P.M. Chimwamurombe · A.-M. Botha M.J. Wingfield · B.D. Wingfield

# Molecular relatedness of the polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein genes in *Eucalyptus* species

Received: 19 June 2000 / Accepted: 31 August 2000

Abstract Plants produce polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) as part of their defense against disease. PGIPs have leucine-rich motifs, a characteristic shared by many proteins involved in plant resistance against pathogens. The objective of this study was to clone and analyse the partial sequences of the *pgip* genes from five selected commercially important Eucalyptus species. Genomic DNA from E. grandis, E. urophylla, E. camaldulensis, E. nitens and E. saligna was isolated from young leaves and used as the template in PCR reactions. Primers PC1, previously described, and Per3, developed in this study, were used in a degenerate PCR reaction to amplify a pgip fragment. A PCR fragment of 909 bp was amplified from each *Eucalyptus* spp., cloned and sequenced. The *Eucalyptus pgip* genes were highly conserved (98-100% identity). Analysis of the deduced amino-acid sequences revealed high similarities (44–94%) with other known PGIPs. In general, PGIPs have high homologies within genera as is the case in the genus *Citrus.* These observations strengthen the belief that PGIP plays an important role in plants.

**Keywords** *Eucalyptus* · Leucine-rich repeats · PGIPs · Signal transduction · Resistance

# Introduction

The genus *Eucalyptus* is an economically important source of wood and fibre in many parts of the world. During the course of the past decade, there has been an increasing demand for wood, given diminishing petro-

Communicated by H.C. Becker

chemical reserves and the desire to preserve old-growth forests. One of the major challenges facing forestry industries is the loss of plantation stands due to diseases. Currently, foresters rely on fungicides and breeding for disease resistance, to reduce losses due to disease. However, the use of fungicides is environmentally undesirable, while breeding for resistance is a tedious and time-consuming process. Considerable effort is being focused on improving disease tolerance in *Eucalyptus*. Manipulation of the expression of tree defense genes has potential in this regard.

Polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs), first described by Weurman (1953), are leucine-rich repeat (LRR) proteins that are associated with cells of all dicotyledonous plants that have been studied (De Lorenzo and Cervone 1997). They are also present in at least one monocotyledonous (leek) plant (Favaron et al. 1997). They have been shown to effectively and specifically bind to and inhibit fungal endopolygalacturonases, which are important fungal virulence factors (Cervone et al. 1989). There are two factors that suggest that PGIPs have a role in the plant defense system. Firstly, the inhibition of the polygalacturonase (PG) activity of several pectolytic fungi by pear PGIP is inversely proportional to the ability of those fungi to colonise pears (Powell et al. 1994). Secondly, in tissues where PGIP occurs in low amounts, they can be induced by wounding. PGIPs are also pathogen-induced (Bergmann et al. 1994; Devoto et al. 1997).

The *pgip* gene sequences have been reported for bean, soybean, apple, pear, raspberry, tomato and kiwifruit (Toubart et al. 1992; Johnston et al. 1993; Stotz et al. 1993; Favaron et al. 1994; Stotz et al. 1994; Simpson et al. 1995; Yao et al. 1995). PGIPs are thermolabile glycoproteins with a molecular mass of around 44 kDa. When de-glycosylated, the mass is around 34 kDa, with N-linked glycosylation accounting for the 10 kDa difference. PGIPs are mostly encoded by a single open reading frame of about 1,000 base pairs. They contain a signal peptide that is processed through the endomembrane system for targeting to the apoplast.

Purified PGIPs show differential inhibition against several fungal PGs. Tomato PGIP, for example, inhibits

<sup>P.M. Chimwamurombe · A.-M. Botha · M.J. Wingfield
B.D. Wingfield (I)
Forest and Molecular Biology Co-operative Programme,
Department of Genetics, Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences,
University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa
e-mail: Brenda.Wingfield@fabi.up.ac.za
Tel.: +27-12-420-3946, Fax: +27-12-420-3947</sup> 

646

**Table 1** GenBank accessionnumbers of sequences used inthis study

Species	Sequence description	Genebank accession number
Actinidia deliciosa	pgip	Z49063
Citrus ivo	pgip A	AB016205
Citrus iyo	pgip B	AB016206
Citrus jambhiri	pgip A	AB013397
Citrus jambhiri	pgip B	AB015198
Citrus sinensis	pgip	Y08618
Citrus sp cv sannumphung	pgip A	AB015356
Citrus sp cv sannumphung	pgip B	AB015643
Citrus unshiu	pgip	AB016204
Eucalyptus camaldulensis	pgip	AF159168
Eucalyptus grandis	pgip	AF159167
Eucalyptus nitens	pgip	AF159171
Eucalyptus saligna	pgip	AF159170
Eucalyptus urophylla	pgip	AF159169
Fortunella margarita	pgip	AB020529
Glycine max	pgip	X78274
Lycopersicon esculentum	pgip	L26529
Malus domestica	pgip	U77041
Phaseolus vulgaris	pgip	X64769
Poncirus trifoliata	pgip	AB020528
Prunus armeniaca	pgip	AF020785
Pyrus communis	pgip	L09264

PGs from *Glomerella cingulata*, but not from *Botrytis cinerea* (Stotz et al. 1994). In bean, PGIPs with different specificities have been observed, which shows that PGIPs are encoded by a family of genes (Desiderio et al. 1997; Leckie et al. 1999).

