35S::BRI1* plants. The lack of BAK1-mediated MTI response in *35S::BRI1* plants could be the consequence of a limiting pool of BAK1 that is unavailable for MAMP signaling. To test this, we moderately increased *BAK1* dosage by introducing a *BAK1-HA* transgene into *35S::BRI1* plants and tested flg22 responsiveness (Fig. 3A). The presence of extra copies of *BAK1* restored flg22 sensitivity in *35S::BRI1* plants. Thus, there is a direct link between restoration of FLS2 function and BAK1 dosage in the specific context of heightened BRI1 levels. Collectively, our results demonstrate that increased BR signaling triggered by BRI1 overexpression can antagonize the activities of at least three BAK1-dependent MAMP signaling pathways.

In some instances, our *BAK1-HA* transgenic plants displayed morphological phenotypes reminiscent of those associated with plants that develop spontaneously plant cell death (17). To confirm our observations, we used the native promoter to express a mCitrine epitope-tagged *BAK1* in WT (*BAK1mCIT*) and *bak1* (*BAK1mCIT bak1*) plants. *BAK1mCIT* accumulates to equiva-




Fig. 2. BR signaling modulates MTI. (A) Oxidative burst in relative luminescence units, triggered by 1 μ M flg22 in leaf discs of the genotypes listed on the top right corner. (B) Aniline blue-stained callose deposits in leaves of the genotypes listed at the bottom treated with 1 μ M flg22 or elf18 and 100 μ g/mL of PGNs or chitin.




Fig. 3. Overexpression of BRI1 antagonizes BAK1-mediated MAMP and cell death responses. (A) *Top*: Aniline blue-stained callose deposits in leaves of the genotypes listed treated with 1 μ M flg22. *Middle, Bottom*: Microsomal protein extracts prepared from the genotypes listed at the top were subjected to an anti-GFP (WB:mCit) or to an anti-HA (WB:HA) immunoblot analysis to detect the accumulation of mCit or HA tagged proteins. (B) *Top*: Trypan blue stain of leaves from the genotypes listed at the top. Genotypes of parental and resulting F1 lines are indicated at the top. The control lane (*Left*) represents F1 plants obtained through a cross between *BRI1mCit* and Col-0. Trypan blue stains of F1 plants from the following crosses: *BRI1mCit* \times Col-0 (control; *Left*), *BAK1mCHE* \times Col-0 (*Middle*), and *BAK1mCHE* \times *BRI1mCit* (*Right*). Two middle panels: Microsomal protein extracts were prepared from the genotypes listed at the top and subjected to anti-GFP and anti-DsRED immunoblot analysis to detect mCitrine and mCherry tagged proteins, respectively. *Bottom*: Total protein extracts were prepared from the genotypes listed at the top and were subjected to anti-PR1 immunoblot analysis.

lent levels in *bak1* and WT plants and complements the BR- and flg22-dependent phenotypes of *bak1* plants (9) (Fig. S4). The increased dose of *BAK1* in WT, but not in *bak1*, resulted again in plants displaying morphological phenotypes reminiscent of spontaneously discrete necrotic lesions (17), which we confirmed with trypan blue staining in *BAK1mCit* plants (Fig. S4). Plants displaying ectopic cell death often accumulate constitutively Pathogenesis-Related (PR) proteins and are called *cpr* mutants (17). PR1 protein accumulated to readily detectable levels in *BAK1mCit* plants but not in *BAK1mCit bak1* plants (Fig. S4). Thus, increased BAK1 dosage drives inappropriate cell death responses. By contrast, we never observed plants displaying a *cpr* morphology when the levels of a dominant allele of *BAK1*, *bak1^{elg}*, were increased (Fig. S4). Because the *elg* mutation generates a BAK1 variant that more strongly associates with BRI1 (9), we reasoned that the phenotypes associated with heightened BAK1 levels could be suppressed by altering *BRI1* gene dosage. We used transgenic plants expressing mCherry epitope-tagged BAK1 under its native promoter in Columbia-0 (Col-0) WT (*BAK1mCHE*) (16). *BAK1mCHE* plants displayed phenotypes similar to those observed in *BAK1mCit* plants. Thus, the inappropriate cell death phenotypes observed in our transgenic lines are specific to BAK1 levels, rather than being related merely to the BAK1 epitope tag. We crossed *BAK1mCHE* plants to WT *BRI1mCit* plants and monitored ectopic cell death and PR protein accumulation. Importantly, increasing the dose of *BRI1* in the context of heightened BAK1 levels sup-

