



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Exploited Mutualism: the reciprocal effects of plant-parasitic nematodes on the mechanisms underpinning plant-mutualist interactions*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/224971/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Wieczorek, K. and Bell, C.A. orcid.org/0000-0002-7437-2793 (Accepted: 2025) Exploited Mutualism: the reciprocal effects of plant-parasitic nematodes on the mechanisms underpinning plant-mutualist interactions. *New Phytologist*. ISSN 0028-646X (In Press)

This is an author produced version of an article accepted for publication in *New Phytologist*, made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Exploited Mutualism: the reciprocal effects of plant-parasitic nematodes on the mechanisms**
2 **underpinning plant-mutualist interactions**

3 Wieczorek, K¹ & Bell, C.A²

4 ¹ Department of Agricultural Sciences, Institute of Plant Protection, University of Natural
5 Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna, Tulln an der Donau, Austria

6 ² School of Biology, Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United
7 Kingdom

8 **Summary**

9 We are quickly gaining insights into the mechanisms and functions of plant-mutualist
10 relationships with the common overarching aim of exploiting them to enhance food security
11 and crop resilience. There is a growing mass of research describing various benefits of plant-
12 mutualistic fungi, including increased nutrition, yields and tolerance to biotic and abiotic
13 factors. The bulk of this research has been focused on arbuscular mycorrhiza, however there
14 is now an expansion towards other plant mutualistic fungi. Contrary to the established
15 “mycorrhizal induced resistance” principle, increasing evidence shows that certain plant pests
16 and pathogens may in fact exploit the benefits that mutualists provide their hosts, resulting
17 in enhanced pathogenicity and reduced mutualist-derived benefits. In this Viewpoint, we
18 propose that studying plant mutualistic fungi under controlled artificial conditions indeed
19 provides in-depth knowledge but may mislead long-term applications as it does not accurately
20 reflect multi-symbiont scenarios that occur *in natura*. We summarize the reciprocal impacts
21 of plant pests, such as plant-parasitic nematodes, on plant-fungal mutualisms and highlight
22 how glasshouse experiments often yield contradictory results. We emphasize the need for
23 collaborative efforts to increase the granularity of experimental systems, better reflecting
24 natural environments to gain holistic insights into mutualist functions before applying them in
25 sustainable crop protection strategies.

26 **The role of plant-mutualistic fungi in food security: from lab to field**

27

28 The FAO estimates that 20-40% of global crop production is lost due to plant pests and
29 diseases every year (FAO, 2020). The Circular Economy (European Commission, 2020a) and
30 Zero Pollution Action Plan (European Commission, 2021) directives, as well as the Farm to Fork
31 and Biodiversity strategies of the European Union (European Commission, 2020b & 2020c),
32 promote the development of innovative crop protection measures to sustainably enhance and
33 maintain crop yields. Sustainable plant protection strategies are increasingly sought after to
34 reduce fertilizer and chemical pesticide usage in agriculture. Among the promising
35 approaches, the use of mutualistic microorganisms as both biofertilizers and biological control
36 agents are often studied in varied scenarios.

37 Mutualistic interactions are those in which two or more species gain reciprocal benefits
38 (Bronstein, 2001). A plant-based scenario is when mutualistic fungi colonize and exchange
39 nutrients/resources with their plant host, which mutually benefits both organisms. This can
40 increase plant vigor, and for crop plants may increase yields. Crucially, the term “plant
41 mutualism” commonly refers to the direct effects of a single symbiont on a single plant,
42 excluding indirect effects the mutualist may have on other plant symbionts, such as
43 pathogens, and knock-on implications for the host plant or wider plant community. Although
44 this limitation is not inherently problematic, it should be considered when defining the
45 function of a mutualist within a system. Whilst arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi (van der
46 Heijden et al., 2015), and certain *Fusarium spp.* (Ahmed et al. 2023), *Trichoderma spp.* (Tseng
47 et al., 2020), and *Sebacinales* fungi (Weiß et al., 2011) are vastly different in their biology, they
48 all have the potential to form mutualistic relationships with their host plants. This may
49 enhance plant growth, development, and productivity (reviewed in Franken, 2012) whilst
50 increasing stress tolerance to abiotic factors such as drought, soil acidity, and heavy metals
51 (Porter et al., 2020). AM fungi are arguably the most well-studied fungal mutualists of plants,
52 with this classic interaction based on the “trade” of plant carbon to the fungus to support
53 fungal growth, in exchange for AM-scavenged macro- and micronutrients from the soil
54 (Lebron and Keller, 2024). Although the dynamics of carbon-for-nutrient exchange between
55 plants and AM fungi varies between systems and has become somewhat controversial (Bunn
56 et al., 2024), it is claimed that their ability to boost the productivity of a vast range of plant
57 species can contribute to future food security and sustainable agriculture (Lebreton & Keller,
58 2024).

