Plant secondary metabolites as defenses, regulators and primary metabolites- The blurred functional trichotomy

Matthias Erb^{a,1,2} and Daniel J. Kliebenstein^{b,1}

^a Institute of Plant Sciences, University of Bern, 3013 Bern, Switzerland

^b Department of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

ORCID-IDs: 0000-0002-4446-9834; 0000-0001-5759-3175

¹ This work was supported by the University of Bern, the Swiss National Science Foundation Grant Nr. 155781 to ME, the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Program Grant ERC-2016-STG 714239 to ME, the USA NSF award IOS 1655810 and MCB 1906486 to DJK, the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture the Hatch project number CA-D-PLS-7033-H to DJK and by the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF99) grant to DJK.

² Author for contact: matthias.erb@ips.unibe.ch

Abstract

The plant kingdom produces hundreds of thousands of small molecular weight organic compounds. Based on their assumed functions, the research community has classified them into three overarching groups: primary metabolites which are directly required for plant growth, secondary (or specialized) metabolites which mediate plant-environment interactions and hormones which regulate organismal processes, including metabolism. For decades, this functional trichotomy has shaped theory and experimentation in plant biology. However, evidence is accumulating that the boundaries between the different types of metabolites are blurred. An increasing number of mechanistic studies demonstrate that secondary metabolites are multifunctional and can act as potent regulators of plant growth and defense. Secondary metabolites are also re-integrated into primary metabolism, thus behaving like primary metabolites *sensu lato*. Several adaptive scenarios may have favored this functional diversity for secondary metabolites, including signaling robustness and cost-effective storage and recycling. Secondary metabolite multi-functionality can provide new explanations for ontogenetic patterns of defense production and can refine our understanding of plant-herbivore interactions, in particular by accounting for the discovery that adapted herbivores misuse plant secondary metabolites for multiple purposes, some of which mirror their functions in plants. In conclusion, recent work unveils the limits of our current classification system for plant metabolites and suggests that viewing them as integrated components of metabolic networks that are dynamically shaped by environmental selection pressures and transcend multiple trophic levels can improve our understanding of plant metabolism and plant-environment interactions.

Advances Box

- Genetic and chemical experiments demonstrate that plant secondary metabolites can act as regulators of development, growth and defense.
- Secondary metabolites can be re-integrated into plant primary metabolism, thus acting as primary metabolites *sensu lato*.
- Many secondary metabolites have multiple functions, and these functions are reflected in corresponding spatiotemporal and stress-dependent accumulation and decoration patterns.
- The multifunctionality and metabolic integration of secondary metabolites is mirrored in the adaptations of specialized herbivores.

Outstanding questions box

- Do secondary metabolites regulate development, growth and defense by binding to receptor proteins like plant hormones, do they function by altering the function of specific non-receptor proteins or do they act via more general autotoxicity/ reactivity mechanisms?
- Do secondary metabolites that regulate multiple processes in plants act through single signaling pathways or do they have multiple direct targets?
- How are secondary metabolites re-integrated into primary metabolism?
- Is multifunctionality and metabolic integration a common function of most secondary metabolite classes?
- Can plants protect themselves from enemies that manipulate canonical signaling pathways by evolving specialized signaling pathways involving secondary metabolites?
- How common is the misuse of plant secondary metabolites as primary metabolites and regulators by adapted herbivores?
- Can natural enemies use plant secondary metabolites as primary metabolites and physiological regulators?

Introduction

Plants can use simple, inorganic precursors to synthesize a large diversity of low molecular weight organic compounds. This synthetic capacity helps plants to colonize diverse and challenging environments. Low molecular weight organic compounds are commonly separated by perspective function into primary metabolites, secondary metabolites (also called specialized metabolites) and plant hormones (Figure 1) (Taiz et al., 2015). Primary metabolites are highly conserved and directly required for the growth and development of plants (Fernie and Pichersky, 2015). Secondary metabolites are often lineage-specific and aid plants to interact with the biotic and abiotic environment (Hartmann, 2007). And plant hormones are defined as small compounds that regulate organismal processes, including the production of the other metabolites, by interacting with receptor proteins (Davies, 2004).

The distinction between primary metabolites, secondary metabolites and plant hormones has found its way into textbooks and shapes our thinking in plant biology to this day. An illustrative example is the field of plant-herbivore interactions, where major efforts have gone into disentangling how plants protect their primary metabolites (serving as nutrients for herbivores) using secondary metabolites (serving as defenses

for plants), and how adapted herbivores manage to extract primary metabolites while avoiding the negative effects of secondary metabolites (Awmack and Leather, 2002; Howe and Jander, 2008; Zhou et al., 2015; Erb and Reymond, 2019). In this context, plant hormones are investigated as regulators of primary and secondary metabolism, defense and resistance that may be manipulated by adapted herbivores (Howe and Jander, 2008; Schuman and Baldwin, 2016; Stahl et al., 2018), similar to pathogens (Kazan and Lyons, 2014). The biochemical co-evolutionary arms race theory (Ehrlich and Raven, 1964), a key concept in plant-herbivore interactions (Berenbaum and Zangerl, 2008; Jander, 2018), postulates that plant secondary metabolites evolve in response to herbivore pressure, resulting in the evolution of resistance mechanisms in herbivores. The resulting arms race is thought to drive the diversity of plant secondary metabolites and insect herbivores (Futuyma and Agrawal, 2009).

Over the last decades, the distinction between primary metabolites, secondary metabolites and plant hormones has proven a useful approximation. However, the emergence of a more detailed understanding of plant metabolism may require us to revisit this functional partitioning (Neilson et al., 2013; Maag et al., 2015; Kliebenstein, 2018; Pichersky and Raguso, 2018; Zhou et al., 2018). In particular, an increasing number of genetic and functional studies on plant secondary metabolites are blurring the functional trichotomy by showing that plant secondary metabolites can have regulatory functions and serve as precursors for primary metabolites. In this review, we discuss this evidence, mostly focusing on examples that rely on the use of natural knockout variants, mutants and transgenic plants altered in their capacity to produce certain secondary metabolites in combination with chemical complementation assays to demonstrate activity of the metabolites. We illustrate that for an increasing number of plant secondary metabolites, a strict functional separation from regulators and primary metabolites may not do them justice and possibly hinders our progress in understanding their roles for plant survival in hostile environments.

Integration of plant secondary metabolites into regulation and metabolism

Early evidence for metabolic integration of secondary metabolites

In 1977, David Rhoades studied the properties of leaf resin of creosotebush (*Larrea* spp.). He found that the resin, which contained high levels of phenolic acids, absorbed UV radiation, reduced evaporative water loss across cellulose membranes and had the capacity to form complexes with proteins, thus possibly reducing the digestibility of plant materials for herbivores (Rhoades, 1977). Rhoades thus postulated that "...any chemical system possessed by a plant must necessarily be integrated into the total metabolic scheme and multiple functions are to be expected." In other words, Rhoades proposed that secondary metabolites are not endpoints, but integrated components of plant metabolism, and, may by consequence, take on any number of functions, similar to other plant metabolites. Indeed, evidence was emerging at that time that secondary metabolites may regulate growth and defense, as exogenously applied flavonoids could modulate polar auxin transport and catabolism (Stenlid, 1963; Stenlid, 1976), glucosinolate breakdown products could replace auxins in inducing hypocotyl bending (Hasegawa et al., 1986) and induced volatiles promoted resistance and defense regulation in neighboring trees (Baldwin and Schultz, 1983; Rhoades, 1983).

Figure 1. Small molecular weight compounds in plants are functionally classified as primary metabolites, secondary metabolites or hormones. Current work on plant secondary metabolites demonstrates that many of them also have regulatory roles, and some are demonstrated precursors of primary metabolites. Note that primary metabolites and hormones also show functional overlap with the other metabolite classes (not discussed here). These findings blur the functional trichotomy of plant metabolism and call for a reassessment of ecological and evolutionary frameworks that are based on this model.

Secondary metabolites as regulators of plant defense

Following early preliminary evidence of secondary metabolites regulating defenses, genetic evidence followed in 2009, when it was reported that *Arabidopsis thaliana* mutants defective in indole glucosinolate biosynthesis no longer mount a callose defense response following Flg22 treatment. Callose formation is rescued by adding 4-methoxy-indol-3-ylmethylglucosinolate (Clay et al., 2009). The myrosinase *PEN2* is required for this phenomenon, implicating glucosinolate breakdown in callose regulation (Clay et al., 2009). Shortly thereafter, it was discovered that indole-derived benzoxazinoid secondary metabolites have a comparable callose regulatory function in cereals. Benzoxazinoid-deficient *bx1* maize mutants are defective in aphid- and chitosan-induced callose deposition and callose induction is rescued by the addition of DIMBOA or DIMBOA-Glc (Ahmad et al., 2011; Meihls et al., 2013). In both cases, the capacity to regulate callose is structurally specific and depends on the modification of the indole-derived ring. In *Arabidopsis*, indol-3-ylmethylglucosinolate, which lacks a methylated hydroxy-group on the aromatic ring is inactive, while the methylated form is active (Clay et al., 2009). In maize DIMBOA-Glc, which lacks a methylated hydroxy-group at the nitrogen is active, while the methylated form (HDMBOA-Glc) is inactive (Li et al., 2018a). While the callose response to benzoxazinoids is conserved between wheat and maize, they do not elicit callose in *Arabidopsis*, and intact glucosinolates do not elicit callose in maize (Li et al., 2018a). These studies show that callose regulation

by secondary metabolites is highly specific, tightly controlled and likely evolved repeatedly. The mechanism underlying secondary metabolite-induced callose formation awaits to be elucidated. Glucosinolates and benzoxazinoids may for instance promote callose production by regulating hormonal pathways (Burow et al., 2015; Katz et al., 2015), through transcriptional regulation (Kim et al., 2015), or by directly initiating callose formation post-translationally.