pressed almost entirely the BAK1 overexpression phenotypes (Fig. 3B). Thus, increased BR signaling mediated by BRI1 overexpression can antagonize the inappropriate cell death signaling triggered by increased BAK1 dosage.

***BRI1^{sud1}* Plants Display Enhanced flg22-Induced Signaling.** Our data suggest that the BR-independent functions of BAK1 in plant immunity can collide with its BR-dependent role in growth and development when BRI1 dosage is increased. To test whether the loss of MAMP signaling in *35S::BRI1* plants was a result of increased BRI1 levels, or of increased BRI1 activity, we used the hypermorphic *BRI1^{sud1}* allele (Fig. S2). *BRI1^{sud1}* plants phenocopied every BR-dependent morphological aspect of *35S::BRI1* plants, but displayed dramatically increased responses to flg22 (Fig. 2A and Figs. S2 and S3A). *BRI1^{sud1}* protein accumulates to approximately WT levels (Fig. S2). Thus, the antagonistic effects on MAMP signaling we observed in *35S::BRI1* plants are likely the consequence of increased levels of BRI1, and not of increased intrinsic BRI1 signaling activity.

The unexpected result that *BRI1^{sud1}* plants displayed enhanced responses to flg22 treatment prompted us to investigate this response during a plant-microbe interaction. We used the hemibiotrophic bacterial pathogen, *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *tomato* (*Pto*) DC3000, and the isogenic *Pto* DC3000*hrcC* mutant, which is deficient in its type III secretion system (T3SS). The T3SS allows bacterial effectors delivery to host cells for maximal virulence (18). Flg22 infiltrated into *Arabidopsis* leaves induces MTI that can inhibit *P. syringae* growth (19). Flg22 treatments weakly inhibited *Pto* DC3000 growth on all genotypes tested, with the exception of *BRI1^{sud1}*, which exhibited enhanced response, and *fls2*, which, as expected, exhibited none (Fig. S3). When *Pto* DC3000*hrcC* was infiltrated together with flg22, bacterial growth was inhibited approximately 10 fold on *BRI1* plants and approximately 100 fold on *BRI1^{sud1}* plants (Fig. 4). Thus, the FLS2 signaling pathway in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants can be further stimulated and acts effectively to limit bacterial growth. In contrast, we did not observe flg22-dependent inhibition of *Pto* DC3000*hrcC* growth on *35S::BRI1* or *bak1* plants. We propose that the loss of FLS2 signaling in *35S::BRI1* plants is likely the consequence of the inability of BAK1 to contribute to flg22 signaling. Our results with DC3000*hrcC* imply that increased BR signaling via *BRI1^{sud1}* primes BR and flg22 signaling through BAK1. Accordingly, when BRI1 levels are increased (i.e., *35S::BRI1*) the stimulatory effects of BR on flg22 signaling are negated, presumably by increased recruitment of BAK1 to BRI1.

We used three molecular readouts to monitor the basal activity of FLS2 in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants: (i) its phosphorylation status,




Fig. 4. BR signaling modulates flg22-dependent disease resistance. Growth of *Pto*DC3000 *hrcC* was measured in the genetic backgrounds indicated at the bottom of the chart. Four-week-old plants were infiltrated with 10⁵ cfu/mL *Pto*DC3000 *hrcC* in the absence (black bars) or presence (yellow bars) of 1 μ M flg22. The number of bacteria per area of leaf was determined at 0 and 3 d postinoculation (*Experimental Procedures*) and plotted on a log₁₀ scale. Values are mean cfu/mL \pm 2 SE.

