

Journal of Visualized Experiments

The use of detached leaf assays to simplify gene expression studies in potato during infestation by the chewing insect *Manduca sexta* --Manuscript Draft--

Article Type:	Invited Methods Article - JoVE Produced Video
Manuscript Number:	JoVE59153R1
Full Title:	The use of detached leaf assays to simplify gene expression studies in potato during infestation by the chewing insect <i>Manduca sexta</i>
Keywords:	Infestation; <i>Manduca sexta</i> ; <i>Solanum tuberosum</i> var. Kennebec; herbivory; C2H2 zinc finger transcription factor; defense pathway; jasmonic acid
Corresponding Author:	Susan D Lawrence "USDA-ARS Beltsville Agricultural Research Center" Beltsville, MD UNITED STATES
Corresponding Author's Institution:	"USDA-ARS Beltsville Agricultural Research Center"
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	Susan.Lawrence@ars.usda.gov
Order of Authors:	Nicole G Novak Frances G. Perez Richard W. Jones Susan D Lawrence
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Please indicate whether this article will be Standard Access or Open Access.	Standard Access (US\$2,400)
Please indicate the city, state/province, and country where this article will be filmed . Please do not use abbreviations.	Beltsville, MD, USA

Nicole G. Novak
USDA-ARS
Invasive Insect and Biocontrol and Behavior Lab
10300 Baltimore Ave
Beltsville, MD USA 20705
301-504-6185
Nicole.Novak@ars.usda.gov

Dr. Lyndsay Troyer
Science Editor
JoVE

September 26, 2018

Dear Dr. Troyer

Thank you for the invitation to submit our manuscript entitled "Detached leaf assays: A simplified approach to study gene expression in potato during infestation by the chewing insect *Manduca sexta*".

The manuscript describes a novel approach to insect infestation protocols that will streamline popular methods used to create damaged plant tissue. The challenge was to incorporate the many scientific disciplines involved in the protocol, namely; Entomology, Plant Physiology and Molecular Biology. We believe the final product succeeds in describing a unique and useful alternative to the more traditional infestation studies in the current literature.

For critical review of the manuscript may we suggest the following:

Jacque Bede
Department of Plant Science
McGill University, 21,111 Lakeshore, Ste-Anne-de-Bellevue, QC, H9X 3V9, Canada.
jacqueline.bede@mcgill.ca


Linda L. Walling
Department of Botany and Plant Sciences, Center for Plant Cell Biology, University of California, Riverside, California 92521
llwalling@ucr.edu

Dominique Michaud
Service Pavillon 2440 Hochelaga Blvd. Local 2736 Laval University
dominique.michaud@fsaa.ulaval.ca

Helen Tai
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Fredericton Research and
Development Centre
850 Lincoln Road
PO Box 20280
Fredericton, New Brunswick E3B 4Z7
Email: helen.tai@agr.gc.ca

It was a pleasure to highlight the unique aspects of our work involving analysis of plant gene expression during insect herbivory!

Sincerely,



Nicole G. Novak

TITLE:

Detached Leaf Assays to Simplify Gene Expression Studies in Potato During Infestation by Chewing Insect *Manduca sexta*

AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS:

Nicole G. Novak¹, Frances G. Perez², Richard W. Jones² and Susan D. Lawrence¹

¹United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Agricultural Research Service (ARS), Invasive Insect and Biocontrol and Behavior Lab, Beltsville, MD USA

²USDA-ARS Genetic Improvement for Fruits and Vegetables Lab Beltsville, MD USA

Corresponding Author:

Susan D. Lawrence (Susan.lawrence@ars.usda.gov)

Email Address of Co-authors:

Nicole G. Novak (Nicole.novak@ars.usda.gov)

Frances G. Perez (frances.perez@ars.usda.gov)

Richard W. Jones (Richard.jones@ars.usda.gov)

KEYWORDS:

Infestation, *Manduca sexta*, *Solanum tuberosum* var. Kennebec, herbivory, C2H2 zinc finger transcription factor, defense pathway, jasmonic acid

SUMMARY:

The presented method creates natural herbivore damaged plant tissue through the application of *Manduca sexta* larvae to detached leaves of potato. The plant tissue is assayed for expression of six transcription factor homologs involved in early responses to insect herbivory.

ABSTRACT:

The multitrophic nature of gene expression studies of insect herbivory demands large numbers of biological replicates, creating the need for simpler, more streamlined herbivory protocols. Perturbations of chewing insects are usually studied in whole plant systems. While this whole organism strategy is popular, it is not necessary if similar observations can be replicated in a single detached leaf. The assumption is that basic elements required for signal transduction are present within the leaf itself. In the case of early events in signal transduction, cells need only to receive the signal from the perturbation and transmit that signal to neighboring cells which are assayed for gene expression.

The proposed method simply changes the timing of the detachment. In whole plant experiments, larvae are confined to a single leaf which is eventually detached from the plant and assayed for gene expression. If the order of excision is reversed, from last in whole plant studies, to first in the detached study, the feeding experiment is simplified.

Solanum tuberosum var. Kennebec is propagated by nodal transfer in a simple tissue culture

medium and transferred to soil for further growth if desired. Leaves are excised from the parent plant and relocated to Petri dishes where the feeding assay is conducted with the larval stages of *M. sexta*. Damaged leaf tissue is assayed for the expression of relatively early events in signal transduction. Gene expression analysis identified infestation-specific Cys2-His2 (C2H2) transcription factors, confirming the success of using detached leaves in early response studies. The method is easier to perform than whole plant infestations and uses less space.

INTRODUCTION:

Herbivory sets in motion a series of molecular events during which a plant can both identify the attack and mount an appropriate response for its survival. A plant receives two basic cues from chewing insects; one from the physical damage to the tissue and the other from insect-specific substances. Damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs) are released in response to damage created by larval mouthparts and trigger a well-defined wound response that results in an increase in the hormone jasmonic acid and the transcription of defense genes¹. One of the best-known DAMPs is systemin, a polypeptide that is formed by the cleavage of the larger prosystemin protein after a leaf is wounded^{2,3}. The jasmonic acid wound response is further modulated by herbivore-associated molecular patterns (HAMPs), which can be derived from caterpillar saliva, gut contents (regurgitant) and feces (frass)⁴. Insects use these substances to either boost or evade the defense response⁵. Transcription factors then relay the message from hormone signals in the defense response via regulation of downstream defense genes⁶⁻⁸.

Some plant-insect interaction studies used in laboratory settings are of the simulated type, with a goal of approximating the natural method of feeding by the insect. Simulated herbivory is usually accomplished by creating artificial damage to plant tissues with various tools that mimic the specific mechanism of insect mouthparts sufficient to cause the release of DAMPs and trigger the production of defense genes. Other insect-specific components such as oral secretions or regurgitant are often added to replicate the contribution from HAMPs⁹⁻¹¹. The creation of a specific size and type of wound and the application of precise amounts of HAMPs is one advantage to these types of studies and can offer more reproducible results. Natural herbivory studies, where damage to plant tissue is accomplished by the application of field-acquired or laboratory-reared insects, are often more challenging because wound-size and HAMP amounts are governed by insect behavior and add variability to the data. The natural versus simulated methods and their advantages and disadvantages are well debated in the literature¹²⁻¹⁴.

