



# Soil and plant health in relation to dynamic sustainment of Eh and pH homeostasis: A review

Olivier Husson · Jean-Pierre Sarthou · Lydia Bousset · Alain Ratnadass · Hans-Peter Schmidt · John Kempf · Benoit Husson · Sophie Tingry · Jean-Noël Aubertot · Jean-Philippe Deguine · François-Régis Goebel · Jay Ram Lamichhane

Received: 28 January 2021 / Accepted: 14 June 2021

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

## Abstract

**Background** Plants perform in a specific Eh–pH spectrum and they rely on various processes to ensure their homeostasis, which plays a central role in their defense. The effects of multiple stresses, all translated into oxidative stress into the plant, and the capacity of the latter to respond to these stresses results in specific Eh–pH states in plants.

**Scope** We reviewed plant-invertebrate pests and plant-pathogens interactions under a Eh–pH homeostasis

perspective by extensively analyzing the literature, which converges and supports a set of hypotheses. We report examples showing how the development and attacks of pests are correlated to spatio-temporal variations of Eh–pH in plants. We provide evidence-based discussion on how Eh–pH homeostasis can open a new perspective on plant health, and help unravel and disentangle the many Genotype x Environment x Management x Pest and Pathogen interactions. We propose an original perspective on energy allocation and growth-defense tradeoff by plants based on the Eh–pH homeostasis model. Finally, we show how Eh–pH conditions

---

Responsible Editor: Alexia Stokes.

---

O. Husson (✉) · F.-R. Goebel  
CIRAD, UPR AIDA, 34398 Montpellier, France  
e-mail: olivier.husson@cirad.fr

O. Husson · F.-R. Goebel  
AIDA, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, Montpellier, France

J.-P. Sarthou · J.-N. Aubertot · J. R. Lamichhane  
Université de Toulouse, INRAE, INP-ENSAT Toulouse,  
UMR AGIR, F-31320 Castanet-Tolosan, France

L. Bousset  
INRAE, UMR 1349 IGEPP – Agrocampus Ouest Rennes-  
Université Rennes 1; BP35327, 35653 Le Rheu cedex,  
France

A. Ratnadass  
CIRAD, UPR HortSys, F-97455 Saint-Pierre, Réunion,  
France

A. Ratnadass  
HortSys, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, Montpellier, France

H.-P. Schmidt  
Ithaka Institute for Carbon Strategies, Ancienne Eglise 9,  
1974 Arbaz, Switzerland

J. Kempf  
Advancing Eco Agriculture, 4551 Parks West Rd,  
Middlefield, OH 44062, USA

B. Husson  
IDEE, Parc Euromedecine 2, 39 Rue Jean Giroux,  
34080 Montpellier, France

S. Tingry  
Institut Européen Des Membranes, IEM UMR-5635,  
Université de Montpellier, ENSCM, CNRS, Place Eugène  
Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France

J.-P. Deguine  
CIRAD, UMR PVBMT, 97410 Saint Pierre, La Réunion,  
France

in the rhizosphere are the results of multiple interactions between the root system and microorganisms. Based on this, we hypothesize that soil suppressiveness is derived from soil structure leading to diverse Eh–pH niches that harbor a diversity of microorganisms.

**Conclusions** The Eh–pH homeostasis model proposed herein is central to soil and plant health. An Eh–pH perspective could become a very powerful tool to develop a “one health approach” unifying a large range of bio-physical processes in a very coherent and consistent manner.

**Keywords** Redox potential · pH · Energy allocation · Growth-defense · One health · Soil suppressiveness

## Introduction

“Research is to see what everybody has seen, and think what nobody has thought” Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Nobel prize laureate.

Since the late nineteenth century and until quite recently, medical microbiology was based on the assumption that a few microorganisms are pathogens while most are not. Although this binary view has now been strongly criticized, and considered untenable (Méthot and Alizon 2014), it is generally recognized that the interaction of the three factors, viz. the host, pathogenic agent, and environment (the plant disease triangle), determines whether a disease develops or not. Thus, plant stage of growth, pathogen virulence, and environmental changes result in a dynamic relationship over space and time (Agrios 2005). Variations in any of the three interacting factors could significantly alter expected patterns of disease spread and development (Farber and Mundt 2017). Even if a host plant and a potential pathogen are present in a given area, serious disease epidemics will not occur unless the environment fosters their development (Bateman 1978; Keane and Kerr 1997; Agrios 2005). Abiotic stresses can dramatically alter the outcome of plant-pathogen interactions and, depending on the pathosystem and stress intensity, the stress may enhance or reduce disease development. Even mild, episodic stresses can predispose plants to levels of pathogen inoculum that would not be damaging in the

absence of the stress (Bostock et al. 2014). Environmental stresses also affect overall plant tolerance to insect pests (Louda and Collinge 1992).

The idea that a pathogenic organism is essentially a static or unchanging entity that is distinct from other types of microbes would mean that such a microorganism possessed an inherent capacity to cause disease in hosts. Pathogenicity is a dynamic feature of an interaction between a host and microbes as influenced by the environment (Agrios 2005; Méthot and Alizon 2014). The role of beneficial or commensal microorganisms in plant health has now been widely acknowledged, both in soil (especially the rhizosphere microbiome), and in leaves (the phyllosphere microbiome; Andrews and Harris 2000; Paszkowski 2006; Leveau 2019; Teixeira et al. 2019; Yu et al. 2019). Although knowledge of plant–plant and plant–microbe interactions has been greatly extended in recent years, the chemical communication leading to defense priming is not well-understood (Mhlongo et al. 2018). This highlights the need to further elucidate microbial functions and their interactions (Toyota and Shirai 2018). Thus, two of the major remaining questions are “what makes a commensal or an opportunistic microorganism pathogenic?” and “how do pathogenic microorganisms affect plant health?”.

Understanding the impacts of stresses on plant health is, therefore, important to maximize crop production efficiency. Stress is defined as “a sudden change in the environment that exceeds the organism’s optimum to cause homeostatic imbalance which must be compensated for” (Kilian et al. 2012). Homeostasis is considered as an underestimated focal point of ecology and evolution (Giordano 2013) although “cellular redox homeostasis in plants” is known to be central to the plant stress defense system (Anjum et al. 2016). Redox potential (Eh) and hydrogen potential (pH) signaling and homeostasis should be regarded as key processes in many aspects of plant biology (Rengel 2002; Foyer and Noctor 2016). This is because plants function in a specific Eh–pH spectrum and they rely on various processes to ensure intracellular homeostasis (Husson 2013). Therefore, the redox balance in both the host and pathogen may be considered as a key battlefield that determines the outcome of the pathogen attack (Williams et al. 2011).

Eh–pH regulation (sustainment of extra- and intracellular redox states) are important to both plant-pathogen (bacteria, fungi, oomycetes, and viruses) and plant-invertebrate pest (especially insects) interactions via:

- i) upstream regulation, by sustaining the plant unfavorable to pest or pathogen attacks: via development of physical barriers (wax, suberin, cutin, hardened cell walls, silica, etc.) or regulation of natural openings such as stomata (Chen and Gallie 2004; Foyer 2005; Liu et al. 2007; Pollard et al. 2008; Samuels et al. 2008; Pastor et al. 2013; Coskun et al. 2019);
- ii) downstream regulation, following pest or pathogen attacks, mainly through oxygen burst by plants and responses of pests or pathogens (Mehdy 1994; Lamb and Dixon 1997; Kuzniak et al. 2005; Kuzniak 2010; Lehmann et al. 2015; Qi et al. 2016; González-Bosch 2018; Segal and Wilson 2018) to include;
- iii) control of Systemic Acquired Resistance (SAR) and Induced Systemic Resistance (ISR) (Fobert and Després 2005; Spoel and Loake 2011; Frederickson Matika and Loake 2013) in a complex interaction with plant hormones (Srivastava et al. 2017).

Sensing of the host plant by pests and pathogens can be affected by the plant's Eh–pH state in different ways, including emission of volatiles (Wei et al. 2014), redox associated mechanisms as in parasitic weeds (Yoder 2001), osmotic changes, and alteration of magnetic and electric fields emitted by plants, which are recognized by insects (Newland et al. 2008; Greggers et al. 2013; Clarke et al. 2013), nematodes (Shapiro-Ilan et al. 2012; Ilan et al. 2013) and oomycetes (van West et al. 2002).


Cook and Baker (1983) defined disease suppressive soils as soils in which the pathogen: i) does not establish or persist, ii) establishes but causes no damage, or iii) causes some damage but the disease development progressively halts even though the pathogen persists in soil. Two types of soil suppressiveness are known: i) general suppression, which is not transferable between soils, is due to nutrient status and activity of the total microbial biomass in soil, and ii) specific suppression, which is transferable, is owing to

the activity of individual or selected groups of microorganisms (Weller et al. 2002; Schlatter et al. 2017). While soil suppressiveness is mainly derived from the biological functions of soils (Toyota and Shirai 2018; Steinberg et al. 2019; De Corato 2021), there is also plenty of evidence showing the role of abiotic factors in disease reduction (Schneider 1982). Chemical and physical components of soil, including pH, organic matter and clay content, can be associated with disease suppression directly or indirectly by affecting soil microbial activity (Smiley and Cook 1972; Chandrashekara et al. 2012).

The definition of soil health or quality includes a range of physical, chemical and biological soil properties, such as soil type, organic matter content, nutrient cycling, biological activity and soil structure, all of which impact and are impacted by soil Eh and pH (Van Bruggen and Semenov 2000; Cardoso et al. 2013; Moebius-Clune et al. 2017; Bünemann et al. 2018; Husson et al. 2018b). Methods developed to assess plant health, based on the underlying stress level measured as chlorophyll fluorescence or other photo-oxidative stress markers (including photosynthetic pigments, Photosystem II efficiency, Reactive Oxygen Species -ROS-, reactive carbonyl species, antioxidant systems), are related to Eh and pH (Husson et al. 2018a).

A previous interdisciplinary review highlighted that Eh and pH are major drivers of soil–plant–microorganism systems (Husson 2013). This review, by bridging different disciplines such as soil sciences, plant physiology and microbial ecology, proposed a conceptual framework for studies of soil–plant–microorganism functioning. The framework was based on the hypothesis that plants function physiologically within a specific internal Eh–pH range and that, along with microorganisms, they alter Eh and pH in the rhizosphere to ensure homeostasis at the cell level. Based on that review and subsequent works, we propose a conceptual model of soil–plant–microorganism system functioning driven by Eh and pH (Fig. 1):

Changes in Eh–pH levels in plants can result from interactions among different factors (edaphic, climatic and biotic). In this model, the effects of multiple stresses induce oxidative stress in the plant that result in a specific Eh–pH state. Under favorable conditions, plants will be able to sustain their homeostasis through an efficient photosynthetic



**Fig. 1** The Eh–pH driven conceptual model of how the soil–plant–microorganism system could function to indicate the key role of dynamic sustainment of Eh–pH homeostasis for soil and plant health. Plants (01) grow in soil with highly fluctuating Eh–pH (02). To ensure the necessary Eh–pH homeostasis at the cellular level (03), they regulate Eh and pH at short term through cascades of chemical and buffering reactions (04). When short-term buffering capacity is exceeded, there is a response at the transcript level (05). Eh–pH homeostasis is also sustained through metabolic compartmentation in the various organelles as the latter operate at specific levels inside a cell (06), and the cells evacuate the highly oxidized or reduced products from the cytoplasm through the cell walls (07). Another important process to achieve internal Eh–pH homeostasis is regulation of the external Eh–pH at the rhizosphere level (08). Under highly reduced (anaerobic) conditions, some plants (such as rice) have the ability to pump oxygen through aerenchyma cells to raise Eh in the rhizosphere (09). Under aerobic (oxidizing) conditions, plants exudate a wide range of

process, which uses solar energy to produce energy rich-glucose by combining  $\text{CO}_2$  with  $\text{H}_2$  from water. Oxidative stresses linked to unfavorable conditions (extreme pH, nutrient deficiency,  $\text{NO}_3^-$  absorption, metal toxicity, reduction of N, Fe, Mn, or S, pollution, low light, water stress, extreme temperatures, biotic stresses, etc.) require responses that represent an energy cost for the plant. The higher the stress, the higher the cost, creating a vicious circle where the more the plant spends energy to sustain cell homeostasis, the less energy it has to produce leaves; the smaller the leaf area, the lower the photosynthetic capacity; and the lower the photosynthesis, the lower

compounds (10). These exudates modify rhizosphere Eh–pH (11), stimulate and feed specific microorganisms (12), which further alter rhizosphere Eh–pH conditions (13). In return, soil, and especially rhizosphere, Eh–pH will largely determine the composition of the microflora (14) and the solubility and absorption of nutrients and heavy metals (15). Plant nutrition affects plant Eh–pH, especially nutrient deficiencies and toxic elements, which results in oxidative stress (16). Similarly, abiotic stresses (temperature, water,  $\text{CO}_2$ , light, etc.) (17) lead to oxidative stress in the plant which conducts to higher susceptibility to pests and pathogens. These biotic stresses (18) also lead to oxidative stress in the plant (19). In the medium to long term, plant residues (20) feed the soil microbes, alter soil organic matter (21), determine biological activity and diversity (22) and affect soil structure (23). Via these interactions, soil pH is buffered towards neutral values while soil Eh is lowered and buffered (24). Finally, soil microbes and Eh affect the fate of soil organic matter by increasing mineralization and reducing humification under oxidized conditions (25)

the capacity to sustain Eh–pH homeostasis. When the various stresses overpass the plant capacity to sustain cell homeostasis, it leads to a strong imbalance that can cause severe consequences, as for example, increased susceptibility to pests and pathogens and leading ultimately to plant death.

This paper proposes a novel conceptual framework of plant interactions with pests and pathogens that is based on the following hypotheses: soil and plant health are strongly related to Eh–pH homeostasis and plants become susceptible to pest and pathogen attacks if their compartments are subjected to imbalanced Eh–pH conditions with specific Eh–pH values

for each pest or pathogen to thrive. The conceptual framework is based on four sub-hypotheses:

- i) Pests and pathogens thrive in specific Eh–pH niches, *i.e.*, spots in which the individuals of a species are exposed to different environmental conditions that allow microbial persistence and utilization of present resources. Species-specific phenotypic characteristics determine if a species can be found in a certain ecological niche and how it interacts with its environment (Koch and Harnisch 2016),
- ii) The various plant parts (roots, shoots, stems, flowers, grains or fruits and phloem, xylem or apoplast, cells, organelles etc.) constitute different Eh–pH niches, with temporal variations,
- iii) Eh–pH in various plant parts depends on the plant genotype,
- iv) Environmental (abiotic and biotic) stresses alter Eh–pH in these niches.

Redox regulation is also involved in plant-weed interactions, especially in parasitic weeds (Yoder 2001) and through redox-associated mechanisms for allelopathy (Downum and Rodriguez 1986; Cheng and Cheng 2015). However, we exclude weeds from this review and focus only on pathogens and invertebrate pests for which Eh–pH interactions are better documented.

Likewise, the detailed processes involved in sustainment of Eh–pH homeostasis at various scales of the plant/soil/microorganisms systems are not the focus of this review. In particular, we do not consider the critical roles of transition metals in processes related to dynamic redox regulation. However, it is worth to stress that metals such as Fe, Mn, Zn, Cu, Co, or Mo regulate and are regulated by Eh–pH conditions and their homeostasis in the various plant compartments is crucial, especially in chloroplasts (Yruela 2013). Transition metals are virtually involved in all oxidation–reduction reactions through:

- i) physical processes, as their ability to accept or donate single electrons allows them to overcome the spin restriction in oxidation by O<sub>2</sub>, in accordance with Pauli’s principle (Halliwell and Gutteridge 1984);
- ii) chemical processes, exchanging electrons and protons with a ratio different than one as the Fe<sup>2+</sup>/Fe(OH)<sub>3</sub> redox couple exchanging three protons for one electron, thus impacting the electrons-protons balance

(*pe* + pH) in soils (Ponnamperuma 1972); and iii) biological processes, being essential constituents of molecules involved in redox processes as chlorophyll, cytochromes and enzymes as oxidases and hydrogenases (Halliwell and Gutteridge 1984; Yruela 2013). Sustainment of Eh–pH homeostasis should therefore be regarded as a dynamic process, insured by strong interactions between physical, chemical and biological processes and is related to metal ions homeostasis.

To support our underlying hypotheses, we: i) Provide an analysis of plant-invertebrate pests and plant-pathogens interactions from an Eh–pH perspective by reviewing the literature; ii) Report examples showing how development and attacks of pests or pathogens are correlated with spatial and temporal variations in plant Eh–pH; iii) Propose evidence-based discussion with regard to how Eh–pH homeostasis can provide a new perspective on plant health and help clarify the many Genotype x Environment x Management x Pest or Pathogen (G x E x M x P) interactions; iv) Explore correlations between spatio-temporal variability of Eh–pH and genotypic variations as affected by various abiotic and biotic stresses and plant susceptibility-tolerance-resistance to pests and pathogens; v) Revisit mineral nutrition and plant-pest or pathogen interactions from an Eh–pH perspective as well as pathogenicity and virulence; vi) Propose an original perspective on energy allocation and growth-defense tradeoff by plants, based on the Eh–pH homeostasis approach, and finally; vii) Review how Eh–pH conditions in the rhizosphere are the results of multiple interactions between roots and microorganisms that allow us to propose the following hypothesis: soil structure leading to diverse Eh–pH niches and hosting a high diversity of microorganisms, is the key determinant of a soil’s disease suppressiveness.

### **Eh–pH conditions at which pests or pathogens can thrive**

#### Plant pathogens

Each organism has an optimal Eh–pH range for its development. Pathogens having a broad host range, such as *Pseudomonas syringae* (Morris et al. 2019), are able to develop under a large range of Eh–pH conditions. However, many pathogens are adapted to specific hosts, with a relatively narrow optimal range



of Eh–pH in which they are pathogenic (Rabotnova and Schwartz 1962). The Eh–pH conditions at which some plant pathogenic fungi and oomycetes can thrive are summarized in Table 1 while those for bacteria and viruses are reported in Table 2.

### Insect pests

Insect pest interactions with plants are affected by regulation and balance of pH (Harrison 2001) as well as by redox signaling (Zebelo and Maffei 2015). However, little is known about the influence of the combined Eh–pH levels (reflected in  $pe + pH$ ) of the plant parts that insects feed upon.

The redox state of the apoplast exerts a strong influence on the extent of the plant response to aphid infestation in terms of altered cell wall composition and nutritional quality (Rasool et al. 2017). Eh–pH conditions affect plant digestibility by insects, and redox active components such as phenols are regarded as antifeedant, digestibility reducers and toxic (Fürstenberg-Hägg et al. 2013; Usha Rani and Pratyusha 2013; Napoleão et al. 2017). The Eh–pH in insect intestinal tract is related to digestive enzymes and reflects different digestive strategies. The effects of plant allelochemicals, especially phenols, on insect herbivores are influenced by gut redox conditions. Therefore, the regulation of gut redox conditions is an important adaptation strategy of insect herbivores to the plant chemical defenses that must be included in the analysis of plant–insect interactions (Appel and Martin 1990). Herbivores may have multiple strategies to deal with foliar phenolics such as a "reducing strategy" in which reducing conditions in the gut prevent phenolic oxidation, and an "oxidative or polymerization strategy" in which phenolics are oxidized and rapidly polymerized. Herbivores feeding on foliage with a high concentration of readily oxidized and polymerized phenolics and low concentration of nutrients (e.g., many trees) may use the oxidative polymerization strategy. Conversely, herbivores feeding on foliage with a low concentration of phenolics but high concentration of nutrients for reducing potential (e.g., many herbs) may employ the reducing strategy (Appel 1993). Saprophytic larvae of *Penthetria holosericea*, which feed selectively on decomposed leaves and their own microbe-rich faeces, present very alkaline ( $pH > 11$ ) conditions with moderately low Eh (230 mV) in their midgut, what

means a high  $pe + pH$  ( $> 15$ ). These conditions differ fundamentally from those of detritivorous and humivorous insects which host a highly active, fermentative microbiota in their alkaline midgut or hindgut compartments (Šustr et al. 2014).

Regarding phytophagous insects, little is known about the Eh–pH level of the plant parts they feed upon. Adults or nymphs of sucking insects preferentially feed on plant parts at neutral to basic pH, e.g. the phloem (Giaquinta 1977; Gerendás and Schurr 1999). They dislike strongly reduced plants or plant parts that are rich in phenols and ascorbic acid (Farkas et al. 1960). It is interesting that these insects often are vectors of viruses that require high pH.

In a study of Lepidopteran larvae, midgut pH of *Helicoverpa zea*, *Heliothis virescens* and *Hyphantria cunea* (Noctuidae) revealed significant differences between insect species, but no host plant effect (geranium, cotton, clover or soybean), since all species had a strongly alkaline midgut at pH 9.3 to 10.6 (Johnson and Felton 1996a). In contrast, midgut Eh was affected by both insect and host plant species. Midguts of larvae feeding on clover and soybean had more positive redox potentials, with values about 100 mV higher than those of larvae feeding on geranium. In this interaction, much of the variation in midgut redox conditions was due to the redox activity of host plant chemicals at the alkaline pH of the gut (Johnson and Felton 1996a).

Midgut Eh–pH, in relation to plant Eh–pH, therefore, can help discriminate insects based on their feeding mode and capacity to cope with an oxidized diet. Johnson and Felton (1996b) reported midgut Eh and pH values for 13 Lepidopteran, two Coleopteran, one Orthopteran and one Isopteran species feeding on natural host plants or plant-derived foods. Table 3 reports new information published in the literature in this regard.

Phytophagous Lepidopteran larvae have a high midgut pH, with a low Eh and  $pe + pH$  for specialists such as *Manduca sexta*. In contrast, generalists, for example *Lymantria dispar* or *Papilio glaucus*, have a high Eh and  $pe + pH$  (Appel and Martin 1990; Johnson and Felton 1996b).

A lower level of ROS and a higher antioxidant potential in the adult than in the larval midgut indicate stage specificity in the management of oxidative stress as reported for *Leptinotarsa decemlineata* (Coleoptera, Chrysomelidae), the Colorado Potato

**Table 1** Optimal Eh–pH conditions at which key plant fungi and oomycetes are pathogenic. Most fungal pathogens develop under both oxidized (Eh > 400 mV) and acidic conditions. Necrotrophic fungi develop better in more acidic (and less oxidized) conditions than hemi-biotrophic and biotrophic fungi. A number of plant pathogenic fungi thrive in slightly acidic to alkaline conditions, as for example *Gaeumannomyces*, *Verticillium*, *Colletotrichum* sp. etc. Fungi thriving in the apoplast develop at lower pH than those growing in the phloem. Many oomycetes develop in less oxidized conditions than their fungal counterparts, in a wide range of pH although with large species-specific variations in optimal pH. pH values in brackets indicate possible range of survival while na means non-available. These are only indications of the tendency of the main groups of pathogens. As large differences can exist between species, each pathogen should be characterized by its specific Eh–pH range of development and its location in the plant

Pathogen type	Affected tissues	Species	Organs	pH	Eh (mV)	References		
Fungi	Necrotrophic							
		Apoplast	<i>Sclerotinia</i> spp (Mold, rot)	Stems, roots, leaves, fruits	3–4	500–600	(Webb 1921; Howlett et al. 2001; Suznki et al. 2003; Saharan et al. 2007; Yadeta and Thomma 2013; Alkan et al. 2013; Lebreton et al. 2014; Armijo et al. 2016; Knight and Sutherland 2016; Bousset et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2020)	
			<i>Rhizoctonia</i> spp (Various diseases)	Roots, Seeds	4.5–5.5	350–450		
			<i>Leptosphaeria maculans</i> (Blackleg, canker, rot)	Cotyledons	Young leaves	4–5.5	450–600	
			<i>Botrytis cinerea</i> (Grey mould)	Green tissues		4.1–5.9	500–550	
		Epidermis, Hypodermis	<i>Fusarium</i> spp (Rot)	Roots		5–8	400–500	
		Xylem	<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> (Wilt)	Roots, stems		6–7	na	
		Endodermis	<i>Gaeumannomyces</i> spp (Take all)	Stems, leaves	Specific	5–8	400–550	
		Epidermis, Xylem, Phloem	<i>Alternaria</i> spp (Early blight, leaf spot)	Leaves, roots, grain (glumes)		6–7 (5–8)	300–500	(Venard and Vaillancourt 2007; Diéguez-Urbeondo et al. 2008; Wicklow et al. 2009; Xie et al. 2010; Miyara et al. 2012; Landraud et al. 2013; Yadeta and Thomma 2013; Lebreton et al. 2014; Bousset et al. 2019)
	Hemi-biotrophic	Apoplast	<i>Magnaporthe oryzae</i> (Rice blast)	Roots, stems		6–9	400–600	
Xylem		<i>Verticillium</i> spp (Wilt)	Leaves, stems, roots (specific)		7–8 (3–9.2)	na		
Apoplast, Fiber cells, Xylem, Phloem (function of the species)		<i>Colletotrichum</i> spp (Anthracnose)	Green tissues	Conidia: 5–6. Variable with strains. Able to alkalinize		na		
		<i>Puccinia graminis</i> (Cereal rusts) ( <i>Obligiate</i> )	Stems	4–7.5	Variable with growing medium		(Webb 1921; Gebrie 2016)	
		<i>Blumeria graminis</i> (Mildews) ( <i>Obligiate</i> )	Leaves	< 5.5	Resistant		(Felle et al. 2004)	
		<i>Ustilago maydis</i> (Smut)	Leaves	5.1–5.5	na		(Geiser et al. 2014)	
		<i>Erysiphe graminis</i> (Powdery mildew)	Leaves	5.6	265–325		(Benada 1966; Arabi and Jawhar 2002)	

Table 1 (continued)

Pathogen type	Affected tissues	Species	Organs	pH	Eh (mV)	References
Oomycetes	Epi- and endodermis, Apoplast, Xylem, Phloem	<i>Pythium</i> spp (Damping off)	Seeds, roots, stems	6–6.5 (3–9) specific	Using nitrate Cathodo-tactic ( <i>P. aphanidermatum</i> )	(Van West et al. 2003; Kong et al. 2009; Van Buyten and Höfte 2013; Krasnow and Hausbeck 2017; Ah-Fong et al. 2019)
Hemi-biotrophic	Apoplast, Xylem	<i>Phytophthora</i> spp (Mildew)	Roots, tubers, leaves	6–6.5 Specific <i>P. citricola</i> : 9 <i>P. calis</i> : 5 <i>P. palmivora</i> : 4–6	<350 mV ( <i>Ph. infestans</i> ) Using amino-acids Anodotactic ( <i>P. palmivora</i> )	(Morris et al. 1995; Simpfendorfer et al. 2001; Van West et al. 2003; Benada 2012; Ah-Fong et al. 2019)
Biotrophic	Apoplast	<i>Albugo candida</i> (White rust)	Green tissues	6.5 (3.5–9.5)	na	(Endo and Linn 1960)

Beetle (Table 3). However, *L. decemlineata* is the only species studied for both adults and larvae and information on Eh–pH midgut conditions is missing for those species whose diet differs between immature and adult stages. For example, information on chewing-biting Lepidopteran caterpillars-worms is available only for larvae (since adults generally do not feed on plant parts) while the information is available only for adults for chewing-biting grasshoppers.

Nevertheless, the positioning of *L. decemlineata* on the Eh–pH map is consistent with that of beetles as *Epilachna varivestis* (Murdock et al. 1987; Johnson and Felton 1996b; Krishnan et al. 2009). The positioning of *Locusta migratoria* is also consistent with that of 25 species of Orthoptera, with *slightly acidic to neutral* (pH 6.05 to 7.48) and *oxidized* (Eh 190 to 335 mV) conditions in the digestive tract (Bignell 1984; Johnson and Felton 1996b; Appel and Joern 1998).

Similar information is not available for phloem-feeding species (e.g., aphids), since studies were conducted mainly for insects whose body size allows gut dissection (e.g., Lepidoptera, Orthoptera, and some Coleoptera, particularly Scarab beetles). Although Isoptera have a small body size, there is interest in studying their digestive processes because they involve symbiotic microbiota (in the hindgut). Still, there are some reservations about the accuracy of Eh measurements for the latter (Eutick et al. 1976; Veivers et al. 1980; Brune et al. 1995).

Overall, it is difficult to draw overarching conclusions of phytophagous-saprophytic insects based on their taxonomy, feeding-style or developmental stage due either to a complete lack of information on piercing-sucking species, or a partial lack of information on chewing-biting species for which diet differs between immature and adult stages.

#### Gastropods and nematodes

Charrier and Brune (2003) showed that two phyllophagous species of starved helcid snails (Gastropoda and Pulmonata), (*Helix pomatia* and *Cornu aspersum*, syn. *Helix aspersa*) had a pH increasing from the crop (an expanded portion of the alimentary tract used for the storage of food prior to digestion) to the distal intestine with a pH of 6.4 and 7.4, respectively. In the saprophagous *Elona quimperiana*, the pH along the gut axis remained acidic (5.1–6.6).