Interestingly, glucosinolates and benzoxazinoids also seem to regulate the accumulation of other secondary metabolites (Hemm et al., 2003; Kim et al., 2015; Li et al., 2018a). In *Arabidopsis*, mutants defective in the CYP83B1 enzyme required for indole glucosinolate production also show lower accumulation of the phenylpropanoid sinapoylmalate (Kim et al., 2015). The phenylpropanoid phenotype is rescued in mutants that no longer produce the substrate of CYP83B1, indole-3-acetaldoxime (Kim et al., 2015), suggesting that it may be the aldoxime overaccumulation rather than the lack of downstream glucosinolates that suppresses sinapoylmalate. Suppressor screens showed that the phenylpropanoid phenotype is also absent in plants that have mutated *MEDa/b* genes encoding key components of a large multisubunit transcriptional complex that regulates phenylpropanoid biosynthetic genes (Kim et al., 2015; Dolan et al., 2017). A recent study demonstrates that a group of *Kelch Domain F-Box* (KFB) genes that are involved in PAL inactivation (Zhang et al., 2013) are upregulated in indole glucosinolate mutants in a MED5-dependent manner, while PAL-activity is suppressed (Kim et al., 2020). PAL-activity and sinapoylmalate accumulation are (partially) rescued in glucosinolate-deficient KFB mutants (Kim et al., 2020). The model emerging from these studies is that aldoximes which accumulate in CYP83B1 mutants increase KFB-mediated PAL degradation through MED5 transcriptional regulation as well as other, yet unknown mechanisms (Kim et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2020). As aldoximes are produced by many different species, this form of defense regulation may also occur beyond glucosinolate-producing plants (Kim et al., 2020). Interestingly, wheat lines overexpressing a maize benzoxazinoid O-methyl transferase and thus accumulate more HDMBOA-Glc and less DIMBOA-Glc also show higher levels of the phenylpropanoid ferulic acid, despite unaltered pool sizes of amino acid precursors (Li et al., 2018a), suggesting that phenolic compounds may also be regulated by other secondary metabolite pathways.

Apart from glucosinolates and benzoxazinoids, volatile secondary metabolites such as terpenoids, green leaf volatiles and aromatic compounds can also regulate plant defenses (Baldwin et al., 2006; Godard et al., 2008; Erb, 2018; Bouwmeester et al., 2019). Many of these volatiles are released upon herbivore- or pathogen attack and are capable of directly inducing or priming hormonal defense signaling pathways and resistance. In maize for instance, mutants that are defective in their capacity to produce volatile indole are unable to prime their systemic tissues to rapidly release terpenes upon herbivore attack (Erb et al., 2015). Adding indole to the headspace of maize plants restores this priming phenotype (Erb et al., 2015). Rice plants also respond to indole through priming of early defense signaling elements such as the map kinase OsMPK3 (Ye et al., 2019). Transgenic plants that are deficient in *OsMPK3* expression are no longer responsive to indole, suggesting that indole acts via the priming of early defense signaling (Ye et al., 2019). In *Arabidopsis*, geranylgeranyl reductase1 mutants are defective in systemic acquired resistance against *Pseudomonas syringae*

(Riedlmeier et al., 2017). Adding the pathogen induced volatiles α - and β -pinene to the headspace of the mutant restores resistance, with the response depending on intact salicylic acid signaling and the AZELAIC ACID INDUCED (AZI1) gene (Riedlmeier et al., 2017). The precise role of other volatile secondary metabolites that can regulate defenses at physiological concentrations, including homoterpenes (Arimura et al., 2000) and green leaf volatiles (Ameye et al., 2018) has not yet been explored using genetic approaches, but their activity has been demonstrated clearly through chemical complementation (Arimura et al., 2000; Engelberth et al., 2004; Frost et al., 2008; Meents et al., 2019). Further support for the potential regulatory role of defense volatiles comes from LOX2 silenced *Nicotiana attenuata* plants, which are deficient in the production of herbivory-induced green leaf volatiles. In contrast to the other systems where volatiles induce defense, the LOX2 mutants lead to stronger expression of defense-related genes in neighbors than wild type plants, suggesting that volatiles can also suppress defenses (Paschold et al., 2006).

In summary, at least five classes of secondary metabolites (glucosinolates, benzoxazinoids, terpenes, aromatics and green leaf volatiles) are now confirmed to act as potential regulators of *in planta* defense. It is exciting to speculate that these cases may just be the tip of the iceberg, and that many other secondary metabolites may play similar regulatory roles. An important gap of knowledge is the mechanism by which secondary metabolites regulate defenses. As many of the secondary metabolites are chemically reactive (Farmer and Davoine, 2007; Hadacek et al., 2010), it is possible that they act indirectly by depleting detoxification enzymes, thus triggering the accumulation of known signaling molecules such as reactive oxygen species (ROS) (Khokon et al., 2011). However, as discussed below, secondary metabolites may also have hormone-like properties by binding to specific receptor proteins (Katz et al., 2015). More work on the targets of secondary metabolites in planta is clearly warranted and would help to clarify the ecological and evolutionary context of their capacity to regulate defenses.

Secondary metabolites as regulators of growth and development

Plants regulate their growth dynamically and often reduce their investment into growth and development upon herbivore- or pathogen attack. This reduction in growth is thought to be largely due to the reconfiguration of a plant's signaling network rather than a lack of resources (Kliebenstein, 2016; Machado et al., 2017; Guo et al., 2018). Strikingly, plant secondary metabolites and their breakdown products are being (re)-discovered as plant growth modulators, thus adding another layer of regulation to growth-defense patterns. Again, glucosinolates provide a mechanistic example of how secondary metabolites can modulate growth. When applied to the roots of *Arabidopsis* and many other plant species, the aliphatic 3-hydroxypropylglucosinolate inhibits root meristematic growth at physiological concentrations via an intact Target of Rapamycin (TOR) pathway (Malinovsky et al., 2017). The exact molecular interaction partner of 3-hydroxypropylglucosinolate remains unknown. Studies on the indole glucosinolate breakdown product indole-3-carbinol have identified an unexpected target protein. Indole-3-carbinol accumulates upon wounding in *Arabidopsis* and rapidly reduces root growth upon exogenous application. *In vitro*, indole-3-carbinol interferes with the interaction between auxin and its receptor TIR1 by binding at an allosteric site (Katz et al., 2015). As the indolic glucosinolate catabolite likely binds directly to TIR1 (Katz et

al., 2015), one may argue that TIR1 acts as an indolic glucosinolate receptor that mediates the regulation of growth by a plant secondary metabolite. Another link to auxin signaling was found with a structurally unrelated aliphatic glucosinolate. This was found by the initial observation that the auxin-sensitive repressors IAA5/6/19 strongly regulate 4-methylsulfinyl (4-MSO) glucosinolate levels in dehydrated Arabidopsis plants (Salehin et al., 2019). *laa5,6,19 mutants* fail to close their stomata upon drought stress, a phenotype which can be reverted by adding 4-MSO (Salehin et al., 2019). Together with the finding that glucosinolate biosynthesis and activation mutants are less tolerant to drought (Salehin et al., 2019), and that glucosinolate breakdown products can trigger stomatal closure in Arabidopsis and *Vicia faba* (Khokon et al., 2011; Hossain et al., 2013), these results provide evidence that aliphatic glucosinolates are involved in stomatal regulation. Interestingly, glucosinolate-mediated stomatal regulation requires a functional reactive oxygen species (ROS) receptor kinase (GHR1) (Salehin et al., 2019). Given that the myrosinase TGG1 accumulates in guard cells and is required for stomatal regulation (Zhao et al., 2008), and that glucosinolate breakdown products can regulate stomatal closure through ROS production (Khokon et al., 2011), it is conceivable that ROS link endogenous glucosinolates to stomatal regulation (Khokon et al., 2011).

Apart from growth and stomatal opening, glucosinolates may also regulate the circadian clock and flowering time. Natural presence/absence variation in the 2-oxoglutarate-dependent dioxygenase AOP2, which converts methylsulfinylalkyl glucosinolates into alkenyl glucosinolates, is linked to variation in the expression of the major flowering gene FLC and to variation in flowering time (Kliebenstein et al., 2001; Atwell et al., 2010). Introducing a functional AOP2 into Col-0 (a natural AOP2 knockout) confirmed the flowering time effect, identified a shift in the expression of circadian genes and showed a one hour decrease in clock periodicity (Kerwin et al., 2011). Abolishing glucosinolate production using *Myb* transcription factor mutants lead to the same periodicity shift suggesting that the effect may be linked to the presence of the 4-MSO glucosinolate in WT Col-0 (Kerwin et al., 2011). The effect of the AOP locus on flowering time depends on the genetic background (Jensen et al., 2015), supporting the hypothesis that secondary metabolites are integrated into a complex and variable regulatory network. How aliphatic glucosinolates directly regulate gene expression networks and developmental phenotypes such as flowering time remains to be tested (Burow and Halkier, 2017).

The current data suggests that glucosinolates can influence growth by multiple different mechanisms, including TOR-regulation, auxin-regulation, auxin-independent transcriptional regulation and auxin-mediated ROS accumulation (Katz et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2015; Malinovsky et al., 2017; Salehin et al., 2019). This diversity, paired with the substantial variation in glucosinolate biosynthesis within species, creates a wealth of metabolic networks and phenotypes which can be acted upon by natural selection. It is tempting to speculate that this diversity is a reflection of the highly diverse habitats and environments that a single species can inhabit and may provide adaptive potential beyond conserved hormonal pathways.