To study early signaling events such as transcription factors, a certain percentage of the leaf must be consumed in a relatively short amount of time, so larvae must begin to chew immediately and maintain consumption until the leaf is frozen for analysis. *M. sexta* is a voracious feeder on multiple solanaceous plants during many of its larval stages, making it ideal for imparting maximum damage in a relatively short amount of time¹⁵. This is convenient when studying early signaling events, as the plant response occurs almost immediately after an insect contacts the leaf surface^{16,17}. The commonly used clip cage method of containment proves clumsy, as multiple cages would require continual adjustments throughout the experiment to allow for the removal or addition of larvae. The leaves must also be large enough and strong enough to support multiple insects feeding at the same time. These types of potato plants require a large amount

of space to observe feeding. Larvae will often relocate to the underside of the leaf surface which also makes feeding observations quite difficult. Using whole plants to perform these experiments is clearly cumbersome.

The current study uses detached leaves isolated in Petri dishes rather than whole plants to streamline and simplify the whole plant approach to studying herbivory. The application of the protocol in this study is limited to the observation of a group of C2H2 transcription factors induced early in potato leaves after herbivorous damage by *M. sexta* larvae.

PROTOCOL:

NOTE: The following protocol is designed for one person to set up, make observations and collect samples. Multiple runs of the same setup may be combined to increase biological replication. Any additional repetitions of the experiment should be set up at the same time of day to eliminate possible diurnal influences on gene expression. The protocol is designed to create 3 'infested' leaves for 5 separate harvest time points. Matched control leaves for each time point create a total of 30 samples. The experiment may be performed with a variety of leaf sizes and larval stages, but it is recommended that leaf size, larval stage and infestation time be consistent throughout the procedure.

1. Preparation of the potato plants

NOTE: All steps requiring sterile technique must be performed in a tissue culture hood^{18,19}.

1.1. Prepare Kennebec plantlets from explant source.

1.1.1. Prepare propagation medium.

1.1.1.1. Add 4.43 g of Murashige and Skoog (MS) with vitamins powder, 20 g of sucrose and 2 g of agar substitute to 1 L of reverse osmosis (RO)-purified water in a 2 L flask with a spin bar. Transfer flask to a stir plate and mix. Adjust pH to 5.8 using NaOH while continuing to stir.

NOTE: Agar will not dissolve until autoclaved.

1.1.1.2. Add 1 mL of preservative/biocide and autoclave on liquid cycle for 20 min (121 °C, 101.3 kPa). Remove medium from autoclave immediately after the cycle is finished and cool it to 50 °C. Transfer 100 mL of sterile and cooled propagation medium to sterile culture vessels (e.g., Magenta or Plantcon) using sterile technique in a tissue culture hood.

1.1.2. Prepare explant material.

1.1.2.1. Obtain explant source as Kennebec seed potatoes and remove all traces of soil by washing with tap H₂O. Remove sprouts and cut into 2 cm pieces with a sterile scalpel.

1.1.2.2. Sterilize sprout pieces by soaking for 15 s in 70% ethanol, followed by 13 min in 1:1 bleach (1 part RO-water: 1 part concentrated germicidal/commercial grade bleach). Rinse 5 times in sterile H₂O.

1.1.2.3. Transfer explant material to sterile tissue culture vessels with propagation medium in a tissue culture hood using sterile technique. Transfer vessels to a plant tissue culture chamber and grow for 2–3 weeks or until plantlets form at 24 °C, 16 h light (140 μmol·m⁻²·s⁻¹)/8 h dark photoperiod.

1.2. Prepare nodal-propagated tissue culture potato plants.

1.2.1. Prepare nodal transfer medium.

NOTE: This will make 10 tissue culture vessels which may be used the same day or may be made ahead of time and stored at 4 °C until nodal transfer.

1.2.1.1. Add 36.43 g of nutrient agar mix to 1 L of RO-purified water in a 2 L flask with a spin bar. Transfer flask to a stir plate and mix. Adjust pH to 5.8 using KOH while continuing to stir.

NOTE: Agar will not dissolve until autoclaved.

1.2.1.2. Autoclave on liquid cycle for 20 min (121 °C, 101.3 kPa). Remove medium from autoclave immediately after the cycle is finished and cool it to 50 °C. Transfer 100 mL of sterile cooled nodal transfer medium to sterile culture vessels (see the **Table of Materials**) using sterile technique in a tissue culture hood.

1.2.2. Prepare nodal cuttings.

1.2.2.1. Obtain Kennebec plantlets grown from explant material (produced in step 1.1.2). Plantlets should have at least 3 to 4 nodes (branch points). Remove leaves using sterile scissors or scalpel. Cut branches close to the main stem, leaving about 2 mm of branch tissue.

1.2.2.2. Remove nodal sections from stem by cutting approximately 2 mm above and below each branch point or node. Arrange nodal cuttings in a sterile tissue culture vessel containing nodal transfer medium (produced in step 1.2.1.2) in the same orientation as in the previous vessel (branch pointing up).

1.2.2.3. Transfer vessels with nodal cuttings to a plant tissue culture chamber and grow for 2–3 weeks at 24 °C, 16 h light (140 μmol·m⁻²·s⁻¹)/8 h dark photoperiod.

NOTE: Each nodal cutting will grow into a new plantlet. The number of cuttings in each vessel determines leaf size. Fewer cuttings transferred per vessel will result in larger leaves. Three plants per vessel will have 15 mm x 20 mm leaves in 2–3 weeks.

1.3. (Optional) Prepare soil grown Kennebec potato plants.

NOTE: To produce larger leaves, nodal propagated potato plantlets can be transferred to soil.

1.3.1. Transfer potato plantlets grown in nodal transfer medium to soil by gently pulling the plant from the medium until all the root tissue is released from the agar.

1.3.2. Transfer to soil just above the 1st node from the roots and lightly pack the soil around the transplant. Water gently to ensure soil contact with the root system.

1.3.3. Place in a growth chamber with 16 h light ($140 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)/8 h dark photoperiod and 25/20 °C day/night temperatures.

NOTE: Plants are ready when the top two fully expanded leaves have reached the size appropriate for the assay.

1.4. (Optional) Prepare tuber-grown potato plants.

NOTE: Potato plants grown from tubers are larger and more robust and can be useful if rearing larvae on plants or if overnight larval feeding is desired.

1.4.1. Place a potato tuber 6 in deep in a 10 in pot containing soil mix supplemented with 10 mL pelleted slow release fertilizer.

1.4.2. Place in a growth chamber with 16 h light ($140 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)/8 h dark photoperiod and 25/20 °C day/night temperature. Plants are ready approximately 30–40 days from tuber planting.

NOTE: Do not use plants that have begun to flower.

2. Preparation of insects for feeding

2.1. Obtain desired larval stage of *M. sexta*.

NOTE: Larvae for this study were reared on artificial diet through the 5th instar²⁰ and staged by an experienced individual from the in-house insectary. Larvae may also be reared partially or completely on plant tissue. Larvae do not eat immediately before a molt and are most likely to eat right after molt, so appropriate staging is important²¹.

2.2. Transfer larvae to an appropriate containment vessel (e.g., 6-, 12-, 24-well tissue culture dish) depending on larval size. There should be one larva per well in the dish.

NOTE: Larvae may display territorial or cannibalistic behavior without a food source and may become injured if housed together.

2.3. (Optional) Starve larvae for up to 2 h as this may improve larval feeding.

NOTE: Larvae should be in a containment vessel stored in the growth chamber during this time.

3. Components setup for the infestation experiment

NOTE: See the schematic summary in **Figure 1**.

3.1. Make placement templates for each harvest time point.

NOTE: It is helpful to set up 5 different trays for each harvest time point. This keeps samples organized and allows the dishes to be moved around more efficiently as a set without changing their arrangement. If percentage-of-damage calculations will be performed, this is essential as before- and after-infestation images must be captured at the same focal length.

3.1.1. Obtain 5 sturdy trays capable of holding a set of six appropriately sized Petri dishes and line with white paper.

NOTE: The size of the Petri dish is based on the leaf size chosen for the feeding assay. The leaf should fit easily in the dish without touching the sides. For instance, a 60 mm x 15 mm dish is suitable for leaves up to 50 mm in length or width.

