Responses to drought stress modulate the susceptibility to *Plasmopara viticola* in grapevine

Lisa Heyman

Universiteit Gent

Antonios Chrysargyris

Cyprus University of Technology

Kristof Demeestere

Universiteit Gent

Nikolaos Tzortzakis

Cyprus University of Technology

Monica Höfte (✉ monica.hofte@ugent.be)

Universiteit Gent <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0850-3249>

Research article

Keywords: Climate change, irrigation, drought stress, biotic stress, grapevine, downy mildew, *Plasmopara viticola*, phytohormones, oxidative stress, abscisic acid

Posted Date: November 12th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-54575/v2>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background

Climate change will increase the occurrence of plants simultaneously suffering drought and pathogen stress. Although it is well-known that drought can alter the way plants respond to pathogens, knowledge about the effect of concurrent drought and biotic stress in grapevine is scarce. This is especially true for *Plasmopara viticola*, the causal agent of grapevine downy mildew. This research addresses how vines with different drought tolerance respond to the challenge with *P. viticola*, drought stress or their combination, and how one stress affects the other.

Results

Artificial inoculation was performed on two cultivars, exposed to full or deficit irrigation, in the Mediterranean climate of Cyprus. In parallel, leaf disks from these plants were inoculated in controlled conditions. Leaves were sampled at an early infection stage to determine the influence of the single and combined stresses on oxidative parameters, chlorophyll, and phytohormones. Under irrigation, the local Cypriot cultivar Xynisteri was more susceptible to *P. viticola* than the drought-sensitive Chardonnay. The successful infection by *P. viticola* at 1.5 days post inoculation was associated with high levels of indole-3-acetic acid (IAA), salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA), and proline and strong decreases in antioxidant enzyme activity. Drought, on the other hand, triggered the accumulation of IAA and abscisic acid (ABA), which antagonized JA and SA. Exposure to drought stress increased the susceptibility to *P. viticola* of the leaves inoculated in controlled conditions. Conversely, both cultivars showed resistance against *P. viticola* when inoculated *in planta* under continued deficit irrigation. Despite their resistance, the pathogen-associated responses in IAA, antioxidant enzyme activity, and proline still occurred in these drought-stressed plants. Surprisingly, abscisic acid, rather than the generally implicated jasmonic and salicylic acid, seemed to play a prominent role in this resistance.

Conclusions

Drought exposure increased the susceptibility of *in vitro* inoculated leaves. Conversely, deficit irrigation induced resistance to *P. viticola* in both Chardonnay and Xynisteri when inoculated *in planta*. ABA, rather than JA and SA, was implicated in this resistance. The irrigation-dependent susceptibility highlights that the changing climate and the practices used to mitigate its effects, may have a profound impact on plant pathogens.

Main Conclusion

Plasmopara viticola cannot successfully infect intact, drought-stressed grapevine. ABA, rather than JA and SA, is implicated in this resistance. Conversely, drought exposure increased the susceptibility of *in vitro* inoculated leaves.

Background

The global climate is changing. The ongoing rising temperatures, shifting precipitation patterns, and changing frequency of extreme weather events, such as droughts, are putting a significant strain on many ecosystems [1]. Many viticultural areas are already suffering from seasonal drought and water availability may become the bottleneck of wine production. The Mediterranean, a hotspot for wine production, is one of the world's regions most vulnerable to the impact of climate change [2]. Global warming is very likely to aggravate soil moisture drying in this region, augmenting the intensity and frequency of the drought episodes [2].

In the Eastern Mediterranean, the island of Cyprus is known for its hot, arid summers. Its mean annual precipitation is projected to decline by more than 20% by mid-century [3]. Viticulture has played an important role in Cyprus for over 5,500 years [4]. In 2017, vineyards covered 5% of the agricultural area [5]. With only 11% of the vine area under irrigation [5], most indigenous cultivars can be grown without irrigation. Drought tolerance has been an important selection criterion for these local grapevine cultivars. Since the end of the 20th century, however, the international market pushed Cyprus towards the use of commercial cultivars. These introduced cultivars require more water and fertilizers because they are not adapted to the less fertile soils and the arid conditions in Cyprus [6].

The changing climate will also significantly affect plant pathogens' traits, such as distribution, virulence, abundance, and host range [7, 8]. This will increase the likelihood of a combined occurrence of drought and pathogen stress, already a very common event [9]. The complexity of the interactions between plant and pathogen gains another dimension when exposed to drought stress, resulting in a new state of stress [10]. Because of overlap and crosstalk between the responses to the individual stresses, this new stress will instigate tailored responses, customized to this specific stress combination [11]. Thus, the response to the concurrent challenge cannot simply be interpolated from the independent stress response [9, 11–15].

The net outcome of the host-pathogen interaction under drought conditions is dependent on plant genotype, the nature of the pathogens, and the timing, severity, and duration of the stress [16–19]. Concurrent drought stress most often aggravates disease [20, 21], yet it can also trigger resistance [22, 23]. In grapevine, a lot of research has been done on drought stress, but less is known about pathogen stress and there is almost no knowledge about the simultaneous occurrence of drought and pathogen stress [24]. A few studies provide information about subsequent, rather than simultaneous, drought and pathogen stress, after inoculation with *Plasmopara viticola* on intact plants [25] or with *Botrytis cinerea* on detached leaves [26].

The current study aimed to gain more insight into the mechanisms underlying drought and pathogen stress, both individually and simultaneously, and the influence of their interplay on disease susceptibility. Fully irrigated and drought-stressed vines were artificially inoculated with *P. viticola*. This obligate biotroph causes grapevine downy mildew, one of the most important diseases in European viticulture [27,

28]. Interaction between both stresses is to be expected, since the stomata, the site of entry of *P. viticola*, are the plants' first line of defense against drought stress. *P. viticola* can manipulate stomatal behavior [29], facilitating the infection and thus potentially altering the drought response. The experiment was conducted using an introduced cultivar (Chardonnay) and a drought-tolerant, indigenous cultivar (Xynisteri) in the natural, hot and dry climate of Cyprus.

Results

Experimental set-up

The experimental set-up is given in Fig. 1. More details can be found in Materials and Methods.

Basal differences between cultivars

Fig. 2 represents the basal content of hormones, chlorophylls, and oxidative parameters in drought-tolerant Xynisteri and drought-sensitive Chardonnay plants without abiotic or biotic stress (control treatments of the full irrigation – see Fig. 1). Strikingly, in Chardonnay, the abscisic acid (ABA) and salicylic acid (SA) levels were more than double and the levels of chlorophyll a (Chl a) and chlorophyll b (Chl b) almost double the levels of Xynisteri. The H₂O₂ content tended to be slightly elevated in Chardonnay. In contrast, the peroxidase (POD) and superoxide dismutase (SOD) activities and the indole-3-acetic acid (IAA) and proline content were significantly higher in Xynisteri than in Chardonnay. The malondialdehyde (MDA) content tended to be slightly higher in Xynisteri. For the catalase (CAT) activity and jasmonic acid (JA) content, no significant differences were observed between the cultivars.

Effect of drought stress on disease susceptibility

Previous exposure - in vitro inoculation

To assess the effect of a previous exposure to drought stress on the susceptibility to *P. viticola*, Xynisteri and Chardonnay plants were first exposed to full or deficit irrigation, either for 7 or 14 days of irrigation treatment (dot), before the *in vitro* inoculation of leaf disks with the pathogen (previous exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). The disease evaluation of the leaf disks is shown in Fig. 3a. When watered sufficiently (full irrigation), Xynisteri showed a significantly higher disease severity than Chardonnay. On disks from non-stressed Chardonnay plants, almost no sporulation was present. However, Chardonnay leaf disks became more susceptible to *P. viticola* when exposed to 7 days of deficit irrigation. On Xynisteri leaf disks, *P. viticola* was able to develop fast, irrespective of this exposure to drought stress. As the duration of the previous drought exposure increased from 7 to 14 days, the disease severity increased in both cultivars. Especially in Chardonnay, the longer exposure to drought stress drastically enhanced susceptibility, reaching a level similar to Xynisteri.

Continuous exposure - in planta inoculation

In parallel, the effect of continuous exposure to drought stress on the susceptibility to *P. viticola* was examined. Chardonnay and Xynisteri plants were subjected either to 7 or 14 days of full or deficit irrigation, before being sprayed with a *P. viticola* sporangia suspension or distilled water (continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). The disease evaluation of the plants is shown in Fig. 3b. The irrigation regime was maintained until the moment of disease evaluation, at 7 days post inoculation (dpi). Interestingly, in fully irrigated conditions, the indigenous cultivar Xynisteri showed more severe symptoms than the introduced cultivar Chardonnay. While the fully irrigated plants showed clear disease symptoms, the symptoms on plants challenged with a short drought stress (7 days of deficit irrigation prior to inoculation) remained almost completely absent. Comparing deficit-irrigated plants inoculated at 7 and 14 dpi, the resistance to *P. viticola* did not significantly change with longer exposure to deficit irrigation before inoculation.

Field measurements

Single drought stress

Fig. 4 shows how the stomatal conductance, chlorophyll fluorescence, and soil plant analysis development (SPAD) measurements changed in response to a short (9 dpi) or prolonged (16 dpi) irrigation treatment, whether or not combined with *P. viticola* inoculation. The statistical analyses of the single stress treatments are indicated in Additional file 1: Table S1. The temporal changes in the physiological parameters during drought stress are presented in Additional file 2: Fig. S1. The drought stress had a profound effect on the leaf stomatal conductance. After three days of deficit irrigation, the stomatal conductance had already plummeted in both cultivars (Additional file 2: Fig. S1). The drought stress (Fig. 4, FI + Ctrl $\varnothing$ vs DI + Ctrl $\varnothing$) did not affect the SPAD values, initially (9 dpi), though a slight reduction was observed during prolonged drought stress (16 dpi) for Chardonnay. The chlorophyll fluorescence increased significantly in Xynisteri, but not in Chardonnay, after 3 and 7 days of deficit irrigation (Additional file 2: Fig. S1). After 14 days of prolonged stress, the drought caused the chlorophyll fluorescence to decrease sharply in both cultivars. The higher loss of chlorophyll fluorescence at 16 dpi in Chardonnay indicates this cultivar suffered more than Xynisteri (Fig. 4).

Single pathogen stress

No significant differences in the physiological parameters were observed between plants inoculated with water and plants inoculated with *P. viticola* for the same irrigation regime (Additional file 1: Table S1). However, an increasing trend in the stomatal conductance due to the pathogen infection was observed at 16 dpi (Fig. 4, $\varnothing$ FI + Ctrl vs $\varnothing$ FI + Path). The SPAD values were slightly lower in the pathogen-inoculated compared to the water-inoculated plants at 1.5 dpi.

Combined stress

When both stresses were combined (Fig. 4, ¢ DI + Path), the net effect on the physiological parameters was comparable to the strong effect of drought stress. The physiological parameters were not statistically different between drought-stressed plants with and without the pathogen (not shown). Xynisteri demonstrated a slightly higher stomatal conductance in plants under combined stress compared to plants under single drought stress. Conversely, a slightly lower stomatal conductance was found in Chardonnay under combined drought stress. Furthermore, the chlorophyll fluorescence seemed to decrease in Xynisteri, but not in Chardonnay, under combined stress compared to single drought stress.