**Table 2** Eh–pH conditions where various types of plant pathogenic bacteria and viruses can develop. Many plant pathogenic bacteria grow under more reduced (lower Eh) conditions than their fungal counterparts, in alkaline or slightly acidic plants or plant parts. These conditions are met in reduced (anaerobic) soils, and correspond to relatively oxidized plants as nutrient balanced plants are reduced (pe+pH<10). Viruses develop under both reduced and alkaline conditions, which also correspond to conditions found in reduced soils, but in strongly oxidized plants as the phloem is buffered at very low Eh in nutrient balanced plants. The listed Eh–pH values are indicative of the range at which microorganisms are pathogenic on plants although some of them (notably Gram-negative bacteria) can thrive under different Eh–pH conditions, especially in reduced soil conditions for bacteria, and then become pathogenic when conditions become more oxidized. Aerobic conditions correspond to pe+pH>10 according to Rabotnova and Schwartz (1962), pe+pH is equivalent to the chemical notion of rH<sub>2</sub> or to correct Eh to pH 7, which better characterizes oxidation in organic chemistry than Eh alone. At 25 °C, pe+pH = Eh(V)/0.059 + pH. Electrical neutrality corresponds to pe+pH = 14 or Eh@pH7 = 402 mV (Husson et al. 2016)

Pathogen type	Affected tissues	Species	Organs	pH	Oxidation (pe+pH)	References
Bacteria Proteobacteria (Gram-negative)	Apoplast	<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i>	Leaves, roots, seedlings, Seeds	Large range. Apoplastic alkalization induced lesions	Oxic and micro-oxic = aerobic and facultative anaerobic	(Rabotnova and Schwartz 1962; Gour et al. 2000; Bové and Garnier 2003; Gnanamanickam 2006; Hogenhout and Loria 2008; Bueno et al. 2012; Yadeta and Thomma 2013; Geilfus et al. 2020)
		<i>Xanthomonas</i> spp		5–9	Aerobic	
		<i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i>		7–8	Aerobic	
	Apoplast,	<i>Erwinia</i> spp	Leaves, fruits, tubers	7.5 (5–9) Shifts > 8 upon infection	Facultative anaerobic, fermentative	(Nachin and Barras 2000; Shrestha et al. 2005; Matlysse 2006; Bueno et al. 2012; Hwang et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2018)
		<i>Agrobacterium tumefaciens</i>	Roots, stems, trunks	5.5	Aerobic Able to respire nitrogen oxides	
	Xylem limited	<i>Xylella fastidiosa</i>	Leaves	6.5–6.9	Aerobic	(Wells et al. 1987)
	Phloem limited	<i>Candidatus Liberibacter crescens</i>	Leaves, roots, tubers	5.8–6.8	Strictly aerobic	(Haapalainen 2014; Bendix and Lewis 2018; Cruz-Munoz et al. 2019; Molki et al. 2019)
		<i>Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus</i>		Neutrophilic Alkalinization of hemolymph to 8.1	Micro-aerophilic Facultative aerobic	
Firmicutes (Gram+)	Phloem limited	<i>Candidatus Phytoplasma</i>	Leaves, roots	6	Micro-aerophilic	(Wissenschafits et al. 1999; Bové and Garnier 2003; Hogenhout and Loria 2008; Jha and Sonti 2009; Sen et al. 2015; Bendix and Lewis 2018)
		<i>Spiroplasma</i>				
Actino-bacteria (Gram+)	Xylem and apoplast	<i>Clavibacter michiganensis</i>	Leaves, seed, roots, tubers	7–8 in culture Up to 5 in xylem Acidification of extracellular pH to 4.5 in Potato	Aerobic	
		<i>Corynebacterium sepeconomicum</i>				

**Table 2** (continued)

Pathogen type	Affected tissues	Species	Organs	pH	Oxidation (pe + pH)	References
Viruses	Phloem	Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus	Leaves	7	< 200 mV	(Best and Samuel 1936; Best 1968; Opalka et al. 1998; Brigidou et al. 2002; Steinmetz et al. 2006; Zechmann et al. 2007; Király et al. 2008; Clemente-Moreno et al. 2013; Gillet et al. 2013; Liao et al. 2015; Wills et al. 2015; Berthelot et al. 2019)
	Epidermis cells	Various viruses (Tobacco Mosaic Virus, Cowpea Mosaic Virus, Plum Pox Virus, Turnip Mosaic Virus, etc.)		(> 6 and < 9)	Controlled by antioxidant, increased by ROS	
	Phloem and xylem Epidermis cells	Rice Yellow Mottle Virus	Leaves, stems	Swollen, unstable at basic pH in cytosol (7.5) Compact, stable at acidic pH in vacuoles (5)	Favored by H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> redox switch	

**Table 3** Eh–pH physicochemical status of some phytophagous-saprophagous insects midgut (based on literature published following the review by Johnson and Felton 1996b)

Insect species	Order & Family	Food source	Midgut Redox (Eh: mV)	Midgut pH	References
<i>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</i>	Coleoptera; Chrysomelidae	Leaves-mesophylla	Adults: -177 to 0 Last instar larvae: +32 to +38 pe + pH: 5.93 to 6.95	Adults: 5.37–6.4 Last instar larvae: 5.38–6.30	(Krishnan et al. 2007, 2009)
<i>Melolontha melolontha</i>	Coleoptera; Scarabaeidae	Roots	+220 to +340	7.9–8.2	(Egert et al. 2005)
<i>Pachnoda ephippiata</i>	Coleoptera; Scarabaeidae	Soil organic matter	-190 to +180	8.4–10.7	(Lemke et al. 2003)
<i>Pachnoda marginata</i>	Coleoptera; Scarabaeidae	Soil organic matter	-200 to -100	9.5 – 11.7	(Cazemier et al. 1997, 2003)
<i>Penthetria holosericea</i>	Diptera; Bibionidae	Soil organic matter	+20 to +60	11	(Šustr et al. 2014)
<i>Agrois ipsilon</i>	Lepidoptera; Noctuidae	Stem-collar	+171 to +250	9–9.75	(Ellakwa 2014)
<i>Spodoptera littoralis</i>	Lepidoptera; Noctuidae	Leaves-mesophylla	-131 to +370	8.2–8.8	(Krishnan and Kodrik 2006)
<i>Acrididae (23 spp)</i>	Orthoptera; Acrididae	Leaves-mesophylla	+179 to +327	5.90–7.33	(Appel and Joern 1998)
<i>Reticulitermes flavipes</i>	Isoptera; Rhinotermitidae	Soil organic matter	+80 to +200	6.5 to 7.0	(Ebert and Brune 1997)
<i>Cubitermes ugandensis</i>	Isoptera; Termitidae	Soil organic matter	+350 to 400	6.0	(Kappler and Brune 2002)

Oxygen was not detected in the gut lumen of any of these species to highlight anaerobic conditions. This clearly illustrates that the morpho-anatomical differentiation of the intestinal tract corresponds to different physicochemical microenvironments. The increasing alkalinity along the gut should have repercussions for the microbial communities colonizing the intestine. Intestinal microbiota, in turn, may cause changes in the pH of the host tissue during anaerobiosis (Pörtner 1987; Charrier and Brune 2003).

Nematodes perceive and respond to pH and redox potential gradients in the soil or rhizosphere (Hua et al. 2020). Detrimental nematodes seem to require oxidized conditions as suggested by the negative impact of reduced conditions during anaerobic soil disinfection (Di Gioia et al. 2016; Browne et al. 2018), the efficient antioxidant defense systems of spring barley in response to stress induced by *Heterodera filipjevi* (Labudda et al. 2020), the high nematocidal activity of reduced organic acids (Oka 2010), or the requirement of peroxiredoxins from *Meloidogyne incognita* for its successful development (Dubreuil et al. 2011). Many plant pathogenic nematodes such as *Heterodera glycines*, *Meloidogyne incognita* or *M. hapla*, thrive at low (4.5 to 5.5) pH (Hua et al. 2020). The greatest numbers of *Pratylenchus alleni* colonized soybean roots at pH 6.0. *Hoplolaimus galeatus* and members of the Tylenchinae-Psilenchinae survived best at soil pH 6.0, while numbers of the Dorylaimidea were greatest at both pH 6.0 and 8.0. Non-styloid nematodes (Rhabditidae and Cephalobidae) were recovered in greater numbers from soil with pH 8.0 (Burns 1971).

### Spatial and temporal variability of Eh and pH in plants: identification of Eh–pH niches

Studying the effect of plant age and leaf position on susceptibility to wheat stripe rust, Farber and Mundt (2017) suggested that the distribution of the rust could be driven more by differences in host susceptibility than by propagule dispersal. Benada (2017) hypothesized that Eh and pH are major players in plant physiology and pathogen resistance in order to explain the variable changes in resistance that occur during ontogeny of the host and environment that involve: i) the disease gradients on a plant, ii) the evolution of susceptibility of organs during ontogeny and

growth, and iii) the difference in resistance of individual plant cells and relatively swift changes of its resistance within a couple of hours. From an evolutionary point of view, the circadian rhythmic cell is a hydro-electro-chemical oscillator driven or synchronized by sunlight with a temporal compartmentation of metabolism and a network of metabolic sequences to compensate for oxidative stress (Wagner et al. 2000). It is, therefore, not surprising to observe a strong spatial and temporal variability of Eh and pH in plants.

### Spatial variability of Eh and pH in plants

Plants have five key nutrient tissues, namely the phloem, xylem, leaf apoplast, root apoplast, and cellular organelles that serve as nutrient reservoirs. Each of these tissues are the target of certain pests or pathogens (Fatima and Senthil-Kumar 2015). The nutrient content in these tissues differ in types of minerals and carbon sources (sugars, amino- and organic acids, and organic alcohols) (Fatima and Senthil-Kumar 2015), all of which affect Eh or pH. Eh and pH have been recognized as important factors defining ecological niches for microorganisms (Köpke et al. 2005; Vartoukian et al. 2010; Cardinale 2011; Jones et al. 2015; Koch and Harnisch 2016). The difference in Eh–pH between roots and shoots, as well as between apoplast, xylem and phloem, can therefore be used to characterize Eh–pH niches.

### Eh–pH niches: roots vs shoots or grains

The assessment of redox state based on ASC/DHA (Ascorbate/ De Hydro Ascorbic acid, *i.e.* reduced *vs.* oxidized AsA) or GSH/GSSG (reduced *vs.* oxidized Glutathione) ratios shows that roots (*i.e.* non photosynthetic organs) are more oxidized than leaves (*i.e.* photosynthetic organs) in maize (Ahmad et al. 2016), soybean (Borella et al. 2019), sunflower (Ortega et al. 2017), onion (García et al. 2020) and poplar (Morabito and Guerrier 2000). Roots show tremendous variability in rhizospheric-apoplastic pH, especially in relation to nitrogen mineral nutrition. There is strong acidification related to  $\text{NH}_4^+$  absorption and pronounced alkalization related to  $\text{NO}_3^-$  absorption (Marschner et al. 1986). Masiello et al. (2008) measured a higher carbon oxidation state in maize grains than in maize stover. Internal oxygen concentrations are lower within bulky storage organs

such as fruits (apple, banana) or tubers than other tissues. This results in different oxygen gradients within growing potato tubers which have a very low oxygen level in the center of the tuber (Geigenberger 2003).

Leaf Eh–pH also has high spatial variability. Husson et al. (2018a) plotted the spatial distribution of Eh and pH in rice plants and showed that average leaf pH decreased from younger (located on the upper part of the canopy) to the older (located on the lower part of the canopy) leaves. The youngest leaves had the highest Eh values, which were negatively correlated with their length (the shorter the leaf, the higher the Eh value). The last fully expanded leaf had the lowest Eh, and Eh of mature leaves increased with leaf age, with the lowest leaves being the most oxidized (higher Eh). The tip of the leaves was more acidic and in a reduced state (lower pH and Eh) than the base. This corroborates the results of Benada (1967, 2017) who measured the lowest redox potential in the second upper leaf of wheat and barley during stem elongation, while the lowest value was in the top leaf when the ear appeared in wheat. In dicotyledons such as bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*), 3-day-old intact plantlets had greater antioxidant protection by antioxidant proteins (thioredoxin, glutathione reductase, peroxiredoxin) than 9-day-old individual cotyledons (Karmous et al. 2017). Overall, while the mean Eh–pH measured at the leaf level or the redox state at the leaf or root level provides useful information on plant health (Husson et al. 2018a), this knowledge does not provide information on Eh and pH intra-organ variability. Nevertheless, such information is needed since not all types of pests or pathogens colonize or feed on the same plant organs.

#### *Eh–pH niches within organs: phloem, xylem and apoplast*

Eh–pH conditions in phloem, xylem and apoplast are summarized in Table 4. The phloem is strongly buffered at high pH and low Eh. In contrast, the xylem pH is acidic but its Eh–pH varies relative to external conditions, especially with regard to the soil Eh–pH. The apoplast is acidic and more oxidized but the apoplast Eh–pH varies relative to tissue age and function (elongating tissues are more acidic) and is poorly buffered.

The low antioxidant efficiency in the apoplast allows ROS to easily accumulate and provides a

condition for ROS signaling. Therefore, the apoplastic ROS-antioxidant homeostasis is actively engaged in the reception of, and reaction to, many biotic and abiotic stresses (Podgórska et al. 2017). Similarly, pH signals light intensity changes, drought, lack of oxygen, and the presence of symbiotic partners or microbial attackers (Felle 2001).

The plant apoplast is the first site of direct contact with a pathogen and represents an interface mediating the first crosstalk between host and pathogens to perform a crucial role in initiation and coordination of many defense responses (Bolwell et al. 2001; Gupta et al. 2015). Any deviations from the basal cellular redox balance may induce responses that continuously readjust cellular functions; however, diversion of resources to stress responses may limit growth and may thus be detrimental to the plant. The ultimate outcome of these responses must therefore be tightly controlled by the redox signaling networks between organellar and apoplastic signaling systems (Sierla et al. 2013). This is also valid for pH that acts as a messenger in situations where pH changes are preconditions for certain processes, e.g., the gravity response, activation of certain transporters in stomatal movements, and possibly for plant growth in general (Felle 2001).

#### *Intra-cellular variability of Eh–pH*

Eh–pH conditions in the cell organelles are summarized in Table 5. Cell Eh–pH is strongly buffered to permit marked differences and interplay between organelles.

Cellular redox imbalances are usually induced by environmental changes that can be clearly observed in chloroplasts and mitochondria, which are also key players in the regulation of cytosolic and extra-cellular redox states (Tsang et al. 1991; Dietz 2003). Thus, the photosynthesizing chloroplast functions as a conditional source of important redox and ROS information, which is exploited to tune processes inside the chloroplast, cytosol and nucleus (Baier and Dietz 2005; Dietz et al. 2016).

#### *Temporal variability of Eh and pH in plants*

Photosynthesis is the primary reduction reaction by accumulating electrons and protons. All variations in

**Table 4** Homeostasis level, buffering capacity and processes involved in Eh–pH regulation in phloem, xylem and apoplast

Location	pH-Eh	Homeostasis Buffering capacity	Physiological processes	References
Phloem	pH	7.5 to 8.5 Strongly buffered 5.0 to 6 in Citrus	High pH needed for active transport system coupling sucrose translocation across the plasma membrane (phloem loading) to the proton motive force generated by the H <sup>+</sup> -pumping ATPase Phloem loading of sucrose is pH-dependent, and is markedly inhibited at an apoplast pH of 8 compared to pH5	(Giaquinta 1977; Bush 1992; Gerendás and Schurr 1999; Hijaz and Killiny 2014; Killiny 2017; Cruz-Munoz et al. 2019)
	Eh	Low Eh: 50–90 mV 50 to 150 mV lower than apoplast Strongly buffered Micro-aerophilic	Related to sucrose, amino acid and accumulation of Salicylic Acid (SA) Important transport conduit for mobile redox signals inducing SAR (SA, lipid-derived molecules, ascorbate, glutathione, ROS), Systemic Wound Response and Systemic Acquired Acclimation Low internal O <sub>2</sub> in the vascular bundle	(Wright and Fisher 1981; Fromm and Bauer 1994; Schmidke et al. 1999; Van Dongen et al. 2003; Van Bel and Gaupels 2004; Hafke et al. 2005; Rocher et al. 2006; Gaupels et al. 2017; Bendix and Lewis 2018)
Xylem	pH	5.0–6.0 Weakly buffered	Strongly fluctuates with composition of dominant ions in the xylem sap, uptake of inorganic ions (especially nitrogen), external conditions (microclimatic factors) and stresses	(Gloser et al. 2016; Pandit and Mukkherjee 2016)
	Eh	Related to soil Eh and pH Weakly buffered	Xylem has a lower concentration of organic compounds (sugars, peptides and proteins) than the phloem. The difference between xylem pH and soil pH creates a difference in redox potential (50 to 200 mV) between xylem and soil (corresponding to the Nernst's equation). For a xylem at pH6 when soil pH is lower than 6, the xylem Eh is lower than soil Eh. When soil pH is higher than 6, xylem Eh is higher than soil Eh, with approximately -60 mV pH <sup>-1</sup>	(Love et al. 2008; Pandit and Mukkherjee 2016)



Table 4 (continued)

Location	pH-Eh	Homeostasis	Buffering capacity	Physiological processes	References
Apoplast	pH	4.5–6.0	Buffered Variable with tissues 5.2 for rice, 5.75 for barley	Regulated through H <sup>+</sup> -ATPase pumps and influenced by photosynthesis Result of a complex interaction between ion transport, H <sup>+</sup> -buffering, H <sup>+</sup> -consumption, and H <sup>+</sup> -production. pH regulation is energy costly Low apoplast pH in elongating tissues are associated with growth. Lower apoplastic pH compared to the cytosolic pH has a crucial control effect on redox properties of protein cysteine thiols and overall redox conditions. Palisade apoplast pH is higher than stomatal and epidermal apoplast pH	(Grignon and Sentenac 1991; Mühling et al. 1995; Felle 2005; Geilfus and Mühling 2011; Landraud et al. 2013; Visnovitz et al. 2013; Janku et al. 2019)
Eh		100–250 mV 50–150 mV higher than phloem	Weakly buffered	Predominantly determined by a high concentration of ASC; the production of ROS, an active process in the apoplast that is controlled by either a plasma membrane-bound NADPH oxidase or a set of peroxidases in the cell wall; and large numbers of thiol groups present on the proteins of the plasma membrane with a potential capacity 10 orders of magnitude lower than the phloem capacity	(Fromm and Bauer 1994; Felle 2001; Hafke et al. 2005; Potters et al. 2010; Gjetting et al. 2012; Foyer and Noctor 2013)

photosynthetic activity (related to temperature, light, nutrition, etc.) affect the redox state and pH of the plant. Reduced photosynthesis leads to oxidation and alkalization while efficient photosynthesis in optimal conditions will lead to more acidic and reduced plants (Mühling et al. 1995; Mullineaux and Rausch 2005). Thus, both the ROS and antioxidant levels have diurnal changes. Abrupt variations in temperature and light intensity may lead to ROS accumulation due to disruption of the photosynthetic and respiratory electron transport chains (Kocsy et al. 2013). In rice leaves, Eh and pH (and thus, pe+pH) were high at the end of the night (absence of photosynthesis). Both Eh and pH decreased in the morning, reached a low plateau during the day and increased again at the end of the day (Husson et al. 2018a). This is consistent with: i) hourly and seasonal variations in photosynthesis, as reported by Bernacchi et al. (2006) who reported a raise in instantaneous carbon assimilation in the morning that reached a high plateau during the day but decreased at the end of the afternoon, and ii) the changes in petiole pH in grapevine during the day, as reported by Masoero and Cugnetto (2018).

Annual, seasonal or irregular fluctuations in environmental conditions also alter the plant's cellular redox state (Kocsy et al. 2013) and antioxidant responses (Ferreira and Domingos 2012). As for Eh, the pH of xylem sap from several species shows seasonal variations, being more acidic in the spring than in the rest of the year (Wilkinson 1999).

Plant age is also an important factor in understanding Eh–pH variation. In the early growth stage, germination is accompanied by extensive changes in the redox state of seeds. Proteins present in an oxidized form in dry seeds are converted into the reduced state following water imbibition (Alkhalifioui et al. 2007). Seed acidification also coincides with germination (Footitt and Cohn 1992). With aging, peroxidation of lipid complexes present in seed reserves liberates fatty acids, which, at the moment of germination, are transformed by lipolysis into alcohols, aldehydes and ketones (Norton and Harman 1985; Davet 2004). On rice, Husson et al. (2018a) showed that aging of organ (leaf) and at the plant level, was related to acidification and oxidation (increase in Eh) which was consistent with variations in chlorophyll content and net assimilation of CO<sub>2</sub> in leaves at different ages (Backhausen and Scheibe 1999).

**Table 5** Homeostasis level, buffering capacity and processes involved in Eh–pH regulation in the cytoplasm, mitochondria and chloroplast

Organelle	pH-Eh	Homeostasis level	Physiological processes	References
Cytoplasm	pH	7.2–7.5 Strongly buffered	<p>Proton pumps in the plasma membrane and tonoplast provide intracellular pH homeostasis and sustainment of a transmembrane proton gradient. Many plant functions (nutrient and sugar transport, cell elongation, organ development) are highly dependent on the ability of individual cells to control pH in the cytosol and in the apoplast</p> <p>The cytosolic antioxidant system shields the nucleus from chloroplast ROS signals. Photosynthetic ROS signals and redox imbalances are buffered by cytosolic antioxidants. Whether they reach the nucleus depends on the rate of ROS-formation and strength of the cytosolic antioxidant system</p> <p>Organic acid metabolism equilibrates the redox potential in plant cells but also transfers redox equivalents between cell compartments supporting various metabolic processes</p>	(Felle 2001; Himsinger et al. 2003; Baier and Dietz 2005; Schwarzländer et al. 2008; Gjetting et al. 2012)
	Eh	-320 mV to -312 mV Strongly buffered	<p>The mitochondrial matrix and chloroplast stroma need to keep a relatively basic environment around pH 8 for optimization of biochemical reactions occurring in these two compartments</p> <p>The generation of a proton gradient across the inner mitochondrial membrane is an essential energy conservation event that couples the oxidation of carbohydrates and fat to the synthesis of ATP. There is a close metabolic interaction and redox exchange between chloroplasts and mitochondria</p>	(Schwarzländer et al. 2008; Jubany-Mari et al. 2010; Igamberdiev and Bykova 2018)
Mitochondria	pH	7.8–8 (matrix) Strongly buffered	<p>Mitochondria are at the center of redox dependent processes as they generate ROS that drive redox-sensitive events and respond to ROS-mediated changes in the cellular redox state</p>	(Schwarzländer et al. 2008; Santo-Domingo and Demaux 2012; Su and Lai 2017)
	Eh	-360 to -310 mV in unstressed plants Strongly buffered		(Schwarzländer et al. 2008; Handy and Loscalzo 2012; Müller-Schüssele et al. 2020)

Table 5 (continued)

Organelle	pH-Eh	Homeostasis level	Physiological processes	References
Chloroplast	pH	7 in the dark to 7.8–8 in the light	The chloroplast is buffered at pH 8 for optimization of biochemical reactions	(Su and Lai 2017)
	Eh	-400 to -340 < -300 to -240 mV in the dark Very dynamic signaling compartment sensing perturbations at the subcellular level and to integrate a multitude of intracellular signals	The chloroplast stroma is highly reducing, thanks to large amounts of ascorbate, glutathione and other antioxidants Interplay among apoplastic and chloroplastic redox signaling networks is a key mechanism in plant stress responses Depending on the photo-oxidative strain, up to almost 100% of the photosynthetically transported electrons can be diverted into the antioxidant defense system that is involved in the synthesis of important mediators of plant defense responses such as nitric oxide (NO), salicylic acid (SA), jasmonic acid (JA) and abscisic acid (ABA), as well as secondary messengers including calcium and ROS	(Johnson 2003; Baier and Dietz 2005; Noctor et al. 2007; Sierla et al. 2013; Dietz et al. 2016; Foyer and Noctor 2016; Serrano et al. 2016; Lu and Yao 2018)

## Genotypic variability of plant Eh–pH

By analyzing almost two dozen species, Cornelissen et al. (2011) showed that leaf pH was a species-specific trait with interspecies differences of over 2 pH units. Masoero and Cugnetto (2018) also reported high variability of raw pH across 49 species. The grapevine, *Vitis vinifera*, appeared as the most acidic species (pH 3.68) while maize (4.84), potato (5.77), lettuce (5.97), basil (6.08), cauliflower (6.10) and pumpkin (6.38) were less acidic.

Data regarding the differences in redox state-leaf Eh are limited but show differences between:

- i) species: Leaf redox potential was 80 mV higher in sunflower than in wheat (Benada 2017). Furthermore, rice roots had a lower AsA/DHA ratio (meaning more oxidized conditions) than that of wheat with values of 0.3 and 0.7, respectively under aerobic conditions (Blokchina et al. 2000). Deciduous leaves had a higher carbon oxidation (Cox) state than that of coniferous leaves while goldenrod (*Solidago canadensis* L.) had a much lower Cox than that of red clover (*Trifolium pretense*; Masiello et al. 2008);
- ii) varieties: In rice, Nerica 4 (*Oryza sativa* type *japonica* × *O. glaberrima*) variety grown under various conditions (fertilization, growing season) and at different ages had a lower Eh, pH and pe+pH in their last fully developed leaf than those of IRBLTA-2Pi (*O. sativa* sub. *Indica*; Husson et al. 2018a).

## Environment and plant Eh–pH

Cellular redox homeostasis is affected by abiotic factors that can affect the ROS level (and their reaction products) at varying degrees in the major energy organelles such as chloroplast and mitochondria (Das et al. 2015; Anjum et al. 2016). Oxidative stress may occur under high light intensities over long time periods, during drought, waterlogging, cellular toxicity (under soil contamination or air pollution) or mineral deficiency (Elstner and Osswald 1994). Leaf Eh is altered by external factors such as light, temperature, moisture, nutrition, etc. (Benada 2017). Based on all this, the following section reviews how plant Eh–pH can be affected by abiotic and biotic stresses.

## Abiotic stresses and plant Eh–pH

*Climatic conditions and plant Eh–pH*

A non-exhaustive list of reports that highlight how stresses related to low or high light intensity or temperature lead to plant oxidation (increase in Eh and pe+pH) and alkalization in relation to decreased photosynthesis is summarized in Table 6.

Extreme water conditions usually lead to increased Eh and pH, except for roots under waterlogged conditions that result in asphyxia (Table 7). Drought and waterlogging also strongly impact plant nutrition through alteration of soil-rhizosphere Eh–pH that determines the form and solubility of major elements and micronutrients (Husson 2013).

*Edaphic conditions and plant Eh–pH*

Overall, leaf pH proved to be species-specific but remarkably constant for a given species grown on soils at pH ranging from 3.67 to 6.51 (Cornelissen

et al. 2011). Both high and low soil-rhizospheric pH led to oxidation of wheat leaves (Bhuyan et al. 2019). pH regulation mobilizes numerous H<sup>+</sup>-pumps all of which employ the same universal physical principles of converting redox energy into proton pumping (Thomma et al. 2011). Leaves of wheat seedlings grown under extremely acidic or strongly alkaline-stress showed strong oxidative damage compared with the control at pH 7.0. A sharp increase in H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> content (134 and 90%) and in malondialdehyde—a stress indicator produced from lipid peroxidation (199% and 194%)—was observed at both an extremely acidic (pH 4.0) and strongly alkaline pH (pH 8.5), respectively (Bhuyan et al. 2019). Leaves of rice grown under aerobic conditions (high soil Eh, low soil pH, no water stress) had a higher Eh (20 mV higher) and lower pH (-0.2 to -0.4 pH units) compared with those of plants grown under anaerobic conditions (low soil Eh and high soil pH; Husson et al. 2018a). High soil pH leads to higher xylem Eh than soil Eh while low pH leads to lower xylem Eh than soil Eh. At constant

**Table 6** Effects of light intensity and temperature on plant Eh–pH

Stress	Impact	Mechanisms	References
Low or very high light intensity	Eh Increased Eh	Stomatal closure via abscisic acid pathway; reduced photosynthesis by reduced CO <sub>2</sub> availability; reduced photorespiratory carbon metabolism; photosynthetic generation of biologically damaging molecules	(Ort 2001; Benada 2017; Maai et al. 2019)
	pH Increased apoplast and xylem pH Decreased cytosol pH Increased vacuolar pH	Influence of photosynthesis on Plasma-lemma H <sup>+</sup> -ATPase Heat induced electrical signals Variable between C3 and C4 plants and according to CO <sub>2</sub> concentration	(Raghavendra et al. 1993; Mühling et al. 1995; Grams et al. 2009; Aubrey et al. 2011)
Low or high temperature	Eh Increased Eh (+8 to 10 mV in <i>A. thaliana</i> cytosol and nuclei after 5 days at 42 °C vs 22 °C)	Disruption of cellular homeostasis and photosynthesis; increase in photorespiration; overproduction of ROS; decrease in chlorophyll content; photoinhibition; interference with carbohydrate metabolism; stomatal closure, inhibition of Rubisco activity	(Allen and Ort 2001; Noctor et al. 2007; Hemantaranjan et al. 2014; Awasthi et al. 2015; Benada 2017; Soengas et al. 2018; Babbar et al. 2021)
	pH Increased pH	Reduced photosynthesis by extreme temperatures Increase in leaf pH with decreasing temperature (pH = 5.1 at 35 °C increasing to 6 at 10 °C)	(Masoero and Cugnetto 2018)

**Table 7** Effects of drought and waterlogging-submersion on plant Eh–pH

Stress		Impact	Mechanisms	References
Drought	Eh	Strong oxidation	GSSG/GSH increased 2.6-fold in maize leaves and 2.3 in roots after 12 days of drought Decreased photosynthetic rate increased production of superoxide anion and hydrogen peroxide by twofold In <i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i> , cytosolic Eh was significantly raised from -312 mV to -302 mV after 11 days of water stress, although cytosolic Eh is strongly buffered	(Jubany-Mari et al. 2010; Li et al. 2014; Ahmad et al. 2016)
	pH	Usually, increase in plant pH. Variable with plant species	Leaf and root pH increase in some drying plants by unknown processes; however, a leaf pH decrease is reported for grapevine, <i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i> , <i>Pisum sativum</i> and <i>Trifolium repens</i> and poplar There is a nonlinear relationship between leaf xylem sap pH and soil water content in <i>Brassica napus</i> and <i>Raphanus sativus</i> , but no change in <i>Helianthus annuus</i>	(Wilkinson and Davies 1997; Bahrn et al. 2002; Gloser et al. 2016; Secchi and Zwieniecki 2016; Masoero and Cugnetto 2018)
	Electrical Conductivity (EC)	Increase in xylem EC	Accumulation of sugars in the xylem apoplast observed under water stress conditions is controlled by xylem pH and lower xylem pH is related to loss of xylem transport function to eventually result in accumulation of sugars, thus raising xylem EC	(Secchi and Zwieniecki 2016)
Waterlogging Submersion	Root Eh	Strong reduction Asphyxia	Reduced oxygen (O <sub>2</sub> ) availability in plant roots creates a barrier for gas diffusion into plant cells, inhibiting free gas exchange for photosynthesis and respiration and induces changes in plant water relations Reduction in aerobic respiration. Lowering of the redox status of root cells. Stronger impact in the root stele since aerenchyma can provide O <sub>2</sub> for respiration in the cortex	(Thomson and Greenway 1991; Blokhina et al. 2000; Vozáry et al. 2008)
	Leaf Eh	Increase, oxidation	A decline in net photosynthesis decreases stomatal conductance, transpiration, and the intercellular partial pressure of CO <sub>2</sub> in leaves Production of nitric oxide (NO), hydrogen peroxide (H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> ) or other ROS Alteration of ascorbate–glutathione related parameters during anoxia but restored during re-oxygenation	(Igamberdiev et al. 2005; Salazar et al. 2015; Paradiso et al. 2016)



**Table 7** (continued)

Stress	Impact	Mechanisms	References
pH	Decrease in cytoplasmic pH Increase in apoplastic pH	Energy crisis, tolerance of which varies from plant to plant Switch to anaerobic respiration. Production of lactate and ethanol by glycolysis Rapid acidification of the cytoplasm (half a pH unit), depending on H <sup>+</sup> pump activity and lactate production Acidosis can cause cell death Apoplastic alkalization decreases the proton motive force thus reduces the transport mediation of energy-rich compounds	(Felle 2006)

soil Eh, high soil pH leads to xylem oxidation (Love et al. 2008).