3.1.2. Trace a set of six circles using the appropriately sized Petri dish on the paper in each tray. Label one set of circles 'control' A, B and C and the other 'infested' A, B, and C. Also label each placement template with the appropriate harvest time.

3.2. (Optional) Set up a camera for 'before infestation' and 'after infestation' image capture.

3.2.1. Secure a camera on a stand at the appropriate focal length for image capture of all Petri dishes in the placement template.

3.3. Label the harvest time point tubes.

3.3.1. Label a set of 30, 1.7 mL microcentrifuge tubes corresponding to each circle in the placement template. Label the tubes to appropriately identify the perturbation (control/infested), the plant replication letter (A, B or C) and the harvest time point (number of minutes post infestation period).

3.4. Prepare Petri dishes chosen in step 3.1.1.

3.4.1. Place a sterile filter paper disc in each of the 30 Petri dishes from step 3.1.1. Add sterile water to moisten the discs; do not allow excess water to pool in the dish. Place each dish in each of the six circles in each placement template.

3.4.2. Position three potato plants next to each placement template. Ensure that plants are all the same age and relative size.

4. Performing infestation

NOTE: One harvest time point/placement template is set up at a time.

4.1. Remove the top two size-matched leaves from each plant with sterile scissors and place one leaf in the control Petri dish and one in the infested Petri dish for each plant (A, B and C). Carry out this process as quickly as possible.

4.2. (Optional) Transfer the placement template to the camera stand to capture a 'before infestation' image.

4.3. Transfer larvae to each infested dish using soft touch forceps as quickly as possible. Set the timer for desired 'infestation' time.

NOTE: The period of time when larvae are consuming the leaf tissue is the 'infestation time'. This is something that can be determined empirically using a few test leaves/larvae before the start of the actual infestation. The chosen 'infestation time' should be consistent for all infested leaves.

NOTE: Larvae should be handled with care by soft touch forceps. 2nd through 4th instar may be grasped gently by their horn or midsection.

4.4. Observe feeding to make sure all larvae are eating. Larvae should be added/removed based on feeding behavior. Keep lids on the Petri dishes as much as possible.

NOTE: Multiple larvae may be used per leaf.

4.5. Remove larvae from leaves at the end of the infestation time. Start the timer for the harvest time.

4.6. (Optional) Transfer the placement template to the camera stand to capture the 'after infestation' image.

NOTE: All six leaves in the placement template are harvested at the specific harvest time.

5. Harvesting leaves

5.1. Transfer each leaf to the corresponding labeled tube at the end of each harvest time point and immediately freeze by dropping the tube into liquid N₂. Store the harvested plant tissue at -80 °C until the isolation of RNA.

5.2. Repeat steps 4–5.1 for each harvest time point.

6. Processing leaf tissue for gene expression analysis

6.1. Grind the frozen leaf tissue to a powder with a micropestle.

6.2. Isolate total RNA and process for gene expression as previously described²².

7. (Optional) Estimating leaf damage

7.1. Visually estimate percent of leaf damage or calculate leaf area in the before- and after-infestation images.

7.2. Measure leaf area with software tools (e.g., Phenophyte)²³.

7.3. From leaf area measurements, calculate percentage of damage as

% damage = [(leaf area before – leaf area after)/leaf area before] x 100.

REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:

Leaf consumption defines success of the protocol. Healthy, accurately staged larvae should begin feeding immediately after placement on the leaf surface and feeding should continue in a fairly consistent manner throughout the infestation time. In **Video 1**, the larva at the top begins to chew immediately after placement and maintains a consistent rate while feeding. This is especially important if assaying early gene expression events after infestation. The larva at the bottom did not consume any leaf material and is an example of an unsuccessful infestation.

Visual approximations during leaf consumption are monitored to ensure enough damage is produced. The amount of leaf material consumed can be calculated as the percentage of damage by using images of leaves before and after the infestation. **Figure 2** illustrates the variable rates of consumption by different developmental stages of *M. sexta* larvae on different types of potato plants. The leaves in **Figure 2A** were detached from 2-week-old nodal-propagated tissue culture plants. All the leaves in this figure are of the same size but were subjected to infestation by different stages of larvae for 5 min. **Figure 2A: I–IV, Video 2, Video 3, Video 4, and Video 5** illustrate the different rates of consumption and feeding styles for each larval stage from a portion of the infestation. This is helpful in determining how much damage is possible using each leaf and larval stage combination and illustrates the voracious nature of the older larvae. The use of 1st instar larvae is not recommended as their mandibles are not developed enough to produce damage in the 5 min infestation window. It is important to note that younger more tender leaves derived from tissue-culture-grown plants are often more palatable to larvae. Based on these results, 4th instar larvae were chosen to further assess damage to leaves from more mature, soil grown potato plants. The soil grown plants more closely approximate those acquired in the field. **Figure 2B** illustrates the range of damage when 3rd and 4th instar larvae were applied to leaves detached from soil-grown potato plants. Two-week-old nodal propagated plants were transplanted to soil and grown for an additional 3 weeks. Damaged leaves from soil grown plants

fell into three groups; 15–20%, 20–30%, and 30–40%. The three leaves in each group are shown to represent the different levels of damage for each range. The leaves from more mature soil-grown plants needed more larvae applied and a longer infestation time to reach the same level of damage observed in the leaves from younger nodal-propagated plants. These results illustrate the range of outcomes possible from successful herbivory from different types of plants.

After successful herbivory is complete and percent damage is assessed, leaf tissue is assayed for gene expression. Gene expression results should indicate a robust induction or repression of transcripts involved in the response to infestation. **Figure 3** illustrates the gene expression profiles of six C2H2 transcription factors from a successful herbivory experiment in detached leaves. C2H2 zinc finger *StZFP2* was induced by *M. sexta* herbivory in potato in previous whole plant studies²⁴. Although *StZFP2* was induced by herbivory in the detached leaf assay, infestation was not significant when compared to the effect of the detachment itself. However, two other *StZFP2* homologs, *StZFP5* and *StZFP7*, were significantly induced at 40 and 80 min post herbivory when compared to detached controls. *StLOX3* and *StMYC2* are marker genes induced by both wounding and herbivory and indicate the involvement of jasmonic acid regulated defense pathways. The goal of this particular study was to identify infestation-responsive transcription factors among a panel of candidate genes. The identification of two C2H2 zinc finger transcription factors that are robustly responsive to *M. sexta* herbivory supports the use of detached leaves for infestation assays.

FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS:

Figure 1: Flowchart for the infestation protocol. Schematic representation of the steps included in the experimental workflow of the infestation section of the protocol.

Figure 2: Leaf damage caused by *M. sexta* larvae. (A) Percentage damage to tissue culture leaves at each larval stage over 5 min. Roman numerals I–IV refer to videos 2–5 respectively that show each instar feeding on the leaf pictured. (B) Range of damage to soil-grown leaves by 4th instar over 20 min.

Figure 3: Gene expression analysis of leaves. Real-time quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) gene expression analysis of C2H2 zinc finger transcription factors is shown. Mean transcript level is, $2^{-\Delta CT}$ with ($\Delta CT = CT$ of test gene – CT of exogenous control gene). Excised control leaves in (blue) and excised infested leaves in (red) are shown at each time point. Each value is the average of three biological replicates. Three-way ANOVA was conducted on the ΔCt values. Significant differences in control leaves over time are indicated with capital letters. Significant differences in infested leaves over time are indicated in lower case letters. Significant differences between control and infested leaves at the same time point is shown with an asterisk (*). $Pr > F$ values were all less than 0.001, except for *StZFP6* control treatment with 0.0086. Error bars represent standard deviation. NCBI accession numbers are: *StLOX3*-X96406.1, *StZFP2*-BQ121105.2, *StZFP4*-CV500970.1, *StZFP6*-DN587601.1, *StZFP7*-DN590005.1. Spud DB accession numbers from <http://solanaceae.plantbiology.msu.edu> are *StMYC2*-PGSC0003DMT400045204, *StZFP3*-PGSC0003DMT400040144, *StZFP5*-PGSC0003DMT400040141. This figure has been

modified from²².