Phytohormone balance

Single drought stress

Fig. 5 shows how drought and pathogen stress affect phytohormone content (continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). The statistical analysis of the single stress treatments is indicated in Additional file 1: Table S1. Interactions between the cultivar, pathogen stress, and irrigation and its duration were analyzed with a regression model (Additional file 3: Table S2, Additional file 4: Table S3). A short (9 dot) or prolonged (16 dot) deficit irrigation had a profound effect on the phytohormone balance (Fig. 5, ¢ FI + Ctrl vs ¢ DI + Ctrl). The drought stress caused significantly increased ABA and decreased JA levels in both cultivars, resulting in similar levels. Considering the large basal differences in ABA, Xynisteri was producing much more ABA than Chardonnay in response to drought. Indeed, the ABA response to the drought stress was likely to be cultivar-dependent (Additional file 3: Table S2). Moreover, the ABA levels seemed to increase when the drought stress prolonged. Drought stress was also related to a significant increase in IAA in both cultivars, which seemed to be higher as the drought stress prolonged. Finally, the SA response to the drought stress was significantly dependent on the cultivar (Additional file 3: Table S2). Chardonnay responded to drought stress by dropping its SA content, especially at 16 dot (Additional file 1: Table S1), while still maintaining levels higher than Xynisteri. No clear SA response to drought was observed for Xynisteri (Fig. 5).

Single pathogen stress

To assess the hormonal changes in the cultivars upon pathogen infection, plants were sprayed with water or *P. viticola* inoculum. Hormone analysis was performed on samples taken at 1.5 dpi from fully irrigated plants (Fig. 5, ¢ FI + Ctrl vs ¢ FI + Path). Independent repetitions occurred at 9 and 16 dot, with only a slight change in plant age. Although Xynisteri was more susceptible to *P. viticola* than Chardonnay, the hormonal responses of the cultivars to the pathogen were similar. Compared to water-sprayed plants, the pathogen-inoculated plants accumulated more JA and IAA (Fig. 5). In the linear regression, there are indications that IAA is positively affected by the interaction with the pathogen, at least in Xynisteri

(Additional file 4: Table S3). The SA levels seemed slightly elevated and the level of ABA remained unaffected by the pathogen (Fig. 5).

Combined stress

The cultivars were subjected to 7 or 14 days of deficit irrigation, before being sprayed with water or *P. viticola* inoculum, to determine the combined effect of abiotic and biotic stress. The irrigation regime was maintained and samples for analysis were taken 1.5 dpi at 9 or 16 dot (Fig. 5, ¢ DI + Path). Interestingly, the ABA levels, already strongly increased due to drought, rose even more 1.5 days after inoculation with the pathogen. The interaction between pathogen and drought stress was highly significant for ABA (Additional file 3: Table S2). The additional ABA accumulation indicated that drought-stressed plants responded to the pathogen, although no symptoms were observed under drought stress (Fig. 3b). Similarly, an increasing trend in IAA was observed in drought-stressed Xynisteri, already demonstrating higher levels of IAA due to the drought. In drought-stressed Chardonnay, the presence of the pathogen did not cause an additional rise in IAA. A significant interaction between drought and pathogen stress was also observed for JA (Additional file 3: Table S2). The accumulation of JA in response to the pathogen in fully irrigated plants, disappeared when deficit irrigation was applied (Fig. 5). A similar trend was observed for SA.

Chlorophylls and oxidative balance

Single drought stress

Fig. 6 demonstrates the impact of drought and pathogen stress on the chlorophyll content and oxidative parameters (continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). The statistical analysis of the single stress treatments is indicated in Supplementary Table S1 (Additional file 1: Table S1). The interactions between cultivar, pathogen stress, and irrigation and its duration were analyzed with a regression model (Additional file 3: Table S2, Additional file 4: Table S3). To assess how short and prolonged drought stress affect the cultivars, plants were subjected to full or deficit irrigation for 9 or 16 days, before samples were collected for analysis of the chlorophyll content and the oxidative parameters (Fig. 6, ¢ FI + Ctrl vs ¢ DI + Ctrl). Even when drought-stressed, the basally higher activities of SOD and POD in Xynisteri were maintained, just as the chlorophyll levels in Chardonnay remained significantly higher than in Xynisteri. At first, the POD activity increased and the MDA content decreased in Xynisteri in response to drought stress (9 dot), while the chlorophyll, SOD, and CAT activity tended to be elevated. However, when the drought stress persisted (16 dot), the POD and SOD activity seemed to diminish, and the H₂O₂ levels to rise. Xynisteri's response did no longer include changes in chlorophyll or MDA content or CAT activity.

This response of Xynisteri to 16 days of deficit irrigation, was comparable to the earlier response of Chardonnay to 9 days of irrigation. The only difference in drought response between Chardonnay at 9 dot and Xynisteri at 16 dot, was the trend for the CAT activity. While the CAT activity dropped significantly in Chardonnay at 9 dot (Additional file 1: Table S1), it remained unchanged in Xynisteri at 16 dot. Continued drought stress (16 dot) eventually caused a significant increase in SOD activity in Chardonnay (Additional file 1: Table S1). Its chlorophyll content seemed to lower and the MDA content and POD and CAT activity seemed to increase.

Single pathogen stress

To determine how the cultivars responded to *P. viticola*, the plants were sprayed with water or pathogen inoculum. The samples for analysis were taken from fully irrigated plants 1.5 dpi (Fig. 6, ¢ FI + Ctrl vs ¢ FI + Path). In this case, both time points (9 or 16 dot) could be seen as a repetition, with only a small change in plant age. Despite their difference in disease severity (Fig. 3b), the responses of the cultivars to the pathogen were similar concerning the parameters tested. The CAT activities were lowered significantly and a decrease was observed for the SOD and POD activities. What stood out most, was the significant burst in proline associated with the pathogen-inoculated plants (Additional file 1: Table S1), especially at 16 dot. At 16 dot, the MDA content rose and the chlorophyll level decreased slightly, the SOD activity was significantly reduced in Xynisteri and the H₂O₂ content seemed to go up in Chardonnay.

Combined stress

To examine the combined effect of both abiotic and biotic stress, the plants were subjected to 7 or 14 days of deficit irrigation, before being sprayed with water or *P. viticola* inoculum. The irrigation regime was maintained and samples for analysis were taken 1.5 dpi at 9 or 16 dot (Fig. 6, ¢ DI + Path). Mostly, the responses of deficit and fully irrigated plants to the pathogen were similar. As the drought prolonged (16 dot) in Chardonnay, however, the chlorophyll content seemed to increase with pathogen inoculation, while it seemed to decrease in full irrigation. Similarly, in Xynisteri, the combination of prolonged drought and pathogen stress seemed to buffer Xynisteri against loss of chlorophyll levels by pathogen stress (Fig. 6). Indeed, for chlorophyll, the interaction between abiotic stress, its duration, and biotic stress is significant (Additional file 3: Table S2). Thus, the chlorophyll loss at 1.5 dpi in Xynisteri might be associated with the successful infection by *P. viticola*. The MDA response to the pathogen depended primarily on the interaction with cultivar, drought stress, and its duration (Additional file 3: Table S2). MDA too seemed rather associated with successful infection: MDA increased in fully irrigated plants at 16 dot when inoculated with the pathogen. Deficit-irrigated, inoculated plants at 16 dot exhibited levels of MDA similar to the non-inoculated plants (Fig. 6).

The CAT and POD activities were significantly reduced in pathogen-inoculated plants under full irrigation. Although no disease symptoms were seen on the drought-stressed plants (Fig. 3b), a similar reduction was observed in plants subjected to drought and pathogen stress. The clear rise in proline in pathogen-

inoculated plants was present in both irrigation regimes, indicating proline was associated with inoculation, rather than disease incidence.

Principal component analysis

Fig. 7 shows the principal component analysis (PCA) of the continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation (Fig. 1). Although the cultivars and the irrigation and pathogen treatment were used as supplementary variables, not taking part in the construction of the dimensions, they allow grouping of the data. A strong correlation was found between the first dimension (Dim1) and the cultivar (Table 1). Indeed, there is a good horizontal separation between both cultivars along the axis of the first dimension (Fig. 7a). The association with the first dimension indicates that the differences between the cultivars, both basally and in their response to the stresses, explained most of the variation in our dataset. Chardonnay was mostly associated with higher values for chlorophyll, SA, ABA, and H₂O₂, while Xynisteri was associated with higher POD, SOD and CAT activities, and MDA content (Table 2). The second dimension (Dim2) was mostly correlated to the irrigation regime and, to a lesser extent, the duration of this treatment (Table 1). In the PCA, a horizontal shift is visible according to drought stress and its duration (Fig. 7b). Drought-stressed plants were mostly associated with ABA, IAA, and CAT activity, but were also positively correlated with the chlorophylls and H₂O₂ content and SOD and POD activities (Table 2). Fully irrigated plants were mainly correlated with JA, and SA to a lesser extent (Table 2). Finally, the third dimension was primarily correlated to the pathogen stress (Table 1). In Fig. 7c, the water (mock) and pathogen-inoculated plants separate clearly along the vertical axis (Dim3), irrespective of the disease severity. Proline, IAA, and MDA seem to be strongly correlated and are associated with the pathogen-inoculated plants.

Along the horizontal axis (Dim2) of Fig. 7c, the plants are separated according to the disease severity, symptomless plants on the right and the most diseased plants on the left. When clustering according to the drought stress in the same dimensions (Fig. 7b), the group showing no symptoms overlap with the drought-stressed group. Resistance is primarily observed in the 1st quadrant since the lion share of the plants in the 3rd and 4th quadrant was not inoculated with the pathogen. The diseased plants are mainly clustered in the 2nd quadrant. The PCA suggests JA is associated with the infection under full irrigation. Interestingly, this PCA indicates that ABA and IAA play a role in the drought-induced resistance, in which JA is no longer involved.

Table 1 Significant square correlation ratios (R²) of the supplementary variables in the principal component analysis. R² indicates the strength of the correlation between the dimensions of the PCA and the variables cultivar (Chardonnay or Xynisteri), irrigation (full or deficit), duration (of the irrigation treatment; 9 or 16 dot), and pathogen (*P. viticola* or water inoculation). These supplementary variables were not involved in the construction of the dimensions. For each significant R², the p-value (<0.05) is also shown

Supplementary variables	R ²			P-value		
	Dim1	Dim2	Dim3	Dim1	Dim2	Dim3
Cultivar	0.703			3.12E-22		
Irrigation		0.355			5.40E-09	
Duration		0.188	0.063		5.74E-05	2.51E-02
Pathogen		0.089	0.490		7.12E-03	5.18E-13

Table 2 Significant correlation coefficients of the active variables in the principal component analysis. The correlation coefficients describe the construction of the different dimensions of the PCA. For each significant coefficient, the p-value (<0.05) is also shown

Active variables	Correlation			P-value		
	Dim1	Dim2	Dim3	Dim1	Dim2	Dim3
ABA	-0.292	0.624		8.61E-03	6.21E-10	
IAA		0.361	0.602		1.01E-03	3.51E-09
JA		-0.806			1.90E-19	
SA	-0.523	-0.283		6.50E-07	1.11E-02	
H ₂ O ₂		0.369			7.67E-04	
CAT	0.505	0.586		1.75E-06	1.14E-08	
POD	0.850	0.225		1.88E-23	4.48E-02	
SOD	0.815	0.382		3.86E-20	4.69E-04	
MDA	0.481		0.467	6.24E-06		1.25E-05
Proline			0.812			5.85E-20
Chl a	-0.759	0.428		3.32E-16	7.37E-05	
Chl b	-0.793	0.413		1.84E-18	1.41E-04	

Discussion

Phytohormones

Single drought stress

Single drought stress severely affected the phytohormone balance of the drought-tolerant cultivar Xynisteri and the drought-sensitive cultivar Chardonnay, respectively native and introduced in the investigated climate. In these conditions, ABA, generally considered the key hormone underpinning mechanisms that regulate drought stress responses in plants, appeared to govern the complex hormone crosstalk by antagonizing JA and SA. For both cultivars, drought stress increasingly triggered ABA as the duration extended, but negatively impacted JA. The SA content was lowered too, but primarily in the drought-sensitive Chardonnay. Although most studies observe that JA and SA are involved in drought stress responses in addition to ABA [30], the negative interaction of ABA with JA and SA has also been reported before [31, 32]. Multiple nodes allow interference of ABA with the JA-ethylene pathway [33], but whether their interaction is antagonistic [33] or synergistic [34] strongly depends on the conditions. The suppressive effect of ABA on the SA signaling pathway [35–37], has been shown for grapevine in particular by Wang et al. [38], who showed that elicitation with exogenous ABA led to a gradual reduction of SA.