In addition to glucosinolates, flavonoids are implicated in regulating growth, development and plant environmental responses. Exogenously applied flavonoids have long been known to modulate auxin transport (Stenlid, 1976). Evidence that

flavonoids may also act as endogenous growth regulators came from an Arabidopsis chalcone synthase mutant, *transparent testa (tt4)*. *tt4* plants show growth alterations that are characteristic of disturbed auxin localization, including reduced root growth and gravitropism (Brown et al., 2001). The mutant also displays increased auxin transport (Murphy et al., 2000), which can be reversed by adding the flavonoid precursor naringenin (Brown et al., 2001). Further mechanistic studies suggest that flavonoids modulate auxin transport through several mechanisms, including interactions with auxin transporters and transport regulating proteins (Peer and Murphy, 2007; Santelia et al., 2008). Arabidopsis roots grow away from light, and flavonoids accumulate in light-exposed sides of Arabidopsis roots (Silva-Navas et al., 2016). A recent study found that the *tt4* mutant show reduced light avoidance, which was linked to reduced auxin polar transport and reduced ROS accumulation, both of which can regulate cell division and elongation (Gayomba et al., 2010; Silva-Navas et al., 2016). Flavonoid biosynthesis evolved in early land plants and likely preceded the emergence of polar auxin transport (Peer and Murphy, 2007). It is thus conceivable that flavonoids were integrated into hormonal regulation early on and thus represent an example of an evolutionarily integrated metabolic network between secondary metabolites and plant hormones.

Other secondary metabolites may also regulate plant development. In *N. attenuata*, silencing a malonyltransferase that malonylates 17-Hydroxygeranylinalool diterpene glycosides reduces floral style cell size and length (Li et al., 2018b). Knocking down diterpene glycoside production by silencing a geranylgeranyl diphosphate synthase leads to the disappearance of the effect of the malonyltransferase, suggesting that specific diterpene hexose decoration patterns are responsible for the flower phenotype (Li et al., 2018b). Furthermore, a labeling experiment in poplar recently uncovered that herbivore-attacked leaves can convert benzyl cyanide, a herbivore-induced volatile, to the auxin phenylacetic acid (Günther et al., 2018), thus providing a potential link between the catabolism of volatile secondary metabolites and the regulation of plant growth and development.

The examples above show how secondary metabolites can modulate growth and development through a variety of mechanisms, some of which are barely distinguishable from mechanisms normally assigned to plant hormones (Figure 2). While some of these secondary metabolite regulators are ancient and highly conserved (e.g. flavonoids), others evolved more recently (e.g. glucosinolates and benzoxazinoids) and are restricted to specific plant families. Plants thus have both a conserved and a unique, variable and flexible repertoire of regulators at their disposition to adjust growth and development, which likely contributes to their potential to colonize variable and challenging habitats.

Figure 2. Glucosinolates and benzoxazinoids as examples of secondary metabolites that blurr the functional trichotomy of plant metabolism. Different functions of glucosinolates in Arabidopsis and benzoxazinoids in maize and wheat are depicted. Genes that are known to be involved in the different functions are indicated. Note that a direct role of benzoxazinoids and glucosinolates as plant primary metabolites (nitrogen/sulfur and/or energy storage) has not been demonstrated experimentally. *MEDs and KFBs are likely regulated by aldoxime precursors of glucosinolates. For references, see text.

Secondary metabolites as primary metabolites

If secondary metabolites can regulate growth, development and defense, can they also function as primary metabolites? While primary metabolites are highly conserved, secondary metabolites evolve dynamically and are inherently variable in structure and production (Wink, 2008). This rapid evolution would seem to complicate their integration into the most fundamental workings of plant metabolism because it would require a rapid evolution of enzymes to connect these novel structures into the more conserved metabolic pathways. However, evidence for secondary metabolites that are not strictly essential, but nevertheless contribute to primary metabolism, is emerging. In Arabidopsis, plants with mutations in the flavonoid pathway upstream of the FLAVANONE-3-HYDROXYLASE (F3H) show a reduction in the respiratory cofactor ubiquinone (coenzyme Q) (Soubeyrand et al., 2018). Ubiquinone levels can be restored by adding dihydrokaempferol or kaempferol to the mutants. Labelling experiments demonstrate that the aromatic ring of kaempferol is integrated into ubiquinone, and heme-dependent peroxidases were identified as enzymes that are

likely to use kaempferol to produce 4-hydroxybenzoate as a substrate for ubiquinone (Soubeyrand et al., 2018).

The integration of flavonoids into primary metabolism is maybe not a surprise, as they represent one of the oldest and most highly conserved classes of secondary metabolism (albeit with substantial inter-specific variation in glycosylation patterns), whose evolution precedes the emergence of many innovations in plant primary metabolism such as C₄ photosynthesis. Whether younger, more specialized secondary metabolites can act as primary metabolites is not well understood. This lack of knowledge is closely related to a limited understanding of the catabolism of secondary metabolites. Where do these compounds go when they are no longer needed? One would assume that re-integrating secondary metabolites into primary metabolism should be beneficial for plants (Neilson et al., 2013). Such a re-integration pathway has been proposed for cyanogenic glycosides (Selmar et al., 1988). It was suggested that, upon deglycosylation, HCN may be assimilated into asparagine via the formation of β -cyanoalanine (Selmar et al., 1988), and two *Sorghum* nitrilases are indeed capable of producing asparagine from β -cyanoalanine (Jenrich et al., 2007). An alternative pathway not involving the release of HCN was suggested in *Sorghum*. In this system, nitrilases are proposed to take the deglycosylated cyanogen and directly release ammonia and the corresponding acetate (Jenrich et al., 2007). Further support for the potential of cyanogenic glucosides as a primary metabolite store came from overexpression of a hydroxynitrile lyase which is involved in HCN formation in cassava. These plants have decreased concentrations of cyanogenic glycosides and increased concentrations of total amino acids, suggesting that cyanogenic glycosides may be degraded and reintegrated into primary metabolism (Narayanan et al., 2011).

Detailed metabolic profiling of secondary metabolite mutants in combination with complementation and labelling experiments are required to identify additional secondary metabolites that serve as precursors of primary metabolites in the future. Alterations in primary metabolites are observed in various plants with altered secondary metabolism (Mayer et al., 2001; Huber et al., 2016; Machado et al., 2017), but often attributed to differences in available resources and precursor accumulation (Ishihara et al., 2007). Keeping an open mind about the capacity of plants to evolve integrated metabolic networks is warranted if we are to work towards a better comprehension of the prevalence and importance of secondary metabolites as precursors of primary metabolites.

Secondary metabolites as siderophores

An additional example that further blurs the distinction between primary and secondary metabolism is plant micronutrient uptake. Grasses excrete small-molecular weight compounds into the rhizosphere to chelate micronutrients such as iron and thus make them biologically available (Curie and Briat, 2003). Recent work suggests that secondary metabolites can also act as siderophores and are likely important for iron uptake in both herbs and grasses. Chemical removal of excreted phenolic acids from the nutrient solution of red clover was found to result in iron deficiency in red clover (Jin et al., 2007). Subsequently, an *Arabidopsis* Feruloyl-CoA 6'-Hydroxylase1 mutant, who is no longer able to produce and release coumarins, was found to suffer from iron deficiency under alkaline conditions (Schmid et al., 2014). Similarly, young maize

benzoxazinoid mutants who do no longer produce and excrete benzoxazinoids were found to suffer from iron deficiency when growing in the presence of iron salts (Hu et al., 2018). Both benzoxazinoids and coumarins are able to chelate iron *in vitro* (Bigler et al., 1996; Mladenka et al., 2010). As these complexes are essential for plant growth and development by providing essential micronutrients, they should, according to definition, be classified as primary metabolites, thus providing another illustration of how secondary metabolites can turn into primary metabolites under given conditions.

Adaptive explanations for metabolic integration of secondary metabolites

There is now ample evidence for secondary metabolites that are regulators and precursors of primary metabolites. But why would plants evolve an integrated metabolism in which the same metabolite class has multiple functions that incorporate growth, development, defense and regulation? Plants have large, interconnected metabolic networks at their disposition. Natural selection acts on these metabolic networks, resulting in the evolution of network topologies that maximize fitness. Over evolutionary time, these topologies likely include dynamic transitions between secondary metabolites and hormones, for instance (Malinovsky et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2019b). Overall, the functional integration of secondary metabolites at a given point in evolution is a likely consequence of the interaction between complex environments with highly connected plant metabolic networks. Below, we discuss potential benefits of metabolic integration of plant secondary metabolites that may have favored their use as regulators and primary metabolites.

Plant secondary metabolites as reliable readouts of defense activation

Plants control defense activation to save metabolic energy and avoid self-damage. Defense investment is typically titrated through feedback regulation, including both positive and negative feedback loops that are built into early defense signaling (Hu et al., 2015; Li et al., 2015) and hormonal networks (Gilardoni et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2019). A limitation of these feedback loops is that they do not provide direct information about the final level of defense activation, i.e. the production of defense metabolites *per se*. As herbivores and pathogens may interfere with the production of defense compounds at many levels, including the final steps of biosynthesis (Jones et al., 2019), integrating them directly into regulatory feedback loops may allow plants to more accurately monitor and adjust defense activation. Using secondary metabolites as defense activation readouts may also help plants to optimize synergies between different defenses and to compensate for accidental failures of specific defense pathways. The increasing number of examples showing that plant secondary metabolites regulate defenses (see section “Secondary metabolites as regulators of plant defense”) hint at the existence of such systems in plants.