Video 1: Video clip of larval feeding. Second instar *M. sexta* larvae feeding on a leaf from two week old tissue culture grown potato plant.

Video 2: Video clip (I) of larval feeding. Second instar *M. sexta* larva feeding on a leaf from two week old tissue culture grown potato plant.

Video 3: Video clip (II) of larval feeding. Third instar *M. sexta* larva feeding on a leaf from two week old tissue culture grown potato plant.

Video 4: Video clip (III) of larval feeding. Fourth instar *M. sexta* larva feeding on a leaf from two week old tissue culture grown potato plant.

Video 5: Video clip (IV) of larval feeding. Fifth instar *M. sexta* larva feeding on a leaf from two week old tissue culture grown potato plant.

DISCUSSION:

The use of existing whole plant herbivory methodologies is unnecessary to achieve the goal of this particular study (i.e., screen a set of candidate genes for their response to infestation). The obvious benefit of the detached leaf refinement is shortening the time it takes to perform herbivory assays. The unwieldy nature of whole plants with clip cages is eliminated and assays are performed sooner, since plants as young as 2 weeks can be used to harvest leaves. It also requires a much smaller footprint during feeding and less growth chamber space; both important when these resources are limited.

The limitation of this assay, namely detachment, is encountered when defense-gene expression is assayed. Detachment itself causes a wound response and it is therefore important to assess what effect detachment has on basal levels of defense-gene expression. In one study involving simulated herbivory, transcript levels of a well-known defense gene protease inhibitor II (*PIN2*) were unexpectedly high in the control leaves of detached potato leaves likely due to “wounding caused during collection of the leaf”²⁵. However, application of insect regurgitant from *M. sexta* greatly enhanced levels of *PIN2* gene expression. This illustrates the need to use controls to tease out the effect of detachment from the infestation response.

Detached leaf assays are often performed to save time, space and resources. They have been used in screening for resistance to fungal diseases in wheat^{26,27}, and insect resistance in soybean²⁸ and chickpea²⁹. The assay is widely accepted in the study of the pathogen that causes late blight in potato^{30,31}. A recent study found that detached leaf assays were equivalent to whole plant assays in determining late blight resistance in the field³².

Scant evidence exists in the literature, however, for the use of detached leaves to assay for defense-gene expression. One study profiled six defense genes in response to spider mite infestation of detached lima bean³³. The leaves also produced volatiles that induced defense

responses in nearby uninfested leaves, a well-known strategy of defense-gene expression in plants³⁴. To our knowledge, no chewing insect herbivory studies to date utilize detached leaves to assay for gene expression.

The previously defined infestation responsive C2H2 zinc finger, *StZFP2* was not significantly induced by infestation in the current detached leaf assay. Aside from the obvious difference of whole plant versus detached leaves, the previous study utilized a continuous type of infestation in which plant tissue was assayed for gene expression immediately following the removal of the larvae²⁴. This is different from the discontinuous type of infestation utilized in the current study, where larval removal was followed by a resting period before leaf harvest. During this recovery period, *StZFP2* levels decrease quickly and may result in a lower level of *StZFP2* induction. There could also be other so-far undefined systemic signaling components that may contribute to the augmented induction observed in the whole plant study. Another possibility is that *StZFP2* transcripts could have peaked before the 20 min harvest time. It is clear, however, that the impressive induction of *StZFP5* and *StZFP7* transcripts make this type of infestation protocol relevant. Another limitation of the present method would be the inability to use root feeding larvae such as corn rootworm. It would also not be suitable when whole plant communication such as root to leaf signaling³⁵ or signaling from systemic leaves^{36,37} is being studied.

Success of this protocol depends heavily on the quality and accurate staging of larva used in the experiment. Rearing skills and basic knowledge of *M. sexta* behavior are helpful but not critical. However, obtaining healthy, appropriately staged larvae can directly affect feeding success. Larvae enter a quiescent period that precedes each larval molt during which they do not feed²¹. Clearly, such larvae will not damage leaf tissue. The ideal time to use larvae is just after a molt. A developmentally staged cohort of insects of a particular larval stage will also improve the reproducibility of gene expression as plants may respond differently to each developmental stage.

Access to an insectary would be ideal for the supply of larvae. *M. sexta* eggs or larvae can also be ordered from commercial sources^{38,39} and reared on diet or plant material to the appropriate stage. There are also several online tools that can help identify each instar⁴⁰⁻⁴². Larvae reared on diet will not contain plant specific components such as microbial symbionts acquired by larvae reared on plants⁴³. Gene expression profiles may be altered if these components are missing. Larvae may be partially or completely reared on their host plant if these effects are important to the study. Withholding food from insects a few hours prior to feeding experiments can also improve feeding behavior. Field-collected larvae could also be robust and advantageous as they have been exposed to proper trophic levels, but that adds another variable which may or not be suitable for all studies.

The production of healthy, insect- and pesticide-free plants is also critical. Plants with viruses, insect pests and fungal organisms will introduce confounding factors and present a challenge in obtaining reproducible data.

Many larval instars, potato plant ages and leaf sizes can be combined to customize the protocol

for a specific type of study. The length of the infestation and harvest times can also be adjusted. Potentially, many other plant–insect interactions could be studied using detached leaves if whole plant observations are used as a baseline. The detached leaf assay is a relevant and valuable alternative to whole plant herbivory studies to analyze gene expression.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The authors would like to thank Bob Farrar and Alexis Park for providing insects used in this study and for their expertise in larval staging. Additional thanks to Michael Blackburn and Saikat Ghosh for critical review of the manuscript.

Mention of trade names or commercial products in this publication is solely for the purpose of providing specific information and does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

USDA is an Equal Opportunity Provider and Employer.

DISCLOSURES:

The authors have nothing to disclose.

REFERENCES:

1. Choi, H.W, Klessig, D.F. DAMPs, MAMPs, and NAMPS in plant innate immunity. *BMC Plant Biology*. DOI 10.1186/s12870-016-0921-2 (2016)
2. Pearce, G., Strydom, D., Johnson, S., Ryan, C.A. A polypeptide from tomato leaves induces wound-inducible proteinase inhibitor proteins. *Science*. **253**, 895-897 (1991)
3. Savatin, D.V., Gramegna, G., Modesti, V., Cervone, F. Wounding in the plant tissue: the defense of a dangerous passage. *Frontiers in Plant Science*. **470** (5), 1-11 (2014) DOI 10.3389/fpls.2014.00470
4. Basu, S., Varsaniti, S., Louis, J. Altering Plant Defenses: Herbivore-Associated Molecular Patterns and Effector Arsenal of Chewing Herbivores. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions*. **31**, 13-21 (2018)
5. Chung, S.H., et al. Herbivore exploits orally secreted bacteria to suppress plant defenses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*. **110** 15728-15733 (2013)
6. Chen, M-S. Inducible direct plant defense against insect herbivores: A review. *Insect Science* **15**, 101-114 (2008)
7. Howe, G.A., Major, I.T., Koo, A.J. Modularity in jasmonate signaling for multistress resilience. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*. **69**, 387-415 (2018)