59 AM fungi may increase host resistance and tolerance to various pests and pathogens, such as
60 insect herbivores, fungal and viral pathogens, and plant-parasitic nematodes (PPNs) (reviewed
61 in Grabka et al., 2022). The mechanisms by which these mutualists antagonize pathogen
62 infection can generally be divided into two modes of action: 1) direct competition for space
63 and nutrition, 2) indirect effects, such as damage compensation, enhanced tolerance, induced
64 systemic resistance (defense priming), and shifts in root exudation profiles. The priming of
65 plant defense responses by mutualists is an intriguing and well-researched phenomenon
66 (Cameron et al., 2013) consisting of the pre-activation of systemic plant defense mechanisms
67 prior to the pathogens arrival, resulting in an enhanced defense response upon pathogen
68 detection. For instance, priming and subsequent resistance derived from AM fungal-

69 colonization (“Mycorrhizal-induced Resistance”: MIR) may be effective against various
70 pathogens (Kadam et al., 2020).

71 Many of these mechanisms have been studied in the interactions between mutualistic fungi
72 and various PPNs (reviewed in Schouteden et al., 2015 and Poveda et al., 2020; Gianinazzi et
73 al., 2010; Vos et al., 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2013; Daneshkhah et al., 2013; Opitz et al., 2024).
74 These parasites collectively burden global agriculture by >US\$170billion per annum (Elling,
75 2013) and are the focus of varied control strategies (Pires et al., 2022). Numerous studies
76 indicate their successful and promising use against PPNs. The protective effects of mutualistic
77 fungi often include reduced infection and reproduction rates, as well as enhanced tolerance
78 to nematodes. For example, a seminal study by Vos et al. (2012a) demonstrated a mycorrhizal-
79 induced systemic reduction in root-knot nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*) infection.
80 Furthermore, several studies have since highlighted the potential of AM fungi to aid the
81 control of PPNs in evolutionarily diverse crop plants (e.g. Marro et al., 2018; Alvarado-
82 Herrejon et al., 2019). Another notable endophyte, *Serendipita indica* (a member of
83 *Sebaciniales*), has also been shown to significantly antagonize PPNs and various other plant
84 pathogens (reviewed in Gill et al., 2016). For example, during its biotrophic colonization stage,
85 *S. indica* significantly reduces populations of the sugar beet cyst nematode *Heterodera*
86 *schachtii* (Daneshkhah et al., 2013) and *M. incognita* (Opitz et al., 2024), leading to disrupted
87 nematode development in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Although *S. indica* is dissimilar to AM fungi
88 in many regards, its similar effects on co-occurring PPN populations presents an interesting
89 opportunity to determine and investigate conserved phenomena.

90 Overall, this highlights the vast benefits that plant mutualistic fungi can potentially provide
91 their hosts, not only by directly promoting growth but also by protecting against pathogens
92 such as PPNs. Although most of the above research is laboratory and glasshouse-based, an
93 optimistic yet potentially incorrect assumption is often globally maintained that the benefits
94 of host-AM interactions translate directly to field soils (Ryan & Graham, 2018). Furthermore,
95 applying AMF inocula without accounting for their persistence, field efficacy, host
96 compatibility, soil conditions, and interactions with resident microbial communities largely
97 overlooks essential ecological principles. Therefore, in this Viewpoint, after years of research
98 articles on the promising role of mutualistic fungi in integrated PPN management strategies
99 and boosting yields of important crop species, we now venture into a critical debate on the
100 use of these mutualists as biocontrol agents. This is fueled by recent research on fungal
101 mutualists affecting PPNs, discussed below, that suggests that these organisms may not
102 always be as beneficial as we previously thought. However, whilst we predominantly focus
103 here on their role in crop defense against pathogens, the broader ecological effects of fungal
104 inocula must also be considered (Vosatka & Dodd, 2002).