PGIPs belong to the LRR protein superfamily and, therefore, may be involved in signalling defense messages to the rest of the plant when a pathogen attack does occur (Jones and Jones 1997). The leucine-rich repeats within PGIPs may play an important role in the interactions between resistance proteins and other important ligands (Powell et al. 1994). PGIPs are also evolutionarily related to several plant resistance proteins that participate in gene-for-gene resistance (Jones and Jones 1997).

Overexpression of PGIPs in plants could potentially be exploited to improve resistance to pathogens (Lafitte et al. 1994; Powell et al. 1994; Burger et al. 1997; Labavitch et al. 1997). Powell and co-workers (1994) expressed a pear PGIP in *Botrytis cinerea*-susceptible tomatoes and the transgenic tomatoes were reported to be resistant to *Botrytis* infection.

PGIP-PG interaction can be utilised to provide a simple and elegant system to investigate the molecular recognition at the level of the plant cell wall. A major goal in plant pathology is to understand the molecular basis of plantpathogen interactions and, as a first step toward that goal, isolation and cloning of responsible genes is vital. The objective of this study was to clone and analyze the *pgip* gene from selected *Eucalyptus* species and to infer the sequence relatedness in the species.

## **Materials and methods**

Sample collection, DNA extraction and PCR amplification

One gram of fresh, young leaves was collected from 2 year-old plants of *Eucalyptus grandis*, *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*, *Eucalyptus* 

N P D D K K V L L O I K K A F G D P 18 GGAATTCAATCCGGACGACAAGAAGGTCCTCCTACAAATCAAGAAAGCCTTCGGCGACCCC 61 Y V L A S W K S D T D C D W Y C V T C TATGTCTTGGCCTCATGGAAATCAGACACCGACTGTTGTGATTGGTACTGCGTCACCTGT 38 121 TNRINSLTIFAGQV G 58 GACTCAACCACAAACCGCATCAACTCCCTCACCATCTTTGCCGGCCAGGTATCCGGCCAA 181 PALVGDLPYLETLEEHKO 78 ATCCCCGCCCTAGTTGGAGACTTGCCGTACCTTGAAACCCTTGAATTCCACAAGCAACCC 241 IQPAIAKLKGL 98 G AATCTCACTGGCCCAATCCAACCCGCCATTGCCAAGCTCAAAGGACTCAAGTTTCTCAGG 301 SWTN S G S V P D F **L S O L K N** 118 CTCAGCTGGACCAACCTCTCAGGCTCTGTCCCTGACTTCCTCAGCCAACTCAAGAACCTC 361  $\underbrace{\textbf{T}}_{\textbf{F}} \textbf{F} \textbf{L} \textbf{D} \textbf{L} \textbf{S} \textbf{F} \textbf{N} \underbrace{\textbf{N}}_{\textbf{L}} \underline{\textbf{T}} \textbf{G} \textbf{A} \textbf{I} \textbf{P} \textbf{S} \textbf{S} \textbf{L} \textbf{S} \textbf{Q}$ ACATICCTCGACCTCTCCTTCAACAACCTCACCGGCGCCATCCCCAGCTCGCTTTCTCAG 138 421 L P N L N A L H L D R N K L T G H I P 158 CTCCCAAACCTCAACGCTCTTCATCTAGACCGCAATAAGCTCACAGGTCATATTCCGAAA 481 FGOFIGNVPDLYLSHNOL 178 TCGTTTGGGCAGTTCATTGGCAACGTTCCAGACCTGTATCTCTCCCCACAACCAGCTCTCG 541 G N I P T S F A Q M D F G K H R L 198 S Ν GGCAACATTCCAACCTCATTTGCCCAGATGGACTTCGGCAAGCATAGACTATCACGGAAC 601 K L E D A S V I F G L N K K L E D A S V I F G L <u>N K T</u> T Q I V D L AAGCTCGAGGACGCATCACTGATATTTGGGCTGAACAAGACAACCCAGATTGTGGACCTA 218 661 S R N L L E F N <u>L</u> S K V E F P T S L T S TCCAGGAACTTGCTGGAATTTAATCTGTCAAAGGTGGAGTTTCCGACAAGCTTGACCTCA 238 721 D V N H N K I Y G S I P V E F T 0 258 CTGGATGTAAACCACAATAAGATCTACGGGAGTATCCCAGTGGAGTTTACCCAACTGAAT 781 FQFLNVSYNRLCGQIPVGGK 278 TTCCAGTTCCTGAACGTGAGCTACAACAGGCTGTGTGGTCAGATTCCAGTGGGCGGAAAG 841 L Q S F N E Y S Y F H N R  $\fbox$  G G A P L TTGCAAAGGTTCCAACGAGTATTCTTATTTCCATAACCGATGCCTGTGTGGTGCACCCCTC 298 901

#### CACACTGC 909

**Fig. 1** The nucleotide sequence and predicted amino-acid sequence of a putative mature polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein of *E. grandis* (data for *E. camaldulensis*, *E. urophylla*, *E. nitens* and *E. saligna* are not shown, see accession numbers indicated in Table 1). Putative N-glycosylation sites are *underlined* and cysteine residues are indicated in *open boxes*. A leucine-rich repeat motif is indicated in *bold print*. The nucleotide sequence has been submitted to GenBank (accession No. AF159167)