8. War, A.R., et al. Plant defence against herbivory and insect adaptations. *AoB PLANTS* **10** (4), 1-19 (2018) DOI: 10.1093/aobpla/ply037
9. McCloud, E.S., Baldwin, I.T. Herbivory and caterpillar regurgitants amplify the wound-induced increases in jasmonic acid but not nicotine in *Nicotiana sylvestris*. *Planta*. **203**, 430-435 (1997)
10. Schittko, U., Hermsmeier, D., Baldwin, I.T. Molecular interactions between the specialist herbivore *Manduca sexta* (Lepidoptera, Sphingidae) and its natural host *Nicotiana attenuate*: II. Accumulation of plant mRNAs responding to insect-derived cues. *Plant Physiology*. **125**, 701-710 (2001)
11. Halitschke, R., Schittko, U., Pohnert, G., Boland, W., Baldwin, I.T. Molecular interactions between the specialist herbivore *Manduca sexta* (Lepidoptera, Sphingidae) and its natural host *Nicotiana attenuate*. III. Fatty acid-amino acid conjugates in herbivore oral secretions are necessary and sufficient for herbivore-specific plant responses. *Plant Physiology*. **125**, 711-717 (2001)
12. Lortzing, T., et al. Transcriptomic responses of *Solanum dulcamara* to natural and simulated herbivory. *Molecular Ecology Resources*. **17**, 1-16 (2017)
13. Hjäältén, J. Simulating herbivory: problems and possibilities. *Ecological Studies*. **173**, 243-255 (2004)
14. Lehtilä K., Boalt, E. The use and usefulness of artificial herbivory in plant-herbivore studies. *Ecological Studies*. **173**, 257-275 (2004)
15. Schittko, U., Preston, C.A., Baldwin, I.T. Eating the evidence? *Manduca sexta* larvae can not disrupt specific jasmonate induction in *Nicotiana attenuate* by rapid consumption. *Planta*. **210**, 343-346 (2000)
16. Zebelo, S.A., Maffei, M.E. Role of early signalling events in plant-insect interactions. *Journal of Experimental Botany*. **66**, 435-448 (2015)
17. Maffei, M.E., Mithofer, A., Boland, W. Before gene expression: early events in plant-insect interaction. *Trends in Plant Science*. **12**, 310-316 (2007)
18. Goodwin, P.B., Adisarwanto, T. Propagation of potato by shoot tip culture in Petri dishes. *Potato Research*. **23**, 445-448 (1980)
19. Goodwin, P.B. Rapid propagation of potato by single node cuttings. *Field Crops Research*. **4**, 165-173 (1981).
20. Martin, P.A.W., Blackburn, M.B. Using combinatorics to screen *Bacillus thuringiensis*

isolates for toxicity against *Manduca sexta* and *Plutella xylostella*. *Biological Control*. **42**, 226-232 (2007).

21. Bell, R.A., Joachim, F.G. Techniques for rearing laboratory colonies of tobacco hornworms and pink bollworms. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*. **69** (2), 365-373 (1976).

22. Lawrence, S.D., Novak, N.G. The remarkable plethora of infestation-responsive Q-type C2H2 transcription factors in potato. *BMC Research Notes*. doi.org/10.1186/s13104-018-3503-6 (2018)

23. Green, J.M., et al. PhenoPhyte: a flexible affordable method to quantify 2D phenotypes from imagery. *Plant Methods*. **8** (45), 1-12 (2012)

24. Lawrence, S.D., Novak, N.G., Jones, R.W., Farrar, R.R. Jr, Blackburn, M.B. Herbivory responsive C2H2 zinc finger transcription factor protein StZFP2 from potato. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry*. **80**, 226-33 (2014)

25. Korth, K.L., Dixon, R.A. Evidence for chewing insect-specific molecular events distinct from a general wound response in leaves. *Plant Physiology*. **115**, 1299-1305 (1997)

26. Browne, R.A. and Cooke, B.M. Development and evaluation of an in vitro detached leaf assay for pre-screening resistance to *Fusarium* head blight in wheat. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*. **110**, 91-102 (2004)

27. Browne, R.A., et al. Evaluation of components of fusarium head blight resistance in soft red winter wheat germ plasm using a detached leaf assay. *Plant Disease*. **89**, 404-411 (2005)


28. Michel, A.P., Rouf Mian, M.A., Davila-Olivas, N.H., Canas, L.A. Detached leaf and whole plant assays for soybean aphid resistance: differential responses among resistance sources and biotypes. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. **103**, 949-957 (2010)



29. Sharma, H.C., Pampapathy, G., Dhillon, M.K., Ridsdill-Smith, J.T. Detached leaf assay to screen for host plant resistance to *Helicoverpa armigera*. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. **98**, 568-576 (2005)


30. Vivianne, G.A.A., et al. A laboratory assay for *Phytophthora infestans* resistance in various *Solanum* species reflects the field situation. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*. **105**, 241-250 (1999)


31. Kamoun, S., et al. A gene encoding a protein elicitor of *Phytophthora infestans* is down-regulated during infection of potato. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions*. **10**, 13-20 (1997)

32. Nowakowska, M., Nowicki, M., Kłosińska U., Maciorowski, R., Kozik, E.U. Appraisal of artificial screening techniques of tomato to accurately reflect field performance of the Late Blight resistance. *Plos One*. **9**: e109328 (2014)
33. Arimura, G., et al., Herbivory-induced volatiles elicit defence genes in lima bean leaves. *Nature*. **406**, 512-515 (2000)
34. Erb, M. Volatiles as inducers and suppressors of plant defense and immunity-origins, specificity, perception and signaling. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*. **44**, 117-121 (2018)
35. Hasegawa, S., et al. Gene expression analysis of wounding-induced root-to-shoot communication in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant, Cell and Environment*. **34**, 705-716 (2011)
36. Ryan, C.A., Moura, D.S. Systemic wound signaling in plants: A new perception. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*. **99**, 6519-6520 (2002)
37. Hilleary, R., Gilroy, S. Systemic signaling in response to wounding and pathogens. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*. **43**, 57-62 (2018)
38. Carolina Biological Supply Company. Hornworms. (2018) Retrieved October 31, 2018, from https://www.carolina.com/hornworm/hornworms/FAM_143880.pr
39. Great Lakes Hornworm. Products. (2018) Retrieved October 31, 2018, from <https://www.greatlakeshornworm.com/products/>
40. The Board of regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Manduca. (2018) Retrieved October 31, 2018, from <http://labs.russell.wisc.edu/manduca/lifecycle/>
41. Retrieved October 31, 2018, from <https://acad.carleton.edu/curricular/Biol/resources/rlink/description2.html>
42. Berkley, C. Teach life cycles with the tobacco hornworm. (2018) Retrieved October 31, 2018, from <https://www.carolina.com/teacher-resources/Interactive/teach-life-cycles-with-the-tobacco-hornworm/tr30179.tr>
43. Chung, S.H., et al., Host plant species determines symbiotic bacterial community mediating suppression of plant defenses. *Scientific Reports*. doi:10.1038/srep39690 (2017)



**Select Plants****Remove leaves****Transfer leaves to placement template****(Optional)
Obtain
'before infestation'
image****Apply larvae
+
Start infestation timer****monitor feeding****Remove larvae
+
Start harvest point timer****(Optional)
Obtain
'after infestation'
image****Harvest**