Our data demonstrate that drought stress also caused the levels of IAA to increase in both cultivars. The basally higher IAA in Xynisteri might contribute to its drought tolerance. Although not as thoroughly studied in this context as ABA, endogenous IAA levels have been reported to increase during the grapevine defense response against drought [39]. Through its crosstalk with reactive oxygen species (ROS), IAA can help plants to adjust their growth to unfavorable conditions [40]. Previous studies have associated elevated auxin with the induction of abiotic stress-related genes, the activation of the antioxidant response, and the reduction in ROS accumulation [41–44].

Single pathogen stress

P. viticola was able to infect irrigated vines easily in the extreme weather conditions of Cyprus, with high light intensities and maximum daily temperatures reaching 45°C in the shade, although previous studies have shown both high temperature [45, 46] and light intensities [47] inhibit sporulation. The nights, with minimum temperatures between 15 and 25°C and relative humidity reaching 80 to 90%, were optimal for infection. Both *in vitro* and *in planta* inoculations demonstrated that Xynisteri was more susceptible to *P. viticola* than Chardonnay when irrigated. Remarkably, our results for fully irrigated plants indicate the infection by the pathogen was also associated with elevated IAA. IAA appeared to be mainly correlated with proline, which accumulated in both cultivars. The higher basal IAA and proline levels in Xynisteri could be related to its higher disease susceptibility. It is well-known that some pathogens are able to upregulate the plant's auxin signaling, in order to suppress the plant defenses, while others can synthesize IAA themselves through various pathways, to increase their pathogenesis [48]. The IAA levels during *P. viticola* infection have not been studied before, so the question of the origin and function of the IAA accumulation remains. The accumulation of proline associated with elevated IAA has been observed in IAA-treated plants [49]. Like auxin, proline is also involved in numerous developmental processes [50], which can help maintain sustainable growth under long-term stress. However, because of its positive correlation with pathogen-triggered IAA, the role of proline in the plant-pathogen interaction is ambiguous. As a ROS scavenger, proline might have been produced as part of the host defense mechanism against the oxidative stress caused in response to the pathogen. However, proline might benefit the pathogen in a similar way, by detoxifying ROS, which restrict pathogen development.

Contrary to the abiotic stress, we found pathogen stress acted positively on the JA and SA contents of both cultivars, without an apparent effect on the ABA levels. The upsurge of JA and SA at 1.5 dpi in infected, fully irrigated plants demonstrates the plants were activating their defense mechanism. SA is basally higher in Chardonnay and might be part of its more successful defense against *P. viticola*. The roles of JA and SA have been extensively studied in resistant cultivars, where both phytohormones strongly accumulate after infection with *P. viticola* [51]. SA as well as JA-mediated defense responses are implicated in the resistance to *P. viticola* [52–56]. Moreover, exogenous JA has been shown to protect grapevine leaf disks against *P. viticola* through callose deposition [57]. The dynamics of endogenous phytohormones during compatible interactions with *P. viticola* have however not been explicitly investigated. Polesani et al. and Li et al. [52, 56] did observe increases in JA, coupled with very strong

risers in methyl jasmonate (MeJA), in successful infections. Both endogenous levels increased from 12 to 48 hours post inoculation but perished once the tissue was completely invaded [52], implicating the involvement of JA and MeJA defenses in the early developmental stages of the pathogen in compatible interactions.

Combined stress

Combined abiotic and biotic stress is a different story entirely. When drought and pathogen stress occurred simultaneously, the two stress responses interacted. Remarkably, under continued deficit irrigation, disease symptoms were no longer observed in Chardonnay or Xynisteri. Even more interesting is our finding that the JA and SA contents were low and no longer substantially contributed to the pathogen defense response. Our results reveal that, under concurrent stress, ABA dominated the responses to the pathogen stress occurring under full irrigation, antagonizing JA and SA. Furthermore, a significant, additional rise in ABA was observed in the inoculated compared to the non-inoculated drought-stressed plants, although under full irrigation, the infection did not trigger ABA. Thus, we hypothesize that ABA, rather than JA or SA, is involved in the observed drought-induced resistance to *P. viticola*. But how can ABA contribute to hindering the infection by *P. viticola*?

Considered a global regulator of plant stress responses, ABA is crucial in the response of plants to multiple stresses [11]. Its role in pathogen defense is poorly understood. Whether ABA acts as a positive or negative regulator of disease resistance, is dependent on the stage of infection and the pathosystem, yet seems to be unrelated to the pathogen lifestyle or mode of attack [16]. Although most studies have established an antagonistic relationship between ABA and disease resistance [33, 35, 58–60], treatment of detached grapevine leaves with exogenous ABA has been shown to result in a reduction of *P. viticola* infection, albeit only in high concentrations [57, 61].

ABA can be involved in pre-invasive defense, preventing pathogen penetration by controlling rapid stomatal movement [62]. Our data suggest however that the pathogen was not stopped during the pre-invasive defense. Despite their differences in disease susceptibility, both fully and deficit-irrigated, pathogen-inoculated plants still showed major changes in IAA and proline content and CAT, POD, and, to a lesser extent, SOD activities. Their independence from the irrigation treatment at this infection stage (1.5 dpi), punctuates the infection in the deficit-irrigated plants ceased post-penetration. It indicates *P. viticola* was able to penetrate the substomatal cavities, even though the stomatal conductance was markedly reduced in response to deficit irrigation. Notably, an additional rise in ABA was observed in deficit-irrigated plants after inoculation with the pathogen. This additional rise in ABA could be key to the post-invasive resistance to this pathogen. During the post-invasion defense, ABA is implicated in callose [34, 63] and stilbene [38] accumulation, thus limiting the pathogen spread. ABA has also been found to accumulate strongly in some genetically resistant *Vitis* species after *P. viticola* inoculation [38, 64]. In many resistant *Vitis* species, most infections never advance beyond the assessed developmental stage (24-48 hpi) [52, 65].

However, while continued exposure to drought induced resistance, we discovered that leaves detached from drought-stressed plants became more susceptible to this pathogen when inoculated in humid, temperate conditions. This indicates the drought-induced, ABA-mediated resistance depends on a rapid defense response, which can be inverted in a very short time. The fast turnover of the drought-induced resistance could explain why Roatti et al. [25] did not report a reduction in disease severity when *P. viticola* was inoculated at the end of a deficit irrigation period. Because of the striking difference in disease severity during and after exposure to deficit irrigation, it is unlikely that a physical barrier is the source of the ABA-mediated, post-invasive resistance. Whatever it may be, the response seems strongly dependent on the ABA concentration, which is determined by ABA production, transport, and catabolism. The rate at which stress ABA is catabolized might be proportional to the amount of stress ABA accumulated [66]. Hence, once the drought stress is lifted and stress ABA is no longer synthesized, the high levels of ABA cannot be sustained. We hypothesize that the recovered disease susceptibility in the detached leaves of drought-stressed plants is linked to their inability to maintain sufficiently high ABA levels and to timely restore the adverse effects of drought on its pathogen defense. After all, the drought severely interfered with the pathogen response, including induced IAA and antioxidant enzyme activity and antagonized JA and SA levels. From this point of view, it is not surprising that post drought, Chardonnay partially lost its higher tolerance to the pathogen. Its *in vitro* susceptibility even increased with the duration of the previous drought stress. Apart from the increased adverse effects, additional ABA accumulated when the deficit irrigation prolonged. This potentially caused lower ABA levels post drought, as a result of the increased ABA catabolism. The previous exposure to deficit irrigation also deteriorated Xynisteri's pathogen defense, but this cultivar was already extremely susceptible under full irrigation.

The changing climate and the practices used to mitigate its effects have a profound impact on plant pathogens. Based on these results, irrigation might render pathogens to become a sudden threat to agroecosystem sustainability. Full irrigation of a drought-tolerant cultivar enhanced its susceptibility to downy mildew infection. The drought-tolerant cultivar can easily be grown with no or ample irrigation, hereby inducing resistance, but for the introduced cultivar, the irrigation is of greater importance. The increasing carbon footprint, coupled with the additional irrigation and disease control measures, underlines the growing importance of the "right plant for the right place". Moreover, the enhanced disease susceptibility found in the *in vitro* assessment prompts the question as to whether vines, under the studied field conditions, could become more vulnerable to *P. viticola* during a rain event following a drought period.

Stomatal conductance and photosynthetic parameters

Single drought stress

Since Chardonnay originates from French valleys with humid conditions, this cultivar probably lacks adaptive changes to quickly cope with water stress and might have less sensitive stomatal control than

Xynisteri [67, 68]. The higher basal concentrations of ABA in the leaves of Chardonnay compared to those of Xynisteri might be related to anisohydric behavior [69]. As a native cultivar in Cyprus, Xynisteri likely has developed fast mechanisms to avoid drought stress. Up to 9 days of deficit irrigation, Xynisteri was even able to increase its chlorophyll fluorescence (a measure for the maximum Photosystem II quantum efficiency) and chlorophyll content compared to full irrigation. Both cultivars suffered more as the drought stress prolonged. Eventually, the losses in chlorophyll fluorescence, chlorophyll content, and SPAD values (a measure for the chlorophyll content per unit leaf area) were higher in Chardonnay, indicating that the drought was a greater burden to Chardonnay than Xynisteri.

Single pathogen stress

In plants without drought stress, *P. viticola* was able to infect its hosts proficiently by manipulating them during the infection. Particularly at 16 dpi, the pathogen seemed to increase stomatal conductance, potentially as a result of the accumulation of IAA after infection [70], since the ABA levels were not substantially lowered. It is well-known that *P. viticola* is able to manipulate stomatal movements. Stoll et al. [71] report that stomatal conductance in irrigated plants decreased when infected with *P. viticola*, while other studies observe the pathogen keeping the stomata open by suppressing ABA [72] or degrading or blocking its transport [29]. The infection also slightly decreased the chlorophyll content and SPAD values, although the chlorophyll fluorescence did not appear to be affected. This biotroph has been shown to lower the photosynthetic rate [73, 74] through the loss of chlorophyll, the downregulation of chlorophyll a/b binding protein, chlorophyll synthase, and Rubisco, and the upregulation of chlorophyllase [75]. Just 2 days after inoculation, the chlorophyll losses recorded were still small, likely because the chlorophyll content only decreases within the infected lesion [75, 76], and might still have been insufficient to affect the chlorophyll fluorescence [77].

