

# Harnessing exogenous membrane vesicles for studying *Fusarium circinatum* and its biofilm communities

Thabiso E Motaung (✉ [thabiso.motaung@up.ac.za](mailto:thabiso.motaung@up.ac.za))

University of Pretoria <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8813-7671>

Francinah M Ratsoma

University of Pretoria <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0305-1327>

Sithembile Kunene

University of Pretoria <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8151-0883>

Quentin C Santana

Agricultural Research Council <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1178-2533>

Emma T Steenkamp

University of Pretoria <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0217-8219>

Brenda D Wingfield

University of Pretoria <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6189-1519>

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** Biofilm architecture, Extracellular matrix, Extracellular vesicles (EVs), *F. circinatum*, Fungal biofilms

**Posted Date:** October 24th, 2023

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3473973/v1>

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

[Read Full License](#)

---

# Abstract

Extracellular vesicles (EVs) are tiny messengers that convey bioactive molecules from donor to recipient cells, leading to changes in their physiology and function. We investigated the role of EVs in shaping growth and the biofilm biology of the tree pathogen *Fusarium circinatum* and its interaction with the susceptible host, *Pinus patula*. Vesicles were collected from fungal planktonic and biofilm cultures and from pine seedling needles and roots. The physical properties of these vesicles were analysed using nanoparticle tracking analysis and transmission electron microscopy, which revealed a diverse range of sizes and shapes, respectively. Furthermore, uptake of vesicles by conidia demonstrated that *F. circinatum* EVs significantly but variably affected spore viability during the early phase (2-4 h) although they enhanced biomass and extracellular matrix (ECM) production in biofilms. In contrast, *P. patula* EVs greatly inhibited hyphal formation and biofilm biomass, but failed to inhibit ECM biosynthesis in the fungal biofilm. Our results therefore suggest that conidial germination is essential for late fungal development including hyphal and biofilm formation while matrix production may be a counter measure against harsh environmental conditions including the effects of plant-derived EVs. Therefore, plant-microbe interactions viewed within the context of biofilm formation can improve understanding into the dynamic and complex behaviours of fungal pathogens and their interactions with plant hosts.

## Introduction

Extracellular vesicles (EVs) have intrigued researchers in most biological disciplines due to their diverse and important roles (1). Many laboratories are increasingly exploring the role of these entities as transporters of bioactive cargo to recipient cells and their influence on the recipients' cellular behaviour. When eukaryotic EVs bud inwardly or outwardly from the parent cell (respectively forming exosomes or microvesicles), they engulf payloads that include proteins and nucleic acids (DNAs, miRNAs, siRNAs, and lncRNAs). The cargo is then delivered to the recipient cell through membrane fusion (1) and or clathrin-mediated endocytosis (2, 3). Because of this, EVs can orchestrate coordinated responses among cells, organs, and even entire organisms (1, 2, 4–6). Their role also extent to biofilms where they are crucial for cellular communication (7–14), likely by mediating synergistic and antagonistic interactions among inhabitants (15).

As with EVs, the varied biological traits associated with biofilms have garnered significant research interest from the scientific community (16). This is particularly true for the yeast and bacterial pathogens of humans and animal, where biofilm formation is often integral to infection and disease development (17–20). Although this growth form has been investigated in certain bacterial pathogens of plants (21), relatively little is known about biofilm formation in the filamentous fungal pathogens of plants (16, 22). This is despite the widely held notion that all microbes can grow while attached to surfaces, thereby forming complex communities embedded in self-produced slimy extracellular matrix (ECM) (23, 24). The latter is a biofilm's major structural constituent and is made up largely of extracellular polymeric substances comprising of organic polymers such as carbohydrates, extracellular DNA, lipids, and proteins (24). Because the ECM also contain EVs, it is essentially involved in various complex and intricate

processes within the biofilm ecosystem (24). In addition to accounting for much of the characteristic 3D architecture of a biofilm, ECM is thus also responsible for a biofilm's emergent properties, which include physical and social interactions, chemical heterogeneity, and greater tolerance to chemical and environmental stresses (25).