105 **Exploitation of mutualism by plant parasitic nematodes**

106 Although there are clear and significant benefits from plant-AM fungal interactions in certain
107 environments, unfortunately an increasing number of risks are increasingly being identified.
108 Firstly, the priming of plant defenses by AM fungi (e.g. MIR), is well-documented as being
109 complex, labile, and highly context-dependent, ultimately impacting host resistance
110 (Schouteden et al., 2015; Martinez-Medina et al., 2016; Saikkonen et al., 2020). The context-

111 dependency of MIR has led to “Mycorrhizal-Induced Susceptibility” (MIS) as an emerging
112 phenomenon (Miozzi et al., 2019), whereby mycorrhizal colonization leads to an increase in
113 pathogen populations. Whilst MIS was initially described in plant-viral systems, there is now a
114 growing mass of research that has evidenced MIS towards various soil-borne pests, such as
115 PPNs (Frew et al., 2018; Bell et al., 2024; Opitz et al., 2024), indicating shared consequences
116 of plant-AM interactions across vastly different pathogens. This raises the question: what
117 determines whether AM-host interactions enhance resistance or susceptibility?

118 It is logical that a healthier host can support a healthier parasite population, even if this
119 contradicts the idea of mutualistic fungi assisting in plant defense. Several studies have
120 confirmed that AM-derived nutrients can directly support and enhance the reproductive
121 potential of dramatically different above- and below-ground pests (Wilkinson et al., 2019; Bell
122 et al., 2022). The bulk of this research is based on AM-plant interactions; however, MIS is now
123 observed in plant interactions with other mutualistic fungi, such as *S. indica*, despite the
124 dramatic differences between fungal species. Data shows the presence of potentially similar
125 underpinning mechanisms, such as enhanced host nutrition and attenuated plant defense
126 responses (Opitz et al., 2024). The priming of plant defenses and simultaneous mutualist-host-
127 pathogen nutrient transfer may be independently regulated, underpinning the variable results
128 that are observed between the effects of both mechanisms on pathogen populations.

129 Although we know that plant-mutualistic fungi can impact plant pathogens (e.g. MIS), there
130 is still limited knowledge about the reverse effects: what impact do pathogens have on the
131 function of plant mutualists? Studying the function of mutualists, rather than purely their
132 colonization rates, can be challenging but provides direct insights into their role within the
133 host. Phytophagy by aphids or PPNs can dramatically reduce the flow of host resources into
134 the mutualist whilst the reverse flow of nutrients into the host is maintained (Charters et al.,
135 2020; Bell et al., 2022, 2024; Durant et al., 2023). This highlights an apparent disconnect
136 between both sides of the exchange/interaction (Bunn et al., 2024) and the long-term impact
137 of a reduced resource flow into AM from their pathogen-infected hosts is unknown. Bell et al.
138 (2024) showed that during concurrent phytophagy, cyst nematode-infected potato
139 maintained fatty acid supply but reduced the flow of hexoses to AM partner. This may be a
140 direct result of sucrose pool metabolism for plant defense (Wang & Wu, 2023) or simply a
141 matter of symbiont competition. If the pathogen is short-lived then the mutualist may be able
142 to survive times of scarce hexose supply by utilizing fatty acids, whilst long-term biotrophy
143 may be more detrimental for the fungus. Although the relative contributions of plant lipid and
144 hexoses to the fungal carbon economy is unknown (Luginbuehl et al., 2017), the inhibition of
145 either has dramatic negative effects (Helber et al., 2011; Luginbuehl et al., 2017). There are
146 possible similar effects of pathogens on carbon-for-nutrient exchange between plants and
147 other, dissimilar mutualists such as *S. indica* (Opitz et al., 2021), which are also suggested as
148 new weapons for agricultural security (Saleem et al., 2023).

149 The abundance of pathogens, along with their effects on plant-fungal carbon flow, may
150 contribute to the dynamic diversity of arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) species in the field, both
151 spatially and temporally (van der Heijden et al., 2015). Pathogen incidence best predicted the
152 success of AM fungal inoculation in field soils (Lutz et al., 2023) and there are links to explore

153 between the mycorrhizal-community composition and their role in plant defense, beyond
154 resource exchange (Frew et al., 2024). These studies show that valuable experimental
155 resolution can be achieved within a “broad scope” experiment to characterize several
156 variables, resulting in field-relevant data.