Salinity is a major plant stress that also leads to oxidation and alkalization. There was a rapid increase in H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and superoxide radical in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) under severe salt stress conditions where an oxidative burst occurred within 30 min leading to increased membrane damage up to 2.8, 7.8 and 9.0 fold, within 30 min, 2 and 24 h after stress induction, respectively (Ranjit et al. 2016). The decline in maize leaf growth under salt stress was due to an inhibition of H<sup>+</sup>-pumping activity and increase in apoplastic pH of leaves (Pitann et al. 2009). In *Vicia faba*, alkalization was acropetally moved to the leaves after first arriving in the older leaves where it spread systemically throughout the entire apoplast, starting from the leaf base towards the tip. The alkalization then increased ABA in the leaf apoplast and guard cells (Geilfus 2017). Apoplast pH affected functionality by reducing the stomatal pore size in *Vicia faba* during the onset of Cl<sup>-</sup> salinity via effects on ABA. Based on this mode of action, it was hypothesized that, under conditions of soil salinity, Cl<sup>-</sup>-inducible alkalization of the leaf apoplast reduces the transpiration rate and, consequently, the uptake of Na<sup>+</sup> and Cl<sup>-</sup> from the soil solution (Geilfus 2017).

Aluminum (Al) is a major plant growth-limiting factor in acid soils (Melakerberhan et al. 1995). The primary site of Al accumulation and toxicity is the root meristem. Al triggers lipid peroxidation and ROS production in roots, inhibits respiration and depletes ATP (Yamamoto et al. 2003). In barley, alleviation of aluminum toxicity by hydrogen sulfide was related to elevated ATPase and suppressed oxidative

stress (Dawood et al. 2012). Several other toxic elements are known to lead to plant oxidation, including cadmium (leading to formation of callose in phloem cells), zinc, mercury, and antimony (Cuypers et al. 2001; Benitez-Alfonso et al. 2011; Sobrino-plata et al. 2014; Ortega et al. 2017).

In general, high levels of metal ions such as Co, Cu, Fe, Mn, Mo, Ni, and Zn, and trace levels of toxic metals (Pb, Cd, Hg, As, Cr, Ag, Al, Cs, Sr, U) have been reported to negatively affect plant growth, metabolism, development, and overall productivity, due mainly to accelerated ROS formation and, to a lower extent, through other reactions (Anjum, 2014). High soil pe+pH also increases Cd availability owing to an increased bacterial activity (Wang et al. 2020). Finally, GSH is a key antioxidant for the plant to cope with mercury and cadmium stress (Sobrino-plata et al. 2014). Likewise, the ascorbic acid (AsA) redox system efficiently protects the plant and plays a key role in metal-metalloid stress tolerance (Chen et al. 2017b). A deficiency of GSH and AsA leads to susceptibility to toxic elements such as Cadmium (Jozefczak et al. 2015).

#### *Mineral nutrition and plant Eh-pH*

Mineral nutrition affects plant photosynthesis and, as a consequence, plant Eh-pH. Any kind of N, P or K deficiency leads to plant oxidation. While N deficiency results in alkalization, P or K deficiency results in acidification (Table 8). The concentration of amino acids and sugars in the apoplast of leaf and stem tissue may increase with Ca, B, Zn or K

**Table 8** Impact of mineral nutrition (N, P, K) on plant Eh–pH

Element	Variable	Effect of deficiency	Physiological processes	References
N	pH	Increases root and shoot xylem pH by 0.2–0.3 units	N deprivation decreases whole plant transpiration which can potentially close stomata	(Dodd et al. 2003; Huber and Thompson 2007)
	Eh	Oxidation and altered antioxidant responses	Deprivation leads to changes in phenolic metabolism and oxidative status Varying patterns of superoxide dismutase isoforms	(Huber and Thompson 2007; Kováčik and Bačkor 2007)
P	pH	Acidification	Promotion of root elongation by acidification; pH control of anthocyanins	(Anuradha and Narayanan 1991; Chen et al. 2013)
	Eh	Oxidation and altered antioxidant responses	Alterations in photosynthetic physiology, including reductions in CO <sub>2</sub> assimilation rates, down-regulation of photosynthesis-related genes and photoinhibition at the photo-system II level. Photo-oxidative stress is characterized by an increased production of ROS in chloroplasts	(Kováčik and Bačkor 2007) (Hernández and Munné-Bosch 2015)
K	pH	Acidification	K is an alkalizing element, and high K nutrition leads to higher plant pH	(Ward 1960)
	Eh	Oxidation and altered antioxidant responses	K enhances antioxidant defense in plants and protects them from oxidative stress Accumulation of soluble sugars in K-deficient plants in both leaves and roots	(Kováčik and Bačkor 2007; Amtmann et al. 2008; Hasanuzzaman et al. 2018)

deficiency (Huber et al. 2011), which leads to an increase in EC. Furthermore, Si content decreases with excess applications of N, which can also affect disease tolerance (Gupta et al. 2017). Besides the availability of N, the form in which it is absorbed by the plant influences soil Eh–pH and has a dramatic impact on plant physiology (Marschner et al. 1986).

The form of nitrogen absorbed by the plant and the solubility of essential elements are related not only to the type of fertilizer applied but also to soil Eh–pH conditions. The main form of N absorbed is mainly determined by  $pe + pH$  with a balance between both forms being reached close to  $pe + pH = 14$  (Husson 2013). Drought limits biological activity and thus leads to a raise in soil Eh and  $pe + pH$ , with a strong negative impact on Fe and Mn solubility, and increased nitrification. For example, a four-fold reduction in nitrate reductase activity was observed following 6 days of severe drought (Li et al. 2014). In contrast, submersion causes a strong and rapid decrease in soil Eh,

with a slight raise in pH, leading to low  $pe + pH$ , thus to reduced, soluble Fe and Mn, and to ammonification (Ponnamperuma 1972; Cottés 2019). Thus, the dominant form of mineral nitrogen in soil is nitrate in dry-oxidized-alkaline soils and ammonium in waterlogged-reduced-acidic soils.

Nitrate absorption strongly alkalizes plant roots and shoot (apoplast) while ammonium absorption leads to strong acidification, with an important impact on other nutrients solubility-absorption. Absorption of nitrate is an active process that increases root respiration to reduce Eh in the rhizosphere while leading to shoot oxidation (Table 9).

#### Biotic stresses and plant Eh–pH

As with abiotic stresses, biotic stresses usually lead to apoplast alkalization and oxidation. Infection by viruses, bacteria or fungi impact photosynthetic activity in various ways. The generation of ROS (an

**Table 9** Impact of N-form of nutrition ( $\text{NH}_4^+$  vs  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) on plant Eh–pH

Form	Variable	Impact on plant	Processes	Impact on other nutrient availability	References
$\text{NO}_3^-$	pH	Strong alkalization of the roots- rhizosphere (up to +2 pH units) Alkalization of shoots, leaf apoplast	Release by roots of $\text{OH}^-$ to compensate for the negative charge absorbed with $\text{NO}_3^-$ Strongly basic hydroxides resulting from assimilation of $\text{NO}_3^-$ in the leaf	Decrease in Fe, Mn, Bo, Cu, Zn, Ca and P solubility -absorption	(Marschner et al. 1986; Marschner 1995; Foyer and Noctor 2013; Elmer and Datnoff 2014; Singh and Schulze 2015; Geilfus 2017; Sun et al. 2020)
	Eh	Roots-rhizosphere reduction Shoots oxidation	Activation of pumps for active N absorption increases root respiration (oxygen consumption) Reduction of $\text{NO}_3^-$ to $\text{NH}_4^+$ requires 8 electrons, and 8 to 16 ATP. Nitrate as N-source generates higher energetic cost (+5 to 12%) for assimilation, reduction to amino acid and pH control, as compared to ammonium nutrition $\text{NO}_3^-$ increases photorespiration		
$\text{NH}_4^+$	pH	Strong acidification of the roots- rhizosphere (up to -2 pH units) Acidification of shoots, leaf apoplast	Release by roots of $\text{H}^+$ to compensate for the positive charge absorbed with $\text{NH}_4^+$	Decreases in P, K, S, Ca, Mg and Mo solubility-absorption $\text{NH}_4^+$ absorption is antagonist to cations as $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ or $\text{Mn}^{2+}$	(Marschner et al. 1986; Marschner 1995; Zou and Zhang 2003; Li et al. 2013; Elmer and Datnoff 2014; Singh and Schulze 2015)
	Eh	Reduction of the shoots Oxidation of the roots	Absorption of strongly reduced $\text{NH}_4^+$ , reduced energetic cost for protein formation Activation of ATP- $\text{H}^+$ pumps for pH regulation, consuming electrons		

oxidative burst) in response to pathogen attack is a ubiquitous early part of the resistance mechanisms of plant cells. ROS, especially hydrogen peroxide ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ), seem to play a dual role in plant defense by eliciting localized death of host plant cells that limits pathogens and by acting as a diffusible signal for the induction of antioxidant and pathogenesis-related genes in adjacent plant tissues (Hernández et al. 2016). A second component of the resistance mechanism is extracellular alkalization, occurring as a result of the  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  and proton influxes, and the  $\text{K}^+$  efflux common to most elicitation systems as one of the earliest virus responses (Bolwell et al. 2002).

In an advanced stage of viral infection, photosynthetic rates of diseased plants only attain 75 to 80% of those of the healthy plants, on a leaf area basis. This reduced photosynthesis can be related to the loss of chloroplast (chlorosis, as in viral and bacterial infection), that of leaf area (destruction as in the case of necrotrophic fungi or bacteria), occlusion of the vascular system, or stomata closure (Goodman et al. 1967; Hernández et al. 2016). Plants infected by fungi, bacteria or viruses also display a common response, namely an increase in respiration, one of the most general physiological phenomena of diseased plants (Goodman et al. 1967).

Similarly, an oxidative response also occurs following an attack by herbivores as *H. zea* (Bi and Felton 1995). A general disturbance of redox balance is induced in tissues also by aphid feeding, including the accumulation of oxidases and phenolic substrates and loss of reducing activity and protein (Jiang and Miles 1993). Overall, following insect attacks, ROS accumulates in apoplastic as well as in symplastic regions. An apoplastic burst of ROS acts as a first barrier against subsequent attack by pathogens and herbivores (War et al. 2012). A systemic suppression of photosynthesis is often associated with caterpillar herbivory where oxidative modifications are observed (Thivierge et al. 2010), e.g. oxidation of ascorbic acid (Goggin et al. 2010). Aphids also oxidize plant phenolic monomers that act as their deterrent, into inert polymers (Jiang 1996). Finally, wounded plants secrete sap with a characteristic acidic pH of 5.0 to 5.8 and high content of different phenolic compounds such as lignin and flavonoid precursors. Plants typically respond to wounding, including that caused by sucking insects, by mobilizing and oxidizing phenolic compounds (Miles and Oertli 1993; Hwang et al. 2017).

### **Eh–pH homeostasis: a unifying perspective on Genotype x Environment x Management x Pest or Pathogen (G x E x M x P) interactions**

We consider Eh–pH homeostasis as a unifying process that attempts to shed light on the multiple processes related to plant-pest or pathogen interactions. A model of these interactions is proposed based on the assumption that plants become susceptible to pests or pathogens when imbalanced Eh–pH conditions in their compartments match the specific Eh–pH ranges at which the various pests or pathogens can thrive, usually in oxidized plants (high  $pe + pH$ ). Once attacked, a major defense reaction of plants is a localized oxidation of the pathogen or wounds.

Hence, this “redox” model (Fig. 2) correlates: i) the Eh–pH conditions of the plants in their various compartments (roots, shoots, stems, grains, fruits and apoplast, xylem, phloem, cell, and organelles), which are the result of genotype, age, management practices and the various stresses related to the abiotic and biotic environments, their intensity and their duration; ii) the specific conditions at which specific pests or pathogens can thrive depending on the pest or pathogen type, their reproductive cycle, metabolism and living style (soil-borne vs air-borne,

biotrophic-hemi-biotrophic-necrotrophic, intracellular-extracellular, chewing-sucking, etc.).


The effects of the multiple and complex abiotic and biotic factors and their interactions can be integrated into these simple parameters to provide a powerful tool for analyzing *GxExMxP* interactions in a temporal and spatialized perspective.

Can spatio-temporal variability in plant Eh–pH explain locations-periods of plant susceptibility-tolerance-resistance to various pests or pathogens?

The “Eh–pH zones”, where the various types of pests or pathogens can thrive in space (relation to the various plant parts) and time is summarized in Fig. 3.

The spatial variations in plant Eh–pH are correlated with, and may explain, the spatial distribution of pests or pathogens within plant organs. This is illustrated by the following five examples: i) the initial development of fungi (wilt pathogens) in the apoplast (more acidic and oxidized than the vascular system); ii) the necrotrophic and biotrophic nature of many soil- and air-borne fungi, respectively, developing in the more acidic-oxidized of the root systems vs. aerial plant parts that are less acidic and oxidized than the roots (Raaijmakers et al. 2009); iii) the preferential development of many Gram-positive bacteria, including phytoplasma and proteobacteria, in the alkaline phloem and in the xylem, which rapidly become alkaline upon various stresses (Bové and Garnier 2003; Padan et al. 2005), iv) the invasion of plants by obligate intracellulars, e.g. viruses, through the alkaline and reduced phloem (Hipper et al. 2013); and v) the feeding habits of insect vectors of these pathogens, which are xylem (bacteria) or phloem (viruses and bacteria), such as sucking insects (Garnier et al. 2001; Wielkopolan and Obre 2016).

Similarly, the spatial distribution of pests or pathogens, between organs, is correlated to Eh–pH niches as shown by the following four examples: i) the resistance to wheat stripe rust (*Puccinia striiformis f. sp. tritici*,) within the same-aged plants was lower on the uppermost (youngest) leaf than in the second leaf, while it was higher in the third (older) leaf (Ferber and Mundt 2017), in accordance with higher Eh levels in the young and not fully developed leaves; ii) the highest infection by Rice Yellow Mottle Virus in the oxidized and alkaline flag leaf (Joseph et al. 2011),



**Fig. 2** Model of GxExMxP interactions in a "Redox" perspective. Environment and management practices impact soil Eh-pH (water and air in interaction with soil structure, carbon, biological activity and clay). Environment (management practices) and soil Eh-pH induce oxidative stresses in plants, which together with genotype affect plant Eh-pH in the various plant compartments through interactions between ROS,


RNS, hormones and antioxidants. These antioxidants can be primed or inversely exhausted in relation to type, duration and intensity of the various stresses. In this model, plants become susceptible when imbalanced Eh-pH conditions in plant compartments match the specific Eh-pH conditions at which the various pests and pathogens can thrive

iii) the higher resistance of rice to bacterial blast (*Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *oryzae*), in old, mature leaves compared with that in young leaves with low Eh and high pH (Koch and Mew 1991); and iv) the highest resistance to thrips (*Frankliniella occidentalis*) of the youngest fully opened *Capsicum* leaves compared to that of the older, more oxidized leaves (van Haperen et al. 2019).

Temporal variations in plant Eh-pH are also correlated to timing of susceptibility-tolerance-resistance. In addition, Eh-pH alteration with age could be involved in the processes implied in ontogenic resistance at plant or organ level. Some aged plants naturally develop acidic and less reduced conditions, which could explain the acquired immunity of plants against bacterial diseases (thriving in alkaline and moderately reduced conditions) with aging. This has been described with *Xanthomonas campestris* in rice (Koch and Mew 1991) and in *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Hess et al. 2005), which requires intercellular accumulation of SA. Interestingly, in tomato, age-related

resistance to *Phytophthora infestans* has been related to ethylene (ET) and SA (Shah et al. 2015). Plant-leaf aging is related to acidification that matches with the higher susceptibility of young rice plant-leaves to viruses (thriving in alkaline conditions), as exemplified for Rice Yellow Mottle Virus (Joseph et al. 2011). Young grapevine leaves present a high Grapevine Fanleaf Virus level during the whole vegetative period while mature leaves, tendrils and flower-berry clusters, do so only at the beginning of the vegetative period (Krebelj et al. 2015). In contrast, the decreasing susceptibility of grapevine leaves to *Erysiphe graminis* during aging (Calonnec et al. 2018) could be related to lower Eh in the fully developed leaves (Husson et al. 2018a). This is also true for the increasing susceptibility of aging rice plants to *Helminthosporium oryzae* and *Magnaporthe oryzae* (formerly *Pyricularia oryzae*; Padmanabhan and Ganguly 1954). Temporal variability in plant Eh-pH may also explain that *Capsicum* plants start to develop resistance to thrips (*Frankliniella occidentalis*) once





**Fig. 3** Eh–pH map of indicative zones where the main groups of pests or pathogens can thrive, corresponding to oxidized plants. Adapted from "Eh–pH conditions at which pests or pathogens can thrive" section (Tables 1 and 2) and "Spatial and temporal variability of Eh and pH in plants: identification of Eh–pH niches" section. Viruses develop in alkaline phloem and possibly xylem, as do most bacteria. Inversely, most fungi prefer the acidic and more oxidized apoplast. Oomycetes often thrive in moderately oxidized apoplast, usually at higher pH than their fungal counterparts. Insects have different prefer-

ences, according to their feeding mode: xylem or phloem sucking insect at higher pH and lower Eh compared with chewing-biting insects; larvae at lower  $pe + pH$  and higher pH compared with adults. These are only tendencies for the main groups of pathogens and pests, as optimal Eh–pH conditions are specific. Although some pathogens are ubiquitous and are able to develop in a large range of Eh–pH conditions, most pathogens can develop only in a specific, narrow Eh–pH range (Rabotnova and Schwartz 1962)

they are between 4- to 8-week-old (van Haperen et al. 2019). Likewise, cabbage plants aging from 3 to 9 weeks increased pre-imaginal mortality of the moth, *Plutella xylostella*, (Lepidoptera) and reduced its larval development rate, pupal weight and fecundity (Campos et al. 2003). An Eh–pH perspective on modulation of plant immunity by light, circadian rhythm and temperature could also be valuable by providing insights into the important role of circadian rhythm in the plant defense system against pests and pathogens (Hua 2013; Lu et al. 2017).

Can genotypic differences in plant Eh–pH explain susceptibility, tolerance or resistance to pests and pathogens?

As for spatio-temporal variations, genotypic variability in plant Eh–pH is correlated to and may explain differential susceptibility to the various types of pests and pathogens. Under this Eh–pH perspective, it can be hypothesized that any pathosystem is related to

specific plant Eh–pH values. Masoero and Cugnetto (2018) reported a predisposition towards fungal infection when the pH was more acidic, with grapevine (pH 3.69) and apple (pH 5.04) as model plant species. The authors also reported a trend towards bacterial infection when the pH was less acidic, as exemplified for pear (pH 5.52). The high propensity of tomato to bacterial and viral diseases (Blancard 2012) might also be related to its high pH (5.46), in addition to a strong increase in xylem pH under extreme water conditions (i. e. up to 7.0 and 8.0 under flooding and drought, respectively; Wilkinson 1999; Jackson et al. 2003). The differences in Eh–pH values among plant species might also explain why aerial hemibiotrophic and biotrophic fungi are specialized to a limited number of hosts, with similar Eh–pH conditions. For instance, the hemibiotrophic *M. oryzae* is limited to rice, a few other cereals including wheat (Debona et al. 2012), or wild grasses such as *Leersia hexandra*, *Echinochloa crusgalli*, or *Brachiaria mutica* (Jashvantlal 2008). This pathogen does not develop,

for instance, on cruciferous species such as rapeseed (*Brassica napus*) that has different Eh–pH conditions. In contrast, the causal agents of phoma stem canker of rapeseed (*Leptosphaeria maculans* and *L. biglobosa*), major biotrophic fungi, are limited to brassicas and do not develop on cereals (Rouxel and Balesdent 2005). The low Eh in rice might explain why this plant is not infected by *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum*, a necrotrophic and aggressive plant pathogen that can infect up to 383 species across 225 taxonomic genera and belonging to 64 plant families (Purdy 1979).

A second hypothesis can also be proposed. Besides the specific recognition processes depending on host and pathogen genotypes, varietal resistance, tolerance and susceptibility to pests and pathogens are related to differences in basal Eh–pH and genetic capacity of the variety to sustain a balanced Eh–pH. For instance, the rice variety Nerica 4 sustains a low Eh and pH and is resistant to several strains of the rice blast pathogen while the more oxidized rice variety IRBLTA-2Pi is highly susceptible to some strains of the same pathogen (Fukuta et al. 2019). Similarly, greater varietal resistance of wheat to the blast pathogen was related to a more efficient antioxidative system in the removal of excess ROS generated during the infection process of *M. oryzae*, limiting cellular damage caused by the fungus (Debona et al. 2012). While these are only major trends observed in the literature, based on “mean” plant Eh–pH conditions, all this should not be generalized without caution. Eh–pH differences between plant varieties can be as important as those between plant species. In addition, local conditions in the different compartments of the same plant might be related to specific pests or pathogens as well as their requirements all of which need to be considered.

Can Eh–pH imbalance related to abiotic stresses explain plant susceptibility, tolerance and resistance to pests and pathogens?


A common feature in the response to all stresses is the onset of oxidative stress through the production of ROS (Carvalho et al. 2015; Sewelam et al. 2016). One of the earliest responses of plants to pathogens, wounding, drought, extremes of temperature or physical and chemical shocks is the accumulation of ROS

such as superoxide, hydroxyl radicals, hydrogen peroxide, singlet oxygen, etc. The oxidative stress that often ensues with and following infection is a widespread phenomenon. This stress is extensively observed in plants exposed to most, if not all, biotic and abiotic stresses (Shao et al. 2008). Plants synthesize a large pool of antioxidants such as ascorbate, tocopherol, and proteinaceous thiols (thioredoxin, peroxiredoxin and glutaredoxin) that interact with ROS to sustain redox homeostasis (Kapoor et al. 2015). During stress, the requirements for energy increases with the intensity of respiration from exergonic processes, as also increases the plant’s entropy (Dragičević 2015). Most abiotic stresses generally result in oxidation with an exception being in roots during waterlogging or flooding. Similarly, abiotic stresses, most often, lead to apoplast alkalization. This systemic pH increase may be a secondary effect without functional implications that results from ion movements or proton-pump regulation. There is increasing evidence that apoplast alkalization is part of a mechanism to withstand stress (Geilfus 2017).

A schematic summary highlighting the impacts of major abiotic stresses on plant Eh–pH homeostasis is presented in Fig. 4. Waterlogging, drought (Fig. 4a) and salinity (Fig. 4b) stresses are most directly encountered by roots although the consequent effects may be manifested throughout the entire plant (Bostock et al. 2014). This is also the case when soil imbalances occur (pH, Eh, mineral deficiency, toxic elements etc.). In contrast, light, temperature (Fig. 4a) and air pollution are most directly encountered by aerial parts. “While plants becomes susceptible to some diseases following abiotic stresses in relationship to oxidation, they becomes tolerant to other diseases, as that caused by *Fusarium poae*, following waterlogging events (Martínez et al. 2019).

Variations of plant Eh–pH following stress has been correlated with increased susceptibility to various types of pathogens (Schoeneweiss 1975). Abiotic stresses can predispose plants to potentially aggressive hemi-biotrophic pathogens that result in severe disease development despite very low levels of inoculum. Abiotic stress can also facilitate diseases caused by opportunistic or facultative pathogens, including those present in association with their hosts such as epiphytes or endophytes (Lamichhane 2015). Examples are the root- and crown-infecting pathogens *Pythium ultimum* and *Fusarium spp.*; air-borne

**Fig. 4** Impact of abiotic stresses leading to unbalanced redox conditions in plant parts (pH-Eh map) in relation to zones indicating optima where the main pest and pathogen groups can thrive optimally adapted from Tables 1 and 2). a. Climatic stresses. b. Edaphic stresses. Edaphic stresses often lead to plant oxidation and increased plant susceptibility except for waterlogging that results in root asphyxia and, shoot oxidation or acidification. Low and high soil pH leads to further acidification and alkalization in the rhizosphere, respectively



pathogens, *Alternaria* spp. and *Botrytis cinerea*; and many canker-causing pathogens of woody perennials (Bostock et al. 2014). For instance, summer heat is conducive to epidemics of cytospora canker on *Alnus* sp. (Worrall et al. 2010).

Abiotic stresses can also result in reduced incidence or severity of diseases caused by obligate or biotrophic, pathogens, although there are exceptions such as diseases caused by some viruses, fungi, and nematodes (Bostock et al. 2014). Pathogen infections on already drought-stressed plants can either result in plant resistance to pathogens, through

drought-induced activation of basal defense mechanisms or, inversely, in an increased susceptibility due to a weakened basal defense (Bertrand 1976).

To understand how abiotic stresses, including the edaphic ones, can increase or decrease plant susceptibility to various pests or pathogens, a dynamic approach considering additional parameters is required. The latter include: i) the intensity and duration of the stress since abiotic stresses occurring prior to infection affect susceptibility of plants in different ways; ii) the synergistic occurrence of multiple stresses and their combined effects (Lamichhane

2015); and iii) availability of anti-oxidant pools in the plant, their ability to counterbalance the oxidative stresses and their possible exhaustion.

*Predisposition, acclimation, priming effect, exhaustion and death in a “redox” perspective*

A stress may affect plant diseases through different effects on the pathogen, host, or the host–pathogen interaction. The concept of predisposition implies an effect on the host rather than on the pathogen (Sorauer 1974). Stresses or nutrition that cause stomatal closure or formation of a thicker cuticle may prevent invasion by pathogens. In some cases, however, pathogens may enter a plant regardless of stress and affect disease development more than infection (Schoeneweiss 1975). Drought-induced pathogen resistance is presumably due to enhanced induction of antimicrobial and PR-proteins activated by drought. These compounds can protect plants during early stages of pathogen infection. Plant susceptibility to drought may be attributed to high levels of ABA in drought stressed plants since this hormone interferes with pathogen-induced plant defense signaling thereby reducing the expression of defense-related genes (Ramegowda and Senthil-Kumar 2015).

Bostock et al. (2014) developed a model of plant response to integrate the general adaptation syndrome with the concept of disease severity, disease duration and disease predisposition. In this model, there is an alarm stage following an abiotic stress event, which corresponds to the maximum predisposition before the acclimation-resistance stage (maximum resistance) to conclude with a final collapse, exhaustion and death stage.