Actinidia deliciosa Citrus iyo A Citrus iyo B Citrus jambhiri Citrus jambhiri B Citrus sinensis Citrus sp cv sannumphung A Citrus sp cv sannumphung B Citrus unshiu Eucalyptus camaldulensis Eucalyptus grandis Eucalvptus nitens Eucalyptus saligna Eucalyptus urophylla Fortunella margarita Glycine max Lycopersicon esculentum Malus domestica Phaseolus vulgaris Poncirus trifoliata Prunus armeniaca Pvrus communis

Actinidia deliciosa Citrus iyo A Citrus iyo B Citrus jambhiri A Citrus jambhiri B Citrus sinensis Citrus sp cv sannumphung A Citrus sp cv sannumphung B Citrus unshiu Eucalyptus camaldulensis Eucalyptus grandis Eucalyptus nitens Eucalyptus saligna Eucalyptus urophylla Fortunella margarita Glycine max Lycopersicon esculentum Malus domestica Phaseolus vulgaris Poncirus trifoliata Prunus armeniaca Pvrus communis

Actinidia deliciosa Citrus iyo A Citrus iyo B Citrus jambhiri A Citrus jambhiri B Citrus sinensis Citrus sp cv sannumphung A Citrus sp cv sannumphung B Citrus unshiu Eucalyptus camaldulensis Eucalyptus grandis Eucalyptus nitens Eucalyptus saligna Eucalyptus urophylla Fortunella margarita Glycine max Lycopersicon esculentum Malus domestica Phaseolus vulgaris Poncirus trifoliata Prunus armeniaca Pyrus communis