Combined stress

Our results suggest the pathogen affects the stomatal control of Xynisteri, part of the strategies to tolerate drought. In plants with drought stress, the pathogen-inoculation at 1.5 dpi was associated with an additional rise in ABA. As expected, this resulted in a further decrease of the stomatal conductance in Chardonnay. In contrast, in drought-stressed Xynisteri, the pathogen was associated with a slightly higher stomatal opening despite this pathogen-induced increase in ABA. In this cultivar, the combined stress also caused an additional rise in IAA, which has the ability to counteract ABA-induced closure [70].

Moreover, the drought stress seemed to abolish the loss of chlorophyll by the pathogen stress. This indicates the chlorophyll loss only occurred as part of a successful infection by the pathogen and demonstrates the pathogen development at 1.5 dpi was already hindered compared to the fully irrigated plants. As would be expected when less chlorophyll is lost, the pathogen inoculation also decreased the loss of chlorophyll fluorescence due to prolonged drought stress in Chardonnay. In Xynisteri, however, this loss was increased, despite the trends towards higher stomatal conductance and abolished chlorophyll

loss. This might be an indication that the response to the pathogen interferes with the adaptive strategies of Xynisteri to cope with drought stress, which are lacking in Chardonnay.

Oxidative stress parameters

Single drought stress

Plants generally respond to abiotic and biotic stresses with the production of ROS as signaling molecules. This is typically followed by the activation of the antioxidant system, to finely tune ROS-dependent signal transduction and prevent oxidative damage. During drought, the antioxidant system is activated sooner or stronger in a drought-tolerant than in a drought-sensitive cultivar [78]. ROS can severely damage many host cell components, by breaking DNA, destroying the function of proteins, and causing lipid peroxidation [79]. Lipid peroxidation is the most prominent symptom of oxidative stress in animals and plants [80]. It is highly correlated with the concentration of MDA, one of its final products, which enhances the cell membrane damage, leading to cell death, but also acts as a signaling molecule under stress conditions. Stress can disturb the well-maintained equilibrium between the production and scavenging of ROS.

The drought-sensitive Chardonnay did not respond as fast to the drought stress as Xynisteri. In Chardonnay, the activity of the antioxidant enzymes only increased during prolonged drought stress. During the initial drought stress, the antioxidant enzymes in Chardonnay even showed lowered activity. Further illustrating the drought-sensitivity of Chardonnay, is the increasing loss of chlorophyll fluorescence and the gain in MDA as the drought stress prolonged. The indigenous cultivar Xynisteri, on the other hand, is equipped with a basal toolset to cope with oxidative stress, including higher basal activity of the antioxidant enzymes and lower levels of H_2O_2 . The drought-tolerant Xynisteri was able to handle the initial drought stress, by activating the antioxidant enzymes at an early stage, keeping H_2O_2 in balance. Xynisteri even demonstrated slightly higher chlorophyll content and chlorophyll fluorescence and reduced MDA levels compared to the fully irrigated control. However, this cultivar also suffered when the drought stress prolonged, with its oxidative responses becoming more similar to the responses of Chardonnay during initial drought stress.

Single pathogen stress

The single pathogen stress caused high lipid peroxidation, more than the drought stress, as indicated by the high correlation between MDA and pathogen-inoculated plants. Apart from ROS, increased lipoxygenase activity can also be implicated in lipid peroxidation. Associated with JA biosynthesis, lipoxygenases are involved in the activation of defense signaling against *P. viticola* [74]. The course of oxidative stress can be observed particularly at 16 dpi, when the H_2O_2 accumulation due to the pathogen infection at 1.5 dpi led to the highest accumulation of MDA. Interestingly, this was accompanied by

strong decreases in antioxidative enzyme activity. The lipid peroxidation and weak oxidative burst during the first 24 hours of the compatible infection with *P. viticola* have been associated with slight increases of total antioxidant capacity [74, 81]. The increased SA content might have inhibited the activities of the antioxidant enzymes, in order to enhance pathogenesis-related (PR) gene expression [82, 83]. Inactivation of the antioxidant capacity to obtain stronger ROS production could be key in boosting the plant defense and limiting the pathogen infection. Since sufficient oxidative burst can indeed restrain *P. viticola* [74, 81], the basally higher levels of H₂O₂ and the potentially SA-mediated, lower activity of antioxidant enzymes could be part of the more successful pathogen defense of Chardonnay.

However, despite the lowered activity of the antioxidant enzymes, H₂O₂ levels only increased slightly. Proline, which accumulated with MDA, could have been produced to quench and scavenge ROS, in order to stabilize proteins, DNA, and membranes [26, 84]. In the case of drought stress, proline, rather than the antioxidant enzymes, has been associated with the detoxification of ROS in vines [85]. Previous studies have shown proline accumulated under stress by *P. viticola* [86] and by drought [6, 26, 85, 87]. While the net impact of the host-pathogen interaction is clear, it is hard to make a distinction between host response, the pathogens modulation of this response, and the pathogens biosynthesis. Brill et al. [88] report the *P. viticola* genome is holding the genes necessary for proline biosynthesis. In that case, *P. viticola* might have impaired the oxidative burst by producing or triggering the production of proline, restricting ROS to small concentrations which are insufficient to restrain the pathogen.

Combined stress

The infection triggered similar losses of antioxidant enzyme activity in the deficit and fully irrigated plants. Both susceptible, fully irrigated and resistant, deficit-irrigated plants showed a dramatic proline accumulation. This indicates proline levels at 1.5 dpi can be a measure for the pathogen stress, whether the infection was successful or not. The combined stress seemed to revert the MDA and chlorophyll levels, although affected by both single stresses, to levels similar to non-stressed plants. This shows that lipid peroxidation at 1.5 dpi mainly occurred during the successful infection by the pathogen and indicates the pathogen development was already hindered in the deficit-irrigated vines. The inoculation with the pathogen also seemed to mitigate the small changes in MDA and chlorophyll due to drought, an indication of the crosstalk between both responses.

The gap between *in vitro* and *in planta* experiments

Interestingly, depending on the inoculation occurring on leaf disks or intact plants, contradicting conclusions were reached about the impact of irrigation on the susceptibility to *P. viticola*. Because of the perennial nature and size of the grapevine plant, many studies investigating the impact of compounds, microorganisms, resistance genes, or stress, are performed on detached leaves. Understandably, the cutting itself, but also the removal of the leaf from the elicitor of study and the plant system could trigger or inhibit responses in the leaf, resulting in responses different from those occurring *in planta*. In

vitro studies of the plant response could oversimplify the system. This is especially the case when studying the effects of abiotic stress, since placing the leaves in controlled conditions partly relieves the excised leaf disks of the abiotic stresses the plants were experiencing. This study highlights the importance of being careful and critical in generalizing conclusions obtained through *in vitro* assays. Sometimes, *in vitro* assays provide an excellent model, like for the comparison of the cultivar susceptibility under full irrigation. In other cases, it proves impossible to extrapolate the results of *in vitro* studies to the whole plant and field system.

Conclusions

Because of overlap and crosstalk between the responses to the individual stresses, the response to the concurrent pathogen and drought challenge could not be interpolated from the independent stress response. Single drought stress triggered IAA and ABA, which antagonized JA and SA. Compared to the native cultivar Xynisteri, which boosted chlorophyll fluorescence and chlorophyll levels when initially faced with drought, the drought-sensitive Chardonnay activated the antioxidant system later and seemed to suffer more as the drought stress prolonged. Chardonnay, however, proved less susceptible to *P. viticola* than Xynisteri when irrigated. Under full irrigation, the successful infection by *P. viticola* at 1.5 dpi was associated with high IAA, SA, and JA levels, strong decreases in antioxidant enzyme activity, and parallel bursts in proline. When both stresses were combined, the response to the pathogen seemed to interfere slightly with the adaptive strategies of Xynisteri to cope with drought stress. Most interesting was the discovery that the deficit irrigation induced resistance to this pathogen in both Chardonnay and Xynisteri. Since drought-induced ABA overruled the SA and JA defense responses, generally implicated in the resistance against *P. viticola*, ABA is suggested to be involved in this resistance to *P. viticola*. Supporting this hypothesis is the additional rise in ABA observed in deficit-irrigated plants after inoculation with the pathogen, compared to non-inoculated plants. The nature of this ABA-mediated defense remains to be investigated, but is most likely post-invasive, since the changes in IAA, antioxidant enzyme activity, and proline at 1.5 dpi occurred independently of the irrigation treatment. Other major findings in this study are the differences between concomitant and consecutive drought and pathogen stress, and as such between *in planta* and *in vitro* research. In sharp contrast to the *in planta* drought-induced resistance, leaves from drought-stressed plants became more susceptible to the pathogen when inoculated *in vitro*. This quick turn-over led us to conclude that high ABA concentrations may be most important to the drought-induced resistance. It suggests that, once the ABA concentrations are lowered, the adverse effects of the drought on the pathogen response, such as the lowered JA, can increase the susceptibility to *P. viticola*. It still stands to question as to whether vines, under the studied field conditions, could become more vulnerable to *P. viticola* during a rain event following a drought period.

The irrigation-dependent susceptibility highlights that the practices used to mitigate the effects of climate change may have a profound impact on plant pathogens. For sustainable vineyard management, the effect of deficit and full irrigation on the crops and prevailing plant pathogens should be evaluated. To avoid downy mildew epidemics, the application of deficit rather than full irrigation may be advisable when the drought becomes intolerable. In arid conditions, however, deficit irrigation might not be

sufficient for introduced cultivars. The increasing carbon footprint, associated with the additional irrigation and disease control measures of the introduced cultivar, underlines the growing importance of the “right plant for the right place”. In the context of climate change, the impact on one stress should not be considered without the other. Breeding programs, breeding for the future, should pay special attention to the combination of biotic and abiotic stresses. The expected increase in abiotic stress might also be of importance in selecting resistance-inducing beneficial microorganisms or elicitors since abiotic stress might interfere with the pathways needed to trigger resistance. All of these studies must, however, take into consideration that a simplified model, such as the leaf disk model, cannot be used without prior comparison with the whole plant model.

Materials And Methods

Site description and plant material

This research was conducted on a sun-exposed area in Limassol, Cyprus (34°42'N, 32°59'E; elevation: 100 m a.s.l.), during 22 rainless days in May 2018. The climate is Mediterranean, with hot and dry summers. Additional file 5: Fig. S2 presents the climatic data, recorded with an on-site data logger (Kistock KH 250; Kimo). On an average day during the experiment, a maximum temperature of 38.3°C was achieved in full shade, corresponding with 24 % RH. On an average night, the minimum temperature dropped to 19.5°C and the relative humidity reached 70%.

This study comprised two cultivars of *Vitis vinifera*, Xynisteri and Chardonnay. Xynisteri is the main white grape cultivar grown in Cyprus, while Chardonnay, one of the most planted white grape cultivars internationally, has been introduced in Cyprus. In 2014, they respectively covered 30.2% and 1.6% of the ca. 6,142 ha viticultural area of Cyprus [5]. Of each cultivar, 60 self-rooted cuttings were planted in 5-liter polyethylene pots containing soil, originating from the traditional vineyard area in Limassol. The soil properties were previously described by Tzortzakis et al. [87]. Briefly, the soil had a clay-loam texture, an organic matter content of 2.19%, a total CaCO₃ content of 66.9%, a pH of 7.42, and an electrical conductivity (EC) of 0.28 of mS cm⁻¹. The plants were grown in field conditions and were automatically irrigated at field capacity using a drip irrigation system. Three months after planting, the plants were uniformly distributed over 12 treatment groups. The experimental set-up is shown in Fig. 1. For each treatment, five replicates were used per cultivar. Each group was treated with one of four abiotic stress treatments (7 or 14 days of full or deficit irrigation) to assess the effect of short and prolonged drought stress. Two groups were sampled destructively at 7 and 14 dot. *In vitro* inoculations were performed on disks of these leaves. In the evening, the remaining intact plants were inoculated with either pathogen or water. For these plants, the irrigation regime was maintained until the disease evaluation 7 days later. Some leaves were sampled at 9 and 16 dot to establish the effect of pathogen attack at 1.5 dpi.