157 Overall, the variable impact of these fungal species indicates the dynamic nature of
158 mutualistic status, which depends on additional factors, such as environmental conditions,
159 plant symbiont genotypes, pathogen identity and virulence, and even co-evolution of the host,
160 mutualist, and pathogen. Pathogen pressure might also play a role, as it has recently been
161 suggested that a low number of plant-parasitic nematodes can in fact trigger enhanced plant
162 growth (Topalovic & Geisen, 2023), thus being considered mutualistic by the authors, while
163 infection with greater numbers results in the typical detrimental symptoms. This suggests that
164 the distinction between mutualist and pathogen may be thinner than previously thought,
165 emphasizing the limitations of these definitions.

166 **Promoting field-relevance whilst retaining high-resolution mutualist-host-pathogen** 167 **research**

168 The aforementioned plant-mutualist interactions are often explored under the umbrella of
169 agricultural security and may yield beneficial or detrimental outcomes for the plant species of
170 choice, dependent on a range of variables summarized above. Studies using single AM fungal
171 species colonizing a single plant species are then often extrapolated to provide solutions for
172 field-relevant scenarios (Ryan & Graham, 2018), which may lead to unexpected outcomes, as
173 discussed above. Hence, it will prove valuable to the research community to increase
174 interdisciplinary collaborations between pathology- and mutualism-researchers to share
175 expertise, test the robustness of growth-promoting interactions and better reflect natural
176 systems (Saikkonen et al., 2020; Belestrini, 2021; Wippel, 2023; Lebreton and Keller, 2024).
177 Is it worthwhile for researchers from different disciplines to work independently towards the
178 same goal, rather than combining efforts to expedite progress? Despite its benefits, studying
179 multiple, concurrent symbionts does come with a trade-off; losing the in-depth resolution
180 gained from single-symbiont/single-plant systems. Whilst reduced systems are of great
181 benefit for academic insights, they may not yield suitable applied outcomes and relevance if
182 they omit field-scenarios. This is particularly important for projects focused on food security,
183 rather than academic outputs. Isolated laboratory research may strongly emphasize certain
184 phases in the mutualist’s lifecycle whilst neglecting other aspects such as interactions with the
185 wider soil micro- and pathobiome. Certainly, it is impossible to explore all potential above-
186 and below-ground interactions. However, if the goal of research is to improve the vigor of a
187 specific crop, prioritizing the interactions most relevant to the intended environment should
188 be a key focus. The inevitable occurrence of such interactions *in natura* should promote their
189 investigation in academic research, thereby increasing the efficiency of impactful outcomes.

190 Expediting research towards field-based experiments or reversing the traditional approach to
191 initiate studies in natural environments, may be beneficial for quickly assessing the efficacy of
192 amendments/mutualists in nature, rather than confirming their efficacy in controlled, artificial
193 scenarios. Retrospective studies could then determine the field factors that negated the
194 desired outcomes. Of course, this inevitably would include much more variability and many

195 influencing factors that are not present in controlled glasshouse studies, however that is
196 precisely why this may be favorable. Studies have shown that this approach can reveal that
197 the co-presence of pathogens is highly linked to a reduced fungi-induced benefits (Lutz et al.,
198 2023), and also surprisingly highlight that many commercially available fungal inocula that are
199 often used in laboratory studies simply do not colonize in the field through species
200 incompatibility or even non-viable propagules (Salomon et al., 2022). This renders their use in
201 glasshouse studies somewhat redundant. Furthermore, if field benefits are the ultimate goal,
202 inoculating soils with multiple, reportedly beneficial mutualists may be a promising “shotgun”
203 approach leveraging their synergistic effects to enhance plant growth beyond what single
204 inocula can achieve (Afkhami et al., 2021). It is known that certain mutualists and pathogens
205 may also enter their host through existing wounds (secondary infection) (Jones et al., 2013),
206 therefore incorporating these possibilities into the experimental system may enhance its field
207 relevance. Furthermore, historically, there has been a separation between researchers
208 studying either the agricultural or ecological relevance of AM fungi. It would seemingly be
209 beneficial to foster collaboration between these different AM fungal disciplines, as the
210 integration of both areas of research would greatly contribute to significant outcomes.