------MSNTSLLSLFFFLSLCISPSLSDLCNPNDKKVLLKFKKSLNNPYVLASWNPKTDCCD--WYCATCDLTTN--RINSLTIFAGDLPG-QIPPEIGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG ------MSNTSLLSLFFFLSLCISPSLSDLCNPNDKKVLLKFKKSLNNPYVLASWNPKTDCCD--WYCVTCDLTTN--RINSLTIFAGDLPG-QIPPEVGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG 107 -----MSNTSLLSLFFFLSLFISPSLSDLCNPNDKKVLLKFKKALNNPYVLASWNPKTDCCD--WYCVTCDLTTN--RINSLTIFAGDLPG—QIPPEVGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG -----MSNTSLLSLFFFLCLCISPSLSDLCNPNDKKVLLKFKKSLNNPYVLASWNPKTDCCD--WYCVTCDLTTN--RINSLTIFAGDLPG—QIPPEVGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG ------MSNTSLLSLFFFLCLCISPSLSDLCNPNDKKVLLKFKKSLNNPYVLASWNPKTDCCD--WYCVTCDLTTN--RINSLTIFAGDLPG--OIPPEVGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG 107 MSNTSLISJEFFICICISPSLSDLCMPNDKKVLIKKSLNNPYVISWPKTDCD--WYCVTDLITN--RINSTIFAGDEG-UPPEVGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG 107 ------MSNTSLLSLEFFLCLCISPSLSDLCNPNDKKVLLKFKKSINNPYVLASWNPKTDCCD--WYCVTCDIATN--RINSLTIFAGDLPG--OIPPEVGDLPYLEILMFHKLPSLTG 107 --MSNTSLLSLFFFLCLCISPSLSDLCNPNDKKVLLKFKKSLNNPYVLASWNPKTDCCD--WYCVTCDLTTN--RINSLTIFAGDLPG-QIPPEVGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG 107 -----82 82 82 107 91 -----MILSLLLVVIFLC-FASPSLSVRCNPKDKKVLLQIKKDLGNPYHLASWDPNTDCCY--WYVIKCDRKTN--RINALTVPQANISG--QIPAAVGDLPYLETLEFHKVTNLTG ----MELKFSIFLSLTLLFSSVLKPALSDLCNPDDKKVLLQIKKAFGDPYVLTSWKSDTDCCD--WYCVTCDSTTN--RINSLTIFAGQVSG--QIPALVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLTG 105 MTQFNIPYTMSSSLSIIWIIVSLRTALSELCNPQDKQALLQIKKDLGNPTTLSSWLPTTDCCNRTWLGVLCDTDTQTYRVNNLDLSGUNEKPYPIPSSLANLPYLNFLYIGGINNLVG 120 -----MSNTSLLSLFFLSLFISLSDLCNPDKRVLLNFKKALNNPYVLASWNFKTDCCD--WYCVTCDLTTN--RINSLTIFAGDL9G--QIPPEVGDLPYLETLMFHKLPSLTG 107 -----MDVKFPTLLCLTLLFSTILNPALSELCNPEDKKVLLQIKKAFNDPYVLTSWKPETDCCD--WYCVTCDSTTN--RINSLTIFAGQVSG--QIPTQVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLTG 109 -MELKFSTFLSLTLLFSSVLNPALSDLCNPDDKKVLLQIKKAFGDPYVLASWKSDTDCCD--WYCVTCDSTTN--RINSLTIFAGQVSG--QIPALVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLTG 109 QIPSAISKUSNLKMVRLSWTNLSGEVPSFFSQLKNLTFLDLSFNDLTGSIPSSLSKLTNLDAIHLDRNKLTGPIPNSFGEFTG-QVPDLYLSHNQLTGSIPKTLGDLNFTVIDVSRNMLSG 226 PIQPAIAKPKNLKTLRISWTNISGEVPDFISQLTNLTFLELSFNNLSGTIPGSLSKLQKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 PIOPAIAKLKNLKTLRISWTNISGEVPDFISOLTNLTFLELSFNNLSGAIPGSLSKLOKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNOLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 PIOPAIAKLKNLKTLRISWTNISGLVPDFISOLTNLTFLELSFNNLSGTIPGSLSKLOKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNOLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLGE 227 PIQPAIAKUKNIKTURISWTNISGPVPDFISQUTNUTFLEPSFNNLSGTIPGSLSKLQKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 PIQPAIAKUKNIKTURISWTNISGPVPDFIRQUTNUTFLELSFNNLSGTIPGSLSKLQKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 PIQPAIAKLINILKTLRISWINISGPVPDFISQLINLIFFLELSFINILSGIIPSSLSKLQKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 PIQPAIAKLKNLKTLRISWINISGPVPDFIRQLINLIFFLELSFINILSGIIPSSLSKLQKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDSNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 PIOPAIAKLKNLKTLRISWTNISGPVPDFISQLTNLTFLELSFNNLSGTIPGSLSKLQKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 PIQPAIAKLKELKFLRLSWTNLSESVPDFLSQLKNLTFLDLSFNNLTGAIPSSLSQLPNLNALHLDRNKLTGHIPKSFGQFIG-NVPDLYLSHNQLSGNIPTSFAQMDFGKHRLSRNKLG-201 PIQPAIAKLKGLKEERLSWINLSGSVPDFLSQLKNLTFLDLSFNNLTGAIPSSLSQLPNLNALHLDRNKLTGHIPKSFGQFIG-NVPDLYLSHNQLSGNIPTSFAQMDFGKHRLSRNKLE - 201 PIQPAIAKLKGLKEERLSWINLSGSVPDFLSQLKNLTFLDLSFNNLTGAIPSSLSQLPNLNALHLDRNKLTGHIPKSFGQFIG-NVPDLYLSHNQLSGNIPTSFAQMDFGKHRLSRNKLG - 201 PIQPAIAKLKGLKEERLSWINLSGSVPDFLSQLKNLTFLDLSFNNLTGAIPSSLSQLPNLNALHLDRNKLTGHIPKSFGQFIG-NVPDLYLSHNQLSGNIPTSFAQMDFGKHRLSRNKLE - 201 PIQPAIAKUKGIKFIRLSWINLSGSVPDFLSQLKNLTFLDLSFNNLTGAIPSSLSQLPNLNALHLDRNKLTGHIPKSFGQFIG-NVPDLYLSHNQLSGNIPTSFAQMDFGKHRLSRNKLE- 201 PIQPAIAKLKNLKTLRISWINISGPVPDFISQLTNLTFLELSFNNLSGTIPGSLSKLQKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPESSGTFTG-SIPDPYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRNKLEG 227 TIPTTITKLKKRELNIRYTNIGGOIPHFLSQIKALGFLDLSNNKLSGNLPSKLPSLPDLYGISFDNNYISGPIPDLFASVSK-LFTAISLSGNRLIGKIPSLGGKPLMKIVDLSRNKLG 211 TIPPAIAKLTNLKMLRLSFTNLTGPIPEFLSQLKNLTLLELNYNOFTGTIPSSLSQLPNLLAMYLDRNKLTGTIPESFGRFKGPNIPDLYLSHNSLTGHVPASLGDLNFSTLDFSRNKLG 226 PIQPAIAKLKGLKFLRLSWTNLSGSVPDFLSQLKNLTFLDLSFNNLTGAIPSSLSQLPNLNALHLDRNKLTGHIPKSLGQFIG-NVPDLYLSHNQLSGNIPTSFAQMDFTSIDLSRNKÆG 229 PIPPAIAKLTQLHYLYITHTNVSGAIPDFLSQLKTLVTLDFSYNALSGTLPPSISSLPNLGGITFDGNRISGAIPDSYGSFSK-LFTAMTISRNRITGKIPPTFANLNLAFVDLSRNMÆG 240 PIOPAIAKLKNLKMLRISWTNISGPVPDFISOLTNLTFLELSFNNLSGTIPSSLSKLRKLGALHLDRNKLTGSIPDSFGTFTG-SIPDLYLSHNQLSGKIPASLGSMDFNTIDLSRSKLEG 227 PIOPSIAKIKLIKELRISWITNISGSVPDFLSOLKALTFIDLSFSNLTGSIPSWLSOLPNLNALRVDRNKLTGHIPKSFGEFDG-SVPDLYLSHNOLSGTIPTSLAKLNFSTIDFSRNKLEG 229 PIOPAIAKLKGLKSLRLSWTNLSGSVPDFLSOLKNLTFLDLSFNNLTGAIPSSLSELPNLGALRIDPNKLTGHIPISFGOFIG-NVPDLYLSHNOLSGNIPTSFACMDFTSIDLSRNKLEG 229 DISFMFGSNKTIQIVDFSRNKFQFDLSKVVFPQSLTSLDLNHNKIYGSLPVGLTKLD-LQYLNVSYNRLCGHIPTGGKLQGFDQTSYFHNRCLCGAPLPDCK 327 DASFLFGLNKTTORIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFPOSLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAOITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLOSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGAPLER-DASFLFGLNKTTQRIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFQSLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAQITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLQSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGPPLER--327 DASFLFGLNKTTQRIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFQSLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAQITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLQSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGAPLER-- 327 DASFLFGLNKTTQRIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFQSLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAQITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLQSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGAPLER-- 327 DASFLFGLNKTTORIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFQSLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAQITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLQSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGAPLER-- 327 DASFLFGLNKTTORIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFQSLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAQITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLQSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGAPLER-- 327 DASFLFGLNKTTORIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFPOSLINLDLNHNKIFGSIPAOITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIFVGGKLOSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGAPLER--327 DASVIFGLNKTTQIVDLARNLLEFNLSKVEFFTSLTSLDVNHNKIYGSIPVEFTQLN-FQFLNVSYNRLCGQIPVGGKLQSFNEYSYFHNRCLCGPFL---- 298 DASVIFGLNKTTQIVDLSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFTSLTSLDVNHNKIYGSIPVEFTQLN-FQFLNVSYNRLCGQIPVGGKLQSFNEYSYFHNRCLCGAPL---- 298 DASVIFGLNKTTQIVDLSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFTSLTSLDVNHNKIYGSIPVEFTQLN-FQFLNVSYNRLCQIPVGGKLQSFNEYSYFHNRCLCGAPL-DASVIFGLNKTTQIVDLSRNLLEFNLSKVEFPTSLTSLDVNHNKIYGSIPVEFTQLN-FQFLNVSYNRLCQIPVGGKLQSFNEYSYFHNRCLCGAPL---- 298 298 DASVIFGLNKTAQIVDLARNLLEFNLSKVEFFTSLTSLDVNHNKIYGSIPVEFTQLN-FQFLNVSYNRLCGQIPVGGKLQSFNEYSYFHNRCLCGAPL---- 298 DASFLFGLNKTTQRIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFFESLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAQITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLQSFGYTEYFHNRCLCGAPLER-- 327 DASVLFGSEKHTERIYLANNLFAFDLGKVRLSKTLGVLDGGHNLIYGTLPKGLTSLKDLYYLDVSYNNLCGEIPRGGKLQEFDASLYANNKCLCGSPLPSCT 313 DVSFLFGKNKTSQVIDLSRNLLEFDISKSEFAESLISLDLNHNRIFGSLPPGLKDVP-LQFFNVSYNRLCGQIPQGGTLQSFDIYSYLHNKCLCGSPLPKCK 327 DASVIFGLNKTTQIVDLSRNLLEFNLSKVEFPTSLTSLDINHNKIYGSIPVEFTQLN-FQFLNVSYNRLCGQIPVGGKLQSFDEYSYFHNRCLCGAPLPSCK 330 DASVLFGSDKNTKKHLAKNSLAFDLGKVGLSKNLNGLDLRNNRIYGTLPQGLTQLKFLQSLNVSFNNLCGEIPQGGNLKRFDVSSYANNKCLCGSPLPSCT 342