As many secondary metabolites are compartmentalized and/or stored in inactive forms, their decompartmentalization and/or activation likely also helps plants to recognize tissue damage and other forms of environmental stress. In this case, the metabolites would be used as damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs). Green-leaf volatiles (GLVs) are an example of secondary metabolites that are also DAMPs (Tanaka et al., 2014; Quintana-Rodriguez et al., 2018). Another potential example of secondary metabolites as DAMPs are the previously discussed links

between indolic glucosinolates and DIMBOA regulation of callose upon pathogen attack. Interestingly in this case, the secondary metabolite/DAMPs are linked to endogenous responses to pathogen-associated molecular patterns, e.g. FLS2, (Clay et al., 2009) and stomatal closure upon drought stress (Salehin et al., 2019).

Given these considerations, secondary metabolites may be common readouts of defense activation and damage may have favored their evolution as defense regulators.

Metabolic network specialization as a means to resist manipulation

Herbivores, pathogens and viruses can interfere with defense hormone signaling and thereby manipulate plants for their own benefit (Kazan and Lyons, 2014; Stahl et al., 2018). The high degree of conservation in defense hormone signaling may in fact favor the evolution of biotic manipulation of plant signaling (Berens et al., 2017). For example, if an attacking organism evolves the ability to alter jasmonate signaling this may provide it a fitness benefit on a wide variety of host plants and may reduce the advantage for plants to evolve new inducible resistance mechanisms regulated by these hormones. One possibility to solve this problem would be to use less conserved metabolites as defense regulators. If a plant had the ability to use these metabolites, it would be less likely to fall prey to host switching by hormone-manipulating enemies. The evolution of (specialized) secondary metabolites into regulatory networks may thus be promoted through the evolution of manipulation strategies in plant enemies. Clear examples supporting this hypothesis are currently lacking. Interestingly, an opposite pattern has been found for the tomato leaf spot fungus, which uses a hydrolase to detoxify steroidal glycoalkaloids and benefits from the defense-suppressing properties of the resulting breakdown products (Bouarab et al., 2002). This illustrates that specialized plant enemies may also misuse the regulatory properties of secondary metabolites of their host plants.

Multifunctionality as a cost-saving strategy

Producing secondary metabolites has energetic and metabolic costs. These costs are not always evident (Züst et al., 2011; Machado et al., 2017), and may mostly occur under specific environmental conditions such as strong competition and nutrient limitation (Cipollini et al., 2018-). Plants likely manage costs of secondary metabolite production through the regulation of biosynthesis, but controlled recycling of the resulting compounds would enhance the plants ability to recoup costs in challenging environments (Neilson et al., 2013). Secondary metabolites that are induced upon environmental stress could for instance be recycled back into primary metabolism once the stress subsides. One way of testing this hypothesis is to manipulate secondary metabolite recycling by targeting enzymes involved in their degradation, such as glucosidases (Morant et al., 2008) or nitrilases (Jenrich et al., 2007). Using this approach, a link between the degradation of cyanogenic glycosides and plant protein supply was uncovered (Narayanan et al., 2011), supporting the hypothesis that reintegration of secondary compounds into primary metabolism may be advantageous for the plant. A caveat of this approach is that it remains difficult to disentangle a direct contribution of the generated catabolites to primary metabolism from their potential regulatory roles. A more detailed understanding of secondary metabolite signaling and

catabolism would help to explore the role of secondary metabolite reintegration as a cost-saving strategy.

Another way to minimize costs is to utilize the same secondary compound for multiple purposes (Neilson et al., 2013). As many secondary compounds are chemically reactive, they need to be managed by the plant through (potentially costly) storage, inactivation and/or resistance mechanisms, including specialized cells, ducts and glands (Sirikantaramas et al., 2008). By employing the same compound class for multiple purposes, plants may spread these fixed costs across more fitness components and increase their competitiveness. While the cost-saving aspects of multifunctionality are difficult to quantify, multifunctionality seems to be a widespread property of secondary metabolites, as discussed above, and it is difficult for this multifunctionality to evolve without benefit.

Ecological consequences of the metabolic integration of secondary metabolites

The separation of small molecular weight compounds into primary metabolites, secondary metabolites and hormones has shaped our ecological and evolutionary thinking in plant-environment interactions. If we abolish this view in favor of a more integrated perspective (i.e. where secondary metabolites can have regulatory roles and can provide precursors for primary metabolites), we can derive new hypotheses on plant defense patterns and plant-herbivore interactions. These hypotheses are likely to improve our understanding of the ecological roles of plant secondary metabolites in the future.

Ontogenetic patterns of secondary metabolite production

Many secondary metabolites show distinct ontogenetic accumulation patterns, with concentrations varying over time and between tissues. Ecological theory explains this within-plant variation using resource constraints, allocation costs and variation in herbivore pressure (McKey, 1974; van Dam, 2009; Meldau et al., 2012; Schuman and Baldwin, 2016; Barton and Boege, 2017). The above theories are all based on costs and benefit relationship, with the benefit typically being limited to herbivore resistance. Given the blurred trichotomy of plant secondary metabolism, the ecological balance sheet may be improved by taking into account multifunctionality (Barton and Boege, 2017). A drop in secondary metabolite levels, as is often observed a few weeks after germination or at the onset of flowering for instance (Meldau et al., 2012; Barton and Boege, 2017) may reflect an increased need of primary metabolites and nutrients rather than a drop in herbivore pressure. Similarly, strong expression of secondary metabolites in roots may not only be the result of high tissue value and a high risk of root herbivore attack, but may simply reflect additional functions of the compounds such as micronutrient uptake and microbial conditioning (Stringlis et al., 2018; Hu et al., 2018a; Hu et al., 2018b). Our understanding of ontogenetic allocation patterns of secondary metabolites may thus improve if we take their full metabolic integration and potential multifunctionality into account and do not limit their considered benefits to herbivore resistance.

Defense metabolites in plant-herbivore interactions

The functional trichotomy used to define plant metabolites has also shaped our understanding of how these metabolites influence plant-herbivores interactions. Herbivores are assumed to forage for primary metabolites while trying to avoid the negative effects of secondary metabolites through behavioral and metabolic adaptations (Behmer, 2009) (Stahl et al., 2018). If we accept that secondary metabolites can also be regulators and precursors of primary metabolites, then it becomes conceivable that they may have similar roles in herbivores. The root feeding larvae of the western corn rootworm for instance forage for iron-benzoxazinoid complexes to acquire iron and improve their growth, thus effectively using a plant secondary metabolite as a primary metabolite (Hu et al., 2018). Several other herbivores also gain more weight in the presence of plant secondary metabolites (Meldau et al., 2009; Richards et al., 2012; Marti et al., 2013; Veyrat et al., 2016; Wetzal et al., 2016), and it is conceivable that some of these effects may be due to the capacity of the herbivores to metabolize these compounds. Recent examples also hint at the possibility that plant secondary metabolites may have hormonal functions in herbivores. In rice, knocking down *CYP71A1* a gene responsible for the production of serotonin, a monoamine neurotransmitter, reduces the performance of the rice brown planthopper. Adding serotonin to artificial diet enhances its performance (Lu et al., 2018), suggesting that the herbivore may benefit from the hormonal properties of this plant metabolite. Plants may also benefit from producing secondary metabolites that act as (de)-regulators of herbivore physiology. Spinach for instance produces the molting hormone 20-hydroxyecdysone (Bakrim et al., 2008), which can interfere with caterpillar development (Kubo et al., 1983).

Box 1. Multifunctionality of plant secondary metabolites shapes the interaction between maize and the western corn rootworm- a case study. Young maize plants produce high amounts of benzoxazinoid secondary metabolites. Benzoxazinoids are used by the plant for multiple purposes, including direct resistance against herbivores (Glauser et al., 2011; Maag et al., 2016), the regulation of callose deposition as a defense against aphids (Ahmad et al., 2011; Meihls et al., 2013), and iron uptake through their capacity to chelate iron in the rhizosphere (Hu et al., 2018). Recent work shows that the western corn rootworm, a highly specialized maize pest, phenocopied these functions and is able to use benzoxazinoids for multiple purposes as well. The larvae of the herbivore use benzoxazinoids as foraging cues in the rhizosphere (Robert et al., 2012), they are able to extract iron from benzoxazinoid-iron complexes to maximize their own growth (Hu et al., 2018), and they are able to store benzoxazinoids to resist their own enemies- entomopathogenic nematodes (Robert et al., 2017). Strikingly, both the plant and the herbivore have evolved to modify the structure, localization and stress-induced modification of benzoxazinoids to fit these different functions (Ahmad et al., 2011; Maag et al., 2016; Robert et al., 2017). This example illustrates how a detailed understanding of the functional integration of plant secondary metabolites can help to unravel the chemical underpinning of plant-herbivore interactions.

In general terms, a plant's metabolism is shaped by a dynamic landscape of environmental selection pressure; conversely, the metabolic network of herbivores is shaped by the functional and chemical potential of plant metabolites within the herbivore's own selection landscape; one can thus expect, that, similar to what Rhoades postulated for plants (Rhoades, 1977), any chemical system taken up by a herbivore must necessarily be integrated into its total metabolic scheme, and multiple functions of plant secondary metabolites are to be expected, some of which likely mirror their multiple functions in plants (Figure 3). Specialist herbivores are known to use secondary metabolites as infochemicals (e.g. foraging cues), and some also sequester defenses to protect themselves against herbivore natural enemies (Nishida,

2002; Opitz and Müller, 2009), in analogy to the use of these chemicals as defense regulators and resistance factors in plants (Figure 3). Cabbage aphids are an illustrative example in this context, as they can activate glucosinolates by producing their own myrosinases (Bridges et al., 2002; Kazana et al., 2007). This allows them to use glucosinolates as two-component defense system against predators (Kazana et al., 2007). As glucosinolate breakdown products (isothiocyanates) also increase aphid responses to alarm pheromones (Dawson et al., 1987), it was proposed that aphid-released isothiocyanates may also act as danger-signals (Bridges et al., 2002). Another example where herbivores use secondary metabolites for several purposes that mirror their multiple uses by plants are again benzoxazinoids, which are used as defense metabolites and siderophores by a specialist root herbivore in maize (Box 1). Apart from mirroring plant functions, adapted herbivores can also use plant secondary metabolites for herbivore-specific functions. Cyanogenic glycosides for instance can be used by specialized lepidoptera as defenses and nuptial gifts (Zagrobelny et al., 2018), and glucosinolates are part of the pheromone blend of flea beetles (Beran et al., 2016).

