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Abstract

The bacterial pathogen Pseudomonas syringae depends on effector proteins secreted by its type III secretion system for the pathogenesis of plants. The majority of these effector proteins are known suppressors of immunity, but their plant targets remain elusive. Using Arabidopsis thaliana as a model host, we report that the HopE1 effector uses the host calcium sensor, calmodulin (CaM), as a co-factor to target the microtubule-associated protein 65 (MAP65), an important component of the microtubule network. HopE1 interacts with MAP65 in a CaM-dependent manner, resulting in MAP65-GFP dissociation from microtubules. Transgenic Arabidopsis expressing HopE1 had reduced secretion of the immunity protein PR-1 compared to wild-type plants. Additionally, Arabidopsis map65-1 mutants were immune deficient and were more susceptible to P. syringae. Our results suggest a virulence strategy in which a pathogen effector is activated by host calmodulin to target MAP65 and the microtubule network, thereby inhibiting cell wall-based extracellular immunity.

Introduction

The Gram-negative bacterial pathogen Pseudomonas syringae can colonize the extracellular spaces between plant cells (i.e., the apoplast) of aerial plant tissue. P. syringae causes chlorotic lesions; however, because most P. syringae strains eventually cause some necrosis, they are generally designated as hemibiotrophs (Glazebrook, 2005). To grow in this niche and cause disease, P. syringae requires a type III protein secretion system, a molecular syringe that injects type III effector proteins into plant cells (Büttner, 2012). It now seems likely that most of these effectors suppress plant immunity, although the plant targets for the vast majority remain elusive (Block and Alfano, 2011; Dou and Zhou, 2012).

The plant immune system can be separated into two branches based on the microbial molecules that are recognized and the receptors that perceive them. The first branch uses extracellular pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) to recognize conserved microbial molecules known as pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs), which induce PAMP-triggered immunity (PTI; Zipfel, 2014). The second branch likely evolved after PTI and uses mostly intracellular nucleotide-binding/leucine-rich repeat (NLR) receptors historically known as resistance proteins, which recognize pathogen effectors inducing effector-triggered immunity (ETI; Cui et al., 2015). Both PTI and ETI induce a series of early immune responses such as reactive oxygen species (ROS) production, increase in intracellular calcium levels, phosphorylation events, gene expression, late immune responses such as callose (β-1,3-glucan) deposition in the cell wall, and secretion of pathogenesis-related (PR) proteins to the apoplast (Tsuda and Katagiri, 2010). The secretion of PR proteins to the apoplast is part of the cell wall-based extracellular immunity employed by the plant to combat extracellular pathogens.

To be pathogenic, P. syringae must suppress or circumvent PTI and ETI. Failure to avoid either of these likely accounts for much of the host specificity of P. syringae. A primary strategy P. syringae uses to suppress PTI and ETI is to inject into plant cells type III effectors that target immunity components at seemingly every conceivable stage of plant immunity. These include PRRs and NLR receptor complexes, mitogen-activated protein kinase pathways, transcription, RNA translation, vesicle trafficking, phytohormone production, and the plant cytoskeleton (Block and Alfano, 2011). Through natural selection, type III effectors have evolved to target crucial components of immunity and therefore are important specialized tools to probe plant immunity.

The microtubule network plays essential roles in eukaryotes, including cell shape determination, cell division, and organelar transport (de Forges et al., 2012). Microtubules are made up of heterodimers of α/β-tubulin polymers forming nanotube-like structures. They are nucleated at γ-tubulin complexes (Kollman et al., 2011) and exhibit dynamic instability—some regions are in a state of growth and others simultaneously in a state of shrinkage (Mitchison and Kirschner, 1984). Microtubule-associated proteins (MAPs), which include motor and non-motor proteins, help grow, break down, and rearrange microtubules to carry out specific cellular functions (Struk and Dhonukshe, 2014). One well-studied MAP is the MAP65/Ase1/PRC1 protein family, which is important for crosslinking anti-parallel microtubule bundles (Gaillard et al., 2008; Tulin et al., 2012). Relatively recently, the P. syringae type III effector HopZ1a was found to target tubulin (Lee et al., 2012), suggesting that the microtubule network is important for plant immunity.
HopE1 contributes to the virulence of P. syringae and suppresses PTI. (A) Arabidopsis plants were spray-inoculated with P. syringae pv. tomato (Pto) DC3000, a Pto DC3000 hrcC type III-defective mutant, a Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant, and a hopE1(Tn7-hopE1) complemented mutant. The experiments were repeated three times with similar results. Standard error bars are indicated. Different lowercase letters indicate statistical significance between treatments (p < 0.01). (B–F) Arabidopsis plants and two independent lines expressing HopE1-HA after treatment with flg22 (1 mM) were used in these experiments. (B) ROS production. Similar results were observed in four independent experiments. (C) Callose deposition. Leaf samples were stained with aniline blue, and callose deposits were visualized with fluorescence microscopy. (D) Quantification of callose deposits depicted in (C) using ImageJ. Values are means ± SEM of 40 fields of view. Similar results were seen in three independent experiments. Different letters in the graph indicate statistical significance between treatments (p < 0.001). (E and F) Gene expression of two PTI-induced genes, FRK1 (E) and NHL10 (F). Gene expressions of FRK1 and NHL10 were analyzed with qRT-PCR. The relative expression levels were normalized to mock-treated ACT2. Values are presented as means ± SEM. Experiments were repeated twice with similar results. See also Figure S1.

Here we report that the P. syringae pv. tomato (Pto) DC3000 effector HopE1 interacts with two Arabidopsis proteins—the calcium sensor calmodulin (CaM) and the microtubule-associated protein 65 (MAP65), a required component of the microtubule network. HopE1 dissociates MAP65-green fluorescent protein (GFP) from the microtubule network and inhibits secretion of an immunity-related protein. Arabidopsis map65 mutants exhibit enhanced susceptibility to P. syringae, reduced PTI responses, and reduced secretion of an immunity-related protein, indicating that MAP65 is a component of plant immunity.