A**B**








Click here to access/download
Video or Animated Figure
Movie 1.mp4








Click here to access/download
Video or Animated Figure
Movie 2.mp4








Click here to access/download
Video or Animated Figure
Movie 3.mp4







Click here to access/download
Video or Animated Figure
Movie 4.mp4





Click here to access/download
Video or Animated Figure
Movie 5.mp4



Name of Material/ Equipment	Company	Catalog Number
agar substitute	PhytoTechnology Laboratories	G3251
containment vessel (6,12 or 24 well dish)	Fisher Scientific	08-772-49, 08-772-50, 08-72-51
manduca eggs	Carolina Biological Supply Company	143880
manduca eggs	Great Lakes Hornworm	NA
manduca larvae	Carolina Biological Supply Company	call for specific larval instar requests
manduca larvae	Great Lakes Hornworm	call for specific larval instar requests
microcentrifuge tubes, 1.7 ml	Thomas Scientific	1158R22
Murashige & Skoog (MS) Basal Medium w/Vitamins	PhytoTechnology Laboratories	M519
nutrient agar mix	PhytoTechnology Laboratories	M5825
paper filter discs	Fisher Scientific	09-805A
petri dish, 60X15 mm or 100X15 mm	Fisher Scientific	FB0875713A or FB0875712
potato tubers	any	B size (not organic)
pots, 10"	Griffin Greenhouse Supplies, Inc.	41PT1000CN2
preservative/biocide	Plant Cell Technology	NA
seed potatoes for explant source	any	B size (not organic)
slow release fertilizer (14-14-14)	any	NA
soft touch forceps	BioQuip	4750
soil mix	Griffin Greenhouse Supplies, Inc.	65-51121
sterile culture vessel	PhytoTechnology Laboratories	C2100
sterile culture vessel	Fisher Scientific	ICN2672206

Comments/Description

product is Gelzan

many other companies sell these products

30-50 eggs

50, 100, 250 or 500 eggs

any instar

any instar

these have been tested in liquid N₂ and will not explode

used to make propagation medium

product is Murashige & Skoog Basal Medium with vitamins, sucrose, and Gelzan

Whatman circles-purchase to fit in petri dish

purchase size appropriate for leaf size

suggest Maine Farmer's Exchange

product is PPM (Plant Preservative Mixture)

suggest Maine Farmer's Exchange

Osmocote is a popular brand name

product is Sunshine LC1 mix

Magenta-type vessel, PTL-100

product is MP Biomedicals Plantcon



1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel. 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

Title of Article:

Detached leaf assays: A simplified approach to study gene expression in potato during infestation by the chewing insect *Manduca sexta*

Author(s):

Nicole G. Novak, Frances G. Perez, Richard W. Jones and Susan D. Lawrence

Item 1 (check one box): The Author elects to have the Materials be made available (as described at <http://www.jove.com/author>) via: ☒ Standard Access ☐ Open Access

Item 2 (check one box):

- ☐ The Author is NOT a United States government employee.
- ☒ The Author is a United States government employee and the Materials were prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee but the Materials were NOT prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

1. Defined Terms. As used in this Article and Video License Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings: "**Agreement**" means this Article and Video License Agreement; "**Article**" means the article specified on the last page of this Agreement, including any associated materials such as texts, figures, tables, artwork, abstracts, or summaries contained therein; "**Author**" means the author who is a signatory to this Agreement; "**Collective Work**" means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Materials in their entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole; "**CRC License**" means the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivs 3.0 Unported Agreement, the terms and conditions of which can be found at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>; "**Derivative Work**" means a work based upon the Materials or upon the Materials and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Materials may be recast, transformed, or adapted; "**Institution**" means the institution, listed on the last page of this Agreement, by which the Author was employed at the time of the creation of the Materials; "**JoVE**" means MyJoVE Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation and the publisher of *The Journal of Visualized Experiments*; "**Materials**" means the Article and / or the Video; "**Parties**" means the Author and JoVE; "**Video**" means any video(s) made by the Author, alone or in conjunction with any other parties, or by JoVE or its affiliates or agents, individually or in collaboration with the Author or any other parties, incorporating all or any portion of the Article, and in which the Author may or may not appear.

2. Background. The Author, who is the author of the Article, in order to ensure the dissemination and protection of the Article, desires to have the JoVE publish the Article and create and transmit videos based on the Article. In furtherance of such goals, the Parties desire to memorialize in this Agreement the respective rights of each Party in and to the Article and the Video.

3. Grant of Rights in Article. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to publish the Article, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Sections 4 and 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Article in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Article into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Article or other Derivative Works (including, without limitation, the Video) or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Article and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. If the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Article as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

4. Retention of Rights in Article. Notwithstanding the exclusive license granted to JoVE in **Section 3** above, the Author shall, with respect to the Article, retain the non-exclusive right to use all or part of the Article for the non-commercial purpose of giving lectures, presentations or teaching classes, and to post a copy of the Article on the Institution's website or the Author's personal website, in each case provided that a link to the Article on the JoVE website is provided and notice of JoVE's copyright in the Article is included. All non-copyright intellectual property rights in and to the Article, such as patent rights, shall remain with the Author.

5. Grant of Rights in Video – Standard Access. This **Section 5** applies if the "Standard Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above or if no box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby acknowledges and agrees that, Subject to **Section 7** below, JoVE is and shall be the sole and exclusive owner of all rights of any nature, including, without limitation, all copyrights, in and to the Video. To the extent that, by law, the Author is deemed, now or at any time in the future, to have any rights of any nature in or to the Video, the Author hereby disclaims all such rights and transfers all such rights to JoVE.

6. Grant of Rights in Video – Open Access. This **Section 6** applies only if the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Section 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Video in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Video into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Video or other Derivative Works or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Video and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. For any Video to which this Section 6 is applicable, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Video as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

7. Government Employees. If the Author is a United States government employee and the Article was prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee, as indicated in **Item 2** above, and any of the licenses or grants granted by the Author hereunder exceed the scope of the 17 U.S.C. 403, then the rights granted hereunder shall be limited to the maximum rights permitted under such

statute. In such case, all provisions contained herein that are not in conflict with such statute shall remain in full force and effect, and all provisions contained herein that do so conflict shall be deemed to be amended so as to provide to JoVE the maximum rights permissible within such statute.

8. Likeness, Privacy, Personality. The Author hereby grants JoVE the right to use the Author's name, voice, likeness, picture, photograph, image, biography and performance in any way, commercial or otherwise, in connection with the Materials and the sale, promotion and distribution thereof. The Author hereby waives any and all rights he or she may have, relating to his or her appearance in the Video or otherwise relating to the Materials, under all applicable privacy, likeness, personality or similar laws.

9. Author Warranties. The Author represents and warrants that the Article is original, that it has not been published, that the copyright interest is owned by the Author (or, if more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, by such authors collectively) and has not been assigned, licensed, or otherwise transferred to any other party. The Author represents and warrants that the author(s) listed at the top of this Agreement are the only authors of the Materials. If more than one author is listed at the top of this Agreement and if any such author has not entered into a separate Article and Video License Agreement with JoVE relating to the Materials, the Author represents and warrants that the Author has been authorized by each of the other such authors to execute this Agreement on his or her behalf and to bind him or her with respect to the terms of this Agreement as if each of them had been a party hereto as an Author. The Author warrants that the use, reproduction, distribution, public or private performance or display, and/or modification of all or any portion of the Materials does not and will not violate, infringe and/or misappropriate the patent, trademark, intellectual property or other rights of any third party. The Author represents and warrants that it has and will continue to comply with all government, institutional and other regulations, including, without limitation all institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy, and all other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, applicable to the Materials, and that all research involving human and animal subjects has been approved by the Author's relevant institutional review board.