These examples illustrate that, as in plants, secondary metabolites can act as defenses, regulators and precursors of primary metabolites in herbivores. Furthermore, the multi-functionality of plant secondary metabolites for plants is reflected the multi-functional misuse of these compounds by specialized plant-feeders (Fig. 3). Whether similar phenomena can also be observed in natural enemies of herbivores, thus also shaping tritrophic interactions, is an exciting open question (Box 2).

Box 2. Potential novel roles of plant secondary metabolites in tritrophic interactions. Beyond plants and herbivores, the multi-functionality of plant secondary metabolites may also extend to the third trophic level. The current view on this topic is that i) plant primary metabolites influence tritrophic interactions by directly or indirectly feeding natural enemies of herbivores (Hunter, 2003; Sarfraz et al., 2009; Ugine et al., 2019), ii) volatile secondary metabolites can serve as foraging cues (Aartsma et al., 2017; Turlings and Erb, 2018), and iii) non-volatile secondary metabolites can reduce herbivore host quality and thereby negatively affect natural enemies of herbivores, in particular when they are sequestered by specialized herbivores (Nishida, 2002; Opitz and Müller, 2009). To what extent natural enemies of herbivores may use plant secondary metabolites as primary metabolites for their own nutrition or as hormone-like regulators is currently unknown. Natural enemies of herbivores can metabolize secondary metabolites (Sloggett and Davis, 2010; Robert et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2019a), and can evolve resistance towards their toxic effects (Fink and Brower, 1981; Rafter et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2019). Understanding if and how plant secondary metabolites are integrated into the metabolism of herbivore natural enemies represents an important current frontier in chemical ecology which can benefit from current insights into the blurred functional trichotomy of plant metabolism.

In summary, the field of plant-herbivore interactions is likely to benefit from abandoning functional preconceptions of plant secondary metabolites and to focus on a better understanding of the metabolic integration of plants and insects through untinted glasses. Comparative metabolomics of plant and herbivore tissues (Jansen et al., 2009) and parallel genome-wide screens of plants and herbivores (Nallu et al., 2018) are promising approaches to assess plant-herbivore interaction and to identify metabolite functions and effects in herbivores without prior functional assumptions.

Figure 3. Functional integration of plant secondary metabolites shapes plant-herbivore and tritrophic interactions. Schematic representation of how different functions of secondary metabolites are used by plants, herbivores and natural enemies of herbivores. Plants use secondary metabolites for multiple purposes, including resistance, regulation and primary metabolism (see Figure 2). Recent work suggests that this multifunctionality is mirrored in adapted herbivores, which also employ secondary metabolites for multiple purposes, including similar and novel functions. Little is known about how adapted natural enemies use secondary metabolites, but multifunctional integration across three trophic levels is likely (Box 2). Circles represent hypothetical individual secondary metabolites (for color code, refer to Figs. 1 and 2). Solid lines indicate metabolic connections within an organism. Dashed lines indicate similar functions of the same compounds in different organisms.

Conclusions

The functional separation of plant-derived small molecular weight organic compounds into primary metabolites, secondary metabolites and hormones has proven to be a useful approximation over the last decades. However, recent work has shown that several classes of plant secondary metabolites are highly integrated into plant metabolism and can serve as both regulators and primary metabolites. Thus, it is likely that most secondary metabolites have additional functions for plants. Taking into account these additional can refine key concepts in plant-environment interactions and improve our understanding of the chemical ecology of plants and their enemies.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Christelle A.M. Robert, Clint Chapple and the twitter community for helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript and Pierre Mateo for drawing chemical structures.

644 **Literature cited**

- 645 **Aartsma Y, Bianchi FJJA, van der Werf W, Poelman EH, Dicke M** (2017)
 646 Herbivore-induced plant volatiles and tritrophic interactions across spatial scales.
 647 *New Phytol* **216**: 1054–1063.
- 648 **Ahmad S, Veyrat N, Gordon-Weeks R, Zhang Y, Martin J, Smart L, Glauser G,**
 649 **Erb M, Flors V, Frey M, Ton J** (2011) Benzoxazinoid metabolites regulate innate
 650 immunity against aphids and fungi in maize. *Plant Physiol* **157**: 317–327.
- 651 **Ameye M, Allmann S, Verwaeren J, Smagghe G, Haesaert G, Schuurink RC,**
 652 **Audenaert K** (2018) Green leaf volatile production by plants: a meta-analysis.
 653 *New Phytol* **220**: 666–683.
- 654 **Arimura G, Ozawa R, Shimoda T, Nishioka T, Boland W, Takabayashi J** (2000)
 655 Herbivory-induced volatiles elicit defence genes in lima bean leaves. *Nature* **406**:
 656 512–515.
- 657 **Atwell S, Huang YS, Vilhjálmsson BJ, Willems G, Horton M, Li Y, Meng D, Platt**
 658 **A, Tarone AM, Hu TT, Jiang R, Mulyati NW, Zhang X, Amer MA, Baxter I,**
 659 **Brachi B, Chory J, Dean C, Debieu M, Meaux J de, Ecker JR, Faure N,**
 660 **Kniskern JM, Jones JDG, Michael T, Nemri A, Roux F, Salt DE, Tang C,**
 661 **Todesco M, Traw MB, Weigel D, Marjoram P, Borevitz JO, Bergelson J,**
 662 **Nordborg M** (2010) Genome-wide association study of 107 phenotypes in
 663 *Arabidopsis thaliana* inbred lines. *Nature* **465**: 627–631.
- 664 **Awmack CS, Leather SR** (2002) Host plant quality and fecundity in herbivorous
 665 insects. *Annu Rev Entomol* **47**: 817–844.
- 666 **Bakrim A, Maria A, Sayah F, Lafont R, Takvorian N** (2008) Ecdysteroids in spinach
 667 (*Spinacia oleracea* L.): biosynthesis, transport and regulation of levels. *Plant*
 668 *Physiol Biochem* **46**: 844–854.
- 669 **Baldwin IT, Halitschke R, Paschold A, Dahl CC von, Preston CA** (2006) Volatile
 670 signaling in plant-plant interactions: "talking trees" in the genomics era. *Science*
 671 **311**: 812–815.
- 672 **Baldwin IT, Schultz JC** (1983) Rapid changes in tree leaf chemistry induced by
 673 damage: evidence for communication between plants. *Science* **221**: 277–279.
- 674 **Barton KE, Boege K** (2017) Future directions in the ontogeny of plant defence:
 675 understanding the evolutionary causes and consequences. *Ecol Lett* **20**: 403–411.
- 676 **Behmer ST** (2009) Insect herbivore nutrient regulation. *Annu Rev Entomol* **54**: 165–
 677 187.
- 678 **Beran F, Jiménez-Alemán GH, Lin M-y, Hsu Y-C, Mewis I, Srinivasan R, Ulrichs**
 679 **C, Boland W, Hansson BS, Reinecke A** (2016) The Aggregation Pheromone of
 680 *Phyllotreta striolata* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) Revisited. *J Chem Ecol* **42**: 748–
 681 755.
- 682 **Berenbaum MR, Zangerl AR** (2008) Facing the future of plant-insect interaction
 683 research: le retour à la "raison d'être". *Plant Physiol* **146**: 804–811.

684 **Berens ML, Berry HM, Mine A, Argueso CT, Tsuda K** (2017) Evolution of Hormone
685 Signaling Networks in Plant Defense. *Annu Rev Phytopathol* **55**: 401–425.

686 **Bigler L, Baumeler A, Werner C, Hesse M** (1996) Detection of Noncovalent
687 Complexes of Hydroxamic-Acid Derivatives by means of electrospray mass
688 spectrometry. *Helv Chim Acta* **79**: 1701–1709.

689 **Bouarab K, Melton R, Peart J, Baulcombe D, Osbourn A** (2002) A saponin-
690 detoxifying enzyme mediates suppression of plant defences. *Nature* **418**: 889–
691 892.

692 **Bouwmeester H, Schuurink RC, Bleeker PM, Schiestl F** (2019) The role of
693 volatiles in plant communication. *Plant J* **100**: 892–907.

694 **Bridges M, Jones AME, Bones AM, Hodgson C, Cole R, Bartlet E, Wallsgrave R,**
695 **Karapapa VK, Watts N, Rossiter JT** (2002) Spatial organization of the
696 glucosinolate-myrosinase system in brassica specialist aphids is similar to that of
697 the host plant. *Proc Biol Sci* **269**: 187–191.

698 **Brown DE, Rashotte AM, Murphy AS, Normanly J, Tague BW, Peer WA, Taiz L,**
699 **Muday GK** (2001) Flavonoids Act as Negative Regulators of Auxin Transport in
700 Vivo in Arabidopsis1. *Plant Physiol* **126**: 524–535.

701 **Burow M, Atwell S, Francisco M, Kerwin RE, Halkier BA, Kliebenstein DJ** (2015)
702 The Glucosinolate Biosynthetic Gene AOP2 Mediates Feed-back Regulation of
703 Jasmonic Acid Signaling in Arabidopsis. *Mol Plant* **8**: 1201–1212.