Abiotic stress

Plants were either well-watered, in the full irrigation treatment, or exposed to drought stress by deficit irrigation. The fully irrigated plants received irrigation at field capacity from an automatic drip system, every 6 hours for 5 min. The deficit irrigation was maintained at 40% of the full irrigation, based on the volumetric water content of the soil (VWC). The deficit-irrigated plants were irrigated manually every two days. To verify and accurately adjust the irrigation, the VWC was measured daily in 8 randomly chosen pots using a portable Time-Domain Reflectometer (TDR) (FieldScout TDR 300 Soil Moisture Probe; Spectrum Technologies) with 4.7-inch rods (Additional file 6: Fig. S3).

Biotic stress

To examine the combined effect of abiotic and biotic stress on the vine, pathogen stress was imposed on the intact plants after 7 or 14 days of drought stress (continued exposure to full irrigation – see Fig. 1). *Plasmopara viticola* isolate FCHPv1, obtained from Chardonnay in France, was grown for 10 days at 22°C on detached Chardonnay leaves on water agar (0.65%). Sporangia were collected with distilled water and the suspension was adjusted to 2.5×10^4 sporangia mL⁻¹. The artificial inoculation was performed in the evening. The abaxial sides of all leaves were sprayed until run-off with 3 mL sporangia suspension of *P. viticola*. The control plants were sprayed with distilled water. The irrigation regimes were maintained until the disease evaluation. Since *P. viticola* needs 95-100% relative humidity during the night for an optimal infection and sporulation, each plant was equipped with a container of water and a humid plastic cover in the evening. To prevent extreme temperature development within the cover, the cover was removed in the morning and a light shade was created using a shadow mesh.

The sampling and disease evaluation took place at 1.5 and 7 dpi respectively. Each plant was evaluated according to the following classes: 0, no symptoms; 1, few oil spots with little to no sporulation; 2, moderate symptoms and non-spreading sporulation; 3, clearly diseased with spreading sporulation; 4, severe symptoms with dense sporangioophore carpets.

Field measurements

At 3, 7, 9, 14, and 16 dpi, the stomatal conductance, chlorophyll fluorescence, and chlorophyll content were recorded. The measurements were conducted on the 4th or 5th leaf starting from the apical meristem on randomly chosen plants at mid-morning, 4 h after onset of light. The stomatal conductance to water vapor was measured on three to five plants, using a transient state diffusion porometer (AP4; Delta-T Devices). The chlorophyll fluorescence ($F_v F_m^{-1}$), an indicator of the maximum quantum efficiency of Photosystem II, was monitored on three or four plants after exposure to darkness for 20 minutes with a dark adaptation pin using a chlorophyll fluorometer (OS30p; Opti-Sciences). The chlorophyll content per unit leaf area was estimated using a non-destructive SPAD meter (SPAD 502 Plus; Spectrum Technologies). SPAD measurements were conducted twice on the same leaf of five or six plants.

***In vitro* assessment of disease susceptibility**

The 3rd and 4th leaf, counted from the apex, sampled at 7 and 14 dpi (previous exposure to full irrigation – see Fig. 1), were used to investigate the effect of the previous exposure to drought stress on the susceptibility to *P. viticola*. Leaf disks (11 mm diameter) were treated with 20 µL distilled water or 20 µL *P. viticola* sporangia suspension containing 2.5×10^4 sporangia mL⁻¹ and incubated on water agar (0.65%) at 22°C. At 5 dpi, the number of sporangiophores was counted to assign each disk to one of the following classes: 0, 0 sporangiophores; 1, 1-6 sporangiophores; 2, 7-20 sporangiophores; 3, more than 20 sporangiophores; 4, numerous sporangiophores. An average of 60 disks was evaluated per treatment.

Quantification of phytohormones

In leaves sampled at 7, 9, 14, and 16 dpi, the levels of ABA, IAA, JA, and SA were determined, in ng per g fresh weight (FW). For each of the five replicates per treatment, two leaves were pooled, immediately frozen in liquid N₂, and kept at -80°C until analysis. The procedure for the quantification of phytohormones is described in detail by Haeck et al. [89]. The ground tissue (100 mg) was incubated with 5 mL modified Bieleski extraction solvent (methanol/water/formic acid 75:20:5, v/v/v) for 20-24 h at -80°C. After this cold extraction, filtration (30 kDa Amicon® Ultra centrifugal filter unit, Merck Millipore, Overijse, Belgium) and evaporation (TurboVap® LV, Biotage, Uppsala, Sweden), the extracts were reconstituted in 0.5 mL methanol/water/formic acid (20:80:0.1, v/v/v). Chromatographic separation was performed on an ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography system (U-HPLC, Thermo Fisher Scientific) equipped with a Nucleodur C18 column (50 × 2 mm; 1.8 µm particle diameter). The mass spectrometric analysis was achieved in targeted single ion monitoring mode on a Q-Exactive™ quadrupole-Orbitrap mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific), equipped with a heated electrospray ionization source, at a resolution of 70,000 full width at half maximum. In negative ionization mode, SA, ABA, and JA were measured using an elution gradient (300 µL min⁻¹) of (A) methanol and (B) water, both with 0.01% formic acid. The formic acid concentration of solvent B was adjusted to 0.1% for the measurement of IAA in positive ionization mode. The following linear gradient was applied (solvent A): 0-1 min at 20%, 1-2.5 min from 20 to 45%; 2.5-9 min from 45 to 100%; 9-10 min at 100%; 10-14 min at 20%. External and deuterated internal (d₄-SA at 200 µg L⁻¹, d₆-ABA and d₅-IAA at 1 µg L⁻¹) standards were used for accurate quantification of the hormone content.

Quantification of photosynthetic pigments

Leaf samples were collected at 7, 9, 14, and 16 dpi with five replications per treatment, each consisting of a pool of two leaves. The leaf tissue (100 mg) was incubated in a heat bath at 65 °C for 30 min, with 10 mL dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO). The absorbance of the extract was measured at 645 nm and 663 nm, using a microplate spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Multiskan GO), and the Chl a and Chl b concentrations were calculated as described by Richardson et al. [90].

Quantification of hydrogen peroxide content, lipid peroxidation, and proline

For the quantification of hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), lipid peroxidation, in terms of MDA content, and proline, two leaves were sampled and pooled for each of the five plants per treatment at 7, 9, 14, and 16 d. Fresh leaves were immediately frozen in liquid N_2 and kept at -80°C until analysis. Before analysis, the ground leaf tissue (200 mg) was homogenized with ice-cold 0.1% trichloroacetic acid (TCA). The extract was centrifuged and the supernatant was used for the quantification of H_2O_2 and MDA [91]. For the quantification of H_2O_2 , 0.5 mL of the supernatant was mixed with 0.5 mL of 10 mM potassium phosphate buffer (PPB) (pH 7.0) and 1 mL of 1M potassium iodide (KI). The content of H_2O_2 was calculated using standards of 5 to 500 μM of H_2O_2 and a calibration curve was plotted accordingly. The absorbance was measured at 390 nm. For the MDA content, 0.5 mL of the supernatant was incubated with 1.5 mL of 0.5% thiobarbituric acid (TBA) in 20% TCA at 95°C for 25 min. The reaction was stopped in an ice bath and the absorbance was measured at 532 nm and 600 nm. The MDA content was calculated using the extinction coefficient of 155 mM cm^{-1} .

The proline content was also determined using this frozen ground tissue. The leaf tissue (200 mg) was homogenized in 2 mL of 3% aqueous sulfosalicylic acid (SSA). The extracts were then centrifuged and 1 mL of the supernatant was incubated with 1 mL of acid ninhydrin and 1 mL of glacial acetic acid, for 1 h at 100°C . Then, the formed chromogen was extracted with toluene and the absorbance was measured at 520 nm, using toluene as blank. The proline concentration was determined using serial dilutions (0-100 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) of D-proline [92].

Quantification of antioxidant enzymes

The ground leaf samples were also used for the determination of the activity of the antioxidant enzymes.

The tissue (200 mg) was homogenized with 3 mL ice-cold 50 mM PPB (pH 7.0), including 1 mM ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA), 1% w/v polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVPP), 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF) and 0.05% polyethylene glycol tert-octylphenyl ether (Triton X-100). The homogenate was centrifuged at 16,000 g for 20 min, at 4°C . The supernatant was collected and an aliquot was first used to determine the protein content via the Bradford method [93], with bovine serum albumin (BSA) as the protein standard.

The CAT (EC 1.11.1.6) activity was determined by following the consumption of H_2O_2 (extinction coefficient 39.4 mM cm^{-1}) at 240 nm for 3 min, as assayed by Jiang and Zhang [94]. The reaction mixture contained 100 mM PPB (pH 7.0), plant extract, and 200 μL of 75 mM of H_2O_2 . The results were expressed as CAT units per milligram of protein. One unit of enzyme decomposed 1 μmol of H_2O_2 per min.

The SOD (EC 1.15.1.1) activity was assayed using the photochemical method. The reaction mixture (1.5 mL) contained 50 mM PPB (pH 7.5), 13 mM methionine, 75 μ M nitro blue tetrazolium (NBT), 0.1 mM EDTA, 2 μ M riboflavin and an enzyme aliquot. The reaction started after the addition of riboflavin. Tubes containing the reaction were then placed under a light source of two 15-watt fluorescent lamps for 15 min. The reaction was stopped by placing the tubes in the dark. The reaction without the extract developed maximal color (control) and a non-irradiated mixture was used as a blank. The absorbance was determined at 560 nm and activity was expressed as SOD units per mg of protein. One unit of SOD activity was defined as the amount of enzyme required to cause 50% inhibition of the NBT photoreduction rate [95].

The POD (EC 1.11.1.7) activity was determined according to the method used by Tarchoune et al. [96]. The POD activity was assayed using pyrogallol, following the increase in absorbance at 430 nm, after the oxidation to purpurgallin. The reaction mixture of 2 mL contained 1,665 μ L of 100 mM PPB (pH 6.5), 200 μ L of 100 mM pyrogallol and 50 μ L of extract. The reaction started with the addition of 85 μ L of 40 mM H_2O_2 . The increase in absorbance at 430 nm was measured on a kinetic cycle for 3 min. Calculations were performed using the coefficient of extinction of 2.47 $mM\ cm^{-1}$. One POD unit was defined as the amount of enzyme needed to decompose 1 μ mol of H_2O_2 per min.

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using R, version 3.6.1 [97]. Normality and homoscedasticity were verified with the Shapiro-Wilk's and Levene's test ($p=0.05$). Data meeting the assumptions were treated with one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), followed by Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference) to compare the means ($p=0.05$). Nonparametric data were analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis test, followed by the Mann-Whitney U -test ($p=0.05$). For the analysis of the interactions between the cultivar, drought, and pathogen stress, a linear regression analysis was performed. A generalized least squares (GLS) model was improved by eliminating interaction terms until the lowest Akaike Information Criterion score (AIC) was reached.