Results

HopE1 Suppresses Plant Immunity and Contributes to Virulence

To evaluate HopE1’s contribution to P. syringae virulence, we generated a Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant. The Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant was significantly reduced in its ability to grow in Arabidopsis leaf tissue compared to wild-type Pto DC3000 (Figure 1A). The weak reduction in in planta growth of single type III effector mutants is likely due to functional redundancy of type III effectors. Reintroduction of hopE1 into the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant restored in planta growth to wild-type Pto DC3000 levels (Figure 1A). Next we made transgenic Arabidopsis plants that expressed HopE1 fused to a hemagglutinin (HA) epitope after estradiol treatment (Figure S1A). Arabidopsis plants expressing HopE1-HA were reduced in both flg22 (a peptide derived from the flagellin PAMP)-induced ROS and callose deposition (Figures 1B–1D). Similar results were observed when elf18 (a peptide derived from the EF-Tu PAMP) and chitin were used to induce PTI in these plants (Figures S1B and S1C). Additionally, we also evaluated PTI-related gene expression after flg22 treatment and found that transgenic expression of HopE1-HA suppressed expression of two genes known to be induced by PTI (Figures 1E and 1F). Finally, to test if bacterially injected HopE1 exhibited the ability to suppress plant immunity, we used a non-pathogenic P. fluorescens ( Pf) strain carrying pLN1965, a cosmid that encodes a functional P. syringae type III protein secretion system (Guo et al., 2009). Bacterially injected HopE1 also suppressed callose deposition, ROS production, and the expression of PTI-induced genes (Figures S1D–S1G). Collectively, these data indicate that HopE1 contributes to P. syringae virulence and suppresses multiple PTI responses.

HopE1 Interacts with Calmodulin

To better understand HopE1’s role in virulence, we screened for proteins that interacted with HopE1 using a yeast two-hybrid (Y2H) system. Only seven different HopE1 interactors were identified from three independent Y2H screens (Figure 2A; Table S1). Six of these proteins were CaM isoforms, which function as calcium sensors in eukaryotes (Poovaiah et al., 2013), and the seventh interactor was microtubule-associated protein MAP65-1, a non-motor microtubule-associated protein that belongs to the MAP65/Asel/PRC1 protein family (Walczak and Shaw, 2010).

To further validate the HopE1 and CaM interaction, we performed in vitro pull-down assays using CaM affinity resin. HopE1 fused to a six histidine tag (HopE1-His) was pulled down by the CaM resin (Figure 2B), indicating that HopE1-His interacts with CaM in vitro. The addition of the calcium chelator EGTA into the incubation mixture blocked the ability of CaM resin to pull down...
HopE1-His (Figure 2B), suggesting that the biologically active CaM form is required for CaM to interact with HopE1.

To determine if HopE1 interacts with CaM in planta, we performed bimolecular fluorescence complementation (BiFC) assays in Nicotiana benthamiana (Hu et al., 2002). We transiently co-expressed HopE1 fused with an N-terminal yellow fluorescence protein (YFP) fragment (HopE1-nYFP) with CaM1 fused with a C-terminal YFP fragment (CaM1-cYFP) in N. benthamiana leaves using agroinfiltration. Confocal images were taken 48 hr after infiltration. (D) An alignment of the putative CaM-binding site found in HopE1 with CaM-binding sites in representative Arabidopsis CaM-binding proteins. The asterisks indicate conserved hydrophobic amino acids that were mutated in HopE1 derivatives and used in experiments shown in this manuscript. (E) Yeast two-hybrid assays with CaM1 and HopE1 or HopE1 CaM-binding site mutants HopE1 L182A-His, HopE1 F178A-His, and HopE1 F184A-His were subjected to pull-down assays with CaM resin or N2 resin. Eluted samples were subjected to immunoblot analysis using anti-His antibodies. The vertical lines in the Pull-down and Input images indicate where immunoblots were spliced together. (F) Complementation of the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant with HopE1 CaM-binding site mutation derivatives. The experiments were repeated three times with similar results. Standard error bars are indicated. Different letters indicate the statistical significance (p < 0.05). See also Figure S2.

**HopE1’s CaM-Binding Site in Its C Terminus Is Required for Its Contribution to Virulence and Immunity Suppression**

We used BiFC assays with HopE1 derivatives to identify regions of HopE1 that bind to CaM. In these experiments we used agroinfiltration to transiently express HopE1 derivatives fused to nYFP with CaM1 fused to cYFP in N. benthamiana. We found that the HopE1-nYFP fusions that retained the ability to interact with CaM-cYFP all contained the C-terminal 52 amino acids of HopE1 (Figures S2C and S2D). Moreover, a HopE1-nYFP derivative that lacked amino acid residues 171–190 did not detectably interact with CaM-cYFP (Figures S2C and S2D). Interestingly, HopE1 L171-190 is amphipathic (Figure S2E) and shares weak sequence similarity to known CaM-binding sites of the Arabidopsis proteins CBP60g, WRKY7, and WRKY15 (Figure 2D) (Park et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2009). These data suggest that the CaM-binding site of HopE1 is within amino acid residues 171–190.

To determine if the putative CaM-binding site is required for the interaction between HopE1 and CaM1, Y2H constructs were made that encoded HopE1 derivatives containing single alanine substitutions in three different conserved hydrophobic amino acids in the putative CaM-binding site of HopE1. It has been demonstrated that analogous residues in other CaM-binding proteins are required to bind CaM (Park et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2009). All three HopE1 CaM-binding site mutants (HopE1 F178A, HopE1 L182A, and HopE1 F184A) displayed no detectable interaction with CaM1 in the Y2H system (Figure 2E). These hopE1 mutant constructs made similar amounts of HopE1 derivatives in yeast, as did the construct encoding wild-type HopE1 (Figure S2F). We expressed these HopE1 derivatives in E. coli, and in contrast to wild-type HopE1, these were not pulled down by the CaM resin (Figure 2B). Furthermore, the peptide corresponding to the CaM-binding site of HopE1 can form stable complexes with CaM in the presence of calcium, but not EGTA (Figures S2G and S2H). Collectively, these data suggest that the CaM1-binding site of HopE1 resides within amino acids 171–190.

To determine whether the HopE1-CaM interaction is required for HopE1’s contribution to P. syringae virulence, we complemented the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant with the HopE1 F178A, HopE1 L182A, and HopE1 F184A derivatives that contained site-directed...
mutations in HopE1’s CaM-binding site. These HopE1 derivatives were unable to complement the reduced growth phenotype of the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant (Figure 2F), suggesting that CaM is required for HopE1’s contribution to virulence. Furthermore, these HopE1 CaM-binding site mutants fused to nYFP did not interact with CaM1-cYFP in BiFC assays (Figures 2C and S2A). Finally, we made Arabidopsis transgenic plants that separately expressed each HopE1 site-directed mutant (Figure S2I). These plants were unable to suppress flg22-induced callose or ROS production (Figures S2J and S2K), suggesting that CaM is required for HopE1 to suppress PTI.