211 **Conclusions**

212 In summary, the increased susceptibility of fungal-colonized hosts to pathogens has
213 implications for the role of fungal mutualists in soil amendments, as their actions in natural
214 settings can indirectly lead to significant negative consequences. Similarly, a disruption of
215 plant-AM fungal resource exchange is known to be triggered by pathogens, potentially
216 resulting in long-term consequences on mutualist populations and function within the wider
217 soil community. A final layer of complexity is added by pathogens potentially providing
218 mutualist-like benefits at low population densities. Therefore, we summarize that, while
219 numerous studies highlight the positive outcomes of plant-fungal mutualist interactions, these
220 benefits often diminish or even become detrimental when tested in field scenarios or in the
221 presence of field pathogens. This is especially prevalent in the case of PPNs, as recent research
222 demonstrates paradigm shifts, as discussed above. However, it is highly likely that this also
223 applies to other types of plant field pathogens. In this context, it might be incorrect that the
224 prevailing definition of a plant mutualist focuses solely on the one-on-one interaction, without
225 necessarily considering the holistic host biome. Therefore, we acknowledge that drawing
226 overall conclusions is challenging, as it requires careful consideration of the interactions and
227 biology of multiple organisms, both among themselves and within highly variable
228 environments. However, to produce robust and field relevant research that enhances food
229 security measures, we must collaborate amongst plant science disciplines and expedite
230 experimental systems-based research rather than closed artificial environments.

231

232 **Acknowledgements**

233 C.A.B. is supported by a BBSRC Discovery Fellowship (BB/X009823/1). For the purpose of open
234 access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license to any Author
235 Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

236 **References**

- 237 Ahmed, A.M., Mahmoud, B.K., Millán-Aguiñaga, N., Abdelmohsen, U.R., Fouad M.A. 2023. The
238 endophytic fusarium strains: a treasure trove of natural products. *RSC Advances*, 13(2), 1339–69.
239 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D2RA04126J>
- 240 Alvarado-Herrejon, M., Larsen, J., Gavito, M.E., Jaramillo-López, P.F., Vestberg, M., Martínez-Trujillo,
241 M., Carreón-Abud, Y. 2019. Relation between arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, root-lesion nematodes and
242 soil characteristics in maize agroecosystems. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 135, 1-8.
243 [10.1016/j.apsoil.2018.10.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2018.10.019)
- 244 Balestrini, R. 2021. Grand Challenges in Fungi-Plant Interactions. *Frontiers in Fungal Biology*, 2, 750003.
245 <https://doi.org/10.3389/ffunb.2021.750003>
- 246 Bell, C. A., Magkourilou, E., Ault, J. R., Urwin, P. E., & Field, K. J. 2024. Phytophagy impacts the quality
247 and quantity of plant carbon resources acquired by mutualistic arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Nature*
248 *Communications* 2024 15, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-45026-3>
- 249 Bell, C. A., Magkourilou, E., Barker, H., Barker, A., Urwin, P. E., & Field, K. J. 2023. Arbuscular mycorrhizal
250 fungal-induced tolerance is determined by fungal identity and pathogen density. *Plants, People, Planet*,
251 5, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1002/PPP3.10338>
- 252 Bell, C. A., Magkourilou, E., Field, K. J., & Urwin, P. E. 2023. Sequence of introduction determines the
253 success of contrasting root symbionts and their host. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 182, 104733.
254 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APSOIL.2022.104733>
- 255 Bell, C. A., Magkourilou, E., Urwin, P. E., & Field, K. J. 2022. Disruption of carbon for nutrient exchange
256 between potato and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi enhanced cyst nematode fitness and host pest
257 tolerance. *New Phytologist*, 234, 269–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17958>
- 258 Bronstein, J.L. 2001. The exploitation of mutualisms. *Ecology Letters* 4, 277–287.
259 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2001.00218.x>
- 260 Bunn, R.A., Corrêa, A., Joshi, J., Kaiser, C., Lekberg, Y., Prescott, C.E., Sala, A., Karst, J. 2024. What
261 determines transfer of carbon from plants to mycorrhizal fungi? *New Phytologist*, 244: 1199-1215. doi:
262 [10.1111/nph.20145](https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.20145). Epub 2024 Oct 1. PMID: 39352455.
- 263 Cameron, D. D., Neal, A. L., Van Wees, S. C. M., & Ton, J. 2013. Mycorrhiza-induced resistance: more
264 than the sum of its parts? *Trends in Plant Science*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2013.06.004>
- 265 Charters, M. D., Sait, S. M., & Field, K. J. 2020. Aphid herbivory drives asymmetry in carbon for nutrient
266 exchange between plants and an arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus. *Current Biology*, 30, 10.
267 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.02.087>
- 268 Daneshkhah, R., Cabello, S., Rozanska, E., Sobczak, M., Grundler, F.M.W., Wieczorek, K., Hofmann, J.
269 2013. *Piriformospora indica* antagonizes cyst nematode infection and development in Arabidopsis
270 roots. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 64, 3763–3774. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/ert213>