10. JoVE Discretion. If the Author requests the assistance of JoVE in producing the Video in the Author's facility, the Author shall ensure that the presence of JoVE employees, agents or independent contractors is in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Author's institution. If more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, JoVE may, in its sole discretion, elect not take any action with respect to the Article until such time as it has received complete, executed Article and Video License Agreements from each such author. JoVE reserves the right, in its absolute and sole discretion and without giving any reason therefore, to accept or decline any work submitted to JoVE. JoVE and its employees, agents and independent contractors shall have

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

full, unfettered access to the facilities of the Author or of the Author's institution as necessary to make the Video, whether actually published or not. JoVE has sole discretion as to the method of making and publishing the Materials, including, without limitation, to all decisions regarding editing, lighting, filming, timing of publication, if any, length, quality, content and the like.

11. **Indemnification.** The Author agrees to indemnify JoVE and/or its successors and assigns from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, arising out of any breach of any warranty or other representations contained herein. The Author further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless JoVE from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, resulting from the breach by the Author of any representation or warranty contained herein or from allegations or instances of violation of intellectual property rights, damage to the Author's or the Author's institution's facilities, fraud, libel, defamation, research, equipment, experiments, property damage, personal injury, violations of institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy or other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, liabilities and other losses or damages related in any way to the submission of work to JoVE, making of videos by JoVE, or publication in JoVE or elsewhere by JoVE. The Author shall be responsible for, and shall hold JoVE harmless from, damages caused by lack of sterilization, lack of cleanliness or by contamination due to the making of a video by JoVE its employees, agents or independent contractors. All sterilization, cleanliness or decontamination procedures shall be solely the responsibility of the Author and shall be undertaken at the Author's


expense. All indemnifications provided herein shall include JoVE's attorney's fees and costs related to said losses or damages. Such indemnification and holding harmless shall include such losses or damages incurred by, or in connection with, acts or omissions of JoVE, its employees, agents or independent contractors.

12. **Fees.** To cover the cost incurred for publication, JoVE must receive payment before production and publication the Materials. Payment is due in 21 days of invoice. Should the Materials not be published due to an editorial or production decision, these funds will be returned to the Author. Withdrawal by the Author of any submitted Materials after final peer review approval will result in a US\$1,200 fee to cover pre-production expenses incurred by JoVE. If payment is not received by the completion of filming, production and publication of the Materials will be suspended until payment is received.

13. **Transfer, Governing Law.** This Agreement may be assigned by JoVE and shall inure to the benefits of any of JoVE's successors and assignees. This Agreement shall be governed and construed by the internal laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts without giving effect to any conflict of law provision thereunder. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall be deemed to me one and the same agreement. A signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, e-mail or other means of electronic transmission shall be deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.

A signed copy of this document must be sent with all new submissions. Only one Agreement required per submission.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Name: Susan D. Lawrence
Department: Invasive Insect Blocontrol And Behavior Lab
Institution: USDA-ARS/NEA/BARC
Article Title: Detached leaf assays: A simplified approach to study gene expression in potato during infestation by the chewing insect *Manduca sexta*
Signature:  Date: 9/26/18

Please submit a signed and dated copy of this license by one of the following three methods:

- 1) Upload a scanned copy of the document as a pdf on the JoVE submission site;
- 2) Fax the document to +1.866.381.2236;
- 3) Mail the document to JoVE / Attn: JoVE Editorial / 1 Alewife Center #200 / Cambridge, MA 02139

For questions, please email submissions@jove.com or call +1.617.945.9051

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a revision of JoVE59153 "Detached leaf assays: A simplified approach to study gene expression in potato during infestation by the chewing insect *Manduca sexta*. Each editorial and reviewer comment is answered in [blue text](#). For ease of reading and continuity of line numbering, all line numbers referenced in this document refer to the **'clean' version** of the manuscript.

Editorial comments:

Changes to be made by the author(s) regarding the manuscript:

1. Please take this opportunity to thoroughly proofread the manuscript to ensure that there are no spelling or grammar issues.

[The manuscript has been checked for spelling and grammar.](#)

2. Please obtain explicit copyright permission to reuse any figures from a previous publication. Explicit permission can be expressed in the form of a letter from the editor or a link to the editorial policy that allows re-prints. Please upload this information as a .doc or .docx file to your Editorial Manager account. The Figure must be cited appropriately in the Figure Legend, i.e. "This figure has been modified from [citation]."

Reprint and permission information is at the following link under the subheading 'Figures and tables' <https://www.biomedcentral.com/about/policies/reprints-and-permissions>

The following is stated: "Reproduction of figures or tables from any article is permitted free of charge and without formal written permission from the publisher or the copyright holder, provided that the figure/table is original, BMC is duly identified as the original publisher, and that proper attribution of authorship and the correct citation details are given as acknowledgment. If you have any questions about reproduction of figures or tables please [contact us](#)."

3. Please revise the title to avoid punctuation.

Title has been changed from "Detached leaf assays: A simplified approach to study gene expression in potato during infestation by the chewing insect *Manduca sexta*" to "The use of detached leaf assays to simplify gene expression studies in potato during infestation by the chewing insect *Manduca sexta*"

The revised title has been added to the document. However, the authors feel that the original title conveyed the importance of the simplified protocol, namely the detached leaf assay, better with the colon.

4. Keywords: Please provide at least 6 keywords or phrases.

[Additional keywords have been added to the manuscript.](#)

5. Please define all abbreviations before use.

[This has been done for the first use of each abbreviation throughout the manuscript.](#)

6. Please use SI abbreviations for all units: L, mL, µL, h, min, s, etc.

All units have been changed to SI abbreviations.

7. Please include a space between all numerical values and their corresponding units: 15 mL, 37 °C, 60 s; etc.

The manuscript has been checked to make sure there is a space between values and their corresponding units.

8. Please add more details to your protocol steps. There should be enough detail in each step to supplement the actions seen in the video so that viewers can easily replicate the protocol. Please ensure you answer the “how” question, i.e., how is the step performed? Alternatively, add references to published material specifying how to perform the protocol action. See examples below.

Detail has been added throughout the protocol and per editor’s specific requests in 9-14 below.

9. 1.1.1.3: Please specify the preservative/biocide used in the protocol.

The preservative/biocide is Plant Preservative Mixture (PPM) and was originally not included because it is a proprietary mixture. It has been added to the protocol in line 130.

10. 1.1.1.4: Please specify the sterile culture vessels used in the protocol.

The sterile culture vessels are Magenta or Plantcon and are trade names for this type of culture vessel. This has been added to the protocol in steps 1.1.1.2 (line 133), 1.1.2.2 (line 142), 1.2.1.2 (line 160), and 1.2.2.2 (line 170).

11. 1.1.2.4: What is the composition of 1:1 bleach?

1:1 bleach is 1 part RO (reverse osmosis) purified water and 1 part concentrated germicidal/commercial grade bleach. This information has been added to the protocol in step 1.1.2.1 (lines 139 and 140).

12. 1.2.1.1: Please specify the amount of nutrient agar powder added.

36.43 g

This has been added to the protocol in step 1.2.1.1 (line 154).

13. 3.1.1, 3.4.1: Please specify the size of the petri dish.

The size of the petri dish is dependent on the size of the leaf used for the infestation. An example size has been added to the protocol for clarity in the NOTE immediately after step 3.1.1 (line 238 and 239). Additionally, two size options are listed in the materials list.

14. 7: Please specify how to calculate % damage of leaves.

This detail has been added in step 8 (lines 314-317) of the protocol.

15. After you have made all the recommended changes to your protocol (listed above), please highlight 2.75 pages or less of the Protocol (including headings and spacing) that identifies the essential steps of the protocol for the video, i.e., the steps that should be visualized to tell the most cohesive story of the Protocol. Please note that shorter steps can be combined so that individual steps contain 2-3 actions and maximum of 4 sentences per step.

The protocol has been reorganized and essential steps for video production have been highlighted.