HopE1 Binds to MAP65 in a CaM-Dependent Manner

We hypothesized that CaM may be either a true virulence target for HopE1 or a required co-factor. To further investigate HopE1 plant targets, we turned our attention to MAP65-1, the other Arabidopsis protein that interacted with HopE1 in our Y2H screens. We first performed BiFC assays in N. benthamiana to determine the extent to which these proteins interact in vivo. Using agroinfiltration, HopE1-nYFP and full-length MAP65-1 fused with cYFP (MAP65-1-cYFP) showed strong BiFC fluorescence that displayed a localization pattern typical of microtubule bundles (Figures 3A and S3A). To further examine this interaction, in vitro pull-down assays were performed using bacterially expressed HopE1 fused to a Flag tag (HopE1-Flag) and MAP65-1-His. Recombinant HopE1-Flag did not pull down MAP65-1-His in detectable amounts (Figure S3B), leading us to speculate that HopE1 requires CaM as a co-factor to interact with MAP65-1. To test this, we performed pull-down experiments using CaM affinity resin to determine if recombinant MAP65-1 could be pulled down by CaM in the presence of HopE1-HA and found that CaM resin pulled down MAP65-1-HA only when HopE1-HA was present (Figure 3B). Next we tested whether the CaM-binding site of HopE1 is required for the HopE1-MAP65-1 interaction in these assays. The HopE1 CaM-binding site mutants HopE1F178A and HopE1F184A were unable to interact with MAP65-1 in BiFC, pull-down, and Y2H assays even though similar amounts of HopE1 were made (Figures 3A–3C and S3A–S3C). This finding suggests that CaM is required for the interaction between HopE1 and MAP65-1. To further test this idea, we performed BiFC assays between MAP65-1-nYFP and CaM1-cYFP in the presence or absence of HopE1-HA or the HopE1-HA CaM-binding site mutants. YFP fluorescence in N. benthamiana was detectable only if wild-type HopE1 was present (Figures 3D and S3D). These data suggest that HopE1, CaM, and MAP65-1 form a complex inside plant cells.

Arabidopsis possesses nine members of the MAP65 family, which share 28%–79% similarity at the protein level (Hussey et al., 2002). MAP65 is broadly conserved in eukaryotes (Hussey et al., 2002), and the nine Arabidopsis MAP65 members fall in the same clade in a phylogenetic tree of the MAP65/Ase1/PRC1 family (Figure S3E). Of these, only MAP65-1, MAP65-2, MAP65-5, and MAP65-9 interacted with HopE1 in BiFC assays in N. benthamiana (Figures 3A and S3F). GFP fusions to all MAP65 homologs indicated that each localized to microtubules (Figure S3G).
HopE1 Dissociates MAP65-1 from the Microtubule Network

MAP65/Ase1/PRC1 family members crosslink microtubules, which is important for a functional microtubule network (Walczak and Shaw, 2010). To test our hypothesis that HopE1 targets MAP65 to perturb the microtubule network, we generated transgenic Arabidopsis plants that constitutively expressed MAP65-1-GFP and crossed these with the transgenic HopE1-HA plants described above. We isolated progeny that expressed both MAP65-1-GFP and HopE1-HA, the latter being produced after treatment with estradiol. We evaluated MAP65-1-GFP fluorescence with confocal microscopy at different time points after HopE1-HA induction. Fluorescence was almost completely absent 50 hr after estradiol treatment, indicating that HopE1 reduced the MAP65-1-GFP signal from microtubules (Figure 4A). Importantly, the reduced MAP65-1-GFP signal did not result from the degradation of MAP65-1-GFP protein, as the amount of MAP65-1-GFP was similar in the presence or absence of HopE1-HA (Figure 4B). Therefore, the diminished MAP65-1-GFP signal was most likely due to the redistribution of MAP65-1-GFP throughout the cytoplasm. We believe this to be the case because at high magnification MAP65-1-GFP is present in the cytoplasm in tissue expressing wild-type HopE1-HA (Figure S4A). Additionally, we quantified the fluorescence intensity in 30 different plant cells for each sample and found that MAP65-1-GFP fluorescence was greatly reduced after HopE1-HA induction (Figure 4C). We also made transgenic Arabidopsis plants expressing MAP65-1-GFP and the HopE1 CaM-binding site mutants. Co-expression of the HopE1-HA CaM-binding site mutants did not alter MAP65-1-GFP microtubule localization and did not significantly reduce the MAP65-1-GFP signal (Figures 4A–4C and S4A). To determine if HopE1 has a more general effect on the microtubule network, we crossed the transgenic HopE1-expressing plants with plants that expressed MAP4-GFP, TUB6-GFP, TUA6-GFP, or EB1-GFP, other proteins associated with the microtubule network (Marc et al., 1998; Mathur et al., 2003; Nakamura et al., 2004; Takemoto et al., 2003). In contrast to MAP65-1-GFP, HopE1-HA had no effect on the fluorescence signal emanating from these GFP fusions (Figures S4B–S4I). Therefore, these data suggest that HopE1 dissociates MAP65-1-GFP from the microtubule network and does not appear to have an effect on other microtubule-associated proteins or on the microtubule network itself.

Phenotypes observed in transgenic plants overexpressing a protein may not accurately represent the activity of the protein in more natural conditions. To determine whether HopE1 injected by the type III protein secretion system has effects similar to those observed in HopE1-HA-expressing transgenic Arabidopsis plants, we infiltrated different Pto DC3000 strains into Arabidopsis plants expressing MAP65-1-GFP and evaluated the MAP65-1-GFP signal at different time intervals after infection. While the reduction in the GFP signal was not as robust as observed in transgenic HopE1-HA plants, the presence of HopE1 in Pto DC3000 strains with a functional type III protein secretion system caused a reduction of the MAP65-1-GFP signal (Figures 4D and 4E). Importantly, plants infiltrated with the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant did exhibit greater MAP65-1-GFP fluorescence compared to strains that produced HopE1 (Figures 4D and 4E). Wild-type HopE1-HA complemented the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant; however, the HopE1 CaM-binding site mutants did not (Figures 4D and 4E). The plants infected with the different bacterial strains produced similar amounts of MAP65-1-GFP throughout the time course (Figure S4J). The increased fluorescence in MAP65-1-GFP in plants infiltrated with the Pto DC3000 hrcC mutant compared to the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant suggests that other type III effectors in this strain may target the microtubule network (Figures 4D and 4E).

To evaluate HopE1’s effect on MAP65-1-GFP in the absence of other effectors, we again used the non-pathogenic Pf(pLN1965). MAP65-1-GFP plants were infiltrated with the Pf(pLN1965) strain with and without a plasmid construct encoding HopE1-HA. Significant decreases of MAP65-1-GFP fluorescence was observed in plants infiltrated with Pf(pLN1965)(hopE1-HA) compared to Pf(pLN1965) with a vector control (Figures S4K and S4L). Collectively, these results suggest that transgenically expressed or bacterially delivered HopE1 dissociates MAP65-1-GFP from the microtubule network.