704 **Burow M, Halkier BA** (2017) How does a plant orchestrate defense in time and
705 space? Using glucosinolates in Arabidopsis as case study. *Curr Opin Plant Biol*
706 **38**: 142–147.

707 **Cipollini D, Walters D, Voelckel C** (2018-) Costs of Resistance in Plants: From
708 Theory to Evidence. In JA Roberts, ed, *Annual plant reviews*. Wiley, [Place of
709 publication not identified], pp. 263–307.

710 **Clay NK, Adio AM, Denoux C, Jander G, Ausubel FM** (2009) Glucosinolate
711 metabolites required for an Arabidopsis innate immune response. *Science* **323**:
712 95–101.

713 **Curie C, Briat J-F** (2003) Iron transport and signaling in plants. *Annu Rev Plant Biol*
714 **54**: 183–206.

715 **Davies PJ** (2004) *Plant hormones. Biosynthesis, signal transduction, action!*, Ed. 3.
716 Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, Boston.

717 **Dawson GW, Griffiths DC, Pickett JA, Wadhams LJ, Woodcock CM** (1987) Plant-
718 derived synergists of alarm pheromone from turnip aphid, *Lipaphis* (Hyadaphis)
719 *erysimi* (Homoptera, Aphididae). *J Chem Ecol* **13**: 1663–1671.

720 **Dolan WL, Dilkes BP, Stout JM, Bonawitz ND, Chapple C** (2017) Mediator
721 Complex Subunits MED2, MED5, MED16, and MED23 Genetically Interact in the
722 Regulation of Phenylpropanoid Biosynthesis. *Plant Cell* **29**: 3269–3285.

723 **Ehrlich PR, Raven PH** (1964) Butterflies and Plants: A Study in Coevolution. *Evol*
724 **18**: 586.

- 725 **Engelberth J, Alborn HT, Schmelz EA, Tumlinson JH** (2004) Airborne signals
726 prime plants against insect herbivore attack. *PNAS* **101**: 1781–1785.
- 727 **Erb M** (2018) Volatiles as inducers and suppressors of plant defense and immunity-
728 origins, specificity, perception and signaling. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **44**: 117–121.
- 729 **Erb M, Reymond P** (2019) Molecular Interactions Between Plants and Insect
730 Herbivores. *Annu Rev Plant Biol* **70**: 527–557.
- 731 **Erb M, Veyrat N, Robert CAM, Xu H, Frey M, Ton J, Turlings TCJ** (2015) Indole is
732 an essential herbivore-induced volatile priming signal in maize. *Nat Commun* **6**:
733 6273.
- 734 **Farmer EE, Dovoine C** (2007) Reactive electrophile species. Current opinion in plant
735 biology **10**: 380–386.
- 736 **Fernie AR, Pichersky E** (2015) Focus Issue on Metabolism: Metabolites,
737 Metabolites Everywhere. *Plant Physiol* **169**: 1421–1423.
- 738 **Fink LS, Brower LP** (1981) Birds can overcome the cardenolide defence of monarch
739 butterflies in Mexico. *Nature* **291**: 67–70.
- 740 **Frost CJ, Mescher MC, Dervinis C, Davis JM, Carlson JE, Moraes CM de** (2008)
741 Priming defense genes and metabolites in hybrid poplar by the green leaf volatile
742 cis-3-hexenyl acetate. *New Phytol* **180**: 722–734.
- 743 **Futuyma DJ, Agrawal AA** (2009) Macroevolution and the biological diversity of
744 plants and herbivores. *PNAS* **106**: 18054–18061.
- 745 **Gayomba SR, Watkins JM, Muday GK** (2010) Flavonols Regulate Plant Growth and
746 Development through Regulation of Auxin Transport and Cellular Redox Status. In
747 C Santos-Buelga, MT Escribano-Bailon, V Lattanzio, eds, Recent advances in
748 polyphenol research. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, West Sussex, Ames, Iowa,
749 pp. 143–170.
- 750 **Gilardoni PA, Hettenhausen C, Baldwin IT, Bonaventure G** (2011) Nicotiana
751 attenuata LECTIN RECEPTOR KINASE1 suppresses the insect-mediated
752 inhibition of induced defense responses during Manduca sexta herbivory. *Plant*
753 *Cell* **23**: 3512–3532.
- 754 **Glauser G, Marti G, Villard N, Doyen GA, Wolfender J-L, Turlings TCJ, Erb M**
755 (2011) Induction and detoxification of maize 1,4-benzoxazin-3-ones by insect
756 herbivores. *Plant J* **68**: 901–911.
- 757 **Godard K-A, White R, Bohlmann J** (2008) Monoterpene-induced molecular
758 responses in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Phytochemistry* **69**: 1838–1849.
- 759 **Günther J, Irmisch S, Lackus ND, Reichelt M, Gershenzon J, Köllner TG** (2018)
760 The nitrilase PtNIT1 catabolizes herbivore-induced nitriles in Populus trichocarpa.
761 *BMC plant biology* **18**: 251.
- 762 **Guo Q, Major IT, Howe GA** (2018) Resolution of growth-defense conflict:
763 mechanistic insights from jasmonate signaling. *Curr Opin Plant Biol* **44**: 72–81.

764 **Hadacek F, Bachmann G, Engelmeier D, Chobot V** (2010) Hormesis and a
765 Chemical Raison D'être for Secondary Plant Metabolites. Dose-response : a
766 publication of International Hormesis Society **9**: 79–116.

767 **Hartmann T** (2007) From waste products to ecochemicals: Fifty years research of
768 plant secondary metabolism. *Phytochemistry* **68**: 2831–2846.

769 **Hasegawa K, Noguchi H, Iwagawa T, Hase T** (1986) Phototropism in Hypocotyls of
770 Radish : I. Isolation and Identification of Growth Inhibitors, cis- and trans-
771 Raphanusanins and Raphanusamide, Involved in Phototropism of Radish
772 Hypocotyls. *Plant Physiol* **81**: 976–979.

773 **Hemm MR, Ruegger MO, Chapple C** (2003) The Arabidopsis ref2 mutant is
774 defective in the gene encoding CYP83A1 and shows both phenylpropanoid and
775 glucosinolate phenotypes. *Plant Cell* **15**: 179–194.

776 **Hossain MS, Ye W, Hossain MA, Okuma E, Uraji M, Nakamura Y, Mori IC,**
777 **Murata Y** (2013) Glucosinolate degradation products, isothiocyanates, nitriles, and
778 thiocyanates, induce stomatal closure accompanied by peroxidase-mediated
779 reactive oxygen species production in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Biosci Biotechnol*
780 *Biochem* **77**: 977–983.

781 **Howe GA, Jander G** (2008) Plant immunity to insect herbivores. *Annu Rev Plant Biol*
782 **59**: 41–66.

783 **Hu L, Mateo P, Ye M, Zhang X, Berset JD, Handrick V, Radisch D, Grabe V,**
784 **Köllner TG, Gershenzon J, Robert CAM, Erb M** (2018) Plant iron acquisition
785 strategy exploited by an insect herbivore. *Science* **361**: 694–697.

786 **Hu L, Ye M, Li R, Zhang T, Zhou G, Wang Q, Lu J, Lou Y** (2015) The Rice
787 Transcription Factor WRKY53 Suppresses Herbivore-Induced Defenses by Acting
788 as a Negative Feedback Modulator of Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase Activity.
789 *Plant Physiol* **169**: 2907–2921.

790 **Huber M, Epping J, Schulze Gronover C, Fricke J, Aziz Z, Brillatz T, Swyers M,**
791 **Köllner TG, Vogel H, Hammerbacher A, Triebwasser-Freese D, Robert CAM,**
792 **Verhoeven K, Preite V, Gershenzon J, Erb M** (2016) A Latex Metabolite Benefits
793 Plant Fitness under Root Herbivore Attack. *PLoS Biol* **14**: e1002332.

794 **Hunter MD** (2003) Effects of plant quality on the population ecology of parasitoids.
795 *Agric Forest Ent* **5**: 1–8.

796 **Ishihara A, Matsuda F, Miyagawa H, Wakasa K** (2007) Metabolomics for
797 metabolically manipulated plants: effects of tryptophan overproduction.
798 *Metabolomics* **3**: 319–334.

799 **Jander G** (2018) Revisiting Plant-Herbivore Co-Evolution in the Molecular Biology
800 Era. *Annu Plant Rev*: 361–384.

801 **Jansen JJ, Allwood JW, Marsden-Edwards E, van der Putten WH, Goodacre R,**
802 **van Dam NM** (2009) Metabolomic analysis of the interaction between plants and
803 herbivores. *Metabolomics* **5**: 150–161.

804 **Jenrich R, Trompetter I, Bak S, Olsen CE, Møller BL, Piotrowski M** (2007)
805 Evolution of heteromeric nitrilase complexes in Poaceae with new functions in
806 nitrile metabolism. *PNAS* **104**: 18848–18853.

807 **Jin CW, You GY, He YF, Tang C, Wu P, Zheng SJ** (2007) Iron deficiency-induced
808 secretion of phenolics facilitates the reutilization of root apoplastic iron in red
809 clover. *Plant Physiol* **144**: 278–285.

810 **Jones AC, Seidl-Adams I, Engelberth J, Hunter CT, Alborn H, Tumlinson JH**
811 (2019) Herbivorous Caterpillars Can Utilize Three Mechanisms to Alter Green Leaf
812 Volatile Emission. *Environ Entomol* **48**: 419–425.