------MKSTTAISLLLFLS-LLSPSLSDRCNPNDKKVLLRIKOALNNPYLLASWNPDNDCCD--WYNVDCDLTTN--RIIALTIFSGNISG--QIPAAVGDLPYLQTLIFRKLSNLTG

**Fig. 2** Amino-acid alignment of the PGIP peptide sequences. The conserved amino acids are indicated in *bold print* 

*nitens, Eucalpytus urophylla* and *Eucalyptus saligna.* The leaves were frozen in a sterile plastic bag for 20 min at  $-20^{\circ}$ C. Mid-ribs of the leaves were removed with a sterile razor blade. The rest of the leaf tissue was cut into 1-2 mm strips. Genomic DNA was isolated from the leaves using the Nucleon Phytopure kit (Amersham Life Science, UK) as recommended by the manufacturers.

Polymerase chain reactions were done in a HYBAID Omnigene TR3 CM220 (UK) thermocycler. In all the PCR reactions, the following reaction mixture was used: oligonucleotide primer PC1 (5'-GGAATTCAAYCCNGAYGAYAARGT-3', Stotz et al. 1993) (0.12 pmol/µl), oligonucleotide primer Per 3 (5'RCANWSNG GNARNGGNGCNCCRCANARRCA-3' (designed in this study by inspection of the C-termini of aligned published peptide PGIPs), (4 pmol/µl), *Eucalyptus* template DNA (25 ng), 1 mM dNTPs, 2.5 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 10×PCR buffer, and 5 units of *Taq* polymerase enzyme (Roche Diagnostics, Germany) in 100 µl. PCR was performed for 30 cycles (one cycle=1 min at 94°C, 2 min at 58°C, and 2 min at 72°C). The reactions had an initial denaturation step of 3.5 min at 94°C and a final elongation step of 7 min at 72°C. The

PCR products were separated on a 1% agarose gel stained with ethidium bromide (Sambrook et al. 1989) and visualised under a UV transluminator. The degenerate PCR amplifications were repeated several times in independent conditions with water controls to ensure that amplifications were authentic and not artifacts.