Here we explored the role of EVs and biofilm formation in the interaction of the filamentous fungus *Fusarium circinatum* (Ascomycota, Nectriaceae) with its *Pinus* (Plantae, Pinaceae) host. This fungus is the causal agent Pine Pitch Canker, which annually causes substantial economic losses wherever pine species are cultivated commercially (26). In production nurseries, it causes devastating root and root collar disease of seedlings, which often hampers the establishment of new plantations (27) (28–30). In established plantations or natural stands, the pathogen causes large resinous cankers on tree trunks and branches, leading to branch die-back, stunted growth and overall yield reductions (31). Although some nurseries utilize antifungal treatments for controlling *F. circinatum*-associated seedling disease, the pathogen is mostly controlled using standard nursery and silvicultural practices, with the most efficient strategy involving deployment of resistant planting stock (31, 32).

In addition to growing as free-living mycelium (i.e., planktonic growth form/mycelium free of the ECM), *F. circinatum* can also grow as biofilms in which ECM-embedded mycelia form compact mat-like colonies (33). This is similar to reports from other notable *Fusarium* species, where biofilm formation appears to provide the pathogen protection against environmental stresses and the plant host's defence responses (34, 34). Although the role of biofilm formation during the pine-*F. circinatum* interaction is currently unknown, biofilms of the pathogen is more resistant to environmental stresses (33). In this fungus, enhanced biofilm formation and increased ECM production during exposure to fungicide or elevated treatments (33) might thus also point to an adaptation for dealing with pine's defence response. Here we further explored this hypothesis by bringing pine and fungus-derived EVs into consideration.

Our aim was therefore to examine how ECM production and biofilm formation by *F. circinatum* influences its responses to EVs produced by itself and by pine. Overall, our findings highlighted an EV-mediated complex interaction by both the planktonic and biofilm states of the fungus with the plant host. Understanding the involvement of EVs in *F. circinatum* communication biology will contribute a foundational step for probing deeper into the impact of vesicles on the regulation of interactions among tree pathogens, as well as their interactions with host organisms.

## Materials and Methods

### Isolate and growth conditions

We sourced isolate FSP34 of *F. circinatum* (35) from the *Fusarium* collection of the Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI; University of Pretoria, South Africa). For routine culturing, the fungus was incubated on potato dextrose agar (PDA; 10 g/L; Merck Group) in darkness at 25°C for 7 days. For obtaining conidia, a 7-day-old culture was flooded with 2 mL of 0.2 M phosphate-buffered

saline (PBS) consisting of 10 mM  $\text{NaH}_2\text{PO}_4$ , 10 mM  $\text{Na}_2\text{HPO}_4$ , and 150 mM NaCl at pH 7.2. Following collection with a sterile pipette, the Countess 3 Automated Cell Counter (ThermoFisher Scientific) was used to quantify the concentration of the spore suspension.

#### Isolation and quantification of EVs from fungal and plant tissue

Fungal EVs were isolated from 72 hour planktonic and biofilm cultures were prepared in 200 mL potato dextrose broth (PDB; 10 g/L; Merck Group). This involved sequential centrifugation steps (4,000  $g$  for 15 min and 15,000  $g$  for 30 min at 4°C) for pelleting fungal tissue, after which the supernatant was passed through a 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  membrane filter (Merck Millipore) to eliminate any remaining cells or debris. By making use of the Amicon Ultra-4 Centrifugal system (100-kDa pore size, Millipore), the supernatant was concentrated to approximately 20 mL. The concentrated supernatant was then subjected to ultracentrifugation (100,000 $\times$   $g$  for 1 hour at 4°C) using Beckman Coulter equipment. The supernatant was discarded, and the EV-enriched pellet was washed twice with PBS at 100,000 $\times$   $g$  for 1 hour at 4°C. Finally, the EV pellet was stored in PBS at 4°C until further use.