HopE1 Inhibits Plant Protein Secretion

The microtubule network is involved in many processes in eukaryotes, including protein secretion (Boutté et al., 2007; Crowell et al., 2009). Because P. syringae is an extracellular pathogen present in the apoplast, we speculated that HopE1 may target MAP65 to inhibit protein secretion and cell wall-based extracellular immunity. To test if HopE1 inhibits protein secretion, we used two established protein secretion assays. The first utilized a GFP derivative (secGFP) fused at its N terminus to a secretion signal peptide from the immunity-related Arabidopsis protein PR-3 (Batoko et al., 2000; Haseloff et al., 1997; Zheng et al., 2004). In this assay, the secGFP fluorescence is stronger if secGFP remains cell-bound and diminishes upon its secretion to the extracellular milieu. Using agroinfiltrations, the secGFP reporter was transiently expressed in N. benthamiana alone, with HopE1-HA, or with one of the HopE1-HA CaM-binding site mutants. As shown in Figure 5A, the secGFP fluorescence was greater when HopE1 was present, even though the amount of secGFP present was similar in all leaf tissue samples (Figure 5B), indicating that wild-type HopE1 inhibits the secretion of secGFP. Inclusion of the HopE1-HA CaM-binding site mutants suggests that CaM is required for the inhibition of secGFP secretion by HopE1 (Figures 5A and 5B).

To substantiate this observation, we investigated the extent to which HopE1 inhibited the secretion of a specific immunity-related protein in plants. PR proteins such as PR-1, which are rapidly induced and accumulate in plants attacked by pathogens, play important roles in plant immunity (van Loon et al., 2006). PR-1 has been shown to be secreted to the apoplast as part of the immune response, and it has been used as a reporter for immunity-related secretion when plants are induced with SA or its analogs (Kalde et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2005). Strikingly, PR-1 levels were greatly reduced in extracellular fluid isolated from HopE1-expressing plants treated with SA compared to wild-type Arabidopsis (Figures 5C and 5SA). Wild-type levels of PR-1 were found in the extracellular fluid of Arabidopsis plants expressing HopE1 derivatives containing mutations in their CaM-binding sites (Figure 5C), suggesting that CaM is needed for the inhibition of PR-1 secretion. To test whether bacterially injected HopE1 also inhibited PR-1 secretion, we again used the non-pathogenic Pf(pLN1965) with a vector control, a construct encoding wild-type HopE1, or a construct encoding a HopE1 CaM-binding site mutant. PR-1 secretion was reduced only in the strain that also
Figure 4. HopE1 Dissociates MAP65-1 from Microtubules (A) Arabidopsis plants expressing MAP65-1-GFP alone or with HopE1-HA, HopE1<sub>F178A</sub>-HA, HopE1<sub>L182A</sub>-HA, or HopE1<sub>F184A</sub>-HA were treated with 20 mM estradiol. MAP65-1-GFP fluorescence was monitored with confocal microscopy at the indicated time points (hr, hours) after estradiol treatment. (B) Immunoblot analysis of MAP65-1-GFP and HopE1-HA, HopE1<sub>F178A</sub>-HA, HopE1<sub>L182A</sub>-HA, and HopE1<sub>F184A</sub>-HA from plants in (A). (C) Quantification of fluorescence intensity of MAP65-1-GFP from plants used in (A). Different lowercase letters indicate statistical significance between time points (p < 0.05). The values are means ± SEM, n = 30. (D) Arabidopsis MAP65-1-GFP transgenic plants were syringe-infiltrated with the following bacterial strains at 10<sup>7</sup> cells/ml: Pto DC3000, Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant, Pto DC3000 hopE1 (phopE1), hopE1 (phopE1<sub>F178A</sub>), hopE1 (phopE1<sub>L182A</sub>), hopE1 (phopE1<sub>F184A</sub>), and a type III-defective mutant hrcC. MAP65-1-GFP signals were monitored with confocal microscopy at the indicated time points (hr, hours) after infiltration. (E) Quantification of fluorescence intensity of MAP65-1-GFP from plants used in (D). Different lowercase letters indicate statistical significance between time points (p < 0.05). The values are means ± SEM, n = 30. See also Figure S4.
expressed wild-type HopE1-HA (Figure S5B). Together these results suggest that HopE1 inhibits the secretion of PR-1 in a CaM-dependent manner.

**Arabidopsis map65 Mutants Exhibit Enhanced Disease Susceptibility to *P. syringae* and Reduced PR-1 Secretion**

To assess whether MAP65 proteins are involved in plant immunity to bacteria, we determined if *map65* mutants were altered in PTI and susceptibility to *P. syringae*. We focused on MAP65-1 and MAP65-2 because MAP65-1 was identified in our Y2H screen and MAP65-2 is its closest homolog (Figure S3E) (Hussey et al., 2002). We obtained the *Arabidopsis* mutants *map65-1* and *map65-2*, and a *map65-1 map65-2* double mutant (Lucas et al., 2011). These plant mutants, along with wild-type *Arabidopsis*, were spray-inoculated with wild-type *Pto DC3000*. *Arabidopsis map65-1* and the double mutant exhibited enhanced susceptibility based on increased growth of *Pto DC3000* 3 days after inoculation, as well as enhanced disease symptom production (Figures 6A and 6B). The *map65-2* mutant was not significantly different from wild-type *Arabidopsis* in *P. syringae* susceptibility (Figures 6A and 6B) and callose deposition (Figure 6E). Thus, MAP65-2 may contribute subtly to immunity, and the ROS assay was perhaps sensitive enough to detect this contribution. We evaluated the gene expression of the *Arabidopsis* MAP65 gene family in leaf tissue and found that MAP65-1 and MAP65-4, and to a lesser extent MAP65-5, were induced by SA, suggesting that these MAP65 homologs may be more involved in plant immunity than the other family members (Figure S6). Next we evaluated *map65-1*, *map65-2*, and *map65-1 map65-2* mutant plants for PR-1 secretion. The *map65-1* and *map65-1 map65-2* plants, but not *map65-2*, showed reduced secretion of PR-1 to the extracellular milieu (Figure 6F). Together these results indicate that MAP65-1 plays an important role in protein secretion and plant immunity.

**Discussion**

We show here that HopE1 makes a substantial contribution to virulence, and, in addition to suppressing ETI (Guo et al., 2009; Jamir et al., 2004), it suppresses PTI (Figure 1), although the molecular mechanism by which it does is unknown. It does not
appear to function by destabilizing its target, as do several other
P. syringae type III effectors (Jiang et al., 2013; Nomura et al.,
2006; Shao et al., 2003), because MAP65-1 is stable in the pres-
ence of HopE1 (Figure 4B). However, the fact that it suppresses
both ETI and PTI suggests that it is acting on a component of
plant immunity used in both immunity types or that it targets
distinct components in each. Our finding that HopE1 targets
MAP65-1 and the microtubule network is consistent with HopE1
suppressing both PTI and ETI because the microtubule network
is likely important for both types of immunity.