#### Cloning

DASFLFGLNKTTQRIDVSRNLLEFNLSKVEFPESLTNLDLNHNKIFGSIPAQITSLENLGFLNVSYNRLCGPIPVGGKLQSFGYKEYFHNRCLCGAPLER-- 327 DASMIFGLNKTTQIVDLSRNLLEINLSNVEFSKSLTSLDLNHNKITGGIPVGLTQVD-LQFLNVSYNRLCGQIPVGGKLQSFDSSTYFHNRCLCGAPLPSCK 327

DASVIFGLNKTTOIVDLSRNLLEFNLSKVEFPTSLTSLDINHNKIYGSIPVEFTQLN-FQFLNVSYNRLCGQIPVGGKLQSFDEYSYFHNRCLCGAPLPSCK 327

All DNA manipulations were done according to the standard protocols in Sambrook et al. (1989). After separating the degenerate PCR products on a 1% agarose gel, a *Eucalyptus* PCR fragment of about 900 bp was purified from the gel with Qiagen columns (Qiagen, Germany) and cloned into the polylinker region of the pGEM-T-Easy vector (Promega). Ligation was done at 4°C for 16 h. Ligation mixtures were transformed into competent *Escherichia coli* (JM109) cells (Promega, UK). Transformants were screened on LB-ampicillin plates using the blue/white phenotype.

#### Sequencing and analysis

Plasmid DNA was isolated from recombinant bacterial clones by the alkaline-lysis method (Sambook et al. 1989) and further purified

Table 2	Com	parison	of the	percentage	simi	larity	of the	ngin	polyp	eptide s	equences	considered	in	this s	tudv
				r				ro-r	P J P						

Fm Fortunella margarita, Pt Poncirus trifoliata, Ci Citrus iyo A, Cb Citrus iyo B, Cu Citrus unshiu, Cs Citrus sp. cv sannumphung A, Cg Citrus sp. cv sannumphung B, Cj Citrus jambhiri A, Cc Citrus jambhiri B, Pa Prunus armeniaca, Md Malus domestica, Ce Citrus

over Qiagen columns. Recombinant plasmid clones were confirmed by restriction enzyme digestion with *Eco*R1. Five recombinant clones from each *Eucalyptus* species were sequenced using the BIG Dye terminator cycle sequencing kit with an ABI Prism model 377 sequencer (Perkin-Elmer). T7 and SP6 primers were used for forward and reverse sequencing of the double-stranded plasmid template.

The DNA sequences were used in BLASTX searches to look for homologous polypeptide sequences (http://www.ncbi.nlm. nih.gov). Peptide sequence alignment for the five *Eucalyptus* species was performed using the CLUSTAL (EBI) database (http://www2.ebi.uk). Other PGIP peptide sequences were included for comparison purposes. The computer programme PAUP (Swofford 1998) was used to draw dendrograms using sequence data obtained from this study and from GenBank (Table 1). The phylogram showing the phylogenetic relatedness of plant species using PGIP sequences was compared to a phylogram produced using the partial ribosomal RNA sequences of the same plants available in GenBank.

# Results

### Cloning of the Eucalyptus pgip gene

To determine the partial nucleotide sequence of the *Eucalyptus pgip* gene, degenerate primers were used and the amplified products were cloned and sequenced. The *E. grandis pgip* DNA sequence (909 bp) was translated into a 298 amino-acid polypeptide with a single open reading frame (see Fig. 1). In all the *Eucalyptus* spp. included in the study, the sequenced fragments were also 909 bp (data not shown). A single open reading frame for the *Eucalyptus* spp. was observed and this is consistent with most of the reported PGIPs (Toubart et al. 1992; Stotz et al. 1993, 1994).

sinensis, Pv Phaseolus vulgaris, Le Lycopersicon esculentum, Gm Glycine max, Ad Actinidia deliciosa, Pc Pyrus communis, Eg Eucalyptus grandis, Ec Eucalyptus camaldulensis, Eu Eucalyptus urophylla, Es Eucalyptus saligna and En Eucalyptus nitens

Seven putative N-glycosylation sites (Asn-X-Ser/Thr) were found in the *E. grandis* PGIP polypeptide sequence (Fig. 1) and they are comparable to those found in pear PGIP (Stotz et al. 1993). In all the *Eucalyptus* PGIPs, the peptide sequence of the putative N-glycosylation sites are the same, which has also been observed in *Citrus* spp. (Fig. 2) in positions where the glycosylations sites are conserved. Interestingly, most of the N-glycosylation sites in the majority of the PGIPs are conserved. This observation suggests important implications for the function of PGIPs.

The *E. grandis* putative mature polypeptide has seven cysteine residues which are in both the N- and C- termini of the polypeptide (Fig. 1). The cysteine residues may have implications in the function or stability of PGIPs. In bean and pear PGIPs, the cysteine residues are conserved (Stotz et al. 1993). The putative mature *Eucalyptus* PGIP has a hydrophilic character as revealed by the distribution of the basic, acidic and hydrophilic amino acids (58.2%) on the entire polypeptide.

Polypeptide sequence alignment of the *Eucalyptus* PGIPs (see Fig. 2) revealed high homologies with other PGIPs. Similarity between the *Eucalyptus* spp. alone was between 98 and 100%, while it was 44–94% when compared to other plant species (see Table 2). PGIPs are generally conserved within species, for example in *Citrus* spp. the identity is between 96 and 99% at the peptide level (Table 2) and 97–99% at nucleotide level.