271 Domka, A. M., Rozpaqdek, P., & Turnau, K. 2019. Are fungal endophytes merely mycorrhizal copycats?
272 The role of fungal endophytes in the adaptation of plants to metal toxicity. *Frontiers in Microbiology*,
273 437564. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FMICB.2019.00371/BIBTEX>

274 Durant, E., Hoysted, G. A., Howard, N., Sait, S. M., Childs, D. Z., Johnson, D., & Field, K. J. 2023.
275 Herbivore-driven disruption of arbuscular mycorrhizal carbon-for-nutrient exchange is ameliorated by
276 neighboring plants. *Current Biology*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2023.05.033>

277 Elling, A. A. 2013. Major Emerging Problems with Minor *Meloidogyne* Species. *Phytopathology*, 103,
278 11. <https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-01-13-0019-RVW>

279 European Commission. 2020a. A new Circular Economy Action Plan: For a cleaner and more
280 competitive Europe (COM/2020/98 final). [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0098)
281 [content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0098](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0098)

282 European Commission. 2020b. A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly
283 food system (COM/2020/381 final). [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0381)
284 [content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0381](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0381)

285 European Commission. 2020c. EU biodiversity strategy for 2030: Bringing nature back into our lives
286 (COM/2020/380 final). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0380>

287 European Commission. 2021. Pathway to a Healthy Planet for All. EU Action Plan: Towards Zero
288 Pollution for Air, Water and Soil (COM/2021/400 final). [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0400)
289 [content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0400](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0400)

290 FAO. 2020. International Year of Plant Health 2020 | FAO | *Food and Agriculture Organization of the*
291 *United Nations*. <https://www.fao.org/plant-health-2020/about/en/>

292 Franken, P. 2012. The plant strengthening root endophyte *Piriformospora indica*: potential application
293 and the biology behind. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 96, 1455–1464. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-012-4506-1)
294 [1007/s00253-012-4506-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-012-4506-1)

295 Frew, A., Powell, J.R., Glauser, G., Bennett, A.E., Johnson, S.N. 2018. Mycorrhizal fungi enhance nutrient
296 uptake but disarm defences in plant roots, promoting plant parasitic nematode populations. *Soil*
297 *Biology and Biochemistry*, 126, 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2018.08.019>

298 Frew, A., Weinberger, N., Powell, J. R., Watts-Williams, S. J., & Aguilar-Trigueros, C. A. 2024. Community
299 assembly of root-colonizing arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi: beyond carbon and into defence? *The ISME*
300 *Journal*, 18, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ISMEJO/WRAE007>

301 Gianinazzi, S., Gollotte, A. Binet, M.N., van Tuinen, D., Redecker, D., Wipf, D. 2010. Agroecology: the
302 key role of arbuscular mycorrhizas in ecosystem services. *Mycorrhiza*, 20, 519–530.
303 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00572-010-0333-3>

304 Gill, S.S., Gill, R., Trivedi, D.K., Anjum, N.A., Sharma, K.K., Ansari, M.W., Ansari, A.A., Johri, A.K., Prasad,
305 R., Pereira, E., Varma, A., Tuteja, N. 2016. *Piriformospora indica*: Potential and significance in plant
306 stress tolerance. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, 332. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00332>

307 Grabka, R., D'entremont, T. W., Adams, S. J., Walker, A. K., Tanney, J. B., Abbasi, P. A., & Ali, S. 2022.
308 Fungal Endophytes and Their Role in Agricultural Plant Protection against Pests and Pathogens. *Plants*,
309 11, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3390/PLANTS11030384>

310 Guarneri, N., Schwelm, A., Goverse, A. & Smant, G. 2024. Switching perspectives: the roles of plant
311 cellular reprogramming during nematode parasitism. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 47, 2325–2333.
312 <https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14859>

313 Helber, N., Wippel, K., Sauer, N., Schaarschmidt, S., Hause, B., & Requena, N. 2011. A versatile
314 monosaccharide transporter that operates in the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *Glomus sp* is crucial
315 for the symbiotic relationship with plants. *Plant Cell*, 23, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.111.089813>

316 Jones J. T, Haegeman A, Danchin E. G, Gaur H. S, Helder J, Jones M. G, Kikuchi T, Manzanilla-López R,
317 Palomares-Rius J. E, Wesemael W. M, Perry R. N. 2013. Top 10 plant-parasitic nematodes in molecular
318 plant pathology. *Mol Plant Pathol*. 149, 946-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mpp.12057>.