MAP65/Ase1/PRC1 family members are non-motor microtu-
bule- associated proteins that play important roles in microtu-
bules by cross-linking them in antiparallel arrays (Gaillard et al.,
2008; Janson et al., 2007; Tulin et al., 2012). Together with the
kinesin motor proteins (Cross and McAinsh, 2014), which can
cross-link and move microtubules relative to one another, they
control the properties of microtubules. Mutants lacking MAP65/
Ase1/PRC1 family members have defects in microtubule cross-
linking and function (Loidodice et al., 2005; Yamashita et al., 2005).
Plants have multiple MAP65/ Ase1/PRC1 family members, unlike

Figure 6. MAP65 Is a Component of Plant Immunity (A) The growth of Pto DC3000 in Arabidop-
sis (Col-0) and map65 mutants. The experiments were repeated three times with similar
results. Standard error bars are indicated. Different letters indicate the statistical significance
(p < 0.05). (B) Disease symptom production in the plants used in (A). Pictures were taken 5
days after inoculation with Pto DC3000. (C) The growth of Pto DC3000 and hopE1 mutant
strains in wild-type Arabidopsis (Col-0) and the map65 mutants. The bacterial growth of the
indicated strains 3 days after inoculation is shown. The bacterial numbers of the strains at
day 0 were not significantly different. The experiments were repeated twice with similar re-
results. Values are means ± SEM, n = 4. Different letters indicate the statistical significance (p <
0.05). (D) Leaf disks were treated with flg22 (1 mM) and ROS production was determined. This
experiment was done three times with similar results. Standard error bars are indicated (n =
12). RLU, relative luminescence unit. (E) Callose deposition in Arabidopsis map65 mutants. The
values are means ± SEM, n = 40. Statistical sig-
nificance (p < 0.05) is indicated with different
letters. (F) PR-1 secretion in Arabidopsis map65 mutants. Samples were subjected to immuno-
blot analysis with anti-PR-1 antibodies. A Pon-
ceau S-stained membrane indicates equal load-
ing. See also Figure S6.
other eukaryotes that generally have only one. It is likely multiple MAP65 homologs are present in plants because microtubules play additional roles in plants compared to in other eukaryotes. Our results suggest that MAP65-1, and perhaps other MAP65 homologs, play roles in Arabidopsis immunity, most likely in their involvement in the secretion of immunity-related products to the apoplast at sites of pathogen ingress.

The cell cortex of plants is associated with interphase microtubules, called cortical microtubules, near the plasma membrane (Ehrhardt and Shaw, 2006), in contrast to the cell cortex of mammalian cells, which is mainly associated with actin (Pesen and Hoh, 2005). Cortical microtubules are required for cell and tissue morphogenesis and are associated with the targeted exocytosis of cell wall components (Lloyd, 2011). We show here that at least one MAP65 homolog is targeted by HopE1, that HopE1 can disrupt the secretion of secGFP (which contains the secretion signal from PR-3) and the immunity-related protein PR-1 (Figure 5), and that Arabidopsis map65-1 mutant (Figure 5), and that Arabidopsis map65-1 map65-2 double mutant has a wild-type-like microtubule network (Lucas et al., 2011). Thus, our hypothesis is that HopE1 subtly affects the microtubule network by targeting MAP65-1 and possibly other MAP65 homologs such that it dampens plant immunity, likely through the inhibition of protein secretion.

How might HopE1 disrupt MAP65 function? Our results suggest that HopE1 can dissociate MAP65-1-GFP from microtubules (Figure 4). Because MAP65 homologs have a microtubule-binding domain in their C termini (Smertenko et al., 2008), the simplest scenario is that HopE1 directly or indirectly modifies MAP65 so its microtubule-binding domain can no longer associate with microtubules. Phosphorylation of the C-terminal region in Arabidopsis and tobacco MAP65 homologs has been shown to reduce their ability to cross-link microtubules (Sasabe and Machida, 2006; Smertenko et al., 2006); therefore, HopE1 or the CaM/HopE1/MAP65 complex may directly or indirectly induce phosphorylation or another enzymatic modification of MAP65 to dissociate it from microtubules. Future studies will determine if HopE1 can modify MAP65 to perturb its function in the microtubule network. Additionally, because the Pto DC3000 hrcC mutant exhibited increased MAP65-1-GFP fluorescence compared to the Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant (Figure 4E), other type III effectors also may target MAP65 and/or microtubules; therefore, we will evaluate the ability of other Pto DC3000 type III effectors to target the microtubule network.

We found that the calcium sensor CaMs required for HopE1 to interact with MAP65 (Figure 3) and therefore acts as a co-factor for HopE1. No other plant pathogen effector has been shown to use CaM as a co-factor. Indeed, the only mammalian pathogen effectors known to use CaM as a co-factor are the Bordetella pertussis CyaA toxin (Wolff et al., 1980) and the Bacillus anthracis Anthrax edema factor toxin (Leppla, 1982), both nontype III adenylate cyclases. The fact that these adenylate cyclases co-opt CaMas a co-factor may not be that surprising since several mammalian adenylate cyclases also use CaM as a cofactor (Monneron et al., 1988). It seems likely that HopE1 acquired the use of CaM from plants since CaM is found only in eukaryotes. Because some plant MAPs use CaM as a co-factor, the genes encoding these represent a potential source for the CaM-binding site present in HopE1 (Bürstenbinder et al., 2013).

There are at least three possible reasons a requirement for calcium and CaM evolved for HopE1’s activation. First, because calcium levels increase when plant immunity is triggered (Poovaiah et al., 2013), linking HopE1 activation to calcium/CaM may be a way to ensure that HopE1 is not active inside host cells unless it has perceived the presence of a pathogen. Second, the CaM requirement may be a way to ensure that HopE1 would be a later-acting effector. There are examples of temporal regulation of Salmonella effectors inside mammalian cells (Kubori and Galán, 2003). Third, using CaM as a cofactor may be an evolutionary strategy to ensure that HopE1 is active only in host cells. Several P. syringae type III effectors have been shown to use cofactors that are present only in eukaryotic cells (Coaker et al., 2005; Giska et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2012; Li et al., 2013).

The plant immunity activation process begins with pathogen perception triggering signal transduction pathways, followed by transcriptional reprogramming, production of immunity-related products, and the delivery of these products to the apoplast, where P. syringae actually resides in the host. The underpinning mechanisms that deliver these products and the specific products important for resistance to bacterial pathogens remain largely unknown. Our finding that HopE1 co-opts CaM to target MAP65 and the microtubule network highlights the importance of the secretion of immunity-related products, cell wall-based extracellular immunity, and the apoplastic environment for the bacterial pathogenicity of plants.