(ii) its internalization and subsequent disappearance, and (iii) the induction of downstream target genes (20, 21). By using an anti-FLS2 antibody, we immunoprecipitated FLS2 from unchallenged WT and *BRI1^{sud1}* plants (Fig. S5). We noted that FLS2 in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants is already phosphorylated in the absence of flg22, and accumulates to lower levels (Fig. S5). Thus, the basal activity of FLS2 is increased in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants in the absence of flg22, and FLS2 accumulation is not rate-limiting for the enhanced flg22 responses. We could not observe reliably increased internalization of FLS2 in endosomal compartments in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants (Fig. S5) (21). This suggests that the stimulatory effect of *BRI1^{sud1}* on FLS2 is mild.

MAMP signals perceived at the cell surface often terminate on the promoters of *WRKY* transcription factor genes (20). To further confirm that FLS2 signaling is primed in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants, we quantified the expression levels of several *WRKY* genes. All the *WRKY* genes tested showed a relative increase in their expression levels in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants (Fig. S5). This change in *WRKY* gene expression might not specifically reflect FLS2 signaling, as MAMP-driven transcriptional reprogramming is generic and results in the activation of a largely overlapping set of defense genes (1). Rather, we envision that the induction of basal defense genes in unchallenged *BRI1^{sud1}* plants is a general consequence of inappropriate BAK1-mediated signaling. To test this hypothesis, we created isogenic lines expressing *BRI1^{sud1}* in the WT and *bak1* genetic backgrounds and looked at the steady-state expression of *WRKY* genes in 30 independent T1 plants. Our results demonstrated that the effects of *BRI1^{sud1}* on defense gene expression are *BAK1*-dependent, whereas the effects on cell elongation are not (Fig. 5A). We attribute this to the fact that BAK1 function in BR signaling can be partially compensated by the LRR-RK Somatic Embryogenesis Receptor Kinase 1 (SERK1) (22). To further confirm that the enhanced flg22 responses observed in *BRI1^{sud1}* plants are *bak1*-dependent, we assayed flg22-mediated seedling growth inhibition (SGI) in *BRI1^{sud1} bak1* double-mutant plants (Fig. 5B). *BRI1^{sud1} bak1* plants showed no SGI, similar to *bak1* plants. Thus, the increased flg22-dependent SGI response in *BRI1^{sud1}* is *BAK1*-dependent. Together, our results indicate that the increased activity of the BR signaling pathway, triggered by the *BRI1^{sud1}* variant, requires BAK1 to enhance MAMP-dependent responses.

BR Signaling Mediates BAK1-Dependent Changes in Susceptibility to Obligate Biotrophic Pathogen. To test if imbalance in BR signaling could be exploited by obligate biotrophic pathogens to further their fitness and growth, we challenged *BRI1^{sud1}* plants with the virulent oomycete *Hyaloperonospora arabidopsidis* (*Hpa*) isolate Noco2. *bak1* displayed a significant increase in resistance to the virulent *Hpa* isolate Noco2 in comparison with WT Col-0 (Fig. 5C and D and Table S1). Sporulation on *BRI1^{sud1}* was not different from that of *BRI1* plants (Fig. 5C and D and Table S1). Morphologically, *BRI1* plants display very mild BR gain-of-function phenotypes, possibly because of accumulation greater than WT endogenous levels. *BRI1* and *BRI1^{sud1}* allowed reproducible, strong increases in sporulation compared with Col-0 (Fig. 5C and D and Table S1).