**Fig. 3** A dendrogram produced with a heuristic analysis from aligned sequences of pgip polypeptides using PAUP. Bootstrap values (%) based on 1,000 replications and branch lengths are indicated above and below the branches respectively

Eucalyptus	camaldulensis	GDASVIFGLNKTTQIVD
Eucalyptus	grandis	EDASVIFGLNKTTQIVD.SRNLLE
Eucalyptus	nitens	GDASVIFGLNKTTQIVD.SRNLLE
Eucalyptus	saligna	EDASVIFGLNKTTQIVD.SRNLLE
Eucalyptus	urophylla	EDASVIFGLNKTQIVD.ARNLLE
Eucalyptus	camaldulensis	QIPALVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLT
Eucalyptus	grandis	QIPALVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLT
Eucalyptus	nitens	BIPALVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLT
Eucalyptus	saligna	QIPALVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLT
Eucalyptus	urophylla	QIPALVGDLPYLETLEFHKQPNLT
Eucalyptus	camaldulensis	YCATCDSTTNRINS TIFAGQVSG
Eucalyptus	grandis	YCVTCDSTTNRINS TIFAGQVSG
Eucalyptus	nitens	YCVTCDSTTNRINS TIFAGQVSG
Eucalyptus	saligna	YCVTCDSTTNRINS TIFAGQVSG
Eucalyptus	urophylla	YCVTCDSTTNRINS TIFAGQVSG

**Fig. 4** The leucine-rich repeat (LLR) structure of *Eucalyptus* PGIPs. Nonsynonymous substitutions are indicated in *bold print* while the *boxed portion* depicts the  $\beta$ -strand/ $\beta$ -turn region showing the general xxLxLxx consensus

Evolutionary relationships between *Eucalyptus* PGIPs and other PGIPs

In this study, we report on the cloning and sequence analysis of mature *pgip* genes from five *Eucalyptus* spp. A heuristic search was done on the manually aligned amino acids and DNA sequences of the 22 PGIPs used in this study, and a dendrogram was obtained (Fig. 3). The *Eucalyptus* PGIP sequences form a well-supported clade (bootstrap support 100%). The dendrogram produced from PGIP data show that *Eucalyptus* PGIP sequences are more closely related to those of stone and pome fruits. Within the *Eucalyptus* clade, the branches have low bootstrap support. This indicates that these species are very closely related and that the PGIP gene sequences are not variable enough to allow resolution at the species level.

## Discussion

Five PGIP polypeptides from *Eucalyptus* spp. have been cloned and sequenced and are very closely related to each other. It remains necessary to determine whether there is more than one PGIP gene in the *Eucalyptus* genome as is the case in other plants such as *Phaseolus vulgaris* (Desiderio et al. 1997).

Eucalyptus PGIPs, like all other PGIPs, fall into the category of the leucine-rich repeat class of proteins. The 24 amino-acid motif, LxxLxxLxxLxxNxLxGxIPxx, shown in Fig. 1 is conserved in all PGIPs sequenced thus far. This may suggest an important role of PGIPs in recognition and signal transduction in plant defense (Jones and Jones 1997). Eight amino-acid positions are different on the peptide sequences of the Eucalyptus spp. PGIPs. With respect to E. grandis, all the differences are due to non-synonymous substitutions. Of the eight substitutions, only one occurs in the  $\beta$ -strand/ $\beta$ -turn region of the LLR structure (Fig. 4). The S221 residue in E. grandis PGIP is changed to A221 in E. camaldulesis and E. urophylla PGIPs, it remains invariant in E. nitens and *E. saligna*. This may have consequences in the ability of the different PGIPs to interact with their ligands, endopolygalacturonases. In P. vulgaris, it has been shown that even only one substitution is sufficient to alter the interaction capacity of PGIPs and their ligands (Leckie et al. 1999). Leckie et al. (1999) showed that bean PGIP-2, which has a Q253, has the capacity to interact with endoPGs of Aspergillus niger and Fusarium moniliforme, while PGIP-1 which lacks it can only interact with the endoPG of A. niger. Three of the non-synonymous substitutions occur in the outside the LLR region while the other four occur in the region contiguous with the xxLxLxx motif of the LLR (Fig. 4). In all the *Eucalyptus* spp. PGIPs there are no synonymous substitutions. It must however be mentioned that the presence of a family of *pgip* genes in each of the *Eucalyptus* spp. can not be ruled out. According to Leckie et al. (1999), variations in the LLR structure influence recognition specificities, and in this study the LLRs are almost 100% identical. This strongly suggests that the PGIPs described in this study may have very similar recognition specificities to endoPGs except for the S221-A221 switch in the solvent exposed area on the  $\beta$ -strand/ $\beta$ -turn region.

The similarity of the PGIPs in the *Eucalyptus* spp. confirms that they are species of the same genus; similarly, in *Citrus* species PGIPs also form a distinct clade (Fig. 3). The sequence conservation across the 22 individuals suggests a conservation of the PGIP functional role in the plant defense system in those plant species. *Eucalyptus* PGIPs were shown to be close to those of the pome and stone fruit PGIPs. This suggests relatedness in the evolution of PGIPs in the two groups of plants. This may have implications when considering the type and diversity of pathogens that can infect these plants.

Distinguishing *E. grandis* and *E. saligna* taxonomically using morphological features is a difficult task. It is, therefore, not surprising that the mature PGIP sequences of these two species show a 100% identity (see Table 2). The relevance of the small differences in the amino acids of the other *Eucalyptus* spp. could be investigated for recognition specifities with surface plasmon resonance studies (Leckie et al. 1999).

In the PGIP phylogram, *Prunus armeniaca* groups away from the rest of the stone fruit sequences. *P. armeniaca* PGIP is encoded by a gene with an intron. Thus, when this sequence is included in the analysis, *P. armeniaca* clusters away from other pome and stone fruits.