Experimental Procedures

Bacterial Strains, Constructs, and Primers

The strains and constructs used in this study are listed in Table S2, and the primers used are listed in Table S3.

Construction of P. syringae DC3000 hopE1 Mutants

A modified unmarked mutagenesis strategy (Hause et al., 2004) was used to construct Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutants. Also see Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

Plant Materials

Following standard methods, transgenic A. thaliana Col-0 plants were generated by floral-dipping transformation with A. tumefaciens. Also see Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

In Planta Bacterial Growth Assay

Plant pathogenicity assays were done as previously described (Block et al., 2014). Also see Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

Agrobacterium-Mediated Transient Assays

Agrobacterium strains carrying binary constructs were infiltrated into N. benthamiana leaves at an OD600 of 0.8. Samples were harvested 48 hr after infiltration for either immunoblot analyses or imaging of fluorescence proteins using confocal microscopy.

Yeast Two-Hybrid Assay

PCR-amplified genes or desired DNA regions were cloned into
either the bait vector pGILDA or the prey vector pJG4-5. The resulting pGilda and pJG4-5 constructs were transformed into yeast strain EGY48(pSH18-34). To evaluate the activity of the lacZ reporter, the interactions were examined on galactose-Ura-His-Trp dropout medium containing X-gal (5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl-β-d-galactopyranoside). For cDNA library screening, hopE1 was cloned into pGilda, resulting in pLN504, which was transformed into the yeast strain EGY48(pSH18-34). The resulting yeast strain EGY48(pSH18-34)(pLN504) was transformed with an Arabidopsis cDNA library in pJG4-5 (Mackey et al., 2002). The interactors were screened based on their growth on galactose-Ura-His-Trp-Leu dropout medium.

**BiFC Assay**

For BiFC constructs, the appropriate DNAs were PCR-amplified with specific primer sets containing engineered 3’ restriction sites, along with the DNA regions corresponding to nYFP (1–155 amino acids) or cYFP (156–243 amino acids), including their stop codons and an introduced 50 restriction site. The gene-specific PCR products were digested with restriction enzymes and ligated with either nYFP or cYFP PCR products digested with the same restriction enzymes and the ligated products served as templates in PCR reactions. The fused DNA fragments were cloned into pENTR, and the resulting constructs were recombined with the binary destination construct pLN462 by LR reactions. The resulting plasmids were transformed into Agrobacterium C58C1. Agrobacterium strains carrying nYFP or cYFP fusion constructs were co-infiltrated into *N. benthamiana* leaves. The interaction was determined 48 hr after infiltration based on YFP fluorescence.

**ROS Production Assay**

ROS production was determined following a previously described protocol (Asai and Yoshioka, 2008). The intensity of ROS generation was determined by counting photons from L-012-mediated luminescence monitored with a Synergy 5 luminometer (BioTek).

**Callose Deposition Assay**

Callose deposition assays were done as previously described (Adam and Somerville, 1996). Also see Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

**Quantitative RT-PCR Analyses**

RNA was extracted with RNeasy miniprep kit (QIAGEN) following manufacturer’s instructions. cDNAs were synthesized using iScript reverse transcriptase- supermix for RT-PCR (Bio-Rad). qRT-PCR was performed using iTaq universal SYBR Green supermix (Bio-Rad) with a Bio-Rad CFX Connect Real-Time System. ACTIN2 was used as a reference gene for normalization of gene expression. The relative gene expression was determined by calculating with 2-ΔΔCT, and the normalized transcript levels were compared to wild-type Col-0.

**Immunoblot Analyses**

After separation with SDS-PAGE, proteins were blotted on PVDF membranes with a semi-wet transfer. Standard protocols were followed for immunoblotting. The following primary antibodies were purchased from commercial suppliers: anti-Flag, Sigma; anti-HA, Roche; anti-His, Invitrogen; anti-LexA, Pierce Antibodies; anti-PR-1, AgriSera; and anti-GFP, Abcam. All secondary antibodies conjugated with alkaline phosphatase were purchased from Sigma.

**CaM Affinity Resin Pull-Downs**

CaM affinity resins were purchased from Agilent Technologies. CaM pull-down assays were done by following manufacturer’s instructions. Also see Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

**Quantification of GFP Fluorescence Intensity**

The GFP fluorescence intensity was quantified with ImageJ. The fluorescence was quantified from three fields of view for each sample. In each, ten plant cells were used for quantification. Also see Supplemental Experimental Procedures.