319 Kadam, S. B., Pable, A. A., & Barvkar, V. T. 2020. Mycorrhiza induced resistance (MIR): a defence
320 developed through synergistic engagement of phytohormones, metabolites and rhizosphere.
321 *Functional Plant Biology*, 47, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1071/FP20035>

322 Lebreton, A. & Keller, J. 2024. At the root of plant symbioses: untangling the genetic mechanisms
323 behind mutualistic associations. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 77, 102448.
324 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2023.102448>

325 Luginbuehl, L. H., Menard, G. N., Kurup, S., Van Erp, H., Radhakrishnan, G. V., Breakspear, A., Oldroyd,
326 G. E. D., & Eastmond, P. J. 2017. Fatty acids in arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi are synthesized by the host
327 plant. *Science*, 356, 6343. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan0081>

328 Lutz, S., Bodenhausen, N., Hess, J., Valzano-Held, A., Waelchli, J., Deslandes-Héroid, G., Schlaeppli, K.,
329 & van der Heijden, M. G. A. 2023. Soil microbiome indicators can predict crop growth response to
330 large-scale inoculation with arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Nature Microbiology*, 8, 12.
331 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-023-01520-w>

332 Marro, N., Caccia, M., Doucet, M.E., Cabello, M., Becerra, A., Lax, P. 2018. Mycorrhizas reduce tomato
333 root penetration by false root-knot nematode *Nacobbus aberrans*. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 124, 262-265.
334 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2017.11.011>

335 Martinez-Medina, A., Flors, V., Heil, M., Mauch-Mani, B., Pieterse, C. M. J., Pozo, M. J., Ton, J., van Dam,
336 N. M., & Conrath, U. 2016. Recognizing Plant Defense Priming. *Trends in Plant Science*, 21, 10.
337 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TPLANTS.2016.07.009>

338 Miozzi, L., Vaira, A. M., Catoni, M., Fiorilli, V., Accotto, G. P., & Lanfranco, L. 2019. Arbuscular
339 Mycorrhizal Symbiosis: Plant Friend or Foe in the Fight Against Viruses? *Frontiers in Microbiology*,
340 <https://doi.org/10.3389/FMICB.2019.01238>

341 Opitz, M., Daneshkhah, R., Lorenz, C., Ludwig, R., Steinkellner, S., Wieczorek, K. (2021) *Serendipita*
342 *indica* changes host sugar and defense status in *Arabidopsis thaliana*: cooperation or exploitation?
343 *Planta*, 253, 74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-021-03587-3>

344 Opitz, M. W., Díaz-Manzano, F. E., Ruiz-Ferrer, V., Daneshkhah, R., Ludwig, R., Lorenz, C., Escobar, C.,
345 Steinkellner, S., & Wiczorek, K. 2024. The other side of the coin: systemic effects of *Serendipita indica*
346 root colonization on development of sedentary plant–parasitic nematodes in *Arabidopsis thaliana*.
347 *Planta*, 259, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00425-024-04402-5>

348 Pires, D., Vicente, C. S. L., Menéndez, E., Faria, J. M. S., Rusinque, L., Camacho, M. J., & Inácio, M. L.
349 2022. The Fight against Plant-Parasitic Nematodes: Current Status of Bacterial and Fungal Biocontrol
350 Agents. *Pathogens*, 11, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/PATHOGENS11101178>

351 Porter, S. S., Bantay, R., Friel, C. A., Garoutte, A., Gdanetz, K., Ibarreta, K., Moore, B. M., Shetty, P., Siler,
352 E., & Friesen, M. L. 2020. Beneficial microbes ameliorate abiotic and biotic sources of stress on plants.
353 *Functional Ecology*, 34, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13499/SUPPINFO>

354 Poveda, J., Eugui, D., Abril-Urías, P., Velasco, P. 2021. Endophytic fungi as direct plant growth
355 promoters for sustainable agricultural production. *Symbiosis* 85, 1–19.
356 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13199-021-00789-x>

357 Ryan, M. H., & Graham, J. H. 2018. Little evidence that farmers should consider abundance or diversity
358 of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi when managing crops. *New Phytologist*, 220, 4.
359 <https://doi.org/10.1111/NPH.15308>