Acknowledgements The authors sincerely acknowledge the National Research Foundation (SA), the Forest and Molecular Biology Cooperative Programme (FMBC) (SA) and the Tree Pathology Cooperative Programme (TPCP) (SA) for financial support. We also thank Dr. Dave Berger for his helpful suggestions on this manuscript. All experiments comply with the laws of South Africa.

## References

- Bergmann CW, Ito Y, Singer D, Albersheim P, Darvill AG, Benhamou N, Nuss L, Salvi G, Cervone F, De Lorenzo G (1994) Polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein accumulates in *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. in response to wounding, elicitors and fungal infection. Plant J 5:625–634
- Burger JT, Berger DK, O'Kennedy MM, Arendse MS (1997) Genetic transformation of maize with a polygalacturonaseinhibiting protein (PGIP) gene. Biotech SA Abstr 87:87
- Cervone F, Hahn MG, De Lorenzo G, Darvill AG, Albersheim P (1989) Host-Pathogen Interactions: A plant protein. Converts fungal pathogenesis factor into an eliator of plant defence responses. Plant Physiol 90:542–548
- De Lorenzo G, Cervone F (1997) Polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs): their role in specificity and defense against pathogenic fungi. In: Stacey G, Keen NT (eds) Plant-microbe interactions, vol 3, Chapman and Hall, New York, pp 76–93

- Desiderio A, Aracri B, Leckei F, Salvi G, Tigelaar H, Van Roekel JSC, Baulcombe DC, Melchers LS, De Lorenzo G, Cervone F (1997) Polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins (PGIPs) with different specificities are expressed in *Phaseoulus vulgaris*. Mol Plant-Microbe Interact 10:852–860
- Devoto A, Clark AJ, Nuss L, Cervone F, De Lorenzo, G (1997) Developmental and pathogen-induced accumulation of transcripts of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein in *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. Planta 202:284–292
- Favaron F, D'Ovidio R, Porceddu E, Alghisi P (1994) Purification and characterization of a soybean polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein. Planta 195:80–87
- Favaron F, Castiglioni C, D'Ovidio R, Alghisi P (1997) Polygalacturonase inhibiting proteins from *Allium porrum* L. and their role in plant tissue against fungal endopolygalacturonases. Physiol Mol Plant Pathol 30:403–417
- Johnston DJ, Ramathan V, Williamson B (1993) A protein from immature raspberry fruits which inhibits endopolygalacturonase from *Botrytis cinerea* and other micro-organisms. J Exp Bot 44:971–976
- Jones DA, Jones JDG (1997) The role of leucine-rich repeats in plant defences. Adv Bot Res 24:89–167
- Labavitch JM, Greve LC, Powell ALT, Bennett AB, Sharrock KR (1997) Polygalacturonase inhibitor proteins. Do they contribute to fruit defense against fungal pathogens. In: Johnson et al. (eds) Disease resistance in fruit. Proc Int Workshop, Chiang Mai, Thailand, pp 139–145
- Lafitte C, Barthe JP, Montillet JL, Touze A (1984) Glycoprotein inhibitors of *Colletotrichum lindemuthianum* endopolygalacturonase in near-isogenic lines of *Phaseolus vulgaris* resistant and susceptible to anthracnose. Physiol Plant Pathol 25:39–53
- Leckie F, Mattei B, Capodicasa C, Hemmings A, Nuss L, Aracri B, De Lorenzo G, Cervone F (1999) The specificity of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP): a single amino acid substitution in the solvent-exposed  $\beta$ -strand/ $\beta$ -turn region of the leucine-rich repeats (LRRs) confers a new recognition capability. EMBO J 18:2352–2363
- Powell ALT, Stotz HU, Labavitch JM, Bennette AB (1994) Glycoproprotein inhibitors of fungal polygalacturonases. In: Daniels MJ et al. (eds) Adv Mol Genet Plant-Microbe Inter 3:399–402
- Sambrook J, Fritsch EF, Maniatis T (1989) Molecular cloning: a laboratory manual, 2nd edn. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, New York
- Simpson CG, MacRae E, Gardner RC (1995) Cloning of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein from Kiwifruit. Plant Physiol 108:1748–1748
- Stotz HU, Powell ALT, Damon SE, Greeve CL, Bennette AB, Labavitch JM (1993) Molecular characterisation of a polygalacturonase inhibitor from *Pyrus communis* L. cv Bartlett. Plant Physiol 102:133–138
- Stotz HU, Contos JAJ, Powell ALT, Bennette AB, Labavitch JM (1994) Structure and expression of an inhibitor of fungal polygalacturonases from tomato. Plant Mol Biol 25:607–617
- Swofford DL (1998) PAUP\*, phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (\* and other methods) version 4. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts
- Toubart P, Desiderio A, Salvi G, Cervone F, Daroda F, De Lorenzo G, Bergmann, C, Darvill AG, Albersheim P (1992) Cloning and characterisation of the gene encoding the endopolygalact-uronase-inhibiting protein (PGIP) of *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. Plant J 2:367–73
- Weurman C (1953) Pectinase inhibitors in pears. Acta Bot Neerl 2:107–121
- Yao C, Conway WS, Sams CE (1995) Purification and characterisation of a polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein from apple fruit. Phytopathology 85:1373–1377