Supplemental Information

Figure S1. Additional Evidence that HopE1 suppresses PTI, Related to Figure 1. (A) Immunoblot analysis of transgenic Arabidopsis lines that express HopE1-HA. Arabidopsis plants were treated with estradiol (20 μM) and after 24 hours plant tissue was harvested and subjected to immunoblot analysis with anti-HA antibodies. These plants were used in experiments described in Figs. 1B-F and S1B-C. (B-C) Experiments used Arabidopsis plants and transgenic lines (#12 & #16) of Arabidopsis expressing HopE1-HA. Plants were treated with elf18 (1 μM) or chitin (100 μg/ml). (B) Callose deposition in Arabidopsis (Col-0) and lines (#12 & #16) expressing HopE1-HA. The values are means ± SEM, n=40. Different lowercase letters in the graphs indicate statistical significance between treatments (P<0.01). Three independent experiments showed similar results. (C) ROS production in Arabidopsis (Col-0) and lines (#12 & #16) expressing HopE1-HA. Similar results were observed in four independent experiments. RLU, relative luminescence unit, n=24. The values are means ± SEM. (D) Immunoblots of Pseudomonas fluorescens(pLN1965) strains carrying pML123, phopE1, phopE1_F178A, phopE1_L182A, or phopE1_F184A. (E) Callose deposition in Arabidopsis plants infiltrated with the bacterial strains listed in (D). The values are means ± SEM, n=20. (F) ROS production in Arabidopsis plants infiltrated with the bacterial strains listed in (D). (G) Expression of two PTI-induced genes, FRK1 and NHL10 was determined in wild type Arabidopsis. Plants were infiltrated with the bacterial strains listed in (D) and gene expression of FRK1 and NHL10 was analyzed with qRT-PCR. The relative expression levels were normalized to mock-treated ACT2. Values are presented as means ± SEM. Experiments were repeated twice with similar results.
Figure S2. Delimiting HopE1’s CaM-binding Site, Related to Figure 2. (A) Immunoblots showing expression of constructs used in BiFC assay in Fig. 2C. (B) Localization of HopE1-GFP and CaM1-GFP in N. benthamiana. (C) A schematic representation of the HopE1-nYFP truncations used to identify regions of HopE1 that interact with CaM1-cYFP. Full-length (FL) HopE1-nYFP and HopE1-nYFP truncations were used in BiFC assays with CaM-
cYFP. A ‘+’ score indicates a visible YFP signal and a ‘-’ indicates no visible signal. (D) Interactions of HopE1-nYFP derivatives depicted in (C) with CaM1-cYFP in BiFC assays. (E) A helical wheel representation of the HopE1\textsubscript{171-190} truncation showing the amphipathicity of HopE1’s putative CaM-binding site. The asterisks indicate conserved hydrophobic amino acids that were mutated in HopE1 derivatives used in several experiments described in this paper. (F) Immunoblots of crude samples of the yeast strains used in yeast two-hybrid assays shown in Fig. 2E. (G-H) Gel mobility shift assay of HopE1’s CaM-binding site with CaM. Peptides corresponding to the CaM-binding site of HopE1 (HopE1\textsubscript{Pep}; G) and the CaM-binding site of Arabidopsis CBP60g (CBP60g\textsubscript{Pep}; H) were incubated with bovine CaM in the presence of 0.1 mM CaCl\textsubscript{2} (upper panels) or 2.0 mM EGTA (lower panels). (I) Immunoblot analysis of transgenic Arabidopsis lines that express HopE1-HA or one of the HopE1 CaM-binding site mutants HopE1\textsubscript{F178A}, HopE1\textsubscript{L182A}, and HopE1\textsubscript{F184A}. Samples were subjected to immunoblot analysis with anti-HA antibodies. (J-K) Experiments used Arabidopsis plants that express HopE1-HA, HopE1\textsubscript{F178A}, HopE1\textsubscript{L182A}, or HopE1\textsubscript{F184A} treated with 1 \textmu M flg22. (J) Callose deposition in Arabidopsis plants that express HopE1-HA or one of the HopE1-HA CaM-binding site mutants. (K) ROS production in Arabidopsis plants that express HopE1-HA or one of the HopE1-HA CaM-binding site mutants. RLU, relative luminescence unit, n=24.
Figure S3. HopE1 can Interact with a Subset of MAP65 Family Members, Related to Figure 3. (A) Immunoblots showing expression of proteins used in BiFC assay in Fig. 3A. (B) Bacterially-expressed HopE1 and MAP65-1 do not interact with each other. Crude extracts from an E. coli culture expressing HopE1-Flag and MAP65-1-His were used in pull-down assays using anti-Flag resin. (C) Immunoblots showing expression of MAP65-1 and HopE1 derivatives in yeast strains used in Fig. 3C. (D) Immunoblots showing expression of proteins
used in BiFC assay in Fig. 3D. (E) A phylogenetic tree showing different clades of the MAP65/Ase1/PRC1 family. (F) HopE1 interacts with a subset of MAP65 family members in BiFC assays. All nine MAP65 homologs from Arabidopsis were cloned into the binary vector pLN462, which results in each being fused with cYFP. These were co-expressed with HopE1-nYFP in *N. benthamiana* using agroinfiltrations. (G) Localization of Arabidopsis MAP65 family proteins in plant cells using C-terminal GFP fusions.
Figure S4. HopE1 Dissociates MAP65-1-GFP from Microtubules, but not MAP4-GFP, TUB6-GFP, TUA6-GFP, or EB1-GFP, Related to Figure 4. (A) 25X magnification of the micrographs from Fig. 4A (at 50 hour time point). (B, D, F, & H) Arabidopsis transgenic plants expressing a microtubule-related GFP fusion protein only or with HopE1-HA were treated with estradiol to induce HopE1-HA production and GFP fluorescence was monitored with confocal microscopy at the indicated times (hours). (C, E, G, & I) Crude extracts were prepared from Arabidopsis tissues at the indicated time points (hours) after estradiol treatment and used in immunoblots with anti-GFP and anti-HA antibodies. (B) MAP4-GFP fluorescence with or without HopE1. (C) Immunoblot analysis of MAP4-GFP and HopE1-HA. (D) TUB6-GFP fluorescence with or without HopE1. (E) Immunoblot analysis of TUB6-GFP and HopE1-HA. (F) TUA6-GFP fluorescence with or without HopE1. (G) Immunoblot analysis of TUA6-GFP and HopE1-HA. (H) EB1-GFP fluorescence with or without HopE1. (I) Immunoblot analysis of EB1-GFP and HopE1-HA. (J) Immunoblot analysis of samples from transgenic Arabidopsis plants expressing MAP65-1-GFP infiltrated with Pto DC3000, Pto DC3000 hopE1 mutant, hopE1(phopE1), hopE1(phopE1_F178A), hopE1(phopE1_L182A), hopE1(phopE1_F184A), or the type III-defective hrcC mutant. These samples were from the leaf tissue used for the micrographs shown in Fig. 4D. (K) Arabidopsis MAP65-1-GFP transgenic plants were syringe-infiltrated with *P. fluorescens* (pLN1965) with or without *phopE1* at $10^7$ cells/ml. This strain produces a functional type III system and injects HopE1 into plant cells. MAP65-1-GFP was monitored with confocal microscopy at the indicated time points (in hours) after infiltration. (L) Quantification of MAP65-GFP fluorescent signal in the plants used in panel (K). Different lowercase letters indicate statistical significance between time points (P<0.05). The values are means ± SEM, n=30.
Figure S5. PR-1 Secretion is Inhibited by HopE1, Related to Figure 5. (A) Arabidopsis Col-0 and transgenic Arabidopsis expressing HopE1-HA were treated with estradiol. After 24 hours, the plants were treated with SA (200 μM) or H2O as a mock control. (B) PR-1 secretion is inhibited by bacterially delivered HopE1. Arabidopsis Col-0 was infiltrated with *P. fluorescens* (pLN1965) strains carrying pML123, *hopE1*, *hopE1F178A*, *hopE1L182A*, *hopE1F184A*. (A & B), Leaves were vacuum-infiltrated with PBS (pH 7.4) at the time of infiltration and/or after 24 hours. Extracellular fluids were collected from vacuum-infiltrated leaves by centrifugation. Anti-HA and anti-PR-1 antibodies were used to detect HopE1-HA and PR-1, respectively. A Ponceau S stain of the membrane is shown to evaluate the relative protein levels of the samples.
Figure S6. Additional evidence that MAP65-1 is a component of plant immunity, Related to Figure 6. MAP65 gene expression as measured by quantitative RT-PCR after salicylic acid (SA) or mock treatments. Statistical significance was analyzed by student t-test ($P < 0.05$). Standard error bars are indicated. Similar results were observed in three independent experiments.
Table S1. HopE1 Interacts with Calmodulins and MAP65-1 in Yeast Two-hybrid Screens, Related to Experimental Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT5G37780</td>
<td>Calmodulin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT3G56800</td>
<td>Calmodulin 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT1G66410</td>
<td>Calmodulin 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT2G27030</td>
<td>Calmodulin 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT5G21274</td>
<td>Calmodulin 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT3G43810</td>
<td>Calmodulin 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT5G55230</td>
<td>Microtubule-associated protein 65-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2. Plasmids and Strains Used in This Study, Related to Experimental Procedures.