Thus, an increase in BR signaling driven by the extra gene dosage of *BRI1* or the hypermorphic activity of *BRI1^{sud1}* enhances susceptibility to Noco2. Importantly, this effect was more pronounced on the first true leaves, organs in which BR-driven cell elongation programs are hyperactive (Fig. 5D). Furthermore, the increased sporulation of Noco2 driven by heightened BR signaling was *BAK1*-dependent, as the *BRI1 bak1* and *BRI1^{sud1} bak1* double mutants supported dramatically less sporulation. These plants supported even less sporulation than *bak1* (Fig. 5C and D and Table S1). Thus, increased BR signaling in the absence of *bak1* is able to suppress Noco2 sporulation. Importantly, *BRI1* and *BRI1^{sud1}* accumulated to approximately equivalent levels in




Fig. 5. Enhanced BR signaling promotes growth of an obligate biotrophic pathogen in a BAK1-dependent manner. (A) Images of representative rosette stage *Arabidopsis* plants with genotypes listed at the top. Bottom: Quantitative RT-PCR analyses of *WRKY6* and *WRKY29* transcripts from plants expressing *BRI1* (red) or *BRI1^{sud1}* (blue) in WT or *bak1* genetic backgrounds. (B) Average fresh-weight ratio of seedlings grown in water (NT) or 1 μ M flg22 (T). Genotypes are listed at the bottom. (C and D) Twelve-day-old seedlings of the genetic backgrounds indicated at the bottom of the chart were inoculated with conidiospores of the virulent *Hpa* isolate Noco2 at 32,000 spores/mL. Sporangiophores were counted 4 d after inoculation on cotyledons (C) and on first true leaves (D) for each of the indicated genetic backgrounds. Means, sample sizes, and 2 \times SE are presented in Table S1. The experiment was repeated twice. sp, sporangiophores per cotyledon (C) or sporangiophores per leaf (D).

Col-0 and *bak1* plants (Fig. S6). *RPP4*-mediated resistance to the avirulent *Hpa* isolate Emwa1 was compromised in a *BAK1*-dependent manner in *BRI1* and *BRI1^{sud1}* plants as well (Fig. S6 and Table S1) (24). These findings suggest that a slight increase in BR

signaling in the presence of BAK1 enhances susceptibility to *Hpa*, whereas the same slight increase in BR signaling reduces susceptibility in *bak1*. This is consistent with our proposal that BAK1 can act as mediator for the activities of BRs on PRR responses but further indicates that BR can also act on plant defenses by using a BAK1-independent mechanism.

Discussion

Despite the involvement of various hormone-regulated responses in plant defense, relatively little is known about the molecular mechanisms that connect pathogen perception to ongoing developmental programs in the infected cell or organ (2, 4). We studied the interaction of growth promotion by BRs with plant immune system activities by taking advantage of the fact that BRI1 activity and BR concentrations are highly regulated, rate-limiting factors for BR-dependent responses. We therefore could manipulate BR signaling to dissect its overlap with the plant immune system. Our data suggest a model in which BRs can reset or prime MTI responses. Our model refines current models of independent signaling functions for BR and MTI outputs, and suggests that there is a potential physiological intersection between the signaling pathways that control body size and innate immunity in plants (10). As such, pathway cross-communication simply cannot be tackled by studying signaling systems in isolation (25, 26).

In WT *Arabidopsis*, BRs and BRI1 exist at concentrations that allow cells to easily modulate their elongation state in response to challenging environmental conditions via BR synthesis (26). However, to set endogenous BR levels and BRI1 sensitivity to a particular activity range, BR biosynthesis is tightly modulated by a feedback regulatory loop controlled by BR signaling (27). A deviation from this range could have detrimental consequences on the adaptive plasticity of plants. In light of our model, we speculate that this homeostatic loop also coordinates BR biosynthesis and signaling to keep the plant immune system properly sensitized. Atop this BR feedback regulatory loop, BR homeostasis is also achieved through circadian control and other environmental factors (e.g., light, temperature, and the circadian clock) (28). Our results showing that flg22-mediated responses can be modified by the availability of BRs suggest that the temporal integration of the BR pathway could directly influence the efficiency of MTI in a circadian manner. Thus, our results build on recent findings revealing a fundamental link between the circadian clock and plant immunity (29). We posit the existence of a narrow range of BR concentrations that sets the immune response for rapid deployment. It will be important to determine precisely how the inducible responses of the plant immune system interact with BR biosynthesis and signaling to integrate defenses responses over normal growth and development programs.