813 **Katz E, Nisani S, Yadav BS, Woldemariam MG, Shai B, Obolski U, Ehrlich M,**
814 **Shani E, Jander G, Chamovitz DA** (2015) The glucosinolate breakdown product
815 indole-3-carbinol acts as an auxin antagonist in roots of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant*
816 *J* **82**: 547–555.

817 **Kazan K, Lyons R** (2014) Intervention of Phytohormone Pathways by Pathogen
818 Effectors. *Plant Cell* **26**: 2285–2309.

819 **Kazana E, Pope TW, Tibbles L, Bridges M, Pickett JA, Bones AM, Powell G,**
820 **Rossiter JT** (2007) The cabbage aphid: a walking mustard oil bomb. *Proc Biol Sci*
821 **274**: 2271–2277.

822 **Kerwin RE, Jimenez-Gomez JM, Fulop D, Harmer SL, Maloof JN, Kliebenstein**
823 **DJ** (2011) Network quantitative trait loci mapping of circadian clock outputs
824 identifies metabolic pathway-to-clock linkages in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* **23**: 471–
825 485.

826 **Khokon MAR, Jahan MS, Rahman T, Hossain MA, Muroyama D, Minami I,**
827 **Munemasa S, Mori IC, Nakamura Y, Murata Y** (2011) Allyl isothiocyanate (AITC)
828 induces stomatal closure in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell Environ* **34**: 1900–1906.

829 **Kim JI, Dolan WL, Anderson NA, Chapple C** (2015) Indole Glucosinolate
830 Biosynthesis Limits Phenylpropanoid Accumulation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant*
831 *Cell* **27**: 1529–1546.

832 **Kim JI, Zhang X, Pascuzzi PE, Liu C-J, Chapple C** (2020) Glucosinolate and
833 phenylpropanoid biosynthesis are linked by proteasome-dependent degradation of
834 PAL. *New Phytol* **225**: 154–168.

835 **Kliebenstein DJ** (2016) False idolatry of the mythical growth versus immunity
836 tradeoff in molecular systems plant pathology. *Phys Mol Plant Pathol* **95**: 55–59.

837 **Kliebenstein DJ** (2018) Plant nutrient acquisition entices herbivore. *Science* **361**:
838 642–643.

839 **Kliebenstein DJ, Lambrix VM, Reichelt M, Gershenzon J, Mitchell-Olds T** (2001)
840 Gene duplication in the diversification of secondary metabolism: tandem 2-
841 oxoglutarate-dependent dioxygenases control glucosinolate biosynthesis in
842 *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* **13**: 681–693.

843 **Kubo I, Klocke JA, Asano S** (1983) Effects of ingested phytoecdysteroids on the
844 growth and development of two Lepidopterous larvae. *Journal of Insect Physiology*
845 **29**: 307–316.

846 **Li B, Förster C, Robert CAM, Züst T, Hu L, Machado RAR, Berset J-D, Handrick**
847 **V, Knauer T, Hensel G, Chen W, Kumlehn J, Yang P, Keller B, Gershenzon J,**
848 **Jander G, Köllner TG, Erb M** (2018a) Convergent evolution of a metabolic switch
849 between aphid and caterpillar resistance in cereals. *Sci Adv* **4**: eaat6797.

850 **Li J, Schuman MC, Halitschke R, Li X, Guo H, Grabe V, Hammer A, Baldwin IT**
851 (2018b) The decoration of specialized metabolites influences stylar development.
852 *eLife* **7**.

853 **Li R, Zhang J, Li J, Zhou G, Wang Q, Bian W, Erb M, Lou Y** (2015) Prioritizing
854 plant defence over growth through WRKY regulation facilitates infestation by non-
855 target herbivores. *eLife* **4**: e04805.

856 **Liu Y, Du M, Deng L, Shen J, Fang M, Chen Q, Lu Y, Wang Q, Li C, Zhai Q** (2019)
857 MYC2 Regulates the Termination of Jasmonate Signaling via an Autoregulatory
858 Negative Feedback Loop. *Plant Cell* **31**: 106–127.

859 **Lu H-P, Luo T, Fu H-W, Wang L, Tan Y-Y, Huang J-Z, Wang Q, Ye G-Y,**
860 **Gatehouse AMR, Lou Y-G, Shu Q-Y** (2018) Resistance of rice to insect pests
861 mediated by suppression of serotonin biosynthesis. *Nat Plants* **4**: 338–344.

862 **Maag D, Erb M, Köllner TG, Gershenzon J** (2015) Defensive weapons and defense
863 signals in plants: some metabolites serve both roles. *Bioessays* **37**: 167–174.

864 **Maag D, Köhler A, Robert CAM, Frey M, Wolfender J-L, Turlings TCJ, Glauser**
865 **G, Erb M** (2016) Highly localized and persistent induction of Bx1-dependent
866 herbivore resistance factors in maize. *Plant J* **88**: 976–991.

867 **Machado RAR, Baldwin IT, Erb M** (2017) Herbivory-induced jasmonates constrain
868 plant sugar accumulation and growth by antagonizing gibberellin signaling and not
869 by promoting secondary metabolite production. *New Phytol* **215**: 803–812.

870 **Malinovsky FG, Thomsen M-LF, Nintemann SJ, Jagd LM, Bourguine B, Burow M,**
871 **Kliebenstein DJ** (2017) An evolutionarily young defense metabolite influences the
872 root growth of plants via the ancient TOR signaling pathway. *eLife* **6**.

873 **Marti G, Erb M, Boccard J, Glauser G, Doyen GR, Villard N, Robert CAM,**
874 **Turlings TCJ, Rudaz S, Wolfender J-L** (2013) Metabolomics reveals herbivore-
875 induced metabolites of resistance and susceptibility in maize leaves and roots.
876 *Plant Cell Environ* **36**: 621–639.

877 **Mayer MJ, Narbad A, Parr AJ, Parker ML, Walton NJ, Mellon FA, Michael AJ**
878 (2001) Rerouting the Plant Phenylpropanoid Pathway by Expression of a Novel
879 Bacterial Enoyl-CoA Hydratase/Lyase Enzyme Function. *Plant Cell* **13**: 1669–
880 1682.

881 **McKey D** (1974) Adaptive Patterns in Alkaloid Physiology. *Am Nat* **108**: 305–320.

882 **Meents AK, Chen S-P, Reichelt M, Lu H-H, Bartram S, Yeh K-W, Mithöfer A**
883 (2019) Volatile DMNT systemically induces jasmonate-independent direct anti-
884 herbivore defense in leaves of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) plants. *Sci Rep* **9**:
885 17431.

886 **Meihls LN, Handrick V, Glauser G, Barbier H, Kaur H, Haribal MM, Lipka AE,**
887 **Gershenzon J, Buckler ES, Erb M, Köllner TG, Jander G** (2013) Natural

variation in maize aphid resistance is associated with 2,4-dihydroxy-7-methoxy-1,4-benzoxazin-3-one glucoside methyltransferase activity. *Plant Cell* **25**: 2341–2355.

Meldau S, Erb M, Baldwin IT (2012) Defence on demand: mechanisms behind optimal defence patterns. *Ann Bot* **110**: 1503–1514.

Meldau S, Wu J, Baldwin IT (2009) Silencing two herbivory-activated MAP kinases, SIPK and WIPK, does not increase *Nicotiana attenuata*'s susceptibility to herbivores in the glasshouse and in nature. *New Phytol* **181**: 161–173.

Mladenka P, Macáková K, Zatloukalová L, Reháková Z, Singh BK, Prasad AK, Parmar VS, Jahodár L, Hrdina R, Saso L (2010) In vitro interactions of coumarins with iron. *Biochimie* **92**: 1108–1114.

Morant AV, Jørgensen K, Jørgensen C, Paquette SM, Sánchez-Pérez R, Møller BL, Bak S (2008) beta-Glucosidases as detonators of plant chemical defense. *Phytochemistry* **69**: 1795–1813.

Murphy A, Peer WA, Taiz L (2000) Regulation of auxin transport by aminopeptidases and endogenous flavonoids. *Planta* **211**: 315–324.

Nallu S, Hill JA, Don K, Sahagun C, Zhang W, Meslin C, Snell-Rood E, Clark NL, Morehouse NI, Bergelson J, Wheat CW, Kronforst MR (2018) The molecular genetic basis of herbivory between butterflies and their host plants. *Nat Ecol Evol* **2**: 1418–1427.

Narayanan NN, Ihemere U, Ellery C, Sayre RT (2011) Overexpression of hydroxynitrile lyase in cassava roots elevates protein and free amino acids while reducing residual cyanogen levels. *PLoS One* **6**: e21996.

Neilson EH, Goodger JQD, Woodrow IE, Møller BL (2013) Plant chemical defense: at what cost? *Trends Plant Sci* **18**: 250–258.

Nishida R (2002) Sequestration of defensive substances from plants by Lepidoptera. *Annu Rev Entomol* **47**: 57–92.

Opitz SEW, Müller C (2009) Plant chemistry and insect sequestration. *Chemoecol* **19**: 117–154.

Paschold A, Halitschke R, Baldwin IT (2006) Using 'mute' plants to translate volatile signals. *Plant J* **45**: 275–291.

Peer WA, Murphy AS (2007) Flavonoids and auxin transport: modulators or regulators? *Trends Plant Sci* **12**: 556–563.

Pichersky E, Raguso RA (2018) Why do plants produce so many terpenoid compounds? *New Phytol* **220**: 692–702.

Quintana-Rodriguez E, Duran-Flores D, Heil M, Camacho-Coronel X (2018) Damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs) as future plant vaccines that protect crops from pests. *Sci Hort* **237**: 207–220.