Table S3. Primers Used for Cloning and RT-PCR, Related to Experimental Procedures.
Supplemental Experimental Procedures

Construction of *P. syringae* DC3000 *hopE1* Mutants
Upstream and downstream DNA regions from the *hopE1* gene were PCR-amplified with Pfu polymerase (Stratagene), then cloned into the pENTR-D TOPO vector (Invitrogen). The resulting pENTR constructs were recombined with suicidal designation vectors pMK2016 and pMK2017 by LR reactions, respectively. Both pMK2016- and pMK2017-derived constructs were integrated into the *Pti* DC3000 chromosome by homologous recombination by tri-parental or bi-parental mating. The *hopE1* deletion mutants were selected for by screening putative mutants for the loss of both spectinomycin and tetracyclin resistance. The strains containing *hopE1* deletions were then grown on sucrose containing King’s B (KB)(King et al., 1954) plates for counter-selection of pHP474.

Plant Materials
Double transgenic plants expressing 35S-MAP65-1-GFP and HopE1-HA, HopE1_F178A-HA, HopE1_L182A-HA, or HopE1_F184A-HA under estradiol inducible promoter were made by crossing individual transgenic lines. All Arabidopsis plants were grown at 24°C with 10 hours of light/day in micro-climate controlled growth chambers. *N. benthamiana* plants were grown in standard greenhouses.

In planta Bacterial Growth Assay
Overnight cultures of *P. syringae* strains grown on KB agar were resuspended to a cell density of 10⁶ cells/ml in 10 mM MgCl₂. Five-week-old Arabidopsis plants were spray-inoculated with bacterial suspensions containing 0.002% Silwet L-77™. Leaf disks of 0.3 cm in diameter were punched with a cork borer at the indicated times after inoculations. The samples were ground in sterile distilled water, and 10-fold serial dilutions were plated on KB agar plates. The bacteria were enumerated after 2-3 days at 30°C.

Callose Deposition Assay and Quantification of Callose
For callose examination, five-week-old Arabidopsis or transgenic plant leaves were infiltrated with flg22 (1 μM), elf18 (1 μM), or 100 μg/ml chitin using a needleless syringe. For callose assay with *P. fluorescens* (*Pf*) (pLN1965) strains, Arabidopsis leaves were infiltrated with *Pf* (pLN1965) strains carrying *phopE1*, *phopE1_F178A*, *phopE1_L182A*, *phopE1_F184A*, and a vector control at 10⁷ cells/ml. The callose deposits were stained with aniline blue and visualized by capturing images with a Zeiss Axiosplan 2 microscope. The numbers of callose deposits were quantified using ImageJ (http://imagej.nih.gov/ij/). Briefly, the callose image files were opened with ImageJ. The menu Image/Type/8-bit was selected to convert the callose picture into an 8-bit grey picture. Then the Image/Adjust/threshold was selected to adjust threshold to the level that shows red dots close to the proximity of the callose foci in the original color pictures. Next Analyze/Analyze Particles was selected, followed by the selection of the setting criteria Size and Summary. The summarized data were then pasted into an Excel worksheet for further statistical analysis.

Quantification of GFP Fluorescence Intensity
MAP65-1-GFP transgenic plants or transgenic plants expressing both MAP65-1-GFP and HopE1-HA and HopE1 calmodulin (CaM)- binding site mutant derivatives were treated with 20 μM estradiol to induce HopE1-HA. The GFP fluorescence was monitored with confocal microscope by capturing images at indicated time points after induction. The GFP fluorescence intensity was quantified with ImageJ. The fluorescence was quantified from 3 fields of view for each sample. In each, 10 plant cells were used for quantification. Briefly, the GFP images files are open with ImageJ (http://imagej.nih.gov/ij/). The menu Image/Split channels is selected if the images contain multiple channels. Then the green channel pictures are selected. The cells of interest are selected using any of the drawing/selection tools (i.e., rectangle, circle, polygon, or freeform). Set Measurements is selected from the Analyze menu. AREA, INTEGRATED DENSITY and MEAN GRAY VALUE are selected from the popup menu. The menu Measure is selected from the Analyze menu. A popup box shows a stack of values for that first cell. The same process is repeated to measure the other cells. All the data in the Results window can be copied and pasted into a new excel worksheet for further statistical analysis.

CaM Affinity Resin Pull-downs
Protein samples were incubated with CaM affinity resin (Agilent Technologies) for 4 hours. Resin samples were washed 3 times with binding buffer to remove unbound proteins. The bound proteins were eluted by washing with
50 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 2 mM EGTA, pH 7.5. For bacterial protein samples, E. coli BL21 carrying pLN4420 that expresses HopE1-His was grown in liquid LM with antibiotics until the culture reached an OD_{600} of 0.6 and then was induced with IPTG (1 mM) and grown an additional 3 hours. The cultures were resuspended with binding buffer (50 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 2 mM CaCl_2, pH7.5) or the same buffer containing 2 mM EGTA. Cell suspensions were lysed by sonication and cleared by centrifugation at 10,000 rpm for 20 min. For plant protein samples, N. benthamiana leaves were infiltrated with Agrobacterium strains carrying plasmids expressing HopE1-HA, MAP65-1-HA, or co-infiltrated with both strains. Transformed leaves were ground in liquid nitrogen and resuspended in binding buffer. The samples were then clarified by centrifugation at 12,000 rpm at 4°C.

**In vitro CaM-Binding Assay**

The *in vitro* binding of synthetic peptides with CaM was determined using a previously reported gel mobility shift assay with some modification (Arazi et al., 1995; Yang et al., 2010). Briefly, peptides corresponding to the HopE1 or CBP60g CaM-binding sites were synthesized by Sigma. Bovine CaM at 125 nM (Sigma) was incubated with the HopE1 peptide or CBP60g peptide at different molar ratios (0, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, and 3.0) in 100 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.2, and containing either 0.1 mM CaCl_2 or 2 mM EGTA in a total volume of 40 μl at room temperature for 1h. The mixtures were subjected to a 4-15% gradient native PAGE (Bio-Rad) followed by standard Coomassie blue staining.

**Supplemental References**