Abbreviations

ABA: abscisic acid; AIC: Akaike information criterion; ANOVA: one-way analysis of variance; BSA: bovine serum albumin; CAT: catalase; Chl a: chlorophyll a; Chl b: chlorophyll b; DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide; dot: days of irrigation treatment; dpi: days post inoculation; EC: electrical conductivity; EDTA: ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid; ET: Ethylene; FW: Fresh weight; HSD: honestly significant difference; IAA: indole-3-acetic acid; JA: jasmonic acid; MDA: malondialdehyde; NBT: nitro blue tetrazolium; PCA: principal component analysis; PMSF: phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride; POD: peroxidase; PPB: potassium phosphate buffer; PR: pathogenesis related; PVPP: polyvinylpyrrolidone; ROS: reactive oxygen species; SA: salicylic acid; SOD: superoxide dismutase; SPAD: soil plant analysis development; SSA:

sulfosalicylic acid; TBA: thiobarbituric acid; TCA: trichloroacetic acid; TDR: Time-Domain Reflectometer; U-HPLC: ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography; VWC: volumetric water content

Declarations

Ethics Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Funding

This research has been co-financed by the European Union (ERA-NET FACCE SURPLUS), in the frame of the collaborative international Vitismart consortium.

Acknowledgments

This research has benefitted from a statistical consult with Ghent University FIRE (Fostering Innovative Research based on Evidence).

Author's Contributions

This research was designed by MH, NT, AC and LH. NT and AC provided the infrastructure, plants and material for the execution of the experiment. The experiment was carried out by AC and LH, led by NT. AC determined the content of all oxidative parameters and chlorophyll. LH performed the infections and disease evaluations, with the support of MH, and the quantification of the phytohormones, with the expert guidance of KD. LH analyzed the data and wrote the original draft under supervision of MH. NT, AC and MH reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the published version of the manuscript.

Availability of Data and Materials

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

1. IPCC. Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response. Press; 2018.
https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2019/05/SR15_SPM_version_report_LR.pdf.
2. IPCC. Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press; 2013.
https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_all_final.pdf.
3. Chenoweth J, Hadjinicolaou P, Bruggeman A, Lelieveld J, Levin Z, Lange MA, et al. Impact of climate change on the water resources of the eastern Mediterranean and Middle East region: Modeled 21st century changes and implications. *Water Resour Res.* 2011;47:w06506.
doi:10.1029/2010WR010269.
4. Lentini A. New archaeobotanical data on the cultivation of *Vitis* ssp. at Pyrgos – Mavrorachi. In: Notes of Kinyras, since 4th Millennium B.C. and Evidence from Erimi. Nicosia: Cyprus Wine Museum and Department of Antiquities Museum; 2009. p. 56–73.
5. Cystat. Statistical service of Republic of Cyprus: Vineyard surveys, 2010-2014. 2016.
<https://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/>.
6. Litskas VD, Irakleous T, Tzortzakis N, Stavrinides MC. Determining the carbon footprint of indigenous and introduced grape varieties through Life Cycle Assessment using the island of Cyprus as a case study. *J Clean Prod.* 2017;156:418–25. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.04.057.
7. Garrett KA, Dendy SP, Frank EE, Rouse MN, Travers SE. Climate Change Effects on Plant Disease: Genomes to Ecosystems. *Annu Rev Phytopathol.* 2006;44:489–509.
8. Elad Y, Pertot I. Climate Change Impacts on Plant Pathogens and Plant Diseases. *J Crop Improv.* 2014;28:99–139. doi:10.1080/15427528.2014.865412.
9. Ramegowda V, Senthil-Kumar M. The interactive effects of simultaneous biotic and abiotic stresses on plants: Mechanistic understanding from drought and pathogen combination. *J Plant Physiol.* 2015;176:47–54. doi:10.1016/j.jplph.2014.11.008.
10. Gupta A, Senthil-Kumar M. Concurrent Stresses Are Perceived as New State of Stress by the Plants: Overview of Impact of Abiotic and Biotic Stress Combinations. In: *Plant Tolerance to Individual and Concurrent Stresses*. New Delhi: Springer India; 2017. p. 1–15. doi:10.1007/978-81-322-3706-8_1.
11. Atkinson NJ, Urwin PE. The interaction of plant biotic and abiotic stresses: from genes to the field. *J Exp Bot.* 2012;63:3523–44.
12. Fujita M, Fujita Y, Noutoshi Y, Takahashi F, Narusaka Y, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K, et al. Crosstalk between abiotic and biotic stress responses: a current view from the points of convergence in the stress signaling networks. *Curr Opin Plant Biol.* 2006;9:436–42. doi:10.1016/j.pbi.2006.05.014.

13. Kissoudis C, van de Wiel C, Visser RGF, van der Linden G. Enhancing crop resilience to combined abiotic and biotic stress through the dissection of physiological and molecular crosstalk. *Front Plant Sci.* 2014;5:207. doi:10.3389/fpls.2014.00207.
14. Choudhary A, Pandey P, Senthil-Kumar M. Tailored Responses to simultaneous drought stress and pathogen infection in plants. In: *Drought Stress Tolerance in Plants, Vol 1.* Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2016. p. 427–38. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-28899-4_18.
15. Zhang H, Sonnewald U. Differences and commonalities of plant responses to single and combined stresses. *Plant J.* 2017;90:839–55. doi:10.1111/tpj.13557.
16. Asselbergh B, De Vleeschauwer D, Höfte M. Global switches and fine-tuning – ABA modulates plant pathogen defense. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact.* 2008;21:709–19.
17. Sinha R, Gupta A, Senthil-Kumar M. Understanding the Impact of Drought on Foliar and Xylem Invading Bacterial Pathogen Stress in Chickpea. *Front Plant Sci.* 2016;7 June:902. doi:10.3389/fpls.2016.00902.
18. Dossa GS, Torres R, Henry A, Oliva R, Maiss E, Cruz CV, et al. Rice response to simultaneous bacterial blight and drought stress during compatible and incompatible interactions. *Eur J Plant Pathol.* 2017;147:115–27. doi:10.1007/s10658-016-0985-8.
19. Songy A, Fernandez O, Clément C, Larignon P, Fontaine F. Grapevine trunk diseases under thermal and water stresses. *Planta.* 2019;249:1655–79. doi:10.1007/s00425-019-03111-8.
20. Mayek-Pérez N, García-Espinosa R, López-Castañeda C, Acosta-Gallegos JA, Simpson J. Water relations, histopathology and growth of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) during pathogenesis of *Macrophomina phaseolina* under drought stress. *Physiol Mol Plant Pathol.* 2002;60:185–95. doi:10.1006/pmpp.2001.0388.
21. Vemanna RS, Bakade R, Bharti P, Kumar MKP, Sreeman SM, Senthil-Kumar M, et al. Cross-talk signaling in rice during combined drought and bacterial blight stress. *Front Plant Sci.* 2019;10 March:1–11.
22. Achuo EA, Prinsen E, Höfte M. Influence of drought, salt stress and abscisic acid on the resistance of tomato to *Botrytis cinerea* and *Oidium neolycopersici*. *Plant Pathol.* 2006;55:178–86. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3059.2006.01340.x.
23. Ramegowda V, Senthil-Kumar M, Ishiga Y, Kaundal A, Udayakumar M, Mysore K. Drought Stress Acclimation Imparts Tolerance to *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* and *Pseudomonas syringae* in *Nicotiana benthamiana*. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2013;14:9497–513. doi:10.3390/ijms14059497.
24. Choi H-K, landolino A, da Silva FG, Cook DR. Water deficit modulates the response of *Vitis vinifera* to the Pierce's disease pathogen *Xylella fastidiosa*. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact.* 2013;26:643–57. doi:10.1094/MPMI-09-12-0217-R.
25. Roatti B, Perazzolli M, Gessler C, Pertot I. Abiotic stresses affect *Trichoderma harzianum* T39-induced resistance to downy mildew in grapevine. *Phytopathology.* 2013;103:1227–34. doi:10.1094/PHYTO-02-13-0040-R.

26. Hatmi S, Gruau C, Trotel-Aziz P, Villaume S, Rabenoelina F, Baillieul F, et al. Drought stress tolerance in grapevine involves activation of polyamine oxidation contributing to improved immune response and low susceptibility to *Botrytis cinerea*. *J Exp Bot*. 2015;66:775–87. doi:10.1093/jxb/eru436.
27. Eurostat. Plant protection in the EU - consumption of plant protection products in the European Union: Data 1992-1996. Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes, Luxembourg. 2000. <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/5626735/KS-34-00-302-3A-EN.PDF/de96ec49-f486-4bde-bbd8-95c6ddb74cee?version=1.0>.
28. Pertot I, Caffi T, Rossi V, Mugnai L, Hoffmann C, Grando MS, et al. A critical review of plant protection tools for reducing pesticide use on grapevine and new perspectives for the implementation of IPM in viticulture. *Crop Prot*. 2017;97:70–84. doi:10.1016/j.cropro.2016.11.025.
29. Allègre M, Daire X, Héloir M, Trouvelot S, Mercier L, Adrian M, et al. Stomatal deregulation in *Plasmopara viticola*-infected grapevine leaves. *New Phytol*. 2007;173:832–40. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2006.01959.x.
30. Tiwari S, Lata C, Chauhan PS, Prasad V, Prasad M. A Functional Genomic Perspective on Drought Signalling and its Crosstalk with Phytohormone-mediated Signalling Pathways in Plants. *Curr Genomics*. 2017;18:469–82. doi:10.2174/1389202918666170605083319.
31. Sánchez-Vallet A, López G, Ramos B, Delgado-Cerezo M, Riviere M-P, Llorente F, et al. Disruption of Absciscic Acid Signaling Constitutively Activates Arabidopsis Resistance to the Necrotrophic Fungus *Plectosphaerella cucumerina*. *Plant Physiol*. 2012;160:2109–24. doi:10.1104/pp.112.200154.
32. Hussain S, Gomes MM, Yano K, Nambara E. Interactions between abscisic acid and other hormones. In: *Advances in Botanical Research*. Elsevier Ltd; 2019. p. 255–80. doi:10.1016/bs.abr.2019.09.001.
33. Anderson JP, Badruzsaufari E, Schenk PM, Manners JM, Desmond OJ, Ehlert C, et al. Antagonistic interaction between abscisic acid and jasmonate-ethylene signaling pathways modulates defense gene expression and disease resistance in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell*. 2004;16:3460–79.
34. Adie BAT, Pérez-Pérez J, Pérez-Pérez MM, Godoy M, Sánchez-Serrano J-J, Schmelz EA, et al. ABA is an essential signal for plant resistance to pathogens affecting JA biosynthesis and the activation of defenses in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell*. 2007;19 May:1665–81.
35. Mohr PG, Cahill DM. Absciscic acid influences the susceptibility of Arabidopsis thaliana to *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. tomato and *Peronospora parasitica*. *Funct Plant Biol*. 2003;30:461. doi:10.1071/FP02231.
36. Mauch-Mani B, Mauch F. The role of abscisic acid in plant–pathogen interactions. *Curr Opin Plant Biol*. 2005;8:409–14. doi:10.1016/j.pbi.2005.05.015.
37. Yasuda M, Ishikawa A, Jikumaru Y, Seki M, Umezawa T, Asami T, et al. Antagonistic Interaction between Systemic Acquired Resistance and the Absciscic Acid–Mediated Abiotic Stress Response in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell*. 2008;20:1678–92. doi:10.1105/tpc.107.054296.
38. Wang C, Wu J, Zhang Y, Lu J. Muscadinia rotundifolia ‘Noble’ defense response to *Plasmopara viticola* inoculation by inducing phytohormone-mediated stilbene accumulation. *Protoplasma*. 2018;255:95–107. doi:10.1007/s00709-017-1118-8.