In an Eh–pH perspective (Fig. 5a), this could be seen as a first phase for the increase in ROS (and ABA) that is followed by the production of anti-oxidants and phytoalexins by the plants (acclimation stage, maximum resistance). The collapse stage could be regarded as the exhaustion of the antioxidant capacity of the plant that leads to a further increase in oxidation level. The collapse, exhaustion and death phase could, therefore, be splitted into two sub-phases: i) a high susceptibility phase that could still be reversible, especially to viruses and necrotrophic pathogens, that is related to strongly oxidized conditions upon exhaustion of antioxidants, and ii) a death phase related to irreversible oxidation. The high


production of antioxidants due to ROS activation following a moderate stress could have a priming effect that confers a greater capacity to respond to further stimulus, lowering the plant redox state, and, thus, preparing it for a rapid response in case of pest or pathogen attacks. One hypothesis could be that plants that sustain a lower Eh level can more readily produce reduced primary and secondary metabolites such as phenolics, SA and phytoalexins or redox regulated molecules such as plant pathogenesis-related proteins (Fobert and Després 2005; Balmer et al. 2015). Indeed, compounds that induce priming are reported to promote stronger and faster responses to stress by modulating the oxidative environment and interacting with signaling pathways mediated by SA, JA and ET (González-Bosch 2018).

*Stress intensity, stress duration, multiple stresses and cumulating oxidative stresses*

Biotic and abiotic stresses frequently co-occur under natural conditions. This leads to the interaction of common molecular signaling pathways governing adaptive responses to individual stresses (Nguyen et al. 2016). A mechanism to study multiple-stress interactions (Bateman 1978) recognizes that plant responses to a combination of stresses, such as heat and drought, may differ from those to individual stresses. Abiotic stress applications are likely to affect plant-pathogen interactions and vice versa (Prasch and Sonnewald 2015). When applied in combination, drought and herbivory had an additive effect on specific processes involved in secondary metabolism and defense responses, including protease inhibitor activity (Nguyen et al. 2016). Abiotic and biotic stress interactions can occur at multiple levels, depending on the type of stress (osmotic, ionic), growth characteristics, infection strategy of the pathogen (biotrophic, necrotrophic, mode of infection by direct penetration or through plant openings such as stomata, etc.) or growth stage of the host at the time of infection (Kissoudis et al. 2014).

Molecular and biochemical studies indicate that there are extensive overlaps in abiotic and biotic stress responses. There is some evidence for a universal stress response transcriptome for which a model involving the recruitment of ROS and phytohormones to sequentially engage defense responses has been proposed although it is still unclear how the sequence





**Fig. 5** Model of plant responses to abiotic and biotic stresses and disease predisposition based on a combination of models from Bostock et al. (2014) and Lushchak (2014) in an Eh-pH perspective. **a.** A low to intermediate stress intensity of long duration. **b.** A high stress intensity and multiple stresses. Production of antioxidants following a moderate stress induces an acclimation stage, leading to an exhaustion of the antioxidant pool. Upon a high intensity, multiple stresses or long stress duration lead to plant cell collapse and death. The stronger

the abiotic stress or the higher the number of simultaneous stresses, the faster the exhaustion (the shorter the tolerance-resistance phase). The longer the stress or more consecutive stresses, the higher the risk of antioxidant's exhaustion. As long as ROS-induced and ROS sensitive functions can be sustained, oxidation-susceptibility can be reversed. Upon exhaustion of antioxidant pools, strong oxidation leads to irreversible collapse and death

is disrupted by predisposing stress events (Bostock et al. 2014). Plants use common pathways and components in the stress-response relationship. This phenomenon, which is known as cross-tolerance, allows plants to adapt or acclimate to a range of different stresses following exposure to a given one. Redox signals appear to have a central role in these common pathways (Pastori and Foyer 2002).

In their seminal review on enhancing crop resilience to combined abiotic and biotic stress, Kissoudis et al. (2014) showed that stress factors affect the homeostasis of chemical signals in the apoplast such as  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , ROS, and pH levels. A combination of abiotic stresses with pathogen infection potentially derails hormone and systemic ROS homeostasis. Under multiple stresses, the intensity of one stress affects the plant's responses to further stresses. For instance, plants exposed to mild drought stress activate the basal defense response that enables them to defend against pathogen infection. In contrast, severe drought causes leakage of cellular nutrients into the apoplast that facilitates successful pathogen infection (Ramegowda and Senthil-Kumar 2015).

Considering both the oxidative stress and the regulation of antioxidant systems, Lushchak (2014) proposed four levels of an intensity-based classification of oxidative stress. They include: i) a basal oxidative level; ii) a low intensity oxidative stress, in which markers of ROS-induced and ROS-sensitive functions can be measured; iii) an intermediate intensity oxidative stress, and iv) a high intensity oxidative stress, dominated by markers of oxidatively modified components.

In our proposed hypothesis, we integrate the various models and classifications through an Eh–pH perspective. Consideration of oxidative stresses in combination with plant responses (antioxidant systems in interaction with hormones) results in a dynamic and spatialized plant Eh–pH model (Fig. 5). In such a model, low to moderate stress induces an alarm stage (predisposition upon oxidation), that leads to the production of antioxidants (in relation to ABA) and priming of plant defense mechanisms with decreased plant susceptibility in an acclimation stage in which SA, JA-ET induce SAR-ISR.

High intensity stress or multiple combined stresses lead to a rapid increase in oxidative stress and a rapid exhaustion of plant antioxidant pools. All this results in increased susceptibility to pests or pathogens,

without possibility of acclimation (Fig. 5b). Several observations suggest that there is a critical glutathione status below which the accumulation of pathogen-defense related molecules is inhibited and, consequently, disease resistance is impaired (Noctor et al. 2011). Similarly, consecutive multiple stresses, or prolonged single stress lead to progressive exhaustion of antioxidant capacity and increased plant oxidation to ultimately result in irreversible collapse and death.

Photosynthesis, the primary mechanism for reduction, is fundamental in restoring the antioxidant pools by regenerating NADPH (Reduced Nicotinamide Adenine Dinucleotide Phosphate; mid-point potential:  $E_m \text{ NADP}^+/\text{NADPH} = -320 \text{ mV}$ ), which then results in regeneration of GSH ( $E_m \text{ GSSG}/\text{GSH}: -230 \text{ mV}$ ) and ASC ( $E_m \text{ DHA}/\text{ASC}: +90 \text{ mV}$ ; Noctor 2006). Paradoxically, chloroplasts produce various forms of ROS, and photosynthesis also produces  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  in the peroxisomes because of photorespiration (Exposito-Rodriguez et al. 2017). These ROS play an important role in signaling, but they also need to be scavenged to sustain redox homeostasis. Removal of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  in chloroplasts occurs through ASC-dependent and TRX-dependent pathways (Foyer and Shigeoka 2011). One of the effects of oxidative stress is a decreased chlorophyll biosynthesis (Aarti et al. 2006) and that is the reason why oxidative stresses generally decrease photosynthesis. Following exhaustion of antioxidant pools, redox imbalance negatively alters photosynthesis and thus the plant's capacity to regenerate antioxidant pools.

This model of Eh–pH homeostasis, as a central component of plant health, proposes a coherent perspective by deciphering the multiple interactions between abiotic stress and plant susceptibility, tolerance and resistance to pests and pathogens. The model introduces a framework explaining how abiotic stresses can alter plant–pest or plant–pathogen interactions by enhancing host plant susceptibility or, inversely, by priming tolerance to pests and pathogens in relation to antioxidant pools in the plant. This model may also be useful to decipher the poorly understood interactions among multiple biotic stresses acting simultaneously or, conversely, to understand how some pests or pathogens may alter plant response to abiotic stresses (Pandey et al. 2017).



Can Eh–pH imbalance related to biotic stress explain biotic-biotic interactions and cohorts of pests or pathogens?

Studies of plant–pathogen interactions have historically focused on simple models of infection involving single pathosystems. In contrast, in the wild, microbes are part of complex multispecies consortia-communities (Lamichhane and Venturi 2015). Plant infections often involve multiple species or genotypes and exhibit complexities that are not captured in individual pathosystems (Abdullah et al. 2017). Simultaneous infection of a single plant by various pathogens has been recognized as an important modulator of host resistance and a driver of pathogen evolution (Tollenaere et al. 2017). Even commensal bacteria can enhance virulence of opportunistic pathogens via cross-metabolism. For example, *Streptococcus gordonii* enhances the bioavailability of oxygen during infection to allow *Aggregatibacter actinomycetemcomitans* to shift from a primarily fermentative to a respiratory metabolism that promotes its growth and persistence (Stacy et al. 2016). Mechanistically, respiratory metabolism enhances the fitness of *A. actinomycetemcomitans* in vivo by increasing ATP yields via central metabolism and creating a proton motive force (Stacy et al. 2016). Furthermore, host plant nutrition can significantly influence the growth and condition of phytophagous insects that influence their susceptibility to pathogens (Shikano et al. 2010).

The recognition of Eh–pH niches specific to each pest or pathogen could help decipher the three main types of interactions in co-infection systems (Seabloom et al. 2015; Abdullah et al. 2017): i) competition, in which competing pathogens develop physical barriers or utilize toxins to exclude competitors as reported for *Fusarium verticilloides* and *Ustilago maydis* in maize (Jonkers et al. 2012). This may involve interactions between pathogens that have different Eh–pH optima with each one altering these conditions to enhance its fitness for its own benefit at the expense of the others; ii) cooperation, whereby pathogens beneficially interact, by providing mutual biochemical signals essential for pathogenesis. This could be regarded as pathogens having similar Eh–pH optima. Similar Eh–pH niches could potentially explain the many fungi–fungi, virus–virus and bacteria–bacteria synergistic interactions (Lamichhane and Venturi (2015) or mixed infections, as reported for Rice Yellow Mottle Virus and

*Xanthomonas oryzae* in rice (Tollenaere et al. 2017); and iii) coexistence, whereby pathogens can stably coexist through niche specialization.

Similarly, the Eh–pH perspective proposes a framework to explain how a pathogen can render a host: i) more vulnerable to other pathogen attacks, as is the case of *Pseudomonas syringae* predisposing plants to invasion by the necrotrophic ascomycetes *Alternaria brassicicola* or *Albugo candida* that allow subsequent infections by several opportunistic pathogens (Abdullah et al. 2017). This induced susceptibility by development of the first pathogen might be attributed to a further imbalance of Eh–pH in the various plant compartments (apoplast, xylem, phloem, intracellular); ii) more resistant through the induction of a systemic defense-signaling cascade that restores Eh–pH conditions unfavorable to pathogens that confers resistance to subsequent attacks, as exemplified by *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (Ongena et al. 2005).

The Eh–pH homeostasis hypothesis could also help explain how above-ground infestation of whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*) in peppers (*Capsicum annuum*), that leads to an increase of root-associated gram-positive bacteria through SA-dependent signaling, can induce below-ground resistance against the gram-negative *Ralstonia solanacearum* that develops in an aerobic, alkaline condition (Yang et al. 2011). This perspective may also explain how a host plant's nutritional status can significantly affect the growth and condition of phytophagous insects and, consequently, the susceptibility of the latter to pathogens (Shikano et al. 2010). Finally, this hypothesis might help clarify the ‘crosstalk’ among hormones involved in plant defense and help improve the model of SA- and JA-ET-mediated defense against biotrophs and necrotrophs, respectively. The latter model is currently regarded as being too simplistic since defense responses are thought to be fine-tuned not only to particular plant–pathogen combinations (Abdullah et al. 2017), but also to multiple biotic and abiotic stresses and co-infections.

Revisiting mineral nutrition and plant-pest or pathogen interactions with an Eh–pH perspective

Studying interactions between mineral nutrition and plant pathogens provides insights into how nutrient supply alters pathogen prevalence and influences competitive interactions among coinfecting pathogens

(Lacroix et al. 2014). Several studies reviewed in this regard and highlighted inconsistent results (Datnoff et al. 2007; Huber and Haneklaus 2007; Amtmann et al. 2008; Dordas 2008; Spann and Schumann 2010; Huber et al. 2011; Elmer and Datnoff 2014; Gupta et al. 2017; Shah 2017). This was due to the lack of information on: (i) the supply level of these nutrients with regard to plant needs; (ii) the form of N or other nutrients supplied (e.g., ammonium or nitrate which are metabolized differently); and (iii) the differences in infection patterns between obligate and facultative parasites (Huber et al. 2011). Other sources of inconsistency can be related to interactions between elements (co-application, antagonism, synergy), the time of application (Amtmann et al. 2008; Elmer and Datnoff 2014), the crop developmental stage at the time of nutrient application (Dordas 2008); soil type and growth conditions, especially pH, and other possible plant stresses (water, temperature, biotic stress, etc.). Overall, there is paucity of information in the literature as many studies did not report key information on the mode of pathogen's entry, the plant tissue that was first attacked (leaf or root, apoplast, xylem or phloem), and the plant physiological stage at which these pathogens develop. Most studies attributed the form of N to pH conditions while Eh conditions are as important as pH with regard to N forms. For example, the  $\text{NH}_4^+$  form is dominant at low pe + pH (< 14) while  $\text{NO}_3^-$  dominates at higher pe + pH (Husson, 2013).

An Eh–pH perspective in relation to plant nutrition, entry points of pathogens and feeding modes of pests, that defines various types of pests and pathogens and characterizes spatio-temporal variations in a plant's susceptibility or resistance to them, could shed light on these interacting processes and identify consistencies that are currently lacking. This section illustrates the importance of a spatialized and dynamic Eh–pH perspective by providing a few examples.

#### *N nutrition and plant-pest and pathogen interactions in an Eh–pH perspective*

Nitrogen availability for plants is one of the most important factors affecting disease development (Elmer and Datnoff 2014; Gupta et al. 2017). However, the mechanisms by which N affects disease


development remains elusive and, sometimes, inconsistent (Gupta et al. 2017). Nitrogen-deficient plants may not provide the nutrient environment necessary for obligate pathogens, whereas nitrogen excess may inhibit the production of defense responses to other pathogens (Elmer and Datnoff 2014). Nitrogen is an essential component of amino acids, enzymes, hormones, phenolics, phytoalexins, and proteins. Interestingly, all of these molecules have direct effects on disease development (Elmer and Datnoff 2014; Gupta et al. 2017), and are involved in redox homeostasis.

Most of the conflicting reports regarding the role of nitrogen in plant disease development may be due to a failure in recognizing and reporting the form of nitrogen used in the experiments (Elmer and Datnoff 2014). Huber and Thompson (2007) highlighted that application of nitrogen under unspecified form resulted in an increased and decreased disease level in 20 and 22 cases, respectively. Similarly,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ -N application resulted in an increased and decreased disease level in 8 and 16 cases, respectively. Likewise,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ -N application led to an increased and decreased disease level in 11 and 9 cases, respectively. Huber, reported an increased and decreased disease level due to  $\text{NH}_4^+$  nutrition in 24 and 20 cases, respectively, while they reported an increased and decreased disease level due to  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in 20 and 24 cases, respectively.

A careful consideration about how the N-form impacts plant Eh–pH homeostasis in its different compartments provides an interesting perspective that helps disentangle the interactions between N-form of nutrition and pests and pathogens (Fig. 6).

By considering the type of pests or pathogens and the part of the plant they first attack, we present clear patterns of their damage (Huber and Watson 1974) that are in accordance with local Eh–pH conditions induced by N-form of nutrition. Indeed, disease severities of:

- Soil-borne fungi that penetrate plants from the roots (*Rhizoctonia* spp., *Fusarium* spp., *Armillaria* spp., *Sclerotinia* spp., *Helminthosporium* spp., *Cercospora* spp., *Thielavopsis* spp., etc.) are decreased by nitrate and increased by ammonium (14 cases out of 16). This is in agreement with increased root pH and decreased root Eh by nitrate nutrition given that these fungi thrive at low pH and high Eh, and that ammonium nutri-



**Fig. 6** Impact of N-form of nutrition, creating unbalanced redox conditions in plant parts (pH-Eh map) in relation to optimum zones where the main groups of pathogenic microorganisms and pests can thrive.  $\text{NH}_4^+$  absorption (black arrows) leads to plant acidification, reduction (decreased  $\text{pe} + \text{pH}$ ) of shoots but oxidation of roots (increased  $\text{pe} + \text{pH}$ ).  $\text{NO}_3^-$  absorption (white arrows) leads to plant alkalization, with

shoots oxidation and roots reduction (Table 9). More generally, absorption of cation leads to acidification and absorption of anion leads to alkalization, as biochemical and biophysical status (i.e., stabilizing) mechanisms sustain status in the plant. However, nitrogen has a remarkably stronger impact than other elements as  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$  amount to 80% of the total anions and cations assimilated by plants (Marschner 1995)

tion leads to strong rhizosphere acidification. In contrast, those of soilborne ascomycetes, such as *Gaeumannomyces spp.*, and actinomycetes, such as *Streptomyces spp.*, are increased by nitrate and reduced by ammonium nutrition.

- Air-borne fungi and those of xylem-apoplast (*Poria=Stenocarpella spp.*, *Verticillium spp.*) are increased by nitrate and decreased by ammonium (4 cases over 4). This is in accordance with lower Eh in aerial parts of ammonium-fed plants.
- Soil-borne oomycetes are either decreased by nitrate and increased by ammonium (*Aphanomyces spp.*, *Phytophthora spp.*: 3 cases out of 3) or vice versa (*Pythium spp.*: 2 cases out of 2). This is in agreement with the facts that zoospore's germination is optimal for this latter pathogen group at high pH of 7–8 (Davet 2004). Likewise, *Aphanomyces spp.* infection is the most severe at low soil pH (<6.5; Payne et al. 1994). Finally, zoospores of *Phytophthora palmivora* are anodotactic while those of *Pythium aphanidermatum* are cathodotactic (van West et al. 2002).

- Virus-like diseases are decreased by ammonium application (5 cases out of 6) but are increased under nitrate nutrition (2 cases out of 2). This confirms that acidification and reduction of aerial parts of the plant under ammonium nutrition are unfavorable to many viruses which require alkaline and oxidized conditions, as those developed under nitrate nutrition.
- Foliar and vascular bacterial pathogens (*Pseudomonas spp.*, *Erwinia spp.*, *Corynebacterium spp.*) are increased by nitrate application (4 cases out of 5), which is consistent with the increased pH related to nitrate nutrition, where most pathogenic bacteria thrive at high pH.
- Plant parasitic nematodes are increased by nitrate and decreased by ammonium nutrition (2 cases out of 2). This is consistent with an increased root pH by nitrate fertilization (and inversely acidification by ammonium) knowing that *Heterodera glycines* is favored by high pH (Pedersen et al. 2010).

Similar conclusions can be drawn from the review by Huber and Thompson (2007). These authors

reported an increased and decreased disease severity with nitrate and ammonium nutrition, respectively, of air-borne fungi such as *M. oryzae*, *Alternaria macrospora*, *Monilinia vacciniae-corymbosi*, etc., viruses and nematodes (*Pratylenchus penetrans*). Ammonium nutrition of soil-borne fungi (*Fusarium* spp., *Rhizoctonia* spp., etc.) had the opposite effect. This dynamic and spatialized Eh–pH perspective can help decipher multiple contrasting interactions. For instance, in winter wheat, foliar and ear disease severity were positively associated with plant N uptake, use of mineral fertilizers, use of low leaf phenolic-flavonoid concentration, and short-straw variety “Solstice” (overall consistent with oxidized growing conditions in plants). In contrast, severity of the same diseases were negatively associated with the inputs of composted farm yard manure, leaf phenolic-flavonoid concentrations, and use of the long-straw variety “Aszita” which is rich in the phenols and flavonoids that sustain plants in a reduced condition (Rempelos et al. 2020).

Nitrogen application also strongly affects the intensity of insect damage. Plant nutritional quality and plant defenses that directly act on herbivores are altered by nitrogen fertilization, and herbivorous insects can distinguish plants receiving different nitrogen applications. Nitrogen fertilization results in higher occurrence of and level of crop damage from herbivorous insects by reducing plant resistance, and also increases sucking pests in 55% of the studies (Shah 2017). This is in agreement with an increase in Eh and pH conditions in nitrate-fed plants. This Eh–pH homeostasis perspective could also be used to analyze the incidence of insect pests under mineral vs organic fertilizations (Altieri and Nicholls 2003).

#### *Micronutrients and plant-pest or pathogen interactions in a Eh–pH perspective*

Manganese is a good illustration of the benefit in considering Eh–pH to decipher relations between mineral nutrition and plant pests and pathogens. Mn absorption is strongly affected by soil-rhizosphere Eh–pH conditions, and is soluble only in its reduced form ( $Mn^{2+}$ ), at low pe + pH. Mn has a tremendous impact on plant Eh–pH. Of central importance are its structural, redox and electron transport roles in photosynthesis, which results in the splitting of water and electron harvesting during the light reaction. Aside from

Mn superoxide dismutase and a few Mn containing enzymes, Mn functions primarily as an activator of enzymes, including dehydrogenases, transferases, hydroxylases and decarboxylases (Thompson and Huber 2007).

Due to its role in plant Eh–pH regulation, it is not surprising that Mn availability reduces diseases in 89% of the cases (reviewed by Thompson and Huber (2007)). All the conditions leading to Mn reduction and, thus to its increased availability, decreased the development and severity of diseases due to pathogenic fungi such as *Gaeumannomyces graminis* and *M. oryzae*. Interestingly, these pathogens possess the ability to oxidize Mn, and their virulence depends on this capacity. Mn oxidation was, thus, highly correlated with fungal virulence and disease development (Thompson and Huber 2007). The battle for Mn between host and bacterial pathogens, in relation to oxidative stress, was, indeed, a major determinant defining the outcome of infections (Juttukonda and Skaar 2015).

Other essential micronutrients in redox regulation have a strong impact on a large range of pests and pathogens. Examples are sulfur (Bloem et al. 2005), copper and boron, which were reported to decrease diseases in 93 and 91% of the studied cases, respectively (Datnoff et al. 2007).

The first-row transition metals—manganese (Mn), iron (Fe), cobalt (Co), nickel (Ni) and copper (Cu)—provide the necessary redox and catalytic activity for many important biological processes (Ranieri et al. 2001; Bárcenas-Moreno et al. 2011; Gerwien et al. 2018). A process aptly named ‘nutritional immunity’ makes the host actively sabotage and counteract metal uptake by microorganisms and it can also fight invaders by deploying toxic levels of certain metals. Iron, Cu and Mn, for example, are intrinsically toxic via Fenton chemistry (generation of oxygen radical species from hydrogen peroxide, catalyzed by the metal), leading to oxidative damage to the microbes at high metal concentrations (Gerwien et al. 2018). Finally, silicon, which has been reported to play an important role in resistance to fungal and bacterial diseases, and to herbivory (Epstein 1994; Fauteux et al. 2005; Sakr 2016; Liu et al. 2017), is also known to improve antioxidant capacity and redox homeostasis (Manivannan et al. 2018; Soundararajan et al. 2018). For example, silicon induces resistance of cassava to

bacterial blight by altering antioxidant enzyme activity (Njenga et al. 2017).

### Revisiting pathogenicity and virulence in an Eh–pH perspective

The Eh–pH perspective described herein provides a simple answer to the question “what makes commensal or opportunistic microorganisms pathogenic?” The answer is that “A commensal or opportunistic microorganism becomes pathogenic when it encounters or can develop Eh–pH niches favorable for its development”.

This hypothesis is supported by the fact that pH has now been recognized as a key factor in reducing fungal pathogenicity (Fernandes et al. 2017). In addition, cellular redox balance may serve as an inducer for the defense-related genes, including pathogenesis-related proteins (Foyer 2005). Oxalic acid indirectly aids *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* pathogenicity by acting as a signaling molecule via manipulation of host ROS (Williams et al. 2011). Furthermore, ROS and redox regulation are also involved in the perception of pests and pathogens and activation of plant defense. For instance, mitogen-activated protein kinase cascade, involved in pattern-triggered and effector-triggered immunity, is activated and regulated by ROS (Bigéard et al. 2015; Liu and He 2017). Indeed, the Rice Yellow Mottle Virus-encoded viral suppressor of RNA silencing P1 is a protein with redox-dependent flexibility (Gillet et al. 2013).

It can also be hypothesized that the virulence of a pathogen is related to its ability to alter and sustain host plant Eh–pH to its benefits despite the plant’s attempts to make it unfavorable, especially during the oxidative burst in the hypersensitive response (Torres et al. 2006). This is observed with *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* and *Botrytis cinerea* through oxalic acid production (Mbengue et al. 2016; Wang et al. 2016), or in bacteria through production of thiol antioxidants such as GSH and detoxification enzymes that consume ROS (Reniere 2018). Fungal pH modulations of the host environment regulate an arsenal of enzymes to increase fungal pathogenicity. This arsenal includes genes and processes that compromise host defenses, contribute to intracellular signaling, produce cell wall-degrading enzymes, regulate specific transporters, induce redox protectant systems, and generate factors needed by the pathogen to

effectively cope with the hostile environment within the host (Alkan et al. 2013). The ability of the pathogen to actively increase or decrease its surrounding pH allows it to select the specific virulence factor, out of its vast arsenal, to best fit a particular host (Prusky and Yakoby 2003).

The evolution of pathogenicity towards novel hosts may be based on traits that were originally developed to ensure survival in the microorganism’s original habitat, including former hosts (Van Baarlen et al. 2007). An Eh–pH perspective could help understand cross-kingdom host jumps or why and how pests or pathogens can expand their host range. This perspective can also provide new insights on the “disease triangle” that integrates pathogenicity, host susceptibility, and environment. This can be done by stating that compatible interactions between a pathogen and a host will only result in disease symptoms when environmental conditions are also fulfilled (Van Baarlen et al. 2007). This review suggests that Eh–pH are major determinants of environmental conditions affecting pest or pathogen–host interactions.

Microorganisms thriving in slightly reduced and acidic conditions could be commensal or even beneficial to plants. However, they may become detrimental when Eh–pH conditions change (especially increase in pe + pH), by altering their interactions. This could be the case for Cyanobacteria, which exhibit characteristics of higher plants (photosynthetic organisms) as well as bacteria. This microorganisms able to reduce the effect of salinity by producing extracellular polysaccharide or compatible solutions, increase rice seed germination in drought situations, and remove pollutants (heavy metals and pesticides) from soil and water (Singh et al. 2016). Faced with biotic stresses, cyanobacteria are capable of efficiently producing a diversity of chemical compounds in addition to releasing various enzymes, competing for rhizosphere space and activating plant defense responses by interacting with plant roots. All these features represent an exploitable strategy against pests and pathogens in agriculture (Singh et al. 2016). In the event of soil oxidation, however, this group of bacteria can contribute to iron starvation of plants because Cyanobacteria require large amounts of iron and have developed very efficient mechanisms for iron uptake. They are very competitive with plants for this essential nutrient element (Kranzler et al. 2013).



## Revisiting energy allocation and growth or defense trade-off with an Eh–pH perspective

The plant immune system should be tunable because the immune response is costly, making unnecessary activation a burden on plant fitness (Nobori and Tsuda 2019). An Eh–pH approach may provide a new perspective on the growth versus defense trade-off in plants as reviewed by Huot et al. (2014). Based on the Eh–pH perspective, we propose a model of plant energy allocation under various conditions (Fig. 7).

This model is based on two key observations. First, the spatial variability of Eh–pH in plants is consistent with a new perspective of defense predicting that the allocation of defensive chemistry within a plant is a function of tissue or organ value in terms of fitness. In other words, tissues with higher predicted value (young leaves with high photosynthetic activity, thus lower Eh–pH, have significantly higher concentrations of defensive chemicals compared to less valuable older tissues (McCall and Fordyce 2010). Second, ruderal plants growing on highly disturbed soil, are anticipated to spend most of their energy in reproduction rather than in mutualism (rhizodeposition). Competitor plants are expected to invest their energy mainly in growth but also in defense (health) and mutualist microorganisms. At the end of the spectrum, stress tolerators growing in soil with low disturbance are anticipated to primarily invest their energy in defense and feeding mutualist microorganisms (De Deyn 2017).


Under favorable soil conditions, the plant traits that govern carbon and nutrient exploitation generally dominate. These traits include fast growth, low C:N and root:shoot ratio, low secondary metabolite content, short lifespan, and short litter residence time (De Deyn et al. 2008). Plants having such a strategy regarding acquisition, use and conservation of nutrients, are regarded as exploitative plants (Guyonnet et al. 2018a). Where soil resources (nutrients, water, oxygen, pH) limit growth, plant traits that govern carbon and nutrient conservation generally dominate. Such plants are characterized by slow growth, high C:N and root:shoot ratios, high secondary metabolite content, long (organ) lifespan and long litter residence time (De Deyn et al. 2008). These species exude less carbon in the rhizosphere but the exudate composition is different. Such species are regarded as conservative species. Under stress conditions such as drought, exploitative species reduce their growth and root exudation faster than conservative species to benefit

from mycorrhizal symbiosis and increased fungal abundance. Upon long term-extreme stress, conservative species are expected to reduce their growth, exudation and transfer of C to microbes and thereby impacting mycorrhizal symbiosis. Under similar conditions, exploitative species will respond by root death, reduced growth and less root exudation and C transfer to microbes. On termination of stress, conservative species, although they have unaltered exudate quality, will resume C transfer to microbes, re-establish mycorrhizal symbiosis, and slowly regrow. Despite altered root exudate quality, exploitative species will transfer high amounts of C to microbes, favor Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria and recreate a high bacterial abundance. This permits rapid mineralization of dead roots, microbes and native soil organic matter that releases large amounts of N and accelerates regrowth (Williams and de Vries 2019). All this illustrates the strong interplay between roots and the soil microbiome.