16. Please highlight complete sentences (not parts of sentences). Please ensure that the highlighted part of the step includes at least one action that is written in imperative tense.

Complete sentences have been highlighted and contain at least one action written in the imperative tense.

17. Please include all relevant details that are required to perform the step in the highlighting. For example: If step 2.5 is highlighted for filming and the details of how to perform the step are given in steps 2.5.1 and 2.5.2, then the sub-steps where the details are provided must be highlighted.

Each step's sub-steps have been included in the highlighted section of the protocol.

18. Figure 2, Figure 3 (I-IV): Please name these video clips as movie 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

Figure 2 has been changed to movie 1 and Figure 3 (I-IV) have been changed to movie 2-5 in both the legend section and the results section.

19. Figure 4: Please define error bars in the figure legend.

The error bars in Figure 4 (now Figure 3) are standard deviation (line 399).

20. Lines 458-461: Please remove the weblink and use a superscripted numbered reference instead.

The weblink references have been removed, replaced with the superscripted numbered references 40-42 (line 465), and properly referenced in the reference section (line 639-line 651).

21. References 3, 8: Please provide complete citation information including journal name, volume number, and page number.

Citation information has been added to complete reference 3 and 8.

22. Table of Equipment and Materials: Please sort the items in alphabetical order according to the Name of Material/ Equipment.

The Materials list has been sorted alphabetically.

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1:

No changes were suggested by this reviewer.

Reviewer #2:

Major Concerns:
none

Minor Concerns:

-Lines 129 and 161 "15psi" This is not an international unit for pressure. The United States is probably the only country in the world that still uses pounds and inches.

15 psi has been changed to 101.3 kPa (line 131 and 158).

-Line 185: change to "Fewer cuttings"

"Less cuttings" has been changed to "Fewer cuttings" (line 177).

-Line 278: Are sterile scissors really needed to feed a leaf to a non-sterile caterpillar in a relatively short feeding assay?

Yes. The introduction of microorganisms not inherent to the plant or insect may affect gene expression.

-Line 321: Please explain how percent damage is measured and calculated based on the images.

This was added to the protocol in step 8 (lines 314-317).

-Line 457: Please list commercial sources, for those who do not maintain a Manduca colony.

Reference 38 and 39 were added to specify sources of *Manduca sexta* and sources were also added to the materials list.

-Figure 1: For a controlled study, it would be better to randomize the positions of the leaves. Otherwise, there can be environmental effects, e.g. one side of the room is slightly darker or cooler.

Since only one tray/placement template/set of 6 leaves is set up at a time, and each set makes a relatively small footprint we didn't consider randomizing the leaf positions. This can certainly be done however. A unique placement template could be created for each infestation/harvest time point. If before and after images are recorded, the template (and arrangement of the leaves) would need to be kept consistent.

-Figure 3B: How was the amount of damage quantified? Did this involve some sort of image processing, e.g. Image J, or is this a visual estimate by the researchers?

For panel A, visual estimates were made based on the damage in panel B. Panel B % damage was calculated using a leaf area calculation program called Phenophyte. Detail referring to these two options has been added to the protocol section in step 8 (lines 314-317).

-Figure 4: What statistical test was used to calculate significance, what P-value was used, what do the error bars mean (standard deviation or standard error)? Please provide GenBank ID numbers or some other record locator for the genes.

The following was added in lines 392-403, Figure 3 legend "Mean transcript level is, $2^{-\Delta\text{CT}}$ with ($\Delta\text{CT} = \text{CT of test gene} - \text{CT of exogenous control gene}$). Excised control leaves in (blue) and excised infested leaves in (red) are shown at each time point. Each value is the average of three biological replicates. Three-way ANOVA was conducted on the ΔCt values. Significant differences in control leaves over time are shown with capital letters. Significant differences in infested leaves over time are shown in lower case letters. Significant differences between control and infested leaves at the same time point is shown with an asterisk (*). $P > F$ values were all less than 0.001, except for StZFP6 control treatment with 0.0086. Error bars represent standard deviation. NCBI accession numbers are: StLOX3-X96406.1, StZFP2- BQ121105.2, StZFP4-CV500970.1, StZFP6-DN587601.1, StZFP7-DN590005.1. Spud DB accession numbers from <http://solanaceae.plantbiology.msu.edu> are StMYC2-PGSC0003DMT400045204, StZFP3-PGSC0003DMT400040144, StZFP5-PGSC0003DMT400040141"

-Table of Materials: Capitalize Fisher Scientific. Capitalize Eppendorf, if you are recommending use of this specific brand of microcentrifuge tube. Otherwise, call them 1.7 ml microcentrifuge tubes. Add *Manduca* to the list of required materials for this experiment.

Eppendorf has been changed to microcentrifuge in the materials list. *Manduca sexta* sources have also been added.

-It should be noted that the *Manduca* larvae used were raised on artificial diet rather than plants (judging by the pictures in Figure 3A). This will undoubtedly affect plant responses.

Yes, we agree. This was mentioned in the protocol (lines 210-212) and discussion (lines 465-469).

-It should be noted that the time of day (or time in the day-night cycle of the growth chamber) matters for these experiments. About half of all plant genes show significant diurnal variation. This is also a reason for analyzing the leaves as quickly as possible. If samples are processed over a two-hour time period, there is likely to be measurable variation in gene expression.

Thank you for pointing this out. The following statement has been added to the paragraph at the beginning of the protocol “Any additional repetitions of the experiment should be set up at the same time of day to eliminate possible diurnal influences on gene expression.” (line 110-111) The comparison between detached and infested leaves at each time point allows the reader to see the response to infestation and how it compares to detachment. This also indicates how the gene may be affected diurnally.

Reviewer #3:

Major Concerns:

1. For the analysis of gene expression in early response to herbivorous damage by the larvae of *M. sexta* in potato leaves, the authors randomly selected 6 transcription factors belonging to the same group C2H2. Analysis of the expression of genes encoding transcription factors belonging to different families or transcriptome analysis seems to be more interesting. Such global data would significantly increase the value of the entire manuscript.

Our lab is interested in C2H2 ZFPs, especially those that are infestation responsive. While data mining for ZFPs in potato we discovered five potato homologs to *StZFP2* on a 28,000 base stretch of chr 11. There were only 2 homologs in this region of chr 11 in the tomato genome (a close relative of potato). Since we have found that over-expression of *StZFP2* can enhance tolerance to *Manduca sexta* we were curious whether any of the 5 additional *StZFP2*-like genes were also responsive to infestation. In other words, the method was primarily developed to be a quick ‘screen’ of a subset of similar genes. You have a good point that perhaps a more global test of the assay would be interesting. However, we did examine, *StLOX3* and *StMYC2* as markers for wounding and infestation. These genes demonstrate that the leaves were responsive to detachment (wounding), but infestation did not significantly enhance their expression.

2. In this article, the authors point out that this simplified approach can be used for the analysis of gene expression profiles, although the aspect related to the description of the expression analysis is strongly overlooked. In this respect, the authors refer to the indicated reference (Lawrence & Novak, BMC Research Notes, 2018). Lawrence & Novak (2018) for analysis of gene expression used quantitative RT-PCR (RT-qPCR). Meanwhile, in this manuscript the authors use Semi-qRT-PCR (line 395). This experiment really needs quantitative real-time PCR.

Please explain!!!

Thank you for bringing attention to this because it is an error in the current manuscript! Semi-quantitative has been changed to Real-Time qRT-PCR in the current manuscript (line 391). Both the 2018 publication and this one used the same methods.

Minor Concerns:

1. Please explain the shortcut RO (page 4 lines: 124, 157).

RO is reverse osmosis purified water. This detail has been added to the protocol in lines 126 and 154.