39. Haider MS, Zhang C, Kurjogi MM, Pervaiz T, Zheng T, Zhang C, et al. Insights into grapevine defense response against drought as revealed by biochemical, physiological and RNA-Seq analysis. *Sci Rep*. 2017;7:13134. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-13464-3.
40. Tognetti VB, Mühlenbock P, Van Breusegem F. Stress homeostasis - the redox and auxin perspective. *Plant Cell Environ*. 2012;35:321–33. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2011.02324.x.
41. Kim JI, Baek D, Park HC, Chun HJ, Oh D, Lee MK, et al. Overexpression of Arabidopsis YUCCA6 in Potato Results in High-Auxin Developmental Phenotypes and Enhanced Resistance to Water Deficit. *Mol Plant*. 2013;6:337–49. doi:10.1093/mp/sss100.
42. Cheol Park H, Cha J, Yun D-J. Roles of YUCCAs in auxin biosynthesis and drought stress responses in plants. *Plant Signal Behav*. 2013;8:e24495. doi:10.4161/psb.24495.
43. Shi H, Chen L, Ye T, Liu X, Ding K, Chan Z. Modulation of auxin content in Arabidopsis confers improved drought stress resistance. *Plant Physiol Biochem*. 2014;82:209–17. doi:10.1016/j.plaphy.2014.06.008.
44. Bielach A, Hrtan M, Tognetti VB. Plants under Stress: Involvement of Auxin and Cytokinin. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2017;18:1427. doi:10.3390/ijms18071427.
45. Caffi T, Legler SE, González-domínguez E, Rossi V. Effect of temperature and wetness duration on infection by *Plasmopara viticola* and on post-inoculation efficacy of copper. *Eur J Plant Pathol*. 2016;144:737–50.
46. Angelotti F, Hamada E, Magalhães EE, Ghini R, Garrido L da R, Júnior MJP. Climate change and the occurrence of downy mildew in Brazilian grapevines. *Pesqui Agropecuária Bras*. 2017;52:426–34.
47. Williams MG, Magarey PA, Sivasithamparam K. Effect of temperature and light intensity on early infection behaviour of a Western Australian isolate of *Plasmopara viticola*, the downy mildew pathogen of grapevine. *Australas Plant Pathol*. 2007;36:325–31. doi:10.1071/AP07029.
48. Yin C, Park J-J, Gang DR, Hulbert SH. Characterization of a Tryptophan 2-Monooxygenase Gene from *Puccinia graminis* f. sp. *tritici* Involved in Auxin Biosynthesis and Rust Pathogenicity. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact*. 2014;27:227–35. doi:10.1094/MPMI-09-13-0289-FI.
49. Joshi G, Shukla A, Shukla A. Synergistic response of auxin and ethylene on physiology of *Jatropha curcas* L. *Brazilian J Plant Physiol*. 2011;23:67–77. doi:10.1590/S1677-04202011000100009.
50. Trovato M, Mattioli R, Costantino P. From A. rhizogenes RoD to Plant P5CS: Exploiting Proline to Control Plant Development. *Plants*. 2018;7:108. doi:10.3390/plants7040108.
51. Guerreiro A, Figueiredo J, Sousa Silva M, Figueiredo A. Linking Jasmonic Acid to Grapevine Resistance against the Biotrophic Oomycete *Plasmopara viticola*. *Front Plant Sci*. 2016;7:565. doi:10.3389/fpls.2016.00565.
52. Polesani M, Bortesi L, Ferrarini A, Zamboni A, Fasoli M, Zadra C, et al. General and species-specific transcriptional responses to downy mildew infection in a susceptible (*Vitis vinifera*) and a resistant (*V. riparia*) grapevine species. *BMC Genomics*. 2010;11:117. doi:10.1186/1471-2164-11-117.
53. Marchive C, Léon C, Kappel C, Coutos-Thévenot P, Corio-Costet M-F, Delrot S, et al. Over-Expression of VvWRKY1 in Grapevines Induces Expression of Jasmonic Acid Pathway-Related Genes and Confers

- Higher Tolerance to the Downy Mildew. PLoS One. 2013;8:e54185. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054185.
54. Gauthier A, Trouvelot S, Kelloniemi J, Frettinger P, Wendehenne D, Daire X, et al. The Sulfated Laminarin Triggers a Stress Transcriptome before Priming the SA- and ROS-Dependent Defenses during Grapevine's Induced Resistance against *Plasmopara viticola*. PLoS One. 2014;9:e88145. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0088145.
55. Figueiredo A, Monteiro F, Sebastiana M. First clues on a jasmonic acid role in grapevine resistance against the biotrophic fungus *Plasmopara viticola*. Eur J Plant Pathol. 2015;142:645–52.
56. Li X, Wu J, Yin L, Zhang Y, Qu J, Lu J. Comparative transcriptome analysis reveals defense-related genes and pathways against downy mildew in *Vitis amurensis* grapevine. Plant Physiol Biochem. 2015;95:1–14. doi:10.1016/j.plaphy.2015.06.016.
57. Hamiduzzaman MM, Jakab G, Barnavon L, Neuhaus J-M, Mauch-Mani B. β -Aminobutyric Acid-Induced Resistance Against Downy Mildew in Grapevine Acts Through the Potentiation of Callose Formation and Jasmonic Acid Signaling. Mol Plant-Microbe Interact. 2005;18:819–29. doi:10.1094/MPMI-18-0819.
58. Audenaert K, De Meyer GB, Höfte M. Absciscic acid determines basal susceptibility of tomato to *Botrytis cinerea* and suppresses salicylic acid- dependent signaling mechanisms. Plant Physiol. 2002;128:491–501. doi:10.1104/pp.010605.1.
59. Asselbergh B, Achuo AE, Höfte M, Van Gijsegem F. Absciscic acid deficiency leads to rapid activation of tomato defence responses upon infection with *Erwinia chrysanthemi*. Mol Plant Pathol. 2008;9:11–24. doi:10.1111/j.1364-3703.2007.00437.x.
60. Gupta A, Hisano H, Hojo Y, Matsuura T, Ikeda Y, Mori IC, et al. Global profiling of phytohormone dynamics during combined drought and pathogen stress in *Arabidopsis thaliana* reveals ABA and JA as major regulators. Sci Rep. 2017;7:4017.
61. Allègre M, Héloir MC, Trouvelot S, Daire X, Pugin A, Wendehenne D, et al. Are grapevine stomata involved in the elicitor-induced protection against downy mildew? Mol Plant-Microbe Interact. 2009;22:977–86.
62. Melotto M, Underwood W, Koczan J, Nomura K, He SY. Plant Stomata Function in Innate Immunity against Bacterial Invasion. Cell. 2006;126:969–80. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2006.06.054.
63. Ton J, Mauch-Mani B. β -amino-butyric acid-induced resistance against necrotrophic pathogens is based on ABA-dependent priming for callose. Plant J. 2004;38:119–30. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2004.02028.x.
64. Liu S, Wu J, Zhang P, Hasi G, Huang Y, Lu J, et al. Response of phytohormones and correlation of SAR signal pathway genes to the different resistance levels of grapevine against *Plasmopara viticola* infection. Plant Physiol Biochem. 2016;107:56–66. doi:10.1016/j.plaphy.2016.05.020.
65. Unger S, Büche C, Boso S, Kassemeyer H-H. The Course of Colonization of Two Different *Vitis* Genotypes by *Plasmopara viticola* Indicates Compatible and Incompatible Host-Pathogen Interactions. Phytopathology. 2007;97:780–6. doi:10.1094/PHYTO-97-7-0780.

66. Ren H, Gao Z, Chen L, Wei K, Liu J, Fan Y, et al. Dynamic analysis of ABA accumulation in relation to the rate of ABA catabolism in maize tissues under water deficit. *J Exp Bot.* 2007;58:211–9. doi:10.1093/jxb/erl117.
67. Schultz HR. Water relations and photosynthetic response of two grapevine cultivars of different geographical origin during water stress. *Acta Hortic.* 1996;:251–66. doi:10.17660/ActaHortic.1996.427.30.
68. Prieto JA, Lebon É, Ojeda H. Stomatal behavior of different grapevine cultivars in response to soil water status and air water vapor pressure deficit. *J Int des Sci la Vigne du Vin* journal Int des Sci la vigne du vin. 2010;44:9–20. doi:10.20870/oeno-one.2010.44.1.1459.
69. Soar CJ, Speirs J, Maffei SM, Penrose AB, McCarthy MG, Loveys BR. Grape vine varieties Shiraz and Grenache differ in their stomatal response to VPD: apparent links with ABA physiology and gene expression in leaf tissue. *Aust J Grape Wine Res.* 2006;12:2–12. doi:10.1111/j.1755-0238.2006.tb00038.x.
70. Pospíšilová J. Participation of phytohormones in the stomatal regulation of gas exchange during water stress. *Biol Plant.* 2003;46:491–506. doi:10.1023/A:1024894923865.
71. Stoll M, Schultz HR, Berkemann-Loehnertz B. Exploring the sensitivity of thermal imaging for *Plasmopara viticola* pathogen detection in grapevines under different water status. *Funct Plant Biol.* 2008;35:281. doi:10.1071/FP07204.
72. Selim M. Elicitation of grapevine defense responses against *Plasmopara viticola*, the causal agent of downy mildew. Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen; 2013.
73. Jermini M, Blaise P, Gessler C. Influence of *Plasmopara viticola* on gas exchange parameters on field-grown *Vitis vinifera* “Merlot.” *Vitis.* 2010;49:87–93.
74. Figueiredo A, Martins J, Sebastiana M, Guerreiro A, Silva A, Matos AR, et al. Specific adjustments in grapevine leaf proteome discriminating resistant and susceptible grapevine genotypes to *Plasmopara viticola*. *J Proteomics.* 2017;152:48–57. doi:10.1016/j.jprot.2016.10.012.
75. Gamm M, Héloir M, Bligny R, Vaillant-gaveau N, Trouvelot S, Alcaraz G, et al. Changes in Carbohydrate Metabolism in *Plasmopara viticola*-Infected Grapevine Leaves. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact.* 2011;24:1061–73. doi:10.1094 /MPMI -02-11-0040.
76. Moriondo M, Orlandini S, Giuntoli A, Bindi M. The Effect of Downy and Powdery Mildew on Grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* L.) Leaf Gas Exchange. *J Phytopathol.* 2005;153:350–7. doi:10.1111/j.1439-0434.2005.00984.x.
77. Cséfalvay L, Di Gaspero G, Matouš K, Bellin D, Ruperti B, Olejníčková J. Pre-symptomatic detection of *Plasmopara viticola* infection in grapevine leaves using chlorophyll fluorescence imaging. *Eur J Plant Pathol.* 2009;125:291–302. doi:10.1007/s10658-009-9482-7.
78. Laxa M, Liebthal M, Telman W, Chibani K, Dietz K-J. The Role of the Plant Antioxidant System in Drought Tolerance. *Antioxidants.* 2019;8:94. doi:10.3390/antiox8040094.
79. Harman GE, Latorre B, Agosin E, San Martin R, Riegel DG, Nielsen PA, et al. Biological and Integrated Control of Botrytis Bunch Rot of Grape Using *Trichoderma* spp. *Biol Control.* 1996;7:259–66.

doi:10.1006/bcon.1996.0092.