### Eh–pH in the rhizosphere: interplay between roots and microbiota

On the assumption that homeostasis is a focal point of ecology and evolution (Giordano 2013), the concept of Eh–pH homeostasis could bring an interesting perspective of soil–plant–microorganism interactions. In all ecosystems, plants transform the surrounding soil to make and sustain a habitat more favorable for growth (Marschner 1995). To this objective, plants shape the microbiome composition by selecting for specific microorganisms from the total pool of microorganisms in the bulk soil. These are then assembled into communities in the rhizosphere (Berg and Smalla 2009; Dini-Andreote and Elsas 2013). On the other hand, bacteria have developed various adaptation strategies to thrive in different rhizosphere niches (Jacoby et al. 2017). Microbial communities in the rhizosphere of different plant species growing on the same soil are often different, and some plant species can create similar communities in different types of soil. Even within species, different genotypes can develop distinct microbial communities in their rhizosphere. This suggests that plants are able to shape the composition of the microbiome in their rhizosphere (Berendsen et al. 2012), in such a way that both microbial density and activity in the rhizosphere are much higher than in bulk soil (Paungfoo-Lonhienne





**Fig. 7** Hypothesized model of energy allocation to reproduction, growth, health and rhizodeposition as a function of growing conditions. The energy investment distribution and above-ground-belowground interactions in this figure vary with plant strategies. A1: Under optimal soil conditions, the high energy produced by very efficient photosynthesis permits a balanced distribution of energy between vegetative growth, reproduction, health and root exudation, with the latter “feeding” the soil microorganisms. High amounts of exudates are released in the rhizosphere, but the high vegetative growth increases photosynthetic capacity, and thus energy production in a very sustainable cycle. Energy rich plants (balanced pH, Eh and pe + pH) are not attractive to pests and are able to sustain interactions unfavorable to pathogens since they accumulate secondary metabolites and, also, are not attractive to insects. A2: When soil imbalance is (partially) compensated for by efficient fertilization (especially through foliar application of elements in an accessible form), high photosynthesis can be achieved. In order to restore the necessary soil balance, plants allocate a higher percentage of photosynthetic products to root exudation that selects and feeds a rich and balanced microflora. However, deficiency in various nutrients, including micronu-

trients, increases exudation of sugars, amino acids and phenolics (Cakmak and Marschner 1988; Carvalhais et al. 2011), at the expense of resources needed by the plant for growth and reproduction. B1: Energy production is low when photosynthesis is affected by various abiotic stresses (low light, extreme temperature, or soil imbalance that leads to nutrient deficiency, toxicity, etc.). In the absence of a pest or a pathogen, the available energy is mainly allocated to shoot and root growth and reproduction, with less rhizodeposition to alter soil conditions favorable for plant health. The low energy allocated to plant health leads to high Eh or high pe + pH and makes the plant attractive to pests and susceptible to pathogens. B2: Upon pest or pathogen attacks, the energy available for the plant is further decreased due to the reduction of photosynthetic activity, reduction of photosynthetic leaf tissues surrounding necrotic lesions, and reorientation of plant metabolism by the pathogen (Bastiaans and Kropff 1993; Berger et al. 2007). The plant then allocates most of its energy towards pest and pathogen containment. This affects its vegetative growth and, as a consequence, it further limits its photosynthetic capacity. In a vicious circle, lower photosynthesis increases plant Eh–pH imbalance thereby increasing its susceptibility to pests and pathogens

et al. 2010; Marschner 2011). Since root exudates play a key role in the establishment of plant-microorganisms interactions (Guyonnet et al. 2018a; Nobori and Tsuda 2019), plants probably shape common microbial communities as a result of these exudates (primary and secondary metabolites). Those that come from plant photosynthates are rich nutrient sources and include carbohydrates, organic acids and amino acids (Paszkowski 2006). Soil pe + pH contributes significantly to determine soil enzyme activities

and differences in microbial composition and function (Wang et al. 2020).

Parameters such as pH, redox, ionic strength, water potential, and the concentration of nutrients and organic compounds are different in the rhizosphere compared to bulk soil (Jones et al. 2004). Under imbalanced soil conditions, plants alter rhizosphere Eh–pH towards neutral conditions (Krasil'nikov 1958; Hinsinger et al. 2003; Husson 2013). They do this through root exudates, as a result of passive diffusion or release under active processes for a specific


purpose (Fischer et al. 1989; Jones et al. 2004). In both cases, plants rely strongly on microorganisms to alter and buffer rhizosphere soil Eh–pH. Microorganisms are: i) adapted to specific Eh–pH conditions (and their fluctuations), ii) able to sense redox signals (redox-taxis), and iii) can alter and adapt Eh and pH of their surrounding environment to their requirements, to a much greater extent than other living organisms (Krasil'nikov 1958; Rabotnova and Schwartz 1962; Alexandre and Zhulin 2001; Pidello 2014). Indeed, soil bacteria are able to create networks with tiny electronic connections between electron donors and acceptors which is critical to electron transfer via electrical currents (Li et al. 2017). These networks enable microbial communities to rapidly eliminate electrons coming from their metabolic processes and transport them to distant electron pumps (Ball 2007; Ntarlagiannis et al. 2007). Soil microorganisms largely govern redox kinetics by producing enzymes that speed up redox reactions to release energy (Burgin et al. 2011; Gianfreda 2015). Under well-structured and biologically active soils, water bounding can be expected, knowing that the so-bound water has a catalytic action facilitating electron and proton transfers (Ball 2008). These redox reactions between connections are also facilitated through soil electrical conductivity which is related to nutrient content, salinity, organic matter, pyrogenic carbon, cation exchange capacity, residual humidity, soil texture and soil compaction (Husson 2013). Electrical currents have actually been measured between roots and arbuscular mycorrhizae (Berbara et al. 1995).

Under biotic stresses, plants react by changing the chemistry of their root exudates to assemble health-promoting microbiomes (Rolfé et al. 2019). Plant roots alter soil structure, aeration and humidity to create microhabitats which can be seen as many Eh–pH niches (Krasil'nikov 1958; Fischer et al. 1989) compatible with microorganisms of various Eh–pH requirements. The joint activity of roots and microbes promotes physico-chemical heterogeneity in the rhizosphere with its spatial and temporal diversity in the local soil microhabitat (Dini-Andreote and Elsas 2013). While stochastic community assembly processes dominate in homogeneous environments, deterministic community assembly processes prevail in heterogeneous environments, creating selective pressure for microorganisms (Dini-Andreote et al. 2015).

Plant roots, microbes and earthworms determine soil aggregation, especially near the surface of their biopores, either by enhancing aggregate diversity or by its homogenization. Roots lead to the formation of subpolyeders and shrinkage-induced cracks due to water uptake while earthworms form tiny platy and sheared structures because of their intermittently swollen body shape (Haas and Horn 2018). Close to the biopore surface (<1 mm), roots have an acidifying effect while earthworms have an alkalinizing one. The interaction of both lead to neutral to slightly acid pH and a neutral Eh at approximately 400 mV. Within the microaggregates, roots lead to higher Eh (600 mV) while earthworm activity leads to a more neutral Eh around 400–450 mV (Haas and Horn 2018). In return, microorganisms further alter and buffer Eh–pH conditions, especially in the rhizosphere, which is a hotspot of biological activity (Krasil'nikov 1958). A direct effect of microorganisms is achieved through the production of biofilms while an indirect impact may occur through aggregation improvement, soil structure stabilization (thanks to bacterial polysaccharide and fungal glycoprotein glues), increased water retention (thanks to biological mesoporosity increase), and erosion containment all of which create a diversity of Eh–pH niches (Pidello 2014; Clocchiatti et al. 2020).

Improved Eh–pH conditions and, consequently, enhanced plant nutrition and health, lead to increased photosynthesis, plant production and root exudation to further favor microbial growth and diversity in a virtuous cycle (Fig. 8). This entire process of soil transformation starts from seed germination: germinating seeds profoundly modify their environment and their microbiota as they constitute important sources of nutritious exudates, a great part of which is volatile. Exudate production increases with the quantity of reserve substances stored in the seeds that varies with the seed size and plant species (Davet 2004; Nelson 2018). Mother plant production situations, the seed age and storage conditions can lead to physiological differences between two genetically identical seed lots. Increased moisture content and storage temperature results in higher oxidation, pH and loss of seed viability (Nagel et al. 2019).

The plant 'lifestyle' consideration is important to put all of this information into perspective. Conservative species exude more amino acids, while exploitative species exude more primary metabolites (sugar,



**Fig. 8** Schematic presentation of the soil–plant–microorganism system showing the central role of photosynthesis by plant that provides the “fuel” for soil system regeneration. On degraded soils (01), poor structure and high Eh–pH fluctuations lead to low diversity of the soil microbiome, with pathogens dominating beneficial organisms (02) that results in poor plant growth. As a consequence, plants have limited capacity and energy to sustain an efficient pest or pathogen defense system, leading to poor plant health. Increasing photosynthetic activity by various means leads to increased root exudation (03) that alters Eh–pH and allows the development of a diversity of microorganisms in the rhizosphere and phyllosphere (04). The inputs of biomass on the soil surface from decaying plant parts create a litter (05) that, promotes the development of active macrofauna. Together with the active macrofauna,

feeding on root exudates microorganisms in the rhizosphere improve soil structure, plant nutrition and plant health (06). The improved soil structure and active microbiota buffer the Eh–pH, both in soil and plants (07) to create a diversity of Eh–pH niches (08) and food supplies for microorganisms. All of this activity favors the completion of major biogeochemical cycles and increases plant defense against pests and pathogens. Improved soil structure, plant nutrition and health (09) result in increased photosynthesis and biomass production (10). Consequently, both root exudation (11) and biomass inputs on the soil surface (12) are enhanced to further fuel the development of biological activity and biodiversity (13) while improving soil aggregation, plant nutrition and plant health in a virtuous cycle. In such a case, beneficial organisms largely dominate pests and pathogens, leading to suppressive soils (14)

organic acids) and this composition differential can be critical in regulating the plant’s microbiota (Guyonnet et al. 2018b). By exuding more carbon into the rhizosphere, exploitative species attract more microbial taxa into root tissues and in the rhizoplane (Root-Adhering Soil, RAS). In such a way, these species stimulate more taxa involved in Soil Organic Matter (SOM) degradation by a “priming effect” mechanism. Exploitative species select more specific SOM degraders, exclude consumers in the RAS and root inhabiting bacteria than conservative species, and they increase denitrifying activity in the RAS (Guyonnet et al. 2018b). Organic acids cause significantly greater increases than sugars do in the detectable richness of the soil bacterial community and lead to

larger shifts in the composition of dominant taxa. The greater response of bacteria to organic acids may be due to the higher amounts of added carbon, solubilization of SOM or shifts in soil pH (Shi et al. 2011). Inversely, the root exudation pattern and respiration are altered by microorganisms such as mycorrhizae or bacteria (Jones et al. 2004; Korenblum et al. 2020).

These interactions occur at medium or long term, in the process of soil aggregation and weathering, although they are also important at relatively short-term. Loss of C from the plant to the rhizosphere is a rapid process. Following photosynthetic fixation, photosynthetically fixed C can be detected in the rhizosphere in less than an hour. Microbial turnover

of root exudates in the soil is very rapid, with a half-life of between 0.5 and 2 h for most sugars, amino acids and organic acids (Jones et al. 2004).

Endophytic microbes (mostly bacteria and fungi) inhabiting asymptomatic plants have also been shown to: (i) obtain nutrients in soils and transfer them to plants in the rhizophagy cycle and other nutrient-transfer symbioses; (ii) increase plant growth and development; (iii) reduce oxidative stress of hosts; (iv) protect plants from diseases; (v) deter feeding by herbivores; and (vi) suppress growth of competitor plant species (White et al. 2019). Plant roots can not only incorporate large organic molecules including proteins and DNA, but are also able to take up non-pathogenic microorganisms into root cells, where they are degraded and used as a nutrient source (Paungfoo-Lonhienne et al. 2010). This rhizophagy cycle is an oxidative process in plants for nutrient extraction from symbiotic microbes (White et al. 2019).

Root exudates drive the soil-borne legacy of aboveground pathogen infection (Yuan et al. 2018). After five generations of *Arabidopsis thaliana* inoculated aboveground with *Pseudomonas syringae* pv *tomato*, the causal agent of bacterial speck of tomato, bacterial communities of both rhizosphere and bulk soil were altered by the infection of this bacterial pathogen. These changes were the result of greater exudation of amino acids, nucleotides, and long-chain organic acids as well as the lower exudation of sugars, alcohols, and short-chain organic acids. The sixth generation of *A. thaliana* was grown on the same pathogen-conditioned soil but was uninfected by the bacterial pathogen. The sixth generation of the plant had increased levels of jasmonic acid (a defense-regulating phytohormone), and improved disease resistance compared with plants grown on control-conditioned soil (five generations of *A. thaliana* uninfected by the bacterial pathogen). This clearly demonstrates the capacity of plants to promote beneficial rhizosphere communities via modification of plant exudation patterns in response to exposure to aboveground pathogens to the benefit of subsequent plant generations (Yuan et al. 2018).

The rhizosphere microbiome results from an interplay between soil and seed microbiota, beneficial and pathogenic microorganisms colonizing aerial parts of plants, and root exudation. All of this appears to be largely regulated by Eh and pH. Microorganisms

play a key role in the numerous interactions between plant and soil while the latter is, in part, derived from the activity of plants (Fig. 8) as they supply organic matter and play a pivotal role in weathering rocks and minerals (Lambers et al. 2009).

### **Are balanced and diverse Eh–pH niches hosting a highly diverse microbiome the key determinant to soil suppressiveness?**

Competitive interactions in soil microbial communities are regarded as the major driving factor of general soil suppressiveness. To infect root tissue, pathogens have to compete with members of the rhizosphere microbiome for available nutrients and microsites (Chapelle et al. 2016). In disease-suppressive soils, pathogen activity is strongly restricted by specific rhizosphere microorganisms. The rhizosphere microbiome of sugar beet seedlings grown in a soil suppressive to the fungal pathogen *Rhizoctonia solani* showed that *Oxalobacteraceae*, *Burkholderiaceae*, *Sphingobacteriaceae* and *Sphingomonadaceae* were significantly more abundant in the rhizosphere upon fungal invasion and that stress-related genes (ppGpp metabolism and oxidative stress) were upregulated in these bacterial families (Chapelle et al. 2016). The pathogenic fungus induces, directly or via the plant, stress responses in the rhizobacterial community that lead to shifts in microbiome composition and activation of antagonistic traits limiting pathogen infection. Several root-colonizing microorganisms are known to improve the plants response to pathogens (Meisner and De Boer 2018). Upon pest or pathogen attacks, plants are able to stimulate protective microorganisms and enhance microbial activity that suppresses pathogens in the rhizosphere (Berendsen et al. 2012). Natural antibiotics are weapons in the microbial warfare in the rhizosphere that are integral to plant health (Cha et al. 2016). Plant response to increased pathogen abundance depends on the microbial community colonizing the root, which is affected by the amount and composition of rhizodeposits. For example, iron-mobilizing coumarins, exudated by *A. thaliana*, shape the root bacterial community by inhibiting the proliferation of a relatively abundant *Pseudomonas* species via a redox-mediated mechanism (Voges et al. 2019). Redox-active phenazine compounds also play a role in the persistence and survival of *Pseudomonas*



spp. in the rhizosphere and, inversely, plant-beneficial phenazine-producing *Pseudomonas* spp. are proficient biocontrol agents of many soilborne pathogens (Biessy and Fillion 2018). Melatonin, an amphiphilic antioxidant produced by cellular organisms able to scavenge both oxygenated and nitrogenated compounds, may decrease the deleterious physiological effect of various abiotic stresses through modulation of antioxidative enzymes and enhancement of organic acid anion exudation. In addition, this antioxidant may differentially modify some bacterial and fungal communities (Pisoschi and Pop 2015; Zhang et al. 2017; Madigan et al. 2019).

Redox states affect substrate availability and energy transformation and, thus, play a crucial role in regulating soil microbial abundance, diversity, and community structure (Song et al. 2008). Redox potential fluctuations are common in soils, and microbial community acclimation or avoidance strategies for survival shape microbial community diversity and biogeochemistry (DeAngelis et al. 2010). By characterizing redox-related soil microbial communities along a river flood plain continuum, Song et al. (2008) observed that, microorganisms, in general were highly abundant, diverse, and distributed more evenly in the oxic layers than the anoxic ones. This was primarily attributed to differences in oxygen availability in these soils. The decrease in abundance with increasing oxygen and substrate limitation, however, was considerably more drastic than the decrease in diversity, suggesting that growth of soil microorganisms is more energy demanding than their maintenance (Song et al. 2008). Indigenous soil bacteria are highly adapted to fluctuating redox regimens, and generally possess physiological tolerance mechanisms allowing them to withstand unfavorable redox periods. However, soil bacterial communities lose significant diversity under sustained or frequent anoxic conditions (Pett-Ridge and Firestone 2005). pH is also a major driver of microorganism diversity in soil, and appears to be more important than nutrients in shaping bacterial communities in agricultural soils, including their ecological functions and biogeographic distribution (Wang, 2019). Fast changing Eh–pH conditions are therefore expected to be detrimental to biological activity and diversity. Soil structure resulting from the interactions of plant roots, associated macrofauna and microbial activity appears to be a key determinant of soil health as it strongly impacts Eh–pH dynamics.

The loss of organic matter and degradation of soil structure due to soil tillage (Reicosky et al. 1997; Johannes et al. 2017) lead to low buffering capacity and thus, strong fluctuations in soil Eh and pH (Husson 2013). Fiedler et al. (2003) found a significant decrease in soil Eh ( $-100$  to  $-200$  mV.h<sup>-1</sup>,  $-800$  mV in 3 days), and increase in soil Eh following water saturation and drought, respectively. Together with mean soil Eh, strong fluctuations of soil pH occur with changes in soil moisture, especially upon saturation (Tano et al. 2020). These fast-changing conditions strongly affect microbial populations and growth. Under rapidly fluctuating conditions, microbial populations can be periodically activated and inactivated, which, in turn, quickly alters the nature and rate of key biogeochemical transformations (Pett-Ridge and Firestone 2005). Physiological responses to stress have costs at the level of organism leading to altered ecosystem-level C, energy, and nutrient flows. These large-scale impacts result from direct effects on active microbes' physiology and stability of the active microbial community (Schimel et al. 2007). Plants unadapted to fast-changing Eh–pH conditions therefore face multiple stresses that render them susceptible to multiple pests and pathogens.

A large diversity of Eh–pH niches can harbor a diverse and highly active biological community under well-structured soils, which are rich in organic matter with active root systems. This provides essential ecological services that allow plants to sustain their Eh–pH homeostasis. Plant- and root-associated microorganisms enhance plant mineral nutrition and carbon cycling through redox alteration (Marschner 1995; Schimel and Schaeffer 2012; Xi et al. 2016; Jacoby et al. 2017). The biogeochemical cycles of carbon, nitrogen, sulfur, and phosphorus appear to be driven by the “FeIII–FeII redox wheel” in dynamic redox environments (Li et al. 2012). Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi improve redox homeostasis in rice through regulation of ROS scavenging activities that help the host release glutathione (Li et al. 2020). *Trichoderma* species are involved in redox processes that confer resistance to redox stresses and facilitate redox homeostasis (Cardoza et al. 2010; Singh et al. 2013). This beneficial effect is reduced by (oxidizing) abiotic stresses for *T. harzianum*-induced resistance to downy mildew in grapevine (Perazzolli et al. 2011).

Well-structured soils, which offer a large range of Eh–pH niches and host a highly diverse microbial

community, have been regarded as plant disease suppressive soils (Cook 2014; Löbmann et al. 2016). Oxygen gradients (in space and time) lead to the assembly of a microbial community that is dominated by populations that are able to endure both aerobic and anaerobic conditions (Chen et al. 2017a). Effective oxygen consumption, combined with the formation of microaggregates, sustains the activity of oxygen-sensitive anaerobic enzymes and leads to the direction of unsorted redox processes (i.e. not following the “redox tower” that would cause ecological niches of prokaryotes that consume electron acceptors in a thermodynamically determined order), within and between populations (Chen et al. 2017a). Various ecological services are simultaneously ensured by the rich soil biodiversity in a balanced environment.

### Conclusions and future perspectives

Although causality cannot be demonstrated with the available literature, the literature reports many spatio-temporal correlations between Eh–pH conditions and plant susceptibility, tolerance and resistance to pests and pathogens across various stress conditions. This supports our initial hypothesis that “Eh–pH homeostasis is central to soil and plant health”. The Eh–pH homeostasis model is strengthened by the fact that this model: i) represents a unifying paradigm that comprises a large range of processes in a very logical and consistent manner; ii) encompasses various other models in crop protection (priming-exhaustion, optimal defense theory, susceptibility-tolerance-resistance, soil legacy, etc.); iii) enlightens our understanding of these processes without contradicting any observation or current knowledge; and, finally iv) provides a useful perspective to disentangle G x E x M x P interactions.

The new perspective this model proposes could therefore help: i) plant pathologists and entomologists better understand plant-pathogen and plant-pest interactions, and develop new approaches to pest and pathogen management; ii) epidemiologists and modelers refine their models; iii) breeders improve and accelerate breeding for improved plant resistance, adaptability and tolerance to various stresses, pests and pathogens; and enhance energy allocation between growth and defense in selected varieties; iv) plant nutrition specialists design advanced fertilizers

adapted to pH-Eh conditions of a given soil to meet the requirements of a given crop; and v) agronomists develop agroecological crop protection (Deguine et al. 2017) or biodiversity-based agriculture by developing ecosystem services provided by biological diversity based on a farming system redesigning (Wezel et al. 2014; Duru et al. 2015).

An Eh–pH perspective could become a very powerful tool to develop a “one health approach” (MacKenzie and Jeggo 2019; Ratnadass and Deguine 2021). This is because the same parameters explain fundamental processes and could be used to characterize the “health” of soils (Husson et al. 2018b), plants (Husson et al. 2018a), animals and humans. This is consistent with the increasing recognition of the role of Eh and pH homeostasis in health (Aoi and Marunaka 2014; Ursini et al. 2016; Kruk et al. 2019) and the role of microbiota and pathobiota in healthy and unhealthy host immune responses, respectively (Littman and Pamer 2011).

Finally, we emphasize the importance of jointly considering Eh and pH in further studies since most studies conducted to date disconnect these two interacting parameters. In order to accomplish this, improved measurement methods and other tools are needed to assess plant and soil Eh–pH conditions. These could include spectrometric methods that help overcome limitations of electrochemical ones for plants, and the use of bio-indicators as natural vegetation species to surmount problems related to the high soil spatio-temporal variability.

**Data availability** Not applicable

**Code availability** Not applicable

### Declarations

**Conflicts of interest/competing interests** The authors declare having no conflict of interest

**Compliance with ethical standards** All authors read and approved the final manuscript

### Glossary

ABA Abscisic acid  
ACP Agroecological Crop Protection



AsA	Ascorbic Acid
ASC	Ascorbate, reduced AsA
ATP	Adenosine Tri Phosphate
DHA	De Hydro Ascorbic acid (Oxidized AsA)
EC	Electrical conductivity
Eh	Redox Potential
ET	Ethylene
G x E x M x P	Interactions Genotype x Environment x Management x Pest and Pathogens interactions
GSH	Reduced Glutathione
GSSG	Oxidized Glutathione
ISR	Induced Systemic resistance
JA	Jasmonic Acid
NADPH	Reduced form of Nicotinamide Adenine Dinucleotide Phosphate
NO	Nitric Oxide
pH	Hydrogen potential
RAS	Root-Adhering Soil
ROS	Reactive Oxygen species
SA	Salicylic Acid
SAR	Systemic Acquired Resistance
SOM	Soil Organic Matter

## References

- Aarti PD, Tanaka R, Tanaka A (2006) Effects of oxidative stress on chlorophyll biosynthesis in cucumber (*Cucumis sativus*) cotyledons. *Physiol Plant* 128:186–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2006.00720.x>
- Abdullah AS, Moffat CS, Lopez-Ruiz FJ et al (2017) Host–multi-pathogen warfare: Pathogen interactions in co-infected plants. *Front Plant Sci* 8:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01806>
- Agrios GN (2005) *Plant pathology*, 5th edn. Elsevier Academic Press, 952 p
- Ah-Fong AMV, Kagda MS, Abrahamian M, Judelson HS (2019) Niche-specific metabolic adaptation in biotrophic and necrotrophic oomycetes is manifested in differential use of nutrients, variation in gene content, and enzyme evolution. *PLoS Pathog* 15:1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1007729>
- Ahmad N, Malagoli M, Wirtz M, Hell R (2016) Drought stress in maize causes differential acclimation responses of glutathione and sulfur metabolism in leaves and roots. *BMC Plant Biol* 16:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12870-016-0940-z>
- Alexandre G, Zhulin IB (2001) More than one way to sense chemicals. *J Bacteriol* 183:4681–4686. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.183.16.4681-4686.2001>
- Alkan N, Espeso EA, Prusky D (2013) Virulence regulation of phytopathogenic fungi by pH. *Antioxid Redox Signal* 19:1012–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2012.5062>
- Alkhalifioui F, Renard M, Vensel WH et al (2007) Thioredoxin-linked proteins are reduced during germination of *Medicago truncatula* seeds. *Plant Physiol* 144:1559–1579. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.107.098103>
- Allen DJ, Ort DR (2001) Impacts of chilling temperatures on photosynthesis in warm-climate plants. *Trends Plant Sci* 6:36–42. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1360-1385\(00\)01808-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1360-1385(00)01808-2)
- Altieri MA, Nicholls CI (2003) Soil fertility management and insect pests: Harmonizing soil and plant health in agroecosystems. *Soil Tillage Res* 72:203–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-1987\(03\)00089-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-1987(03)00089-8)
- Amtmann A, Troufflard S, Armengaud P (2008) The effect of potassium nutrition on pest and disease resistance in plants. *Physiol Plant* 133:682–691. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2008.01075.x>
- Andrews JH, Harris RF (2000) The ecology and biogeography of microorganisms on plant surfaces. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 38:145–180. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.phyto.38.1.145>
- Anjum NA, Gill SS, Gill R et al (2014) Metal/metalloid stress tolerance in plants: role of ascorbate, its redox couple, and associated enzymes. *Protoplasma* 251:1265–1283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-014-0636-x>
- Anjum NA, Khan NA, Sofu A et al (2016) Redox homeostasis managers in plants under environmental stresses. *Front Environ Sci* 4:210. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2016.00035>
- Anuradha M, Narayanan A (1991) Promotion of root elongation by phosphorus deficiency. *Plant Soil* 136:273–275
- Aoi W, Marunaka Y (2014) Importance of pH homeostasis in metabolic health and diseases: crucial role of membrane proton transport. *Biomed Res Int* 2014:ID598986. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/598986>
- Appel HM (1993) Phenolics in ecological interactions: the importance of oxidation. *J Chem Ecol* 19:1521–1552
- Appel HM, Joern A (1998) Gut physicochemistry of grassland grasshoppers. *J Insect Physiol* 44:693–700
- Appel HM, Martin MM (1990) Gut redox conditions in herbivorous Lepidopteran larvae. *J Chem Ecol* 16:3277–3290
- Arabi MIE, Jawhar M (2002) The ability of barley powdery mildew to grow in vitro. *J Phytopathol* 150:305–307. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0434.2002.00751.x>
- Armijo G, Schlechter R, Agurto M et al (2016) Grapevine pathogenic microorganisms: understanding infection strategies and host response scenarios. *Front Plant Sci* 7:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.00382>
- Aubrey DP, Boyles JG, Krysinsky LS, Teskey RO (2011) Spatial and temporal patterns of xylem sap pH derived from stems and twigs of *Populus deltoides* L. *Environ Exp Bot* 71:376–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2011.02.006>
- Awasthi R, Bhandari K, Nayyar H (2015) Temperature stress and redox homeostasis in agricultural crops. *Front Environ Sci* 3:1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2015.00011>
- Babbar R, Karpinska B, Grover A, Foyer CH (2021) Heat-induced oxidation of the nuclei and cytosol. *Front Plant Sci* 11:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.617779>
- Backhausen JE, Scheibe R (1999) Adaptation of tobacco plants to elevated CO<sub>2</sub>: influence of leaf age on changes in physiology, redox states and NADP-malate dehydrogenase