Because MTI and BR responses are coupled, we predict that BR and MAMP signaling pathways do not respond to ligand concentrations directly but rather indirectly, via the ratios of respective ligand concentrations. BAK1 has the attributes required to couple the relative phenotypic outputs in this model: BAK1 interacts physically with several PRRs and BRI1 (5, 20). BAK1 does not appear to bind ligand, and thus cannot directly measure ligand concentrations (13). BAK1 pools are dynamic and, most importantly, our data show that BAK1 dosage is important for two different signaling events to occur in a sustained way. Our data showing that BRI1 overexpression antagonizes BAK1-mediated MAMP signaling and inappropriate BAK1-mediated cell death is in agreement with our proposed model. We suggest that the capacity of BAK1 to evaluate the ratios of ligands can be skewed by ligand-independent activation of BR signaling: overexpressed BRI1 (*35S::BRI1*) could possibly titrate BAK1 from PRRs, activating BR response by mass action. Accordingly, when intracellular BR levels are increased (e.g., in *35S::DWF4*), the inhibitory effects of BRs on FLS2 could take place through increased recruitment of BAK1 to BRI1. How-

ever, Albrecht and colleagues (30) have demonstrated that exogenous application of high concentrations of BR inhibits flg22-dependent signaling via a BAK1-independent mechanism. Thus, the reduced flg22 responses associated with an increase in endogenous BR levels through *DWF4* overexpression could also operate through a BAK1-independent mechanism. However, comparing and understanding the effects of endogenously increased BR pools and exogenously applied BRs on flg22 response may be complex. For instance, exogenously applied BRs taken up by *Arabidopsis* roots can rescue shoot dwarfism, yet, it is known that BRs synthesized in the roots of WT plants cannot rescue the shoot dwarfing phenotype of a BR biosynthetic mutant (31). Nonetheless, our data complement those of Albrecht et al., who also clearly demonstrate that BR and MTI signaling are coupled in a unidirectional antagonistic manner (30).

Collectively, our results demonstrate that BR signaling can dictate the output of a plant-pathogen interaction. Hence, pathogens may perturb PRRs to exploit their crosstalk with BR signaling. To test this, we challenged our BR response gain-of-function plants with oomycetes and bacterial and fungal plant pathogens. The poised activation state of BRI1^{sud1} led to enhanced susceptibility to hemibiotrophic pathogens, despite enhanced MTI output responses. This enhanced susceptibility to hemibiotrophic pathogens was not apparent in plants in which BR signaling was achieved through increased BRI1 dosage. In contrast, very slight activation of the BR pathway triggered both BAK1-dependent and BAK1-independent changes during interactions with an obligate biotrophic pathogen. This is consistent with our proposal that BAK1 can act as mediator for the synergistic activities of BRs. These data are also consistent with the work of Albrecht et al. (30), who propose that BR signaling modulates plant immunity in a BAK1-independent manner. We propose that biotrophic pathogens have evolved virulence mechanisms to detect or create physiological states in which BR concentrations are optimal for pathogen success, perhaps centered on the modification of BR biosynthesis or signaling (32). Further studies aimed at understanding how BRs impact the concerted array of plant hormone signaling relationships with innate immune function will be instrumental to determine how the plant cell integrates normal growth signals with immune system function.

Experimental Procedures

Confocal Microscopy. flg22 and BL treatments were as described previously (9). Confocal microscopy was performed with a Leica SP2 inverted microscope, and image analysis was performed as previously described (16).

Protein Analysis. Equal loading was ensured by Bradford protein quantification before loading. Monoclonal anti-GFP (Roche), anti-HA (Roche), and polyclonal anti-CHERRY (DsRed polyclonal; Clontech) were used at a dilution of 1:2,000. Polyclonal anti-PR1 antibodies were provided by Dan Kliebenstein (University of California, Davis, CA) and used at a dilution of 1:5,000.

MAMP Responses Assays. These assays were as described (9). *pCYP71A12::GUS* staining assays following treatment with 1 μ M flg22 were as described previously (15). Seedlings grown in the presence or absence of 5 μ M BRZ (Chemiclones) were untreated or treated with 1 μ M flg22 for 12 h before GUS staining. Washout indicates removal of BRZ during a short period before flg22 treatment. Representative examples from approximately 30 roots per condition are shown.

Pathogens and Cell Death Assays. *P. syringae* (Pto DC3000 and *hrcC*) assays are described (18, 19). *Hpa* isolates Emwa1 and Noco2 were propagated as described (33) on the susceptible *Arabidopsis* ecotypes Ws and Col-0, respectively. Trypan blue staining to visualize cell death was performed as described previously (33).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. We thank Gregory Vert and Marc Nishimura for discussions. Anti-PR1 and anti-FLS2 antibodies were gifts from Dan Kliebenstein and Cyril Zipfel, respectively. Yves Millet in the Ausubel laboratory provided the *pCYP71A12::GUS* line. We thank Cyril Zipfel and Sacco de Vries for sharing

data and ideas before publication. This work was supported by National Science Foundation Grants IOS-0649389 (to J.C.) and IOS-0929410 (to J.L.D.) and National Institutes of Health Grant GM066025 (to J.L.D.), and by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (J.C.). Y.B. was a Howard Hughes Medical Institute fellow of the Life Sciences Research Foundation and the recipient of the Phillippe Foundation award. Y.J. was supported by fellowships from the Euro-

pean Molecular Biology Organization, the F.M. Kirby Foundation, and the Stern Foundation. E.B-P. was supported by PhD and SWE fellowships from Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, respectively, and by the Salk Institute. J.L.D. is a Howard Hughes Medical Institute–Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation Plant Science Investigator.

1. Jones JD, Dangl JL (2006) The plant immune system. *Nature* 444:323–329.
2. Pieterse CM, Leon-Reyes A, Van der Ent S, Van Wees SC (2009) Networking by small-molecule hormones in plant immunity. *Nat Chem Biol* 5:308–316.
3. Ronald PC, Beutler B (2010) Plant and animal sensors of conserved microbial signatures. *Science* 330:1061–1064.
4. Spoel SH, Dong X (2008) Making sense of hormone crosstalk during plant immune responses. *Cell Host Microbe* 3:348–351.
5. Vert G (2008) Plant signaling: Brassinosteroids, immunity and effectors are BAK. *Curr Biol* 18:R963–R965.
6. Wang X, et al. (2008) Sequential transphosphorylation of the BRI1/BAK1 receptor kinase complex impacts early events in brassinosteroid signaling. *Dev Cell* 15:220–235.
7. Schulze B, et al. (2010) Rapid heteromerization and phosphorylation of ligand-activated plant transmembrane receptors and their associated kinase BAK1. *J Biol Chem* 285:9444–9451.
8. Schwessinger B, et al. (2011) Phosphorylation-dependent differential regulation of plant growth, cell death, and innate immunity by the regulatory receptor-like kinase BAK1. *PLoS Genet* 7:e1002046.
9. Jaillais Y, Belkhadir Y, Balsemão-Pires E, Dangl JL, Chory J (2011) Extracellular leucine-rich repeats as a platform for receptor/coreceptor complex formation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 108:8503–8507.
10. Chinchilla D, Shan L, He P, de Vries S, Kemmerling B (2009) One for all: The receptor-associated kinase BAK1. *Trends Plant Sci* 14:535–541.
11. Nakashita H, et al. (2003) Brassinosteroid functions in a broad range of disease resistance in tobacco and rice. *Plant J* 33:887–898.
12. Nemhauser JL, Mockler TC, Chory J (2004) Interdependency of brassinosteroid and auxin signaling in Arabidopsis. *PLoS Biol* 2:E258.
13. Belkhadir Y, Chory J (2006) Brassinosteroid signaling: A paradigm for steroid hormone signaling from the cell surface. *Science* 314:1410–1411.
14. Sekimata K, et al. (2008) Brz220 interacts with DWF4, a cytochrome P450 monooxygenase in brassinosteroid biosynthesis, and exerts biological activity. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 72:7–12.
15. Millet YA, et al. (2010) Innate immune responses activated in Arabidopsis roots by microbe-associated molecular patterns. *Plant Cell* 22:973–990.
16. Jaillais Y, et al. (2011) Tyrosine phosphorylation controls brassinosteroid receptor activation by triggering membrane release of its kinase inhibitor. *Genes Dev* 25:232–237.
17. Lorrain S, Vailliau F, Balagué C, Roby D (2003) Lesion mimic mutants: Keys for deciphering cell death and defense pathways in plants? *Trends Plant Sci* 8:263–271.
18. Kim MG, et al. (2005) Two *Pseudomonas syringae* type III effectors inhibit RIN4-regulated basal defense in Arabidopsis. *Cell* 121:749–759.
19. Zipfel C, et al. (2004) Bacterial disease resistance in Arabidopsis through flagellin perception. *Nature* 428:764–767.
20. Zipfel C (2009) Early molecular events in PAMP-triggered immunity. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 12:414–420.
21. Geldner N, Robatzek S (2008) Plant receptors go endosomal: A moving view on signal transduction. *Plant Physiol* 147:1565–1574.
22. Albrecht C, Russinova E, Kemmerling B, Kwaaitaal M, de Vries SC (2008) Arabidopsis somatic embryogenesis receptor kinase proteins serve brassinosteroid-dependent and -independent signaling pathways. *Plant Physiol* 148:611–619.
23. Kemmerling B, et al. (2007) The BRI1-associated kinase 1, BAK1, has a brassinolide-independent role in plant cell-death control. *Curr Biol* 17:1116–1122.
24. Knoth C, Ringler J, Dangl JL, Eulgem T (2007) Arabidopsis WRKY70 is required for full RPP4-mediated disease resistance and basal defense against *Hyaloperonospora parasitica*. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* 20:120–128.
25. Sato M, et al. (2010) Network modeling reveals prevalent negative regulatory relationships between signaling sectors in Arabidopsis immune signaling. *PLoS Pathog* 6:e1001011.
26. Jaillais Y, Chory J (2010) Unraveling the paradoxes of plant hormone signaling integration. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 17:642–645.
27. He JX, et al. (2005) BZR1 is a transcriptional repressor with dual roles in brassinosteroid homeostasis and growth responses. *Science* 307:1634–1638.
28. Michael TP, et al. (2008) A morning-specific phytohormone gene expression program underlying rhythmic plant growth. *PLoS Biol* 6:e225.
29. Wang W, et al. (2011) Timing of plant immune responses by a central circadian regulator. *Nature* 470:110–114.
30. Albrecht C, et al. (2012) Brassinosteroids inhibit pathogen-associated molecular pattern-triggered immune signaling independent of the receptor kinase BAK1. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109:303–308.
31. Symons GM, Reid JB (2004) Brassinosteroids do not undergo long-distance transport in pea. Implications for the regulation of endogenous brassinosteroid levels. *Plant Physiol* 135:2196–2206.
32. Kemen E, et al. (2011) Gene gain and loss during evolution of obligate parasitism in the white rust pathogen of Arabidopsis thaliana. *PLoS Biol* 9:e1001094.
33. Holt BF, III, Belkhadir Y, Dangl JL (2005) Antagonistic control of disease resistance protein stability in the plant immune system. *Science* 309:929–932.