Isolation of EVs from the roots and needles of *P. patula* seedlings were performed as previously described (36). Briefly, a total of two healthy seedlings per isolation were used, whereby entire leaves and roots were rinsed and weighed, and distal zones of needles and roots from the same plant were collected. After removing excess water, the plant material was ground using a pestle and mortar in the presence of vesicle isolation buffer containing 5.9 g/L NaCl, 0.002 g/L  $\text{CaCl}_2$ , and 4.3 g/L 2-(N-Morpholino)ethanesulfonic acid hydrate (MES hydrate). This homogenate was filtered by passing it through a cheesecloth, and then centrifuged for 20 min at 700  $\times$   $g$  at 4°C to separate the extracts. Concentrated EVs obtained using the Amicon Ultra-4 Centrifugal system (100-kDa pore size) were then subjected to size-exclusion chromatography (SEC) as described previously (36, 37). This involved application of a mixture containing EVs with a cell membrane-specific dye (FM4-64; Thermo Fisher Scientific) to a Sepharose CL-2B column. Fractions with fluorescence above 3.0 RFU were pooled as "EV signal" after measurement.

#### Analyses of the general properties of vesicles

The general features of the extracted EVs were studied using electron microscopy and nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA). Purified EVs were spotted onto carbon-coated grids for adsorption for 5 min, negatively stained with 1% (w/v) uranyl acetate for 3 min and subjected to transmission electron microscopy (TEM) using the JEM-2100F Field Emission Electron Microscope (JOEL Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) was carried out as previously described (38) for planktonic cells and biofilms in order to observe EV-like structures on the surface of the cells. Briefly, after culturing fungal biofilms on glass slides, the samples were rinsed with PBS and treated with a 2.5% glutaraldehyde/formaldehyde solution (), followed by fixation with 1% osmium tetroxide. Subsequent dehydration steps using graded ethanol concentrations (30%, 50%, 70%, 90%, and absolute ethanol) and a 50:50 mixture of hexamethyldisilazane (HMDS) were performed. The dried samples were mounted on

aluminum stubs, carbon-coated (Quorum Q150T ES sputter coater), and observed using a JEOL JSM 6490LV scanning electron microscope (GenTech Scientific Inc., Arcade, NY, USA). For NTA, 5 mL of an EV suspension was vortexed for 1 minute, and diluted with PBS to a total of 10 mL, of which 1.5 mL was immediately analysed with the NanoSight NS500 (Malvern Panalytical, UK) in triplicate (each run = 30 s video). PBS was treated as a blank. The videos were captured and analysed using the NanoSight NTA software (NTA 3.3 Dev Build 3.3.104, Malvern Panalytical, UK). The camera sensitivity and detection threshold were optimized per video, and the temperature was set at 22°C. We further determined the concentrations of EVs derived from planktonic cells (p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs), biofilms (bdEVs), and pine seedling needles (ndEVs) and roots (rdEVs) based on protein content using the QuantiPro™ BCA Assay Kit (Merck) following manufacturer's instructions.

### Evaluating the effects of EVs on conidial germination and biofilm formation

The analyses of the effects of EV on conidial viability and germination, as well as biofilm formation were conducted using previously published methodologies (39–41). To achieve this, two sets of experiments were performed using PDB. In the one experiment, EVs (p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs, bdEVs, and pdEVs) were co-incubated with conidia to a final concentration of  $5 \times 10^5$  spores/mL and 15 µg/ml EVs at room temperature 16 h while shaking (100 rpm, Shake-O-Mat, Labotec South Africa). Following this, cultures treated and not treated with EVs were examined using an automated cell counter (Countess 3 FL, Thermo Fisher Scientific) that incorporates Trypan Blue staining that selectively colours dead cells blue, distinguishing them from viable ones. We also observed the cultures between 2 and 24 h following shaking using a haemocytometer to determine the number of germ tubes emerging from viable conidia. In the second experiment, all types of EVs isolated were co-incubated with conidia as before, but incubated statically to allow biofilm formation, after which biomass and ECM were analysed as described above at 72 h and 7 days. Biofilms formed without EV treatments were treated as a positive control, while a negative control included PDB with EVs only and EVs that were heat-inactivated in PDB at 90°C for 15 minutes.