- activity. *J Exp Bot* 50:665–675. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/50.334.665>
- Bahrin A, Jensen CR, Asch F, Mogensen VO (2002) Drought-induced changes in xylem pH, ionic composition, and ABA concentration act as early signals in field-grown maize (*Zea mays* L.). *J Exp Bot* 53:251–263
- Baier M, Dietz KJ (2005) Chloroplasts as source and target of cellular redox regulation: A discussion on chloroplast redox signals in the context of plant physiology. *J Exp Bot* 56:1449–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eri161>
- Ball P (2007) Bacteria may be wiring up the soil. *Nature* 449:388. <https://doi.org/10.1038/449388a>
- Ball P (2008) Water as an active constituent in cell biology. *Chem Rev* 108:74–108. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr068037a>
- Balmer A, Pastor V, Gamir J et al (2015) The “prime-ome”: Towards a holistic approach to priming. *Trends Plant Sci* 20:443–452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2015.04.002>
- Bárceñas-Moreno G, García-Orenes F, Mataix-Solera J et al (2011) Soil microbial recolonisation after a fire in a Mediterranean forest. *Biol Fertil Soils* 47:261–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-010-0532-2>
- Bastiaans L, Kropff MJ (1993) Effects of leaf blast on photosynthesis of rice 2. Canopy Photosynthesis Netherlands *J Plant Pathol* 99:205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01974665>
- Bateman D (1978) The dynamic nature of disease. In: Horsfall JG, Cowling EB (eds) *Plant Disease, An Advanced Treatise Vol. III How Plants Suffer from Disease*. Academic Press, pp 53–83
- Benada J (1966) The gradients of oxidation-reduction potentials in cereals and the dependence of obligate parasites on the redox potentials of the host tissues. *Phytopathol Zeitschrift* 55:265–269
- Benada J (2012) Redox potential and pH in plants and their function in the mechanism of resistance to diseases and in plant physiology. A review. *Agrotest fyto, s.r.o. Zemedelsky vyzkumny ustav Kromeriz*
- Benada J (2017) Measurement of redox potential and pH in plants and their function in the mechanism of plant resistance and in plant physiology. *Int J Adv Res Electr Electron Instrum Eng*: 1111–1116. <https://doi.org/10.15662/IJAREEIE.2015.0501001>
- Benada J (1967) The distribution of redox potentials and pH values in the leaves of cereal tillers during the stem extension. *Flora Abt A Bd* 158:343–350
- Bendix C, Lewis JD (2018) The enemy within: Phloem-limited pathogens. *Mol Plant Pathol* 19:238–254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mpp.12526>
- Benitez-Alfonso Y, Jackson D, Maule A (2011) Redox regulation of intercellular transport. *Protoplasma* 248:131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-010-0243-4>
- Berbara RLL, Morris BM, Fonseca HMA et al (1995) Electrical currents associated with arbuscular mycorrhizal interactions. *New Phytol* 129:433–438. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1995.tb04314.x>
- Berendsen RL, Pieterse CMJ, Bakker PAHM (2012) The rhizosphere microbiome and plant health. *Trends Plant Sci* 17:478–486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2012.04.001>
- Berg G, Smalla K (2009) Plant species and soil type cooperatively shape the structure and function of microbial communities in the rhizosphere. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 68:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6941.2009.00654.x>
- Berger S, Sinha AK, Roitsch T (2007) Plant physiology meets phytopathology: Plant primary metabolism and plant-pathogen interactions. *J Exp Bot* 58:4019–4026. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erm298>
- Bernacchi CJ, Leakey ADB, Heady LE et al (2006) Hourly and seasonal variation in photosynthesis and stomatal conductance of soybean grown at future CO<sub>2</sub> and ozone concentrations for 3 years under fully open-air field conditions. *Plant Cell Environ* 29:2077–2090. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2006.01581.x>
- Berthelot E, Ducouso M, Macia J-L et al (2019) Turnip Mosaic Virus is a second example of a virus using transmission activation for plant-to-plant propagation by Aphids. *J Virol* 93:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01822-18>
- Bertrand PF (1976) Late season water deficits and development of *Cytospora* canker in French prune. *Phytopathology* 66:1318
- Best RJ (1968) Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus. *Adv Virus Res* 13:65–146. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-3527\(08\)60251-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-3527(08)60251-1)
- Best RJ, Samuel G (1936) The reaction of the viruses of tomato spotted wilt and tobacco mosaic to the pH value of media containing them. *Ann Appl Biol* 23:509–537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7348.1936.tb06108.x>
- Bhuyan MHMB, Hasanuzzaman M, Al MJ et al (2019) Unraveling morphophysiological and biochemical responses of *Triticum aestivum* L. to extreme pH: Coordinated actions of antioxidant defense and glyoxalase systems. *Plants* 8:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants8010024>
- Bi JL, Felton GW (1995) Foliar oxidative stress and insect herbivory: Primary compounds, secondary metabolites, and reactive oxygen species as components of induced resistance. *J Chem Ecol* 21:1511–1530. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02035149>
- Biessy A, Filion M (2018) Phenazines in plant-beneficial *Pseudomonas* spp.: biosynthesis, regulation, function and genomics. *Environ Microbiol* 20:3905–3917. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.14395>
- Bigeard J, Colcombet J, Hirt H (2015) Signaling mechanisms in pattern-triggered immunity (PTI). *Mol Plant* 8:521–539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2014.12.022>
- Bignell DEE (1984) Direct potentiometric determination of redox potentials of the gut contents in the termites *Zootermopsis nevadensis* and *Cubitermes severus* and in three other arthropods. *J Insect Physiol* 30:169–174. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910\(84\)90122-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910(84)90122-7)
- Blancard D (2012) *Tomato diseases: Identification, biology and control: A colour handbook*, 2nd edn. CRC Press, QUAE
- Bloem E, Haneklaus S, Schnug E (2005) Significance of sulfur compounds in the protection of plants against pests and diseases. *J Plant Nutr* 28:763–784. <https://doi.org/10.1081/PLN-200055532>
- Blokhina OB, Virolainen E, Fagerstedt KV et al (2000) Antioxidant status of anoxia-tolerant and -intolerant plant species under anoxia and reaeration. *Physiol Plant*

- 109:396–403. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3054.2000.100405.x>
- Bolwell GP, Bindschedler LV, Blee KA et al (2002) The apoplastic oxidative burst in response to biotic stress in plants: A three-component system. *J Exp Bot* 53:1367–1376. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/53.372.1367>
- Bolwell PP, Page A, Piślewska M, Wojtaszek P (2001) Pathogenic infection and the oxidative defences in plant apoplast. *Protoplasma* 217:20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01289409>
- Borella J, Becker R, Lima MC et al (2019) Nitrogen source influences the antioxidative system of soybean plants under hypoxia and re-oxygenation. *Sci Agric* 76:51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-992x-2017-0195>
- Bostock RM, Pye MF, Roubtsova TV (2014) Predisposition in plant disease: Exploiting the nexus in abiotic and biotic stress perception and response. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 52:517–549. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-081211-172902>
- Bousset L, Ermel M, Soglonou B, Husson O (2019) Fungal growth is affected by and affects pH and redox potential (Eh) of the growth medium. *Fungal Biol* 123:117–124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adsc.201>
- Bové J, Garnier M (2003) Phloem-and xylem-restricted plant pathogenic bacteria. *Plant Sci* 164:423–438. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-9452\(03\)00033-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-9452(03)00033-5)
- Browne G, Ott N, Poret-Peterson A et al (2018) Efficacy of anaerobic soil disinfestation for control of *Prunus* replant disease. *Plant Dis* 102:209–219. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-16-1392-RE>
- Brugidou C, Opalka N, Yeager M et al (2002) Stability of rice yellow mottle virus and cellular compartmentalization during the infection process in *Oryza sativa* (L.). *Virology* 297:98–108. <https://doi.org/10.1006/viro.2002.1398>
- Brune A, Emerson D, Breznak JA (1995) The termite gut microflora as an oxygen sink: Microelectrode determination of oxygen and pH gradients in guts of lower and higher termites. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 61:2681–2687
- Bueno E, Mesa S, Bedmar EJ et al (2012) Bacterial adaptation of respiration from oxic to microoxic and anoxic conditions: Redox control. *Antioxid Redox Signal* 16:819–852. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2011.4051>
- Bünemann EK, Bongiorno G, Bai Z et al (2018) Soil quality – A critical review. *Soil Biol Biochem* 120:105–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.01.030>
- Burgin AJ, Yang WH, Hamilton SK, Silver WL (2011) Beyond carbon and nitrogen: How the microbial energy economy couples elemental cycles in diverse ecosystems. *Front Ecol Environ* 9:44–52. <https://doi.org/10.1890/090227>
- Burns NC (1971) Soil pH effects on nematode populations associated with soybeans. *J Nematol* 3:238–245
- Bush DR (1992) The proton-sucrose symport. *Photosynth Res* 32:155–165
- Cakmak I, Marschner H (1988) Increase in membrane permeability and exudation in roots of zinc deficient plants. *J Plant Physiol* 132:356–361. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-1617\(88\)80120-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-1617(88)80120-2)
- Calonnec A, Jolivet J, Vivin P, Schnee S (2018) Pathogenicity traits correlate with the susceptible *Vitis vinifera* leaf physiology transition in the biotroph fungus *Erysiphe necator*: An adaptation to plant ontogenic resistance. *Front Plant Sci* 871:1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01808>
- Campos WG, Schoederer JH, Picanço MC (2003) Performance of an oligophagous insect in relation to the age of the host plant. *Neotrop Entomol* 32:671–676. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1519-566x2003000400019>
- Cardinale BJ (2011) Biodiversity improves water quality through niche partitioning. *Nature* 472:86–91. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09904>
- Cardoso EJB, Vasconcellos RLF, Bini D et al (2013) Soil health: Looking for suitable indicators. What should be considered to assess the effects of use and management on soil health? *Sci Agric* 70:274–289. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-90162013000400009>
- Cardoza RE, Mora ME, Hermosa R et al (2010) *TvDim1* of *Trichoderma virens* is involved in redox-processes and confers resistance to oxidative stresses. *Curr Genet* 56:63–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00294-009-0280-8>
- Carvalho LC, Dennis PG, Fedoseyenko D et al (2011) Root exudation of sugars, amino acids, and organic acids by maize as affected by nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, and iron deficiency. *J Plant Nutr Soil Sci* 174:3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.201000085>
- Carvalho LC, Vidigal P, Amâncio S (2015) Oxidative stress homeostasis in grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Front Environ Sci* 3:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2015.00020>
- Cazemier AE, Den Camp HJMO, Hackstein JHP, Vogels GD (1997) Fibre digestion in arthropods. *Comp Biochem Physiol - A Physiol* 118:101–109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0300-9629\(96\)00443-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0300-9629(96)00443-4)
- Cazemier AE, Verdoes JC, Reubsat FAG et al (2003) *Pro-micromonospora pachnodae* sp. nov., a member of the (hemi)cellulolytic hindgut flora of larvae of the scarab beetle *Pachnoda marginata*. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek Int J Gen Mol Microbiol* 83:135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023325817663>
- Cha JY, Han S, Hong HJ et al (2016) Microbial and biochemical basis of a Fusarium wilt-suppressive soil. *ISME J* 10:119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.95>
- Chandrashekar C, Kumar R, Bhatt JC, Chandrashekar KN (2012) Suppressive soils in plant disease management. In: Singh A (ed) *Eco-friendly innovative approaches in plant disease management*. International Book Distributors, New Delhi, pp 241–256. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.5173.7608>
- Chapelle E, Mendes R, Bakker PAH, Raaijmakers JM (2016) Fungal invasion of the rhizosphere microbiome. *ISME J* 10:265–268. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.82>
- Charrier M, Brune A (2003) The gut microenvironment of heliicid snails (Gastropoda: Pulmonata): In-situ profiles of pH, oxygen, and hydrogen determined by microsensors. *Can J Zool* 81:928–935. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z03-071>
- Chen J, Hanke A, Tegetmeyer HE et al (2017a) Impacts of chemical gradients on microbial community structure. *ISME J* 11:920–931. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2016.175>
- Chen R, Song S, Li X et al (2013) Phosphorus deficiency restricts plant growth but induces pigment formation in the flower stalk of Chinese kale. *Hortic Environ Biotechnol* 54:243–248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13580-013-0018-x>

- Chen X, Mao A, Zhang Y et al (2017b) Carbon and nitrogen forms in soil organic matter influenced by incorporated wheat and corn residues. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 63:377–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380768.2017.1359797>
- Chen Z, Gallie DR (2004) The ascorbic acid redox state controls guard cell signaling and stomatal movement. *Plant Cell* 16:1143–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.021584>
- Cheng F, Cheng Z (2015) Research progress on the use of plant allelopathy in agriculture and the physiological and ecological mechanisms of allelopathy. *Front Plant Sci* 6:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.01020>
- Clarke D, Whitney H, Sutton G, Robert D (2013) Detection and learning of floral electric fields by bumblebees. *Science* 340:66–69. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1230883>
- Clemente-Moreno MJ, Díaz-Vivancos P, Rubio M et al (2013) Chloroplast protection in plum pox virus-infected peach plants by L-2-oxo-4-thiazolidine-carboxylic acid treatments: Effect in the proteome. *Plant Cell Environ* 36:640–654. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12003>
- Clocchiatti A, Hannula SE, van den Berg M et al (2020) The hidden potential of saprotrophic fungi in arable soil: Patterns of short-term stimulation by organic amendments. *Appl Soil Ecol* 147:103434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2019.103434>
- Cook JR, Baker KF (1983) The nature and practice of biological control of plant pathogens, American P., St Paul
- Cook RJ (2014) Plant health management: Pathogen suppressive soils. In: Van Alfen NKBT-E of A and FS (ed). Academic Press, Oxford, pp 441–455
- Cornelissen JHC, Sibma F, Van Logtestijn RSP et al (2011) Leaf pH as a plant trait: species-driven rather than soil-driven variation. *Funct Ecol* 25:449–455. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2010.01765.x>
- Coskun D, Deshmukh R, Sonah H et al (2019) The controversies of silicon's role in plant biology. *New Phytol* 221:67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.15343>
- Cottes J (2019) Le couple Eh/pH du sol : Sa mesure, son impact sur la mobilité des nutriments et la croissance du tournesol. Ph.D Thesis, Université de Toulouse, France
- Cruz-Munoz M, Munoz-Beristain A, Petrone JR et al (2019) Growth parameters of *Liberibacter crescens* suggest ammonium and phosphate as essential molecules in the *Liberibacter*-plant host interface. *BMC Microbiol* 19:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12866-019-1599-z>
- Cuyppers A, Vangronsveld J, Clijsters H (2001) The redox status of plant cells (AsA and GSH) is sensitive to zinc imposed oxidative stress in roots and primary leaves of *Phaseolus vulgaris*. *Plant Physiol Biochem* 39:657–664. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0981-9428\(01\)01276-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0981-9428(01)01276-1)
- Das P, Nutan KK, Singla-Pareek SL, Pareek A (2015) Oxidative environment and redox homeostasis in plants: dissecting out significant contribution of major cellular organelles. *Front Environ Sci* 2:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2014.00070>
- Datnoff LE, Elmer WH, Huber DM (2007) Mineral nutrition and plant disease. APS Press, St Paul
- Davet P (2004) Microbial ecology of the soil and plant growth. Science Publishers. Inc., Enfield
- Dawood M, Cao F, Jahangir MM et al (2012) Alleviation of aluminum toxicity by hydrogen sulfide is related to elevated ATPase, and suppressed aluminum uptake and oxidative stress in barley. *J Hazard Mater* 209–210:121–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2011.12.076>
- De Corato U (2021) Soil microbiome manipulation gives new insights in plant disease-suppressive soils from the perspective of a circular economy: A critical review. *Sustain* 13:1–41. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010010>
- De Deyn GB (2017) Plant life history and above–below-ground interactions: missing links. *Oikos* 126:497–507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.03967>
- De Deyn GB, Cornelissen JHC, Bardgett RD (2008) Plant functional traits and soil carbon sequestration in contrasting biomes. *Ecol Lett* 11:516–531. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01164.x>
- DeAngelis KM, Silver WL, Thompson AW, Firestone MK (2010) Microbial communities acclimate to recurring changes in soil redox potential status. *Environ Microbiol* 12:3137–3149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2010.02286.x>
- Debona D, Rodrigues FÁ, Rios JA, Nascimento KJT (2012) Biochemical changes in the leaves of wheat plants infected by *Pyricularia oryzae*. *Phytopathology* 102:1121–1129. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-06-12-0125-R>
- Deguine J-P, Gloanec C, Laurent P et al (2017) Agroecological Crop Protection. Springer, Netherlands
- Di Gioia F, Ozores-Hampton M, Hong J et al (2016) The effects of anaerobic soil disinfection on weed and nematode control, fruit yield, and quality of florida fresh-market tomato. *HortScience* 51:703–711. <https://doi.org/10.21273/hortsci.51.6.703>
- Diéguez-Uribeondo J, Förster H, Adaskaveg JE (2008) Visualization of localized pathogen-induced pH modulation in almond tissues infected by *Colletotrichum acutatum* using confocal scanning laser microscopy. *Phytopathology* 98:1171–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-98-11-1171>
- Dietz K-J (2003) Redox control, redox signaling, and redox homeostasis in plant cells. *Int Rev Cytol* 228:141–193. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696\(03\)28004-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696(03)28004-9)
- Dietz K-J, Turkan I (2016) Krieger-Liszskay A (2016) Redox and reactive oxygen species-dependent signalling in and from the photosynthesizing chloroplast. *Plant Physiol* 171:00375. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.16.00375>
- Dini-Andreote F, Elsas JD (2013) Back to the basics: The need for ecophysiological insights to enhance our understanding of microbial behaviour in the rhizosphere. *Plant Soil* 373:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-013-1687-z>
- Dini-Andreote F, Stegen JC, Van Elsas JD, Salles JF (2015) Disentangling mechanisms that mediate the balance between stochastic and deterministic processes in microbial succession. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112:E1326–E1332. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1414261112>
- Dodd IC, Tan LP, He J (2003) Do increases in xylem sap pH and/or ABA concentration mediate stomatal closure following nitrate deprivation? *J Exp Bot* 54:1281–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erg122>
- Dordas C (2008) Role of nutrients in controlling plant diseases in sustainable agriculture. A review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 28:33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1051/agro:2007051>



- Downum KR, Rodriguez E (1986) Toxicological action and ecological importance of plant photosensitizers. *J Chem Ecol* 12:823–834. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01020254>
- Dragičević V (2015) Thermodynamics of abiotic stress and stress tolerance of cultivated plants. *Recent Adv Thermo Fluid Dyn* 195–221. <https://doi.org/10.5772/60990>
- Dubreuil G, Deleury E, Magliano M et al (2011) Peroxiredoxins from the plant parasitic root-knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita*, are required for successful development within the host. *Int J Parasitol* 41:385–396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2010.10.008>
- Duru M, Therond O, Fares M (2015) Designing agroecological transitions; A review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 35:1237–1257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0318-x>
- Ebert A, Brune A (1997) Hydrogen concentration profiles at the oxic-anoxic interface: A microsensor study of the hindgut of the wood-feeding lower termite *Reticulitermes flavipes* (Kollar). *Appl Environ Microbiol* 63:4039–4046. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.63.10.4039-4046.1997>
- Egert M, Stingl U, Bruun LD et al (2005) Structure and topology of microbial communities in the major gut compartments of *Melolontha melolontha* larvae (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Appl Environ Microbiol* 71:4556–4566. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.71.8.4556>
- Ellakwa ET (2014) Effect of host plant on gut physicochemistry and digestive enzymes of the cutworm (*Agrotis ipsilon*) larvae. *Am J Drug Discov Dev* 4:248–252
- Elmer WH, Datnoff LE (2014) Mineral nutrition and suppression of plant disease. *Encycl Agric Food Syst* 4:231–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-52512-3.00251-5>
- Elstner EF, Osswald W (1994) Mechanisms of oxygen activation during plant stress. *Proc R Soc Edinburgh Sect B Biol Sci* 102:131–154. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0269727000014068>
- Endo RM, Linn MB (1960) The white-rust disease of Horse-radish. *Bull. Illinois Agric. Exp. Stn.* 56 pp
- Epstein E (1994) The anomaly of silicon in plant biology. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 91:11–17
- Eutick ML, O'Brien RW, Slaytor M (1976) Aerobic state of gut of *Nasutitermes exitiosus* and *Coptotermes lacteus*, high and low caste termites. *J Insect Physiol* 22:1377–1380. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910\(76\)90161-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910(76)90161-X)
- Exposito-Rodriguez M, Laissue PP, Yvon-Durocher G et al (2017) Photosynthesis-dependent H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> transfer from chloroplasts to nuclei provides a high-light signalling mechanism. *Nat Commun* 8:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00074-w>
- Farber DH, Mundt CC (2017) Effect of plant age and leaf position on susceptibility to wheat stripe rust. *Phytopathology* 107:412–417. <https://doi.org/10.1094/phyto-07-16-0284-r>
- Farkas GL, Király Z, Solymosy F (1960) Role of oxidative metabolism in the localization of plant viruses. *Virology* 12:408–421. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6822\(60\)90163-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6822(60)90163-X)
- Fatima U, Senthil-Kumar M (2015) Plant and pathogen nutrient acquisition strategies. *Front Plant Sci* 6:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00750>
- Fauteux F, Rémus-Borel W, Menzies JG, Bélanger RR (2005) Silicon and plant disease resistance against pathogenic fungi. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 249:1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsle.2005.06.034>
- Felle HH (2005) pH regulation in anoxic plants. *Ann Bot* 96:519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mci207>
- Felle HH (2001) pH: Signal and messenger in plant cells. *Plant Biol* 3:577–591. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2001-19372>
- Felle HH (2006) Apoplastic pH during low-oxygen stress in barley. *Ann Bot* 98:1085–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcl193>
- Felle HH, Herrmann A, Hanstein S et al (2004) Apoplastic pH signaling in barley leaves attacked by the powdery mildew fungus *Blumeria graminis* f. sp. *hordei*. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact* 17:118–123. <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI.2004.17.1.118>
- Fernandes TR, Segorbe D, Prusky D, Di Pietro A (2017) How alkalization drives fungal pathogenicity. *PLoS Pathog* 13:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1006621>
- Ferreira M, Domingos M (2012) Seasonal characterization of antioxidant responses in plants of *Ipomoea nil* cv Scarlet O'hara. *Braz J Biol* 72:831–837. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1519-69842012000500008>
- Fiedler S, Scholich GU, Kleber M (2003) Construction and evaluation of redox electrode with summing operational amplifier: Application in study of methane emission. *Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal* 34:481–496. <https://doi.org/10.1081/CSS-120017833>
- Fischer WR, Flessa H, Schaller G (1989) pH values and redox potentials in microsites of the rhizosphere. *Zeitschrift Für Pflanzenernährung Und Bodenk* 152:191–195. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.19891520209>
- Fobert PR, Després C (2005) Redox control of systemic acquired resistance. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 8:378–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2005.05.003>
- Footitt S, Cohn MA (1992) Seed dormancy in red rice. *Plant Physiol* 100:1196–1202. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.80.2.531>
- Foyer CH (2005) Redox homeostasis and antioxidant signaling: A metabolic interface between stress perception and physiological responses. *Plant Cell Online* 17:1866–1875. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.105.033589>
- Foyer CH, Noctor G (2016) Stress-triggered redox signalling: What's in pROSpect? *Plant Cell Environ* 39:951–964. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12621>
- Foyer CH, Noctor G (2013) Redox signaling in plants. *Antioxid Redox Signal* 18:2087–2090. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2013.5278>
- Foyer CH, Shigeoka S (2011) Understanding oxidative stress and antioxidant functions to enhance photosynthesis. *Plant Physiol* 155:93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.110.166181>
- Frederickson Matika DE, Loake GJ (2013) Redox regulation in plant immune function. *Antioxid Redox Signal* 21:1373–1388. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2013.5679>
- Fromm J, Bauer T (1994) Action potentials in maize sieve tubes change phloem translocation. *J Exp Bot* 45:463–469. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/45.4.463>
- Fukuta Y, Suzuki T, Yanagihara S et al (2019) Genetic variation of blast (*Pyricularia oryzae* cavara) resistance in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) accessions widely used in Kenya. *Breed Sci* 69:672–679. <https://doi.org/10.1270/jsbbs.19065>

- Fürstenberg-Hägg J, Zagrobelny M, Bak S (2013) Plant defense against insect herbivores. *Int J Mol Sci* 14:10242–10297. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms140510242>
- García G, Clemente-Moreno MJ, Díaz-Vivancos P et al (2020) The apoplastic and symplastic antioxidant system in onion: Response to long-term salt stress. *Antioxidants* 9:67. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox9010067>
- Garnier M, Foissac X, Gaurivaud P et al (2001) Mycoplasmas plants insect vectors: a matrimonial triangle. *C R Acad Sci III* 324:923–928. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0764-4469\(01\)01372-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0764-4469(01)01372-5)
- Gaupels F, Durner J, Kogel KH (2017) Production, amplification and systemic propagation of redox messengers in plants? The phloem can do it all! *New Phytol* 214:554–560. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14399>
- Gebrie SA (2016) Biotrophic fungi infection and plant defense mechanism. *J Plant Pathol Microbiol* 7. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2157-7471.1000378>
- Geigenberger P (2003) Response of plant metabolism to too little oxygen. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 6:247–256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1369-5266\(03\)00038-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1369-5266(03)00038-4)
- Geilfus CM (2017) The pH of the apoplast: Dynamic factor with functional impact under stress. *Mol Plant* 10:1371–1386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2017.09.018>
- Geilfus CM, Mühling KH (2011) Real-time imaging of leaf apoplastic pH dynamics in response to NaCl stress. *Front Plant Sci* 2:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2011.00013>
- Geilfus CM, Wang L, Wu J, Xue C (2020) The pH of the leaf apoplast is critical for the formation of *Pseudomonas syringae*-induced lesions on leaves of the common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*). *Plant Sci* 290:110328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2019.110328>
- Geiser E, Wiebach V, Wierckx N, Blank LM (2014) Prospecting the biodiversity of the fungal family Ustilaginaceae for the production of value-added chemicals. *Fungal Biol Biotechnol* 1:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40694-014-0002-y>
- Gerendás J, Schurr U (1999) Physicochemical aspects of ion relations and pH regulation in plants - A quantitative approach. *J Exp Bot* 50:1101–1114. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/50.336.1101>
- Gerwien F, Skrahina V, Kasper L et al (2018) Metals in fungal virulence. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 42:1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fux050>
- Gianfreda L (2015) Enzymes of importance to rhizosphere processes. *J Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 15:283–306. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-95162015005000022>
- Giaquinta R (1977) Phloem loading of sucrose: pH dependence and selectivity. *Plant Physiol* 59:750–755. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.59.4.750>
- Gillet FX, Cattoni DI, Petiot-Bécard S et al (2013) The RYMV-encoded viral suppressor of RNA silencing P1 is a zinc-binding protein with redox-dependent flexibility. *J Mol Biol* 425:2423–2435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2013.03.028>
- Giordano M (2013) Homeostasis: an underestimated focal point of ecology and evolution. *Plant Sci* 211:92–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2013.07.008>
- Gjetting KSK, Ytting CK, Schulz A, Fuglsang AT (2012) Live imaging of intra-and extracellular pH in plants using pHusion, a novel genetically encoded biosensor. *J Exp Bot* 63:3207–3218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/ers040>
- Gloser V, Korovetska H, Martín-Vertedor AI et al (2016) The dynamics of xylem sap pH under drought: a universal response in herbs? *Plant Soil* 409:259–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-016-2962-6>
- Gnanamanickam SS (2006) Plant-associated bacteria. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands
- Goggin FL, Avila CA, Lorence A (2010) Vitamin C content in plants is modified by insects and influences susceptibility to herbivory. *BioEssays* 32:777–790. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.200900187>
- González-Bosch C (2018) Priming plant resistance by activation of redox-sensitive genes. *Free Radic Biol Med* 122:171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2017.12.028>
- Goodman RN, Kiraly Z, Zaitlin M (1967) The biochemistry and physiology of infectious plant disease. Van Nostrand Company, Toronto
- Gour HN, Ashiya J, Mali BL, Nath R (2000) Influence of temperature and pH on the growth and toxin production by *Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *vignicola* inciting leaf blight of cowpea. *J Mycol Plant Pathol* 30:389–392
- Grams TEE, Lautner S, Felle HH et al (2009) Heat-induced electrical signals affect cytoplasmic and apoplastic pH as well as photosynthesis during propagation through the maize leaf. *Plant Cell Environ* 32:319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2008.01922.x>
- Greggers U, Koch G, Schmidt V et al (2013) Reception and learning of electric fields in bees. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 280. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.0528>
- Grignon C, Sentenac H (1991) pH and ionic conditions in the apoplast. *Annu Rev Plant Physiol Plant Mol Biol* 42:103–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.pp.42.060191.000535>
- Gupta N, Debnath S, Sharma S et al (2017) Role of nutrients in controlling the plant diseases in sustainable agriculture. In: Meena V et al (ed) *Agriculturally Important Microbes for Sustainable Agriculture*. Springer Nature, Singapore, pp 217–262
- Gupta R, Lee SE, Agrawal GK et al (2015) Understanding the plant-pathogen interactions in the context of proteomics-generated apoplastic proteins inventory. *Front Plant Sci* 6:1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00352>
- Guyonnet JP, Cantarel AAM, Simon L, Haichar FZ (2018a) Root exudation rate as functional trait involved in plant nutrient-use strategy classification. *Int J Bus Innov Res* 17:8573–8581. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4383>
- Guyonnet JP, Guillemet M, Dubost A et al (2018b) Plant nutrient resource use strategies shape active rhizosphere microbiota through root exudation. *Front Plant Sci* 871:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01662>
- Haapalainen M (2014) Biology and epidemics of *Candidatus Liberibacter* species, psyllid-transmitted plant-pathogenic bacteria. *Ann Appl Biol* 165:172–198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aab.12149>
- Haas C, Horn R (2018) Impact of small-scaled differences in micro-aggregation on physico-chemical parameters of macroscopic biopore walls. *Front Environ Sci* 6:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2018.00090>



- Hafke JB, Van Amerongen JK, Kelling F et al (2005) Thermodynamic battle for photosynthate acquisition between sieve tubes and adjoining parenchyma in transport phloem. *Plant Physiol* 138:1527–1537. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.104.058511>
- Halliwell B, Gutteridge JMC (1984) Oxygen toxicity, oxygen radicals, transition metals and disease. *Biochem J* 219:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1042/bj2190001>
- Handy D, Loscalzo J (2012) Redox regulation of mitochondrial function. *Antioxid Redox Signal* 16:1323–1368
- Harrison JF (2001) Insect acid-base physiology. *Annu Rev Entomol* 46:221–250. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.46.1.221>
- Hasanuzzaman M, Bhuyan MHMB, Nahar K et al (2018) Potassium: A vital regulator of plant responses and tolerance to abiotic stresses. *Agronomy* 8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy8030031>
- Hemantaranjan A, Bhanu AN, Singh M et al (2014) Heat stress responses and thermotolerance. *Adv Plants Agric Res* 1:62–70. <https://doi.org/10.15406/apar.2014.01.00012>
- Hernández I, Munné-Bosch S (2015) Linking phosphorus availability with photo-oxidative stress in plants. *J Exp Bot* 66:2889–2900. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erv056>
- Hernández JA, Gullner G, Clemente-Moreno MJ et al (2016) Oxidative stress and antioxidative responses in plant–virus interactions. *Physiol Mol Plant Pathol* 94:134–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmpp.2015.09.001>
- Hess DT, Matsumoto A, Kim S-O et al (2005) Protein S-nitrosylation: purview and parameters. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 6:150–166. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm1569>
- Hijaz F, Killiny N (2014) Collection and chemical composition of phloem sap from *Citrus sinensis* L. Osbeck (sweet orange). *PLoS One* 9:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0101830>
- Hinsinger P, Plassard C, Tang C et al (2003) Origins of root-mediated pH changes in the rhizosphere and their responses to environmental constraints: A review. *Plant Soil* 248:43–59
- Hipper C, Brault V, Ziegler-Graff V, Revers F (2013) Viral and cellular factors involved in phloem transport of plant viruses. *Front Plant Sci* 4:1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2013.00154>
- Hogenhout SA, Loria R (2008) Virulence mechanisms of Gram-positive plant pathogenic bacteria. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 11:449–456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2008.05.007>
- Howlett BJ, Idnurm A, Pedras MSC (2001) *Leptosphaeria maculans*, the causal agent of blackleg disease of Brassicas. *Fungal Genet Biol* 33:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1006/fgbi.2001.1274>
- Hua C, Li C, Jiang Y et al (2020) Response of soybean cyst nematode (*Heterodera glycines*) and root-knot nematodes (*Meloidogyne* spp.) to gradients of pH and inorganic salts. *Plant Soil*: 305–318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04677-z>
- Hua J (2013) Modulation of plant immunity by light, circadian rhythm, and temperature. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 16:406–413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2013.06.017>
- Huber D, Römheld V, Weinmann M (2011) Relationship between nutrition, plant diseases and pests. In: Marschner's Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants, 3rd edn. pp 283–298
- Huber DM, Haneklaus S (2007) Managing nutrition to control plant disease. *Landbauforsch Völknerode* 4(57):313–322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803581-8.02518-2>
- Huber DM, Thompson IA (2007) Nitrogen and plant disease. In: Datnoff LE, Elmer WE, Huber DM (eds) Mineral nutrition and plant disease, APS Press. The American phytopathological society, St Paul, Minnesota, USA, pp 31–44
- Huber DM, Watson RD (1974) Nitrogen form and plant disease. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 12:139–165. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.py.12.090174.001035>
- Huot B, Yao J, Montgomery BL, He SY (2014) Growth-defense tradeoffs in plants: A balancing act to optimize fitness. *Mol Plant* 7:1267–1287. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mp/ssu049>
- Husson O (2013) Redox potential (Eh) and pH as drivers of soil/plant/microorganism systems: a transdisciplinary overview pointing to integrative opportunities for agronomy. *Plant Soil* 362:389–417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-1429-7>
- Husson O, Audebert A, Benada J et al (2018a) Leaf Eh and pH: A novel indicator of plant stress. Spatial, temporal and genotypic variability in rice. *Agronomy* 8:1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy8100209>
- Husson O, Brunet A, Babre D et al (2018b) Conservation Agriculture systems alter the electrical characteristics (Eh, pH and EC) of four soil types in France. *Soil Tillage Res* 176:57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2017.11.005>
- Husson O, Husson B, Brunet A et al (2016) Practical improvements in soil redox potential (Eh) measurement for characterisation of soil properties. Application for comparison of conventional and conservation agriculture cropping systems. *Anal Chim Acta* 906:98–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2015.11.052>
- Hwang H-H, Yu M, Lai E-M (2017) *Agrobacterium*-mediated plant transformation: Biology and applications. *Arab B* 15:e0186. <https://doi.org/10.1199/tab.0186>
- Igamberdiev AU, Baron K, Manac'h-Little N et al (2005) The haemoglobin/nitric oxide cycle: Involvement in flooding stress and effects on hormone signalling. *Ann Bot* 96:557–564. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mci210>
- Igamberdiev AU, Bykova NV (2018) Role of organic acids in the integration of cellular redox metabolism and mediation of redox signalling in photosynthetic tissues of higher plants. *Free Radic Biol Med* 122:74–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2018.01.016>
- Ilan T, Kim-Shapiro DB, Bock CH, Shapiro-Ilan DI (2013) Magnetic and electric fields induce directional responses in *Steinernema carpocapsae*. *Int J Parasitol* 43:781–784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2013.05.007>
- Jackson MB, Saker LR, Crisp CM et al (2003) Ionic and pH signalling from roots to shoots of flooded tomato plants in relation to stomatal closure. *Plant Soil* 253:103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024588532535>
- Jacoby R, Peukert M, Succurro A et al (2017) The role of soil microorganisms in plant mineral nutrition—current knowledge and future directions. *Front Plant Sci* 8:1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01617>

- Janku M, Luhová L, Petrivalský M (2019) On the origin and fate of reactive oxygen species in plant cell compartments. *Antioxidants* 8:105
- Jashvantlal PS (2008) Management of bacterial blight of rice. PhD thesis Navsari Agricultural University, India
- Jha G, Sonti RV (2009) Attack and defense in *Xanthomonas*-rice interactions. *Proc Indian Natn Sci Acad* 75:49–68
- Jiang Y (1996) Oxidative interactions between the spotted alfalfa aphid (*Therioaphis trifolii maculata*) (Homoptera: Aphididae) and the host plant *Medicago sativa*. *Bull Entomol Res* 86:533–540. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007485300039328>
- Jiang Y, Miles PW (1993) Responses of a compatible lucerne variety to attack by spotted alfalfa aphid: changes in the redox balance in affected tissues. *Entomol Exp Appl* 67:263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1570-7458.1993.tb01677.x>
- Johannes A, Matter A, Schulin R et al (2017) Optimal organic carbon values for soil structure quality of arable soils. Does clay content matter? *Geoderma* 302:14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.04.021>
- Johnson GN (2003) Thiol regulation of the thylakoid electron transport chain - A missing link in the regulation of photosynthesis? *Biochemistry* 42:3040–3044. <https://doi.org/10.1021/bi027011k>
- Johnson KS, Felton GW (1996a) Physiological and dietary influences on midgut redox conditions in generalist lepidopteran larvae. *J Insect Physiol* 42:191–198. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910\(95\)00096-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1910(95)00096-8)
- Johnson KS, Felton GW (1996b) Potential influence of midgut pH and redox potential on protein utilization in insect herbivores. *Arch Insect Biochem Physiol* 32:85–105
- Jones DL, Hodge A, Kuzyakov Y (2004) Plant and mycorrhizal regulation of rhizodeposition. *New Phytol* 163:459–480. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01130.x>
- Jones DS, Kohl C, Grettenberger C et al (2015) Geochemical niches of Iron-oxidizing acidophiles in acidic coal mine drainage. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 81:1242–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02919-14>
- Jonkers W, Estrada AER, Lee K et al (2012) Metabolome and transcriptome of the interaction between *Ustilago maydis* and *Fusarium verticillioides* in vitro. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 78:3656–3667. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.07841-11>
- Joseph A, Olufolaji D, Nwilele F et al (2011) Effect of leaf age on rice yellow mottle virus severity and chlorophyll content with mechanical inoculation and vector transmission method. *Trends Appl Sci Res* 6:691–698. <https://doi.org/10.3923/tasr.2011.1345.1351>
- Jozefczak M, Bohler S, Schat H et al (2015) Both the concentration and redox state of glutathione and ascorbate influence the sensitivity of Arabidopsis to cadmium. *Ann Bot* 116:601–612. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcv075>
- Jubany-Mari T, Alegre-Batlle L, Jiang K, Feldman LJ (2010) Use of a redox-sensing GFP (c-roGFP1) for real-time monitoring of cytosol redox status in *Arabidopsis thaliana* water-stressed plants. *FEBS Lett* 584:889–897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2010.01.014>
- Juttukonda LJ, Skaar EP (2015) Manganese homeostasis and utilization in pathogenic bacteria. *Mol Microbiol* 97:216–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2017.03.040>
- Kapoor D, Sharma R, Handa N et al (2015) Redox homeostasis in plants under abiotic stress: role of electron carriers, energy metabolism mediators and proteinaceous thiols. *Front Environ Sci* 3:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2015.00013>
- Kappler A, Brune A (2002) Dynamics of redox potential and changes in redox state of iron and humic acids during gut passage in soil-feeding termites (*Cubitermes* spp.). *Soil Biol Biochem* 34:221–227
- Karmous I, Trevisan R, El FE et al (2017) Redox biology response in germinating *Phaseolus vulgaris* seeds exposed to copper: Evidence for differential redox buffering in seedlings and cotyledon. *PLoS ONE* 12:1–23
- Keane P, Kerr A (1997) Factors affecting disease development. In: Brown J, Ogle H (eds) *Plant pathogens and plant diseases*, APPS. Rockvale publications, Amidale, NSW, pp 287–298
- Kilian J, Peschke F, Berendzen KW et al (2012) Prerequisites, performance and profits of transcriptional profiling the abiotic stress response. *Biochim Biophys Acta Gene Regul Mech* 1819:166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbagrm.2011.09.005>
- Killiny N (2017) Metabolite signature of the phloem sap of fourteen citrus varieties with different degrees of tolerance to *Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus*. *Physiol Mol Plant Pathol* 97:20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmpp.2016.11.004>
- Király L, Hafez YM, Fodor J, Király Z (2008) Suppression of tobacco mosaic virus-induced hypersensitive-type necrotization in tobacco at high temperature is associated with downregulation of NADPH oxidase and superoxide and stimulation of dehydroascorbate reductase. *J Gen Virol* 89:799–808. <https://doi.org/10.1099/vir.0.83328-0>
- Kissoudis C, van de Wiel C, Visser RGF, van der Linden G (2014) Enhancing crop resilience to combined abiotic and biotic stress through the dissection of physiological and molecular crosstalk. *Front Plant Sci* 5:1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00207>
- Knight NL, Sutherland MW (2016) Histopathological assessment of *Fusarium pseudograminearum* colonization of cereal culms during crown rot infections. *Plant Dis* 100:252–259. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-04-15-0476-RE>
- Koch C, Harnisch F (2016) Is there a specific ecological niche for electroactive microorganisms? *Chem Electro Chem* 3:1282–1295. <https://doi.org/10.1002/celec.201600079>
- Koch M, Mew T (1991) Effect of plant age and leaf maturity on the quantitative resistance of rice cultivars to *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *oryzae*. *Plant Dis* September:901–904
- Kocsy G, Tari I, Vanková R et al (2013) Redox control of plant growth and development. *Plant Sci* 211:77–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2013.07.004>
- Kong P, Moorman GW, Lea-Cox JD et al (2009) Zoospore tolerance to pH stress and its implications for *Phytophthora* species in aquatic ecosystems. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 75:4307–4314. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00119-09>
- Köpke B, Wilms R, Engelen B et al (2005) Microbial diversity in coastal subsurface sediments: A cultivation approach

- using various electron acceptors and substrate gradients. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 71:7819–7830. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.71.12.7819-7830.2005>
- Korenblum E, Dong Y, Szymanski J et al (2020) Rhizosphere microbiome mediates systemic root metabolite exudation by root-to-root signaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 117:3874–3883. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1912130117>
- Kováčik J, Bačkor M (2007) Changes of phenolic metabolism and oxidative status in nitrogen-deficient *Matricaria chamomilla* plants. *Plant Soil* 297:255–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-007-9346-x>
- Kranzler C, Rudolf M, Keren N, Schleiff E (2013) Iron in Cyanobacteria *Adv Bot Res* 65:57–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394313-2.00003-2>
- Krasil'nikov NA (1958) Soil microorganisms and higher plants. Academy of Sciences of the USSR Institute of Microbiology, Moscow, USSR
- Krasnow CS, Hausbeck MK (2017) Influence of pH and etridiazole on *Pythium* species. *HortTechnology* 27:367–374. <https://doi.org/10.21273/HORTTECH03633-16>
- Krebelj AJ, Čepin U, Ravnikar M, Novak MP (2015) Spatio-temporal distribution of Grapevine fanleaf virus (GFLV) in grapevine. *Eur J Plant Pathol* 142:159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-015-0600-4>
- Krishnan N, Kodrık D (2006) Antioxidant enzymes in *Spo-doptera littoralis* (Boisduval): Are they enhanced to protect gut tissues during oxidative stress? *J Insect Physiol* 52:11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2005.08.009>
- Krishnan N, Kodrık D, Kłodkiewicz B, Sehnal F (2009) Glutathione-ascorbic acid redox cycle and thioredoxin reductase activity in the digestive tract of *Leptinotarsa decemlineata* (Say). *Insect Biochem Mol Biol* 39:180–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibmb.2008.11.001>
- Krishnan N, Kodrık D, Turanlı F, Sehnal F (2007) Stage-specific distribution of oxidative radicals and antioxidant enzymes in the midgut of *Leptinotarsa decemlineata*. *J Insect Physiol* 53:67–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2006.10.001>
- Kruk J, Aboul-Enein HY, Kładna A, Bowser JE (2019) Oxidative stress in biological systems and its relation with pathophysiological functions: the effect of physical activity on cellular redox homeostasis. *Free Radic Res* 53:497–521. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10715762.2019.1612059>
- Kuzniak E (2010) The ascorbate-gluathione cycle and related redox signals in plant-pathogen interactions. *Ascorbate-Glutathione Pathway and Stress Tolerance in Plants*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp 115–136
- Kuzniak E, Skłodowska M, Kuzniak E, Skłodowska M (2005) Fungal pathogen-induced changes in the antioxidant systems of leaf peroxisomes from infected tomato plants. *Planta* 222:192–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-005-1514-8>
- Labudda M, Muszyńska E, Gietler M et al (2020) Efficient antioxidant defence systems of spring barley in response to stress induced jointly by the cyst nematode parasitism and cadmium exposure. *Plant Soil*: 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04713-y>
- Lacroix C, Seabloom EW, Borer ET (2014) Environmental nutrient supply alters prevalence and weakens competitive interactions among coinfecting viruses. *J Physiol* 204:424–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12909>
- Lamb C, Dixon RA (1997) The oxidative burst in plant disease resistance. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* 48:251–275
- Lambers H, Mougél C, Jaillard B, Hinsinger P (2009) Plant-microbe-soil interactions in the rhizosphere: an evolutionary perspective. *Plant Soil* 321:83–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-009-0042-x>
- Lamichhane JR (2015) Bacterial diseases of crops: Elucidation of the factors that lead to differences between field and experimental infections. *Adv Agron* 134:227–246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.agron.2015.06.006>
- Lamichhane JR, Venturi V (2015) Synergisms between microbial pathogens in plant disease complexes: A growing trend. *Front Plant Sci* 6:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.00385>
- Landraud P, Chuzeville S, Billon-Grande G et al (2013) Adaptation to pH and role of PacC in the rice blast fungus *Magnaporthe oryzae*. *PLoS One* 8. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0069236>
- Lebreton L, Daval S, Guillerme-Erckelboudt AY et al (2014) Sensitivity to pH and ability to modify ambient pH of the take-all fungus *Gaeumannomyces graminis* var. *tritici*. *Plant Pathol* 63:117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppa.12062>
- Lehmann S, Serrano M, Haridon FL et al (2015) Reactive oxygen species and plant resistance to fungal pathogens. *Phytochemistry* 112:54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phytochem.2014.08.027>
- Lemke T, Stingl U, Egert M et al (2003) Physicochemical conditions and microbial activities in the highly alkaline gut of the humus-feeding larva of *Pachnoda ephippiata* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Appl Environ Microbiol* 69:6650–6658. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.69.11.6650-6658.2003>
- Leveau JH (2019) A brief from the leaf: latest research to inform our understanding of the phyllosphere microbiome. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 49:41–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2019.10.002>
- Li C, Lesnik KL, Liu H (2017) Stay connected : Electrical conductivity of microbial aggregates. *Biotechnol Adv* 35:669–680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2017.07.010>
- Li H, Chen XW, Wu L et al (2020) Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on redox homeostasis of rice under Cd stress. *Plant Soil*: 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04678-y>
- Li J, Nishimura Y, Zhao X, Fukumoto Y (2014) Effects of drought stress on the metabolic properties of active oxygen species, nitrogen and photosynthesis in cucumber “Jinchun No. 5” seedlings. *Japan Agric Res Q* 48:175–181. <https://doi.org/10.6090/jarq.48.175>
- Li SX, Wang ZH, Stewart BA (2013) Responses of crop plants to ammonium and nitrate N. *Adv Agron* 118:205–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-405942-9.00005-0>
- Li Y, Yu S, Strong J, Wang H (2012) Are the biogeochemical cycles of carbon, nitrogen, sulfur, and phosphorus driven by the “FeIII–FeII redox wheel” in dynamic redox environments? *J Soils Sediments* 12:683–693. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-012-0507-z>

- Liao Y, Tian M, Zhang H et al (2015) Salicylic acid binding of mitochondrial alpha-ketoglutarate dehydrogenase E2 affects mitochondrial oxidative phosphorylation and electron transport chain components and plays a role in basal defense against tobacco mosaic virus in tomato. *New Phytol* 205:1296–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13137>
- Littman DR, Pamer EG (2011) Role of the commensal microbiota in normal and pathogenic host immune responses. *Cell Host Microbe* 10:311–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2011.10.004>
- Liu G, Greenshields DL, Sammynaiken R et al (2007) Targeted alterations in iron homeostasis underlie plant defense responses. *J Cell Sci* 120:596–605. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.001362>
- Liu J, Zhu J, Zhang P et al (2017) Silicon supplementation alters the composition of herbivore induced plant volatiles and enhances attraction of parasitoids to infested rice plants. *Front Plant Sci* 8:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01265>
- Liu Y, He C (2017) A review of redox signaling and the control of MAP kinase pathway in plants. *Redox Biol* 11:192–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redox.2016.12.009>
- Löbmann MT, Vetukuri RR, de Zinger L et al (2016) The occurrence of pathogen suppressive soils in Sweden in relation to soil biota, soil properties, and farming practices. *Appl Soil Ecol* 107:57–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2016.05.011>
- Louda SM, Collinge SK (1992) Plant resistance to insect herbivores: a field test of the environmental stress hypothesis. *Ecology* 73:153–169. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1938728>
- Love CJ, Zhang S, Mershin A (2008) Source of sustained voltage difference between the xylem of a potted *Ficus benjamina* tree and its soil. *PLoS One* 3:1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002963>
- Lu H, McClung CR, Zhang C (2017) Tick tock: Circadian regulation of plant innate immunity. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 55:287–311. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-080516-035451>
- Lu Y, Yao J (2018) Chloroplasts at the crossroad of photosynthesis, pathogen infection and plant defense. *Int J Mol Sci* 19:1–37. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms19123900>
- Lushchak VI (2014) Free radicals, reactive oxygen species, oxidative stress and its classification. *Chem Biol Interact* 224:164–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbi.2014.10.016>
- Maai E, Nishimura K, Takisawa R, Nakazaki T (2019) Light stress-induced chloroplast movement and midday depression of photosynthesis in sorghum leaves. *Plant Prod Sci* 00:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1343943X.2019.1673666>
- Mackenzie JS, Jeggo M (2019) The one health approach-why is it so important? *Trop Med Infect Dis* 4:5–8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/tropicalmed4020088>
- Madigan AP, Egidi E, Bedon F et al (2019) Bacterial and fungal communities are differentially modified by melatonin in agricultural soils under abiotic stress. *Front Microbiol* 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.02616>
- Manivannan A, Soundararajan P, Cho YS et al (2018) Sources of silicon influence photosystem and redox homeostasis-related proteins during the axillary shoot multiplication of *Dianthus caryophyllus*. *Plant Biosyst* 152:704–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11263504.2017.1320312>
- Marschner H (1995) Mineral nutrition of higher plants, 2nd edn. Academic press Publishing
- Marschner H, Römheld V, Horst WJ, Martin P (1986) Root-induced changes in the rhizosphere: Importance for the mineral nutrition of plants. *Zeitschrift Für Pflanzenernährung Und Bodenk* 149:441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.19861490408>
- Marschner P (2011) Rhizosphere biology. In: Marschner's Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants, 3rd edn. Elsevier, pp 369–388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-384905-2.00015-7>
- Martínez M, Arata AF, Lázaro L et al (2019) Effects of waterlogging stress on plant-pathogen interaction between *Fusarium poae* and wheat/ barley. *Acta Sci Agron* 41:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.4025/actasciagron.v41i1.42629>
- Masiello CA, Gallagher ME, Randerson JT et al (2008) Evaluating two experimental approaches for measuring ecosystem carbon oxidation state and oxidative ratio. *J Geophys Res Biogeosciences* 113:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JG000534>
- Masoero G, Cugnetto A (2018) The raw pH in plants: A multifaceted parameter. *J Agron Res* 1:18–34. <https://doi.org/10.14302/issn.2639-3166.jar-18-2397>
- Matthysse AG (2006) The genus *Agrobacterium*. In: Dworkin M, Falkow S, Rosenberg E et al (eds) *The Prokaryotes*. Springer New York, New York, pp 91–114
- Mbengue M, Navaud O, Peyraud R et al (2016) Emerging trends in molecular interactions between plants and the broad host range fungal pathogens *Botrytis cinerea* and *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum*. *Front Plant Sci* 7:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.00422>
- McCall AC, Fordyce JA (2010) Can optimal defence theory be used to predict the distribution of plant chemical defences? *J Ecol* 98:985–992. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2010.01693.x>
- Mehdy MC (1994) Active oxygen species in plant defense against pathogens. *Plant Physiol* 105:467–472
- Meisner A, De Boer W (2018) Strategies to maintain natural biocontrol of soil-borne crop diseases during severe drought and rainfall events. *Front Microbiol* 9:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.02279>
- Melakerberhan H, Jones AL, Hanson E, Bird GW (1995) Effect of low soil pH on aluminum availability and on mortality of cherry seedlings. *Plant Dis* 79:886–892
- Méthot PO, Alizon S (2014) What is a pathogen? Toward a process view of host-parasite interactions. *Virulence* 5:775–785. <https://doi.org/10.4161/21505594.2014.960726>
- Mhlongo MI, Piater LA, Madala NE et al (2018) The chemistry of plant-microbe interactions in the rhizosphere and the potential for metabolomics to reveal signaling related to defense priming and induced systemic resistance. *Front Plant Sci* 9:1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.00112>
- Miles PW, Oertli JJ (1993) The significance of antioxidants in the aphid-plant interaction. *Redox Hypothesis Entomol Exp Appl* 67:275–283
- Miyara I, Shnaiderman C, Meng X et al (2012) Role of nitrogen-metabolism genes expressed during pathogenicity



- of the alkalizing *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* and their differential expression in acidifying pathogens. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact* 25:1251–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-01-12-0017-R>
- Moebius-Clune BN, Moebius-Clune DJ, Gugino BK et al (2017) Comprehensive assessment of soil health - The Cornell framework manual, Edition3.2. New York
- Molki B, Thi Ha P, Mohamed A et al (2019) Physicochemical changes mediated by “*Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus*” in Asian citrus psyllids. *Sci Rep* 9:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-52692-7>
- Morabito D, Guerrier G (2000) The free oxygen radical scavenging enzymes and redox status in roots and leaves of *Populus x Euramericana* in response to osmotic stress, desiccation and rehydration. *J Plant Physiol* 157:74–80. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-1617\(00\)80138-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-1617(00)80138-8)
- Morris BM, Reid B, Gow NAR (1995) Tactic response of zoospores of the fungus *Phytophthora palmivora* to solutions of different pH in relation to plant infection. *Microbiology* 141:1231–1237. <https://doi.org/10.1099/13500872-141-5-1231>
- Morris CE, Lamichhane JR, Nikolić I et al (2019) The overlapping continuum of host range among strains in the *Pseudomonas syringae* complex. *Phytopathol Res* 1:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42483-018-0010-6>
- Mühling KH, Plieth C, Hansen UP, Sattelmacher B (1995) Apoplastic pH of intact leaves of *Vicia faba* as influenced by light. *J Exp Bot* 46:377–382. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/46.4.377>
- Müller-Schüssele SJ, Wang R, Gütle DD et al (2020) Chloroplasts require glutathione reductase to balance reactive oxygen species and maintain efficient photosynthesis. *Plant J* 103:1140–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tj.14791>
- Mullineaux P, Rausch T (2005) Glutathione, photosynthesis and the redox regulation of stress-responsive gene expression. *Photosynth Res* 86:459–474
- Murdock LL, Brookhart G, Dunn PE et al (1987) Cysteine digestive proteinases in Coleoptera. *Comp Biochem Physiol Part B Biochem* 87:783–787. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0491\(87\)90388-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0491(87)90388-9)
- Nachin L, Barras F (2000) External pH: An environmental signal that helps to rationalize *pel* gene duplication in *Erwinia chrysanthemi*. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact* 13:882–886. <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI.2000.13.8.882>
- Nagel M, Seal CE, Colville L et al (2019) Wheat seed ageing viewed through the cellular redox environment and changes in pH. *Free Radic Res* 53:641–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10715762.2019.1620226>
- Napoleão TA, Soares G, Vital CE et al (2017) Methyl jasmonate and salicylic acid are able to modify cell wall but only salicylic acid alters biomass digestibility in the model grass *Brachypodium distachyon*. *Plant Sci* 263:46–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2017.06.014>
- Nelson EB (2018) The seed microbiome: Origins, interactions, and impacts. *Plant Soil* 422:7–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-017-3289-7>
- Newland PL, Hunt E, Sharkh SM et al (2008) Static electric field detection and behavioural avoidance in cockroaches. *J Exp Biol* 211:3682–3690. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.019901>
- Nguyen D, D’Agostino N, Tytgat TOG et al (2016) Drought and flooding have distinct effects on herbivore-induced responses and resistance in *Solanum dulcamara*. *Plant Cell Environ* 39:1485–1499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12708>
- Njenga KW, Nyaboga E, Wagacha JM, Mwaura FB (2017) Silicon induces resistance to bacterial blight by altering the physiology and antioxidant enzyme activities in cassava. *World J Agric Res* 5:42–51. <https://doi.org/10.12691/wjar-5-1-6>
- Nobori T, Tsuda K (2019) The plant immune system in heterogeneous environments. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 50:58–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2019.02.003>
- Noctor G (2006) Metabolic signalling in defence and stress: the central roles of soluble redox couples. *Plant Cell Environ* 29:409–425
- Noctor G, De Paepe R, Foyer CH (2007) Mitochondrial redox biology and homeostasis in plants. *Trends Plant Sci* 12:125–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2007.01.005>
- Noctor G, Queval G, Mhamdi A et al (2011) Glutathione Arab B 9:e0142. <https://doi.org/10.1199/tab.0142>
- Norton JM, Harman GE (1985) Responses of soil microorganisms to volatile exudates from germinating pea seeds. *Can J Bot* 63:1040–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1139/b85-142>
- Ntarlagiannis D, Atekwana EA, Hill EA, Gorby Y (2007) Microbial nanowires: Is the subsurface “hardwired”? *Geophys Res Lett* 34:3–7. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007G1030426>
- Oka Y (2010) Mechanisms of nematode suppression by organic soil amendments-A review. *Appl Soil Ecol* 44:101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2009.11.003>
- Ongena M, Jourdan E, Schäfer M et al (2005) Isolation of an N-alkylated benzylamine derivative from *Pseudomonas putida* BTP1 as elicitor of induced systemic resistance in bean. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact* 18:562–569. <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-18-0562>
- Opalka N, Brugidou C, Bonneau C et al (1998) Movement of rice yellow mottle virus between xylem cells through pit membranes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 95:3323–3328. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.95.6.3323>
- Ort DR (2001) When there is too much light. *Plant Physiol* 125:29–32. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.125.1.29>
- Ortega A, Garrido I, Casimiro I, Espinosa F (2017) Effects of antimony on redox activities and antioxidant defence systems in sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) plants. *PLoS One* 12:1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183991>
- Padan E, Bibi E, Ito M, Krulwich TA (2005) Alkaline pH homeostasis in bacteria: New insights. *Biochim Biophys Acta Biomembr* 1717:67–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmem.2005.09.010>
- Padmanabhan SY, Ganguly D (1954) Relation between the age of rice plant and its susceptibility to *Helminthosporium* and blast diseases. *Proc Indian Acad Sci Sect B* 39:44–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03050372>
- Pandey P, Irulappan V, Bagavathiannan MV, Senthil-Kumar M (2017) Impact of combined abiotic and biotic stresses



- on plant growth and avenues for crop improvement by exploiting physio-morphological traits. *Front Plant Sci* 8:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00537>
- Pandit TK, Mukkherjee D (2016) Cadmium enrichment in soil: plant physiological manifestation. In: Hemantaranjan A (ed) *Advances in plant physiology vol.17. Development and mechanisms underlying plant resilience to changing environment*. Scientific Publishers (India), pp 141–185
- Paradiso A, Caretto S, Leone A et al (2016) ROS production and scavenging under anoxia and re-oxygenation in *Arabidopsis* cells: A balance between redox signaling and impairment. *Front Plant Sci* 7:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01803>
- Pastor V, Luna E, Ton J et al (2013) Fine tuning of reactive oxygen species homeostasis regulates primed immune responses in *Arabidopsis*. *Mol Plant-Microbe Interact* 26:1334–1344. <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-04-13-0117-R>
- Pastori GM, Foyer CH (2002) Common components, networks, and pathways of cross-tolerance to stress. The central role of “Redox” and abscisic acid-mediated controls. *Plant Physiol* 129:460–468. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.011021.460>
- Paszkowski U (2006) Mutualism and parasitism: the yin and yang of plant symbioses. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 9:364–370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2006.05.008>
- Paungfoo-Lonhienne C, Rentsch D, Robatzek S et al (2010) Turning the table: Plants consume microbes as a source of nutrients. *PLoS One* 5:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0011915>
- Payne PA, Asher MJCC, Kershaw CD (1994) The incidence of *Pythium* spp. and *Aphanomyces cochlioides* associated with the sugar-beet growing soils of Britain. *Plant Pathol* 43:300–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.1994.tb02688.x>
- Pedersen P, Tyłka GL, Mallarino A et al (2010) Correlation between soil pH, *Heterodera glycines* population densities, and soybean yield. *Crop Sci* 50:1458–1464. <https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci2009.08.0432>
- Perazzolli M, Roatti B, Bozza E, Pertot I (2011) *Trichoderma harzianum* T39 induces resistance against downy mildew by priming for defense without costs for grapevine. *Biol Control* 58:74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2011.04.006>
- Pett-Ridge J, Firestone MK (2005) Redox fluctuation structures microbial communities in a wet tropical soil. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 71:6998–7007. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.71.11.6998>
- Pidello A (2014) Principes de chimie redox en écologie microbienne, QUAE, CIRAD, IFREMER, INRA, IRSTEA, Paris, France
- Pisoschi AM, Pop A (2015) The role of antioxidants in the chemistry of oxidative stress: A review. *Eur J Med Chem* 97:55–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2015.04.040>
- Pitann B, Schubert S, Mühling KH (2009) Decline in leaf growth under salt stress is due to an inhibition of H<sup>+</sup>-pumping activity and increase in apoplastic pH of maize leaves. *J Plant Nutr Soil Sci* 172:535–543. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.200800349>
- Podgórska A, Burian M, Szal B (2017) Extra-cellular but extraordinarily important for cells: Apoplastic reactive oxygen species metabolism. *Front Plant Sci* 8:1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.01353>
- Pollard M, Beisson F, Li Y, Ohlrogge JB (2008) Building lipid barriers: biosynthesis of cutin and suberin. *Trends Plant Sci* 13:236–246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2008.03.003>
- Ponnamperuma FN (1972) The chemistry of submerged soils. *Adv Agron* 24:29–96
- Pörtner HO (1987) Contributions of anaerobic metabolism to pH regulation in animal tissues: theory. *J Exp Biol* 131:69–87
- Potters G, Horemans N, Jansen MAKK (2010) The cellular redox state in plant stress biology - A charging concept. *Plant Physiol Biochem* 48:292–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2009.12.007>
- Prasch CM, Sonnewald U (2015) Signaling events in plants: Stress factors in combination change the picture. *Environ Exp Bot* 114:4–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVBEXBPOT.2014.06.020>
- Prusky D, Yakoby N (2003) Pathogenic fungi: Leading or led by ambient pH? *Mol Plant Pathol* 4:509–516. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1364-3703.2003.00196.x>
- Purdy LH (1979) *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum*: History, diseases and symptomatology, host range, geographic distribution, and impact. *Phytopathology* 69:875. <https://doi.org/10.1094/phyto-69-875>
- Qi PF, Balcerzak M, Rocheleau H et al (2016) Jasmonic acid and abscisic acid play important roles in host-pathogen interaction between *Fusarium graminearum* and wheat during the early stages of fusarium head blight. *Physiol Mol Plant Pathol* 93:39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmpp.2015.12.004>
- Raaijmakers JM, Paulitz TC, Steinberg C et al (2009) The rhizosphere: A playground and battlefield for soil-borne pathogens and beneficial microorganisms. *Plant Soil* 321:341–361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-008-9568-6>
- Rabotnova IL, Schwartz W (1962) The importance of physical-chemical factors (pH and rH<sub>2</sub>) for the life activity of microorganisms. VEB Gustav Fisher Verlag, Jena
- Raghavendra AS, Yin ZH, Heber U (1993) Light-dependent pH changes in leaves of C4 plants Comparison of the pH response to carbon dioxide and oxygen with that of C3 plants. *Planta* 189:278–287. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00195087>
- Ramegowda V, Senthil-Kumar M (2015) The interactive effects of simultaneous biotic and abiotic stresses on plants: Mechanistic understanding from drought and pathogen combination. *J Plant Physiol* 176:47–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jplph.2014.11.008>
- Ranieri A, Castagna A, Baldan B, Soldatini GF (2001) Iron deficiency differently affects peroxidase isoforms in sunflower. *J Exp Bot* 52:25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/52.354.25>
- Ranjit SL, Manish P, Penna S (2016) Early osmotic, antioxidant, ionic, and redox responses to salinity in leaves and roots of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Protoplasma* 253:101–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-015-0792-7>

- Rasool B, McGowan J, Pastok D et al (2017) Redox control of aphid resistance through altered cell wall composition and nutritional quality. *Plant Physiol* 175:259–271. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.17.00625>
- Ratnadass A, Deguine J-P (2021) Crop protection practices and viral zoonotic risks within a One Health framework. *Sci Total Environ*. In press
- Reicosky DC, Dugas WA, Torbert HA (1997) Tillage-induced soil carbon dioxide loss from different cropping systems. *Soil Tillage Res* 41:105–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-1987\(96\)01080-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-1987(96)01080-X)
- Rempelos L, Almuayrifi MSB, Baranski M et al (2020) The effect of agronomic factors on crop health and performance of winter wheat varieties bred for the conventional and the low input farming sector. *F Crop Res* 254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2020.107822>
- Rengel Z (2002) Handbook of plant growth. pH as the master variable. Marcel Dekker, New York
- Reniere ML (2018) Reduce, induce, thrive: Bacterial redox sensing during pathogenesis. *J Bacteriol* 200:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.00128-18>
- Rocher F, Chollet J-F, Jousse C, Bonnemain J (2006) Salicylic acid, an ambimobile molecule exhibiting a high ability to accumulate in the phloem. *Plant Physiol* 141:1684–1693. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.082537.upper>
- Rolfe SA, Griffiths J, Ton J (2019) Crying out for help with root exudates: adaptive mechanisms by which stressed plants assemble health-promoting soil microbiomes. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 49:73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2019.10.003>
- Rouxel T, Balesdent MH (2005) The stem canker (blackleg) fungus, *Leptosphaeria maculans*, enters the genomic era. *Mol Plant Pathol* 6:225–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1364-3703.2005.00282.x>
- Saharan GS, Mehta N, Saharan, GS, Mehta N (2007) *Sclerotinia* Diseases of Crop Plants: Biology, Ecology and Disease Management
- Sakr N (2016) Silicon control of bacterial and viral diseases in plants. *J Plant Prot Res* 56:331–336. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jppr-2016-0052>
- Salazar C, Hernández C, Pino MT (2015) Plant water stress: Associations between ethylene and abscisic acid response. *Chil J Agric Res* 75:71–79. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-58392015000300008>
- Samuels L, Kunst L, Jetter R (2008) Sealing plant surfaces: Cuticular wax formation by epidermal cells. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* 59:683–707. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.59.103006.093219>
- Santo-Domingo J, Demaurex N (2012) Perspectives on: SGP Symposium on mitochondrial physiology and medicine: The renaissance of mitochondrial pH. *J Gen Physiol* 139:415–423. <https://doi.org/10.1085/jgp.201110767>
- Schimel J, Balsler TC, Wallenstein M (2007) Microbial stress response physiology and its implications for ecosystem function. *Ecology* 88:1386–1394
- Schimel JP, Schaeffer SM (2012) Microbial control over carbon cycling in soil. *Front Microbiol* 3:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2012.00348>
- Schlatter D, Kinkel L, Thomashow L et al (2017) Disease suppressive soils: New insights from the soil microbiome. *Phytopathology* 107:1284–1297. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-03-17-0111-RVW>
- Schmidke I, Krüger C, Frömmichen R et al (1999) Phloem loading and transport characteristics of iron in interaction with plant-endogenous ligands in castor bean seedlings. *Physiol Plant* 106:82–89. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3054.1999.106112.x>
- Schneider R (ed) (1982) Suppressing soils and plant disease. The American phytopathological society, St Paul, Minnesota, USA
- Schoeneweiss DF (1975) Predisposition, stress, and plant disease. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 13:193–211
- Schwarzländer M, Fricker MD, Müller C et al (2008) Confocal imaging of glutathione redox potential in living plant cells. *J Microsc* 231:299–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2818.2008.02030.x>
- Seabloom EW, Borer ET, Gross K et al (2015) The community ecology of pathogens: Coinfection, coexistence and community composition. *Ecol Lett* 18:401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12418>
- Secchi F, Zwieniecki MA (2016) Accumulation of sugars in the xylem apoplast observed under water stress conditions is controlled by xylem pH. *Plant Cell Environ* 39:2350–2360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.12767>
- Segal LM, Wilson RA (2018) Reactive oxygen species metabolism and plant-fungal interactions. *Fungal Genet Biol* 110:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fgb.2017.12.003>
- Sen Y, van der Wolf J, Visser R, van Heusden S (2015) Bacterial canker of tomato: current knowledge of detection, management, resistance, and interactions. *Plant Dis* 99:4–13
- Serrano I, Audran C, Rivas S (2016) Chloroplasts at work during plant innate immunity. *J Exp Bot* 67:3845–3854. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/erw088>
- Sewelam N, Kazan K, Schenk PM (2016) Global plant stress signaling: Reactive oxygen species at the cross road. *Front Plant Sci* 7:1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.00187>
- Shah SRA, Tao L, Haijuan C et al (2015) Age-related resistance and the defense signaling pathway of *Ph-3* gene against *Phytophthora infestans* in tomatoes. *Hortic Plant J* 1:70–76. <https://doi.org/10.16420/j.issn.2095-9885.2015-0019>
- Shah TH (2017) Plant nutrients and insects development. *Int J Entomol Res* 2:54–57
- Shao HB, Chy LY, Shao MA et al (2008) Higher plant antioxidants and redox signaling under environmental stresses. *C R Biol* 331:433–441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crvi.2008.03.011>
- Shapiro-Ilan DI, Lewis EE, Campbell JF, Kim-Shapiro DB (2012) Directional movement of entomopathogenic nematodes in response to electrical field: Effects of species, magnitude of voltage, and infective juvenile age. *J Invertebr Pathol* 109:34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jip.2011.09.004>
- Shi S, Richardson AE, O'Callaghan M et al (2011) Effects of selected root exudate components on soil bacterial communities. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 77:600–610. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6941.2011.01150.x>
- Shikano I, Ericsson JD, Cory JS, Myers JH (2010) Indirect plant-mediated effects on insect immunity and disease

- resistance in a tritrophic system. *Basic Appl Ecol* 11:15–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baee.2009.06.008>
- Shrestha R, Lee SH, Hur JH, Lim CK (2005) The effects of temperature, pH, and bactericides on the growth of *Erwinia pyrifoliae* and *Erwinia amylovora*. *Plant Pathol J* 21:127–131. <https://doi.org/10.5423/PPJ.2005.21.2.127>
- Sierla M, Rahikainen M, Salojärvi J et al (2013) Apoplastic and chloroplastic redox signaling networks in plant stress responses. *Antioxid Redox Signal* 18:2220–2239. <https://doi.org/10.1089/ars.2012.5016>
- Simpfendorfer S, Harden TJ, Murray GM (2001) Effect of temperature and pH on the growth and sporulation of *Phytophthora clandestina*. *Australas Plant Pathol* 30:1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AP00054>
- Singh A, Jain A, Sarma BK et al (2013) Rhizosphere microbes facilitate redox homeostasis in *Cicer arietinum* against biotic stress. *Ann Appl Biol* 163:33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aab.12030>
- Singh B, Schulze DG (2015) Soil minerals and plant nutrition. *Nat Educ Knowl* 6:1–6
- Singh JS, Kumar A, Rai AN, Singh DP (2016) Cyanobacteria: A precious bio-resource in agriculture, ecosystem, and environmental sustainability. *Front Microbiol* 7:1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00529>
- Smiley R, Cook R (1972) Relationship between take-all of wheat and rhizosphere pH in soils fertilized with ammonium vs. nitrate-nitrogen. *Phytopathology* 63:882–890
- Sobrinho-plata J, Meyssen D, Cuypers A et al (2014) Glutathione is a key antioxidant metabolite to cope with mercury and cadmium stress. *Plant Soil* 377:369–381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-013-2006-4>
- Soengas P, Rodríguez VM, Velasco P, Cartea ME (2018) Effect of temperature stress on antioxidant defenses in *Brassica oleracea*. *ACS Omega* 3:5237–5243. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.8b00242>
- Song Y, Deng SP, Acosta-Martinez V et al (2008) Characterization of redox-related soil microbial communities along a river floodplain continuum by fatty acid methyl ester (FAME) and 16S rRNA genes. *Appl Soil Ecol* 40:499–509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2008.07.005>
- Sorauer P (1974) *Handbuch der Pflanzenkrankheiten*. Hempel und Parey, Wiegandt, Berlin
- Soundararajan P, Manivannan A, Ko CH, Jeong BR (2018) Silicon enhanced redox homeostasis and protein expression to mitigate the salinity stress in *Rosa hybrida* ‘Rock Fire.’ *J Plant Growth Regul* 37:16–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00344-017-9705-7>
- Spann TM, Schumann AW (2010) Mineral nutrition contributes to plant disease and pest resistance. *Univ Florida IFAS Ext HS1181:1–5*
- Spoel SH, Loake GJ (2011) Redox-based protein modifications: The missing link in plant immune signalling. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 14:358–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2011.03.007>
- Srivastava A, Atomic B, Redij T (2017) Crosstalk of plant hormone and redox oxidation states signal transduction in plant Interaction of other components with phytohormones. In: Pandey G (ed) *Mechanism of Plant Hormone Signaling under Stress*, First. Wiley, pp 3–22
- Stacy A, Fleming D, Lamont RJ et al (2016) A commensal bacterium promotes virulence of an opportunistic pathogen via cross-respiration. *Mbio* 7:e00782. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00782-16>
- Steinberg C, Edel-Hermann V, Alabouvette C, Lemanceau P (2019) Soil suppressiveness to plant diseases. In: Van Elsas JD, Jansson JTT (eds) *Modern Soil Microbiology*. Press Taylor & Francis Group, New York, pp 345–361
- Steinmetz NF, Lomonosoff GP, Evans DJ (2006) Decoration of cowpea mosaic virus with multiple, redox-active, organometallic complexes. *Small* 2:530–533. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sml.200500453>
- Su PH, Lai YH (2017) A reliable and non-destructive method for monitoring the stromal pH in isolated chloroplasts using a fluorescent pH probe. *Front Plant Sci* 8:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.02079>
- Sun Y, Li Y, Wang B et al (2020) Leaf nitrate accumulation influences the photorespiration of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) seedlings. *Plant Soil*: 323–338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-020-04710-1>
- Šuštr V, Stingl U, Brune A (2014) Microprofiles of oxygen, redox potential, and pH, and microbial fermentation products in the highly alkaline gut of the saprophagous larva of *Penthetria holosericea* (Diptera: Bibionidae). *J Insect Physiol* 67:64–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2014.06.007>
- Suzuki T, Shinogi T, Narusaka Y, Park P (2003) Infection behavior of *Alternaria alternata* Japanese pear pathotype and localization of 1,3-β-d-glucan in compatible and incompatible interactions between the pathogen and host plants. *J Gen Plant Pathol* 69:91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10327-002-0001-3>
- Tano BF, Brou CY, Dossou-yovo ER et al (2020) Spatial and temporal variability of soil redox potential, pH and electrical conductivity across a toposequence in the savanna of West Africa. *Agronomy* 10:1787. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10111787>
- Teixeira PJP, Colaianni NR, Fitzpatrick CR, Dangi JL (2019) Beyond pathogens: microbiota interactions with the plant immune system. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 49:7–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2019.08.003>
- Thivierge K, Prado A, Driscoll BT et al (2010) Caterpillar- and salivary-specific modification of plant proteins. *J Proteome Res* 9:5887–5895. <https://doi.org/10.1021/pr100643m>
- Thomma BPHJ, Nürnberger T, Joosten MHAJ (2011) Of PAMPs and effectors: The blurred PTI-ETI dichotomy. *Plant Cell* 23:4–15. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.110.082602>
- Thompson IA, Huber DM (2007) Manganese and plant disease. In: Datnoff LE, Elmer WH, Huber DM (eds) *Mineral nutrition and plant diseases*. The American Phytopathology Society, pp 139–153
- Thomson CJ, Greenway H (1991) Metabolic evidence for stelar anoxia in maize roots exposed to low O<sub>2</sub> concentrations. *Plant Physiol* 96:1294–1301. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.96.4.1294>
- Tollenaere C, Lacombe S, Wonni I et al (2017) Virus-bacteria rice co-infection in Africa: field estimation, reciprocal effects, molecular mechanisms, and evolutionary implications. *Front plant Sci* 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00645>

- Torres MA, Jones JDG, Dangl JL (2006) Reactive oxygen species signaling in response to pathogens. *Plant Physiol* 141:373–378. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.079467>
- Toyota K, Shirai S (2018) Growing interest in microbiome research unraveling disease suppressive soils against plant pathogens. *Microbes Environ* 33:345–347. <https://doi.org/10.1264/jisme2.ME3304rh>
- Tsang EWT, Bowler C, Herouart D et al (1991) Differential regulation of superoxide dismutases in plants exposed to environmental stress. *Plant Cell* 3:783–792
- Ursini F, Maiorino M, Forman HJ (2016) Redox homeostasis: The Golden Mean of healthy living. *Redox Biol* 8:205–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redox.2016.01.010>
- Usha Rani P, Pratyusha S (2013) Defensive role of *Gossypium hirsutum* L. anti-oxidative enzymes and phenolic acids in response to *Spodoptera litura* F. feeding. *J Asia Pac Entomol* 16:131–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aspen.2013.01.001>
- Van Baaren P, Van Belkum A, Summerbell RC et al (2007) Molecular mechanisms of pathogenicity: How do pathogenic microorganisms develop cross-kingdom host jumps? *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 31:239–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2007.00065.x>
- Van Bel AJE, Gaupels F (2004) Pathogen-induced resistance and alarm signals in the phloem. *Mol Plant Pathol* 5:495–504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1364-3703.2004.00243.X>
- Van Bruggen AHC, Semenov AM (2000) In search of biological indicators for soil health and disease suppression. *Appl Soil Ecol* 15:13–24. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0929-1393\(00\)00068-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0929-1393(00)00068-8)
- Van Buyten E, Hofte M (2013) *Pythium* species from rice roots differ in virulence, host colonization and nutritional profile. *BMC Plant Biol* 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2229-13-203>
- Van Dongen JT, Schurr U, Pfister M, Geigenberger P (2003) Phloem metabolism and function have to cope with low internal oxygen. *Plant Physiol* 131:1529–1543. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.102.017202>
- van Haperen P, Voorrips RE, van Loon JJA, Vosman B (2019) The effect of plant development on thrips resistance in *Capsicum*. *Arthropod Plant Interact* 13:11–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11829-018-9645-6>
- Van West P, Appiah AA, Gow NAR (2003) Advances in research on oomycete root pathogens. *Physiol Mol Plant Pathol* 62:99–113. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-5765\(03\)00044-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-5765(03)00044-4)
- van West P, Morris BM, Reid B et al (2002) Oomycete plant pathogens use electric fields to target roots. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* 15:790–798. <https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI.2002.15.8.790>
- Vartoukian SR, Palmer RM, Wade WG (2010) Strategies for culture of “unculturable” bacteria. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 309:1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.2010.02000.x>
- Veivers PC, O’Brien RW, Slaytor M (1980) The redox state of the gut of termites. *J Insect Physiol* 26:75–77
- Venard C, Vaillancourt L (2007) Colonization of fiber cells by *Colletotrichum gramimicola* in wounded maize stalks. *Phytopathology* 97:438–447. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-97-4-0438>
- Visnovitz T, Touati M, Miller AJ, Fricke W (2013) Apoplast acidification in growing barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) leaves. *J Plant Growth Regul* 32:131–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00344-012-9282-8>
- Voges MJEEE, Bai Y, Schulze-Lefert P, Sattely ES (2019) Plant-derived coumarins shape the composition of an *Arabidopsis* synthetic root microbiome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 116:12558–12565. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1820691116>
- Vozáry E, Jócsák I, Droppa M, Bóka K (2008) Connection between structural changes and electrical parameters of pea root tissue under anoxia. In: Padilla P (ed) *Anoxia*. InTech, pp 131–146
- Wagner E, Abrechtová JTP, Normann J, Greppin H (2000) Redox state and phosphorylation potential as macro-parameters in rhythmic control of metabolism — a molecular basis for seasonal adaptation of development BT - The Redox State and Circadian Rhythms. In: Guisset J-L, Petiau-de Vries GM (eds) *Driessche T Van den*. Springer, Netherlands, pp 257–277
- Wang Cyu, Zhou X, Guo D et al (2019) Soil pH is the primary factor driving the distribution and function of microorganisms in farmland soils in northeastern China. *Ann Microbiol* 69:1461–1473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13213-019-01529-9>
- Wang JP, Xu YP, Zang XP et al (2016) *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* virulence is affected by mycelial age via reduction in oxalate biosynthesis. *J Integr Agric* 15:1034–1045. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(15\)61199-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(15)61199-6)
- Wang M, Chen S, Chen L, Wang D (2020) Microbial mechanisms responsible for the variation of soil Cd availability under different pe+pH environments. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 206:111057. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111057>
- Wang YC, Yu M, Shih PY et al (2018) Stable pH suppresses defense signaling and is the key to enhance *Agrobacterium*-mediated transient expression in *Arabidopsis* seedlings. *Sci Rep* 8:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34949-9>
- War AR, Paulraj MG, Ahmad T et al (2012) Mechanisms of plant defense against insect herbivores. *Plant Signal Behav* 7:1306–1320. <https://doi.org/10.4161/psb.21663>
- Ward GM (1960) Potassium in plant metabolism. III. Some carbohydrate changes in the wheat seedling associated with varying rates of potassium supply. *Can J Plant Sci* 40:729–735
- Webb RW (1921) Studies in the physiology of the fungi. XV. Germination of the spores of certain fungi in relation to Hydrogen-ion concentration. *Ann Missouri Bot Gard* 8:283–341
- Wei J, Van LJJA, Gols R et al (2014) Reciprocal crosstalk between jasmonate and salicylate defence-signalling pathways modulates plant volatile emission and herbivore host-selection behaviour. *J Exp Bot* 65:3289–3298. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eru181>
- Weller DM, Raaijmakers JM, Gardener BBM, Thomashow LS (2002) Microbial populations responsible for specific soil suppressiveness to plant pathogens. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* 40:309–348. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.phyto.40.030402.110010>



- Wells JM, Raju BC, Hung H et al (1987) *Xylella fastidiosa* gen. nov., sp. nov: Gram-negative, xylem- Limited, fastidious plant bacteria related to *Xanthomonas* spp. Int J Syst Bacteriol 37:136–143
- Wezel A, Casagrande M, Celette F et al (2014) Agroecological practices for sustainable agriculture. A review. Agron Sustain Dev 34:1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0180-7>
- White JF, Kingsley KL, Zhang Q et al (2019) Review: Endophytic microbes and their potential applications in crop management. Pest Manag Sci 75:2558–2565. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.5527>
- Wicklow DT, Jordan AM, Gloer JB (2009) Antifungal metabolites (monorden, monocillins I, II, III) from *Colletotrichum graminicola*, a systemic vascular pathogen of maize. Mycol Res 113:1433–1442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mycres.2009.10.001>
- Wielkopolan B, Obre A (2016) Three-way interaction among plants, bacteria, and coleopteran insects. Planta 244:313–332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-016-2543-1>
- Wilkinson S (1999) pH as a stress signal. Plant Growth Regul 29:87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006203715640>
- Wilkinson S, Davies WJ (1997) Xylem sap pH increase: A drought signal received at the apoplastic face of the guard cell that involves the suppression of saturable abscisic acid uptake by the epidermal symplast. Plant Physiol 113:559–573. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.113.2.559>
- Williams A, de Vries FT (2019) Plant root exudation under drought: implications for ecosystem functioning. New Phytol. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.16223>
- Williams B, Kabbage M, Kim HJ et al (2011) Tipping the balance: *Sclerotinia sclerotiorum* secreted oxalic acid suppresses host defenses by manipulating the host redox environment. PLOS Pathog 7:e1002107. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1002107>
- Wilts BD, Schaap IAT, Schmidt CF (2015) Swelling and softening of the cowpea chlorotic mottle virus in response to pH shifts. Biophys J 108:2541–2549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2015.04.019>
- Wissenschafts B, Issn B, Physiology P et al (1999) The role of extracellular pH homeostasis in potato resistance to ring rot pathogen. J Phytopathol 147:679–686
- Worrall JJ, Adams GC, Tharp SC (2010) Summer heat and an epidemic of cytospora canker of Alnus. Can J Plant Pathol 32:376–386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07060661.2010.499265>
- Wright JP, Fisher DB (1981) Measurement of the sieve tube membrane potential. Plant Physiol 67:845–848. <https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.67.4.845>
- Xi B, Zhao X, He X et al (2016) Successions and diversity of humic-reducing microorganisms and their association with physical-chemical parameters during composting. Bioresour Technol 219:204–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.07.120>
- Xie L, Zhang JZ, Cai L, Hyde KD (2010) Biology of *Colletotrichum horii*, the causal agent of persimmon anthracnose. Mycology 1:242–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21501203.2010.526644>
- Yadeta KA, Thomma BPHJ (2013) The xylem as battleground for plant hosts and vascular wilt pathogens. Front Plant Sci 4:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2013.00097>
- Yamamoto Y, Kobayashi Y, Devi SR et al (2003) Oxidative stress triggered by aluminum in plant roots. In: Abe J (ed) Roots: The Dynamic Interface between Plants and the Earth. Developments in Plant and Soil Sciences. Springer, Dordrecht, vol 101, pp 239–243
- Yang JW, Yi HS, Kim H et al (2011) Whitefly infestation of pepper plants elicits defence responses against bacterial pathogens in leaves and roots and changes the below-ground microflora. J Ecol 99:46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2010.01756.x>
- Yoder JI (2001) Host-plant recognition by parasitic Scrophulariaceae. Curr Opin Plant Biol 4:359–365
- Yruela I (2013) Transition Metals in Plant Photosynthesis. Metallomics 5:1090–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c3mt00086a>
- Yu K, Pieterse CMJ, Bakker PAHM, Berendsen RL (2019) Beneficial microbes going underground of root immunity. Plant Cell Environ 42:2860–2870. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.13632>
- Yuan J, Zhao J, Wen T et al (2018) Root exudates drive the soil-borne legacy of aboveground pathogen infection. Microbiome 6:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-018-0537-x>
- Zebelo SA, Maffei ME (2015) Role of early signalling events in plant – insect interactions. J Exp Bot 66:435–448. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eru480>
- Zechmann B, Zellnig G, Urbanek-Krajnc A, Müller M (2007) Artificial elevation of glutathione affects symptom development in ZYMV-infected *Cucurbita pepo* L. plants. Arch Virol 152:747–762. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00705-006-0880-2>
- Zhang J, Yan H, Xia M et al (2020) Wheat root transcriptional responses against *Gaeumannomyces graminis* var. *tritici*. Phytopathol Res 2:23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42483-020-00071-w>
- Zhang J, Zeng B, Mao Y et al (2017) Melatonin alleviates aluminium toxicity through modulating antioxidative enzymes and enhancing organic acid anion exudation in soybean. Funct Plant Biol 44:961–968
- Zou C, Zhang F (2003) Ammonium improves iron nutrition by decreasing leaf apoplastic pH of sunflower plants (*Helianthus annuus* L. cv. Frankasol). Chin Sci Bull 48:2216–2221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03182855>

**Publisher's note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.