80. Yamamoto Y, Kobayashi Y, Matsumoto H. Lipid Peroxidation Is an Early Symptom Triggered by Aluminum, But Not the Primary Cause of Elongation Inhibition in Pea Roots. *Plant Physiol.* 2001;125:199–208. doi:10.1104/pp.125.1.199.
81. Nascimento R, Maia M, Ferreira AEN, Silva AB, Freire AP, Cordeiro C, et al. Early stage metabolic events associated with the establishment of *Vitis vinifera* – *Plasmopara viticola* compatible interaction. *Plant Physiol Biochem.* 2019;137:1–13. doi:10.1016/j.plaphy.2019.01.026.
82. Klessig DF, Durner J, Noad R, Navarre DA, Wendehenne D, Kumar D, et al. Nitric oxide and salicylic acid signaling in plant defense. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2000;97:8849–55. doi:10.1073/pnas.97.16.8849.
83. Foyer CH, Noctor G. Redox Homeostasis and Antioxidant Signaling: A Metabolic Interface between Stress Perception and Physiological Responses. *The Plant Cell.* 2005;17 July:1866–75. doi:10.1105/tpc.105.033589.
84. Matysik J, Alia, Bhalu B, Mohanty P. Molecular mechanisms of quenching of reactive oxygen species by proline under stress in plants. *Curr Sci.* 2002;82:525–32. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24105959>.
85. Doupis G, Chartzoulakis K, Beis A, Patakas A. Allometric and biochemical responses of grapevines subjected to drought and enhanced ultraviolet-B radiation. *Aust J Grape Wine Res.* 2011;17:36–42. doi:10.1111/j.1755-0238.2010.00114.x.
86. Ali K, Maltese F, Figueiredo A, Rex M, Margarida A, Zyprian E, et al. Alterations in grapevine leaf metabolism upon inoculation with *Plasmopara viticola* in different time-points. *Plant Sci.* 2012;191–192:100–7. doi:10.1016/j.plantsci.2012.04.014.
87. Tzortzakis N, Chrysargyris A, Aziz A. Adaptive Response of a Native Mediterranean Grapevine Cultivar Upon Short-Term Exposure to Drought and Heat Stress in the Context of Climate Change. *Agronomy.* 2020;10:249. doi:10.3390/agronomy10020249.
88. Brilli M, Asquini E, Moser M, Bianchedi PL, Perazzolli M, Si-Ammour A. A multi-omics study of the grapevine-downy mildew (*Plasmopara viticola*) pathosystem unveils a complex protein coding- and noncoding-based arms race during infection. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8:757. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-19158-8.
89. Haeck A, Van Langenhove H, Harinck L, Kyndt T, Gheysen G, Höfte M, et al. Trace analysis of multi-class phytohormones in *Oryza sativa* using different scan modes in high-resolution Orbitrap mass spectrometry: method validation, concentration levels, and screening in multiple accessions. *Anal Bioanal Chem.* 2018;410:4527–39. doi:10.1007/s00216-018-1112-9.
90. Richardson AD, Duigan SP, Berlyn GP. An evaluation of noninvasive methods to estimate foliar chlorophyll content. *New Phytol.* 2002;153:185–94. doi:10.1046/j.0028-646X.2001.00289.x.
91. Chrysargyris A, Xylia P, Botsaris G, Tzortzakis N. Antioxidant and antibacterial activities, mineral and essential oil composition of spearmint (*Mentha spicata* L.) affected by the potassium levels. *Ind Crops Prod.* 2017;103 August 2016:202–12. doi:10.1016/j.indcrop.2017.04.010.
92. Khedr AHA. Proline induces the expression of salt-stress-responsive proteins and may improve the adaptation of *Pancreaticum maritimum* L. to salt-stress. *J Exp Bot.* 2003;54:2553–62.

doi:10.1093/jxb/erg277.

93. Bradford M. A Rapid and Sensitive Method for the Quantitation of Microgram Quantities of Protein Utilizing the Principle of Protein-Dye Binding. *Anal Biochem.* 1976;72:248–54.
doi:10.1006/abio.1976.9999.
94. Jiang M, Zhang J. Involvement of plasma-membrane NADPH oxidase in abscisic acid- and water stress-induced antioxidant defense in leaves of maize seedlings. *Planta.* 2002;215:1022–30.
doi:10.1007/s00425-002-0829-y.
95. Chrysargyris A, Michailidi E, Tzortzakis N. Physiological and Biochemical Responses of *Lavandula angustifolia* to Salinity Under Mineral Foliar Application. *Front Plant Sci.* 2018;9 April:1–23.
doi:10.3389/fpls.2018.00489.
96. Tarchoune I, Sgherri C, Izzo R, Lachaâl M, Navari-Izzo F, Ouerghi Z. Changes in the antioxidative systems of *Ocimum basilicum* L. (cv. Fine) under different sodium salts. *Acta Physiol Plant.* 2012;34:1873–81. doi:10.1007/s11738-012-0985-z.
97. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2019. <https://www.r-project.org/>.

Figures

Figure 1

The twelve treatments used in this experimental set-up. Each treatment group, represented by one timeline, consisted of five plants of both cultivars, drought-resistant Xynisteri and drought-sensitive Chardonnay. The plants were first exposed to 7 days of full/deficit irrigation (short full irrigation/short deficit irrigation), to establish the effect of short drought stress, or to 14 days of full/deficit irrigation (prolonged full irrigation/prolonged deficit irrigation), to examine the effect of prolonged drought stress. At day 7 or 14, the plants were either sampled destructively or were maintained under the current irrigation regime. Some of the sampled leaves of the first group were used for in vitro inoculation with water (Ctrl) or *P. viticola* (Path) to assess the effect of previous exposure to drought stress on the disease development. The other groups were inoculated in planta, either with water (Ctrl) or with *P. viticola* (Path), to determine the effect of continued exposure to drought stress on the disease development. These plants were sampled at 9 or 16 days of irrigation treatment (dot), corresponding to 1.5 days post inoculation (dpi), and were maintained under the full/deficit irrigation until the disease evaluation at 7 dpi.

Figure 2

Basal content of hormones, chlorophylls, and oxidative parameters in Xynisteri (XYN) and Chardonnay (CHAR). Samples from fully irrigated plants, not inoculated with the pathogen, were analyzed and pooled. The samples had been collected from five plants of each cultivar at 7 and 14 days of full irrigation (previous exposure to full irrigation, before inoculation – see Fig. 1) and at 9 and 16 days of full irrigation (control treatments of the continued exposure to full irrigation – see Fig. 1). The parameters are considered significantly different for both cultivars if the p-value is below 0.05 (Mann-Whitney U-test). All observations are shown as dots. The line inside the box and the lower and upper boundary of the box represent the median, first and third quartile, respectively. The whiskers indicate the minimum and

maximum, excluding outliers. All observations outside the 1.5 times interquartile range of the first or third quartile are considered outliers.

a Previous exposure – *in vitro* inoculation

b Continued exposure – *in planta* inoculation

Figure 3

Influence of drought stress on the susceptibility of Xynisteri (XYN) and Chardonnay (CHAR) to *P. viticola*. The control plants were fully irrigated (FI), while the drought-stressed plants were exposed to deficit irrigation (DI). Different letters indicate significant differences (Mann-Whitney U-test; $p < 0.05$). a Previous exposure to drought stress: Plants were exposed to 7 or 14 dot before the leaves were detached (previous exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). Leaf disks were inoculated with a *P. viticola* sporangia suspension and each disk was evaluated 5 days later by counting the sporangiophores. Five plants of each cultivar were used per treatment, resulting in an average of 60 disks per treatment; b Continued exposure to drought stress: Plants were exposed to 7 or 14 dot prior to being sprayed with a *P. viticola* sporangia suspension (continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). The irrigation regime was maintained until the disease severity was evaluated, 7 days later. Five plants of each cultivar were used per treatment.

Figure 4

The impact of pathogen and drought stress on the plants' physiological parameters. Xynisteri (XYN) and Chardonnay (CHAR) plants had been subjected to 7 or 14 days of full (FI) or deficit (DI) irrigation before in planta inoculation with water (Ctrl) or *P. viticola* (Path) (continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). The stomatal conductance, chlorophyll fluorescence, and SPAD were measured at 1.5 days post inoculation (dpi), corresponding to 9 or 16 days of irrigation treatment (dot). For the effect of drought stress, the fully irrigated and deficit-irrigated control plants are to be compared. For the effect of the pathogen stress, the water-inoculated and pathogen-inoculated, fully irrigated plants should be compared. The line inside the box and the lower and upper boundary of the box represent the median, first and third quartile, respectively. The whiskers indicate the highest and lowest occurring value within the 1.5 times interquartile range. Outliers are marked as individual dots.

Figure 5

The impact of drought and pathogen stress on the leaf phytohormone balance. Xynisteri (XYN) and Chardonnay (CHAR) plants had been subjected to 7 or 14 days of full (FI) or deficit (DI) irrigation before in planta inoculation with water (Ctrl) or *P. viticola* (Path) (continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). Samples for analysis were taken at 1.5 days post inoculation (dpi), corresponding to 9 or 16 days of irrigation treatment (dot). Each treatment consisted of five repetitions. For the effect of drought stress, the fully irrigated and deficit-irrigated control plants are to be compared. For the effect of the pathogen stress, the water-inoculated and pathogen-inoculated, fully irrigated plants should be compared. The line inside the box and the lower and upper boundary of the box represent the median, first and third quartile, respectively. The whiskers indicate the highest and lowest occurring value within the 1.5 times interquartile range. Outliers are marked as individual dots.

Figure 6

Impact of drought and pathogen on the photosynthetic pigments and oxidative parameters. Xynisteri (XYN) and Chardonnay (CHAR) plants had been subjected to 7 or 14 days of full (FI) or deficit (DI) irrigation before in planta inoculation with water (Ctrl) or *P. viticola* (Path) (continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1). Samples for analysis were taken at 1.5 days post inoculation (dpi), corresponding to 9 or 16 days of irrigation treatment (dot). Each treatment consisted of five repetitions. For the effect of drought stress, the fully irrigated and deficit-irrigated control plants are to be compared. For the effect of the pathogen stress, the water-inoculated and pathogen-inoculated, fully irrigated plants

should be compared. The line inside the box and the lower and upper boundary of the box represent the median, first and third quartile, respectively. The whiskers indicate the highest and lowest occurring value within the 1.5 times interquartile range. Outliers are marked as individual dots.

Figure 7

Principal component analysis visualizing the patterns in the phytohormone balance, oxidative balance and chlorophyll content. Phytohormones are indicated with black arrows, oxidative parameters with brown arrows, and chlorophylls with green arrows. All plants (treated with continued exposure to full/deficit irrigation – see Fig. 1) are represented by dots. Grouping is performed according to a cultivar: drought-tolerant Xynisteri (XYN) or drought-sensitive Chardonnay (CHAR); b drought stress: full (FI) or deficit (DI) irrigation and duration, at 9 or 16 days of irrigation treatment (dot); c pathogen stress: water-inoculated (Ctrl), no symptoms (0), oil spots (1), light sporulation (2), spreading sporulation (3), heavily diseased (4). The first, second, and third principal component explain 29.1%, 19.2%, and 13.7% of the variation respectively.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Additionalfile1.xlsx](#)
- [Additionalfile21.tif](#)
- [Additionalfile3.xlsx](#)
- [Additionalfile4.xlsx](#)
- [Additionalfile51.tif](#)
- [Additionalfile61.tif](#)
- [Additionalfile7.xlsx](#)
- [ESM1.pdf](#)