Rafter JL, Gonda-King L, Niesen D, Seeram NP, Rigsby CM, Preisser EL (2017) Impact of Consuming 'Toxic' Monarch Caterpillars on Adult Chinese Mantid Mass Gain and Fecundity. *Insects* **8**.

- 929 **Rhoades DF** (1977) Integrated antiherbivore, antidesiccant and ultraviolet screening
930 properties of creosotebush resin. *Biochem Syst Ecol* **5**: 281–290.
- 931 **Rhoades DF** (1983) Responses of Alder and Willow to Attack by Tent Caterpillars
932 and Webworms: Evidence for Pheromonal Sensitivity of Willows. In PA Hedin, ed,
933 Plant resistance to insects, Vol 208. ACS, Washington, pp. 55–68.
- 934 **Richards LA, Lampert EC, Bowers MD, Dodson CD, Smilanich AM, Dyer LA**
935 (2012) Synergistic effects of iridoid glycosides on the survival, development and
936 immune response of a specialist caterpillar, *Junonia coenia* (Nymphalidae). *J*
937 *Chem Ecol* **38**: 1276–1284.
- 938 **Riedlmeier M, Ghirardo A, Wenig M, Knappe C, Koch K, Georgii E, Dey S,**
939 **Parker JE, Schnitzler J-P, Vlot AC** (2017) Monoterpenes Support Systemic
940 Acquired Resistance within and between Plants. *Plant Cell* **29**: 1440–1459.
- 941 **Robert CAM, Veyrat N, Glauser G, Marti G, Doyen GR, Villard N, Gaillard MDP,**
942 **Köllner TG, Giron D, Body M, Babst BA, Ferrieri RA, Turlings TCJ, Erb M**
943 (2012) A specialist root herbivore exploits defensive metabolites to locate
944 nutritious tissues. *Ecol Lett* **15**: 55–64.
- 945 **Robert CAM, Zhang X, Machado RA, Schirmer S, Lori M, Mateo P, Erb M,**
946 **Gershenzon J** (2017) Sequestration and activation of plant toxins protect the
947 western corn rootworm from enemies at multiple trophic levels. *eLife* **6**.
- 948 **Salehin M, Li B, Tang M, Katz E, Song L, Ecker JR, Kliebenstein DJ, Estelle M**
949 (2019) Auxin-sensitive Aux/IAA proteins mediate drought tolerance in *Arabidopsis*
950 by regulating glucosinolate levels. *Nat Commun* **10**: 4021.
- 951 **Santelia D, Henrichs S, Vincenzetti V, Sauer M, Bigler L, Klein M, Bailly A, Lee**
952 **Y, Friml J, Geisler M, Martinoia E** (2008) Flavonoids Redirect PIN-mediated
953 Polar Auxin Fluxes during Root Gravitropic Responses. *J Biol Chem* **283**:
954 31218–31226.
- 955 **Sarfraz M, Dosdall LM, Keddle BA** (2009) Host plant nutritional quality affects the
956 performance of the parasitoid *Diadegma insulare*. *Biol Cont* **51**: 34–41.
- 957 **Schmid NB, Giehl RFH, Döll S, Mock H-P, Strehmel N, Scheel D, Kong X, Hider**
958 **RC, Wirén N von** (2014) Feruloyl-CoA 6'-Hydroxylase1-dependent coumarins
959 mediate iron acquisition from alkaline substrates in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiol* **164**:
960 160–172.
- 961 **Schuman MC, Baldwin IT** (2016) The Layers of Plant Responses to Insect
962 Herbivores. *Annu Rev Entomol* **61**: 373–394.
- 963 **Selmar D, Lieberei R, Biehl B** (1988) Mobilization and utilization of cyanogenic
964 glycosides: the linustatin pathway. *Plant Physiol* **86**: 711–716.
- 965 **Silva-Navas J, Moreno-Risueno MA, Manzano C, Téllez-Robledo B, Navarro-**
966 **Neila S, Carrasco V, Pollmann S, Gallego FJ, Del Pozo JC** (2016) Flavonols
967 Mediate Root Phototropism and Growth through Regulation of Proliferation-to-
968 Differentiation Transition. *Plant Cell* **28**: 1372–1387.
- 969 **Sirikantaramas S, Yamazaki M, Saito K** (2008) Mechanisms of resistance to self-
970 produced toxic secondary metabolites in plants. *Phytochem Rev* **7**: 467–477.

971 **Sloggett JJ, Davis AJ** (2010) Eating chemically defended prey: alkaloid metabolism
 972 in an invasive ladybird predator of other ladybirds (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). *J*
 973 *Exp Biol* **213**: 237–241.

974 **Soubeyrand E, Johnson TS, Latimer S, Block A, Kim J, Colquhoun TA, Butelli**
 975 **E, Martin C, Wilson MA, Basset GJ** (2018) The Peroxidative Cleavage of
 976 Kaempferol Contributes to the Biosynthesis of the Benzenoid Moiety of
 977 Ubiquinone in Plants. *Plant Cell* **30**: 2910–2921.

978 **Stahl E, Hilfiker O, Reymond P** (2018) Plant-arthropod interactions: who is the
 979 winner? *Plant J* **93**: 703–728.

980 **Stenlid G** (1963) The Effects of Flavonoid Compounds on Oxidative Phosphorylation
 981 and on the Enzymatic Destruction of Indoleacetic Acid. *Physiol Plant* **16**: 110–120.

982 **Stenlid G** (1976) Effects of Flavonoids on the Polar Transport of Auxins. *Physiol*
 983 *Plant* **38**: 262–266.

984 **Sun R, Jiang X, Reichelt M, Gershenzon J, Pandit SS, Giddings Vassão D**
 985 (2019a) Tritrophic metabolism of plant chemical defenses and its effects on
 986 herbivore and predator performance. *eLife* **8**.

987 **Sun Y, Harpazi B, Wijerathna-Yapa A, Merilo E, Vries J de, Michaeli D, Gal M,**
 988 **Cuming AC, Kollist H, Mosquna A** (2019b) A ligand-independent origin of
 989 abscisic acid perception. *PNAS* **116**: 24892–24899.

990 **Taiz L, Zeiger E, Møller IM, Murphy AS** (2015) Plant physiology and development.
 991 Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts U.S.A.

992 **Tanaka K, Choi J, Cao Y, Stacey G** (2014) Extracellular ATP acts as a damage-
 993 associated molecular pattern (DAMP) signal in plants. *Front Plant Sci* **5**.

994 **Turlings TCJ, Erb M** (2018) Tritrophic Interactions Mediated by Herbivore-Induced
 995 Plant Volatiles: Mechanisms, Ecological Relevance, and Application Potential.
 996 *Annu Rev Entomol* **63**: 433–452.

997 **Ugine TA, Krasnoff SB, Grebenok RJ, Behmer ST, Losey JE** (2019) Prey nutrient
 998 content creates omnivores out of predators. *Ecol Lett* **22**: 275–283.

999 **van Dam NM** (2009) Belowground Herbivory and Plant Defenses. *Annu Rev Ecol*
 1000 *Evol Syst* **40**: 373–391.

1001 **Veyrat N, Robert CAM, Turlings TCJ, Erb M** (2016) Herbivore intoxication as a
 1002 potential primary function of an inducible volatile plant signal. *J Ecol* **104**: 591–
 1003 600.

1004 **Wetzel WC, Kharouba HM, Robinson M, Holyoak M, Karban R** (2016) Variability
 1005 in plant nutrients reduces insect herbivore performance. *Nature* **539**: 425–427.

1006 **Wink M** (2008) Plant Secondary Metabolism: Diversity, Function and its Evolution.
 1007 *Nat Prod Commun* **3**: 1934578X0800300.

1008 **Ye M, Glauser G, Lou Y, Erb M, Hu L** (2019) Molecular Dissection of Early Defense
 1009 Signaling Underlying Volatile-Mediated Defense Regulation and Herbivore
 1010 Resistance in Rice. *Plant Cell* **31**: 687–698.

1011 **Zagrobelny M, Castro ÉCP de, Møller BL, Bak S** (2018) Cyanogenesis in
1012 Arthropods: From Chemical Warfare to Nuptial Gifts. *Insects* **9**.

1013 **Zhang X, Gou M, Liu C-J** (2013) Arabidopsis Kelch repeat F-box proteins regulate
1014 phenylpropanoid biosynthesis via controlling the turnover of phenylalanine
1015 ammonia-lyase. *Plant Cell* **25**: 4994–5010.

1016 **Zhang X, van Doan C, Arce CCM, Hu L, Gruenig S, Parisod C, Hibbard BE,**
1017 **Hervé MR, Nielson C, Robert CAM, Machado RAR, Erb M** (2019) Plant defense
1018 resistance in natural enemies of a specialist insect herbivore. *PNAS* **116**: 23174–
1019 23181.

1020 **Zhao Z, Zhang W, Stanley BA, Assmann SM** (2008) Functional proteomics of
1021 Arabidopsis thaliana guard cells uncovers new stomatal signaling pathways. *Plant*
1022 *Cell* **20**: 3210–3226.

1023 **Zhou S, Lou Y-R, Tzin V, Jander G** (2015) Alteration of Plant Primary Metabolism in
1024 Response to Insect Herbivory. *Plant Physiol* **169**: 1488–1498.

1025 **Zhou S, Richter A, Jander G** (2018) Beyond Defense: Multiple Functions of
1026 Benzoxazinoids in Maize Metabolism. *Plant Cell Physiol* **59**: 1528–1537.

1027 **Züst T, Joseph B, Shimizu KK, Kliebenstein DJ, Turnbull LA** (2011) Using
1028 knockout mutants to reveal the growth costs of defensive traits. *Proc Biol Sci* **278**:
1029 2598–2603.