### Biofilm biomass and ECM quantification

Biofilm and planktonic cultures were grown as described previously (38) using either 96-well polystyrene plates (Greiner bio-one, South Africa) or 500 mL pyrex Erlenmeyer flasks (Merck, South Africa). In case of the 96-well plates, conidia were suspended to a final concentration of  $2 \times 10^5$  spores/mL in 400 µL PDB, followed by incubation at room temperature for 72 h and 7 days under stationary conditions to allow biofilm formation. Planktonic cell cultures were grown in the same way in these plates, except that they were incubated on a shaker (100 rpm, Shake-O-Mat, Labotec South Africa). In case of the Erlenmeyer flasks, we inoculated 200 mL of PDB with conidia to a final concentration of  $1 \times 10^6$  spores/mL, followed by incubation at room temperature for 72 hours on an orbital shaker at 100 rpm for the planktonic cultures or statically for the biofilm cultures.

Biomass and ECM analysis of planktonic and biofilm (72 and 7 days) cultures of FSP34 in 96-well polystyrene plates were conducted as before (38). Briefly, biofilms were then rinsed with PBS to remove

non-adherent cells, while planktonic cells were collected by centrifugation (10000 *g* for 10 min) and rinsed the same as the biofilms. Cells were then fixed with methanol and air-dried, followed by respectively crystal violet and fuchsin staining (38). The former allows visualization of fungal cells alongside certain components within the biofilm matrix, while the latter allows for visualization and distribution of polysaccharides in the matrix. We then used a spectrophotometer (SpectraMax paradigm, Multimode detection platform) to quantify biomass (540 nm) and ECM production (530 nm).

#### Morphological analyses of fungal cells exposed to vesicles

We further aimed to determine whether vesicles have potential long-term effects on *F. circinatum*. To do this, a conidial suspension ( $5 \times 10^5$  spores/mL) was pre-treated with 5 µg/mL p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs and bdEVs, as well as 15 µg/mL ndEVs and rdEVs for 24 h. The pre-treated spores were then allowed to grow for 7 days at room temperature on triplicate PDA plates (Merck, Modderfontein GP, South Africa; 4g/L Potato Infusion, 20 g/L D(+)-Glucose), and 15 g/L agar). Following this, mycelial growth was quantified from by measuring the diameter of colonies after 3, 7, and 14 days. In addition, a loopful of cells taken from the periphery of a 7-day-old and 14-day-old culture and analysed using a light microscope at 10x magnification.

#### Reproducibility and statistical analyses

All experimental data, unless specified otherwise, were subjected to one-way ANOVA or non-parametric Student's t-test for comparison. Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad statistical software (GraphPad 5 Software, San Diego, CA, USA). The level of significance was determined through the representation of mean  $\pm$  Standard Deviation (SD) and defined using probability thresholds: \*,  $P \leq 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P \leq 0.002$ ; \*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.0001$ . In most cases, each experiment was conducted with three technical replicates and five biological replicates, unless stated otherwise. Additionally, all experiments included both positive and negative controls to assess the validity and reliability of the experimental results.

## Results

#### Pine and *Fusarium circinatum*-derived EVs have diverse sizes and shapes

We employed NTA and TEM analysis to investigate the physical properties of EVs derived from *F. circinatum* planktonic and biofilm cultures, as well as from *P. patula* roots and needles. The EVs from all these sources exhibited a range of sizes and various shapes, including spherical, rosette, and cup-shaped (Fig. 1a-d). NTA measurements indicated that *F. circinatum* EVs ranged in size from 100 to *ca.* 400 nm (Fig. 2a), while *P. patula* EVs ranged in size from 5 to *ca.* 300 nm (Fig. 2b). Furthermore, SEM analysis of the *F. circinatum* biofilms showed the presence of EV-like structures on the surface of hyphal cells, which appeared to be budding from the plasma membrane (Fig. 1c). The EVs of *P. patula* displayed a distinct outer layer with low density and an inner compartment with high density (Fig. 1d), consistent with previous studies (21, 24).

## Pine-derived EVs inhibit germination of *F. circinatum* conidia

We investigated the influence of pine-derived EVs on the germination of *F. circinatum* conidia. This was done by first examining the effect of these EVs (pdEVs) on spore viability using Trypan blue, which stains dead cells blue, distinguishing them from live cells (unstained). We found that exposure to ndEVs and rdEVs led to a reduction in spore viability, primarily noticeable after 2 h of incubation, with the former having a more pronounced effect relative to the latter (Fig. 3a-b). Additionally, these EVs also inhibited germ tube formation to varying degrees depending on time of exposure and EV concentration. In the case of ndEVs, the inhibition of conidial germination was more pronounced at higher EV concentrations at the earlier (4 h, 8 h) time points (Fig. 3c), while rdEVs exerted their inhibitory effects at all concentrations at all time points after 4 h (Fig. 3d). This time and dose-dependent inhibition suggests that the pine-derived EVs gradually impair germ tube development, pointing towards a role in regulating the early stages of fungal growth. Intriguingly, at a lower concentration (5 µg/mL), ndEVs appeared to promote conidial germination (Fig. 3c;  $P \leq 0.002$ ). Taken together, our results indicate that ndEVs and rdEVs from *P. patula* have dynamic effects on *F. circinatum* spore viability and germ tube formation, with the potential to impact the early stages of fungal growth and development

## Pine-derived EVs inhibit mycelial growth of *F. circinatum*

Fungal cultures established from conidial suspensions that were first co-incubated with pine-derived EVs grew significantly slower on PDA than those grown from untreated conidia (Fig. 4a). This inhibitory effect was evident for both ndEVs and rdEVs after 14 days of growth on PDA, suggesting that these vesicles have effects on fungal growth lasting for at least two weeks. In addition to the effects of pdEVs on fungal growth, our plate assay results also indicated that pdEVs greatly reduced pigmentation in fungal colonies, with EV-exposed colonies showing an orange colour compared to a violet/dark purple colour in the control groups at 3 days. Radial growth was also measured in order to quantify the effects of vesicles on hyphal growth on agar plates. The results confirmed what we observed in terms of hyphal growth by *F. circinatum* colonies of cells exposed to vesicles (Fig. 4b). Further corroborating this data, was the highly reduced hyphal density in cells taken from a 7-day- and 14-day-old culture exposed to EVs (Fig. 4c), suggesting that the observed effects on colony morphology had a cellular origin. Taken together, these results support the idea that pine-derived EVs inhibit mycelial growth of *F. circinatum*.

## Pine-derived EVs negatively impact biofilm biomass in *F. circinatum*

A 24 h exposure of fungal spores to pine-derived EVs also significantly influenced biofilm formation in *F. circinatum* (Fig. 5). When conidial suspensions that were first co-incubated with pine-derived EVs were grown statically in PDB, we observed a significant inhibitory effect on biofilm biomass production, with rdEVs showing a more potent impact across all concentrations (Fig. 5a-b). Taken together, this data suggests that pine-derived EVs can reduce the size of a biofilm, which further support their inhibitory effects on spore germination and hyphal growth (Fig. 4).

## Pine-derived EVs fail to inhibit matrix production in *F. circinatum* biofilms

ECM production was inhibited only by the rdEV treatment in the 72-h-old biofilm, however, neither ndEVs nor rdEVs appeared to impair ECM production in the older biofilm (Fig. 5c-d). Furthermore, in the older biofilms, pre-treatment with ndEVs and rdEVs both resulted in higher ECM-to-biomass ratios (Fig. 5d, Fig. 5e-f). These results collectively suggest that pine-derived EVs have no discernible impact on matrix production in biofilms, although they may possess the ability to modulate the ECM-to-biomass ratio.

### *Fusarium circinatum* EVs promote its conidial germination and biofilm formation

We investigated the influence of *F. circinatum*-derived EVs on the germination of its conidia over a 24-hour period. At the earlier time points, both p