360 Saikkonen, K., Nissinen, R., Helander, M. 2020. Toward Comprehensive Plant Microbiome Research.
361 *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 8, 61. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2020.00061>

362 Saleem, S., Ragasova, L. N., Tekielska, D., Fidurski, M., Sekara, A., & Pokluda, R. 2023. *Serendipita indica*
363 as a Plant Growth Promoter and Biocontrol Agent against Black Rot Disease in Cabbage Grown in a
364 Phytotron. *Agriculture*, 13, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/AGRICULTURE13112048>

365 Salomon, M. J., Demarmels, R., Watts-Williams, S. J., McLaughlin, M. J., Kafle, A., Ketelsen, C., Soupir,
366 A., Bücking, H., Cavagnaro, T. R., & van der Heijden, M. G. A. 2022. Global evaluation of commercial
367 arbuscular mycorrhizal inoculants under greenhouse and field conditions. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 169,
368 104225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APSOIL.2021.104225>

369 Schouteden, N., Waele, D. De, Panis, B., & Vos, C. M. 2015. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi for the
370 biocontrol of plant-parasitic nematodes: A review of the mechanisms involved. *Frontiers in*
371 *Microbiology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01280>

372 Topalović, O. & Geisen, S. 2023. Nematodes as suppressors and facilitators of plant performance. *New*
373 *Phytologist*, 238, 2305-2312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.18925>

374 Tseng, Y.-H., Rouina, H., Groten, K., Rajani, P., Furch, A. C., Reichelt, M., *et al.* 2020. An endophytic
375 Trichoderma strain promotes growth of its hosts and defends against pathogen attack. *Frontiers in*
376 *Plant Science*, 11, 573670. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.573670>

377 van der Heijden, M. G. A., Martin, F. M., Selosse, M. A., & Sanders, I. R. 2015. Mycorrhizal ecology and
378 evolution: the past, the present, and the future. *New Phytologist*, 205, 4.
379 <https://doi.org/10.1111/NPH.13288>

380 Vos, C.M., Tesfahun, A.N., Panis, B., de Waele, D., Elsen, A. 2012a. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi induce
381 systemic resistance in tomato against the sedentary nematode *Meloidogyne incognita* and the

382 migratory nematode *Pratylenchus penetrans*. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 61, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01280>
383

384 Vos, C.M., Claerhout, S., Mkandawire, R., Panis, B., de Waele, D., Elsen, A. 2012b. Arbuscular
385 mycorrhizal fungi reduce root-knot nematode penetration through altered root exudation of their
386 host. *Plant Soil*, 354, 335–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00572-011-0422-y>

387 Vos, C.M., van den Broucke, D., Lombi, F.M., de Waele, D., Elsen, A. 2012c. Mycorrhiza-induced
388 resistance in banana acts on nematode host location and penetration. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*,
389 47, 60–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.12.027>

390 Vos, C.M., Schouteden, N., van Tuinen, D., Chatagnier, O., Elsen, A., de Waele, D., Panis, B., Gianinazzi-
391 Pearson, V. 2013. Mycorrhiza-induced resistance against the root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne*
392 *incognita* involves priming of defense gene responses in tomato. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 60, 45–
393 54. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01280>

394 Vosatka, M., & Dodd, J.C. 2002. Ecological considerations for successful application of arbuscular
395 mycorrhizal fungi inoculum. *Mycorrhizal Technology in Agriculture*, 235–247.
396 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-8117-3_19

397 Wang, Y. J., & Wu, Q. S. 2023. Influence of sugar metabolism on the dialogue between arbuscular
398 mycorrhizal fungi and plants. *Horticulture Advances*, 1, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S44281-023-00001-8>
399

400 Weiß, M., Sýkorov, Z., Garnica, S., Riess, K., Martos, F., Krause, C., Oberwinkler, F., Bauer, R., Redecker,
401 D. 2011. Sebaciales everywhere: previously overlooked ubiquitous fungal endophytes. *PLoS ONE*
402 6:e16793. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016793>

403 Wilkinson, T. D. J., Ferrari, J., Hartley, S. E., & Hodge, A. 2019. Aphids can acquire the nitrogen delivered
404 to plants by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Functional Ecology*, 33, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13283/SUPPINFO>
405

406 Wippel, K. 2023. Plant and microbial features governing an endophytic lifestyle. *Current Opinion in*
407 *Plant Biology*, 76, 102483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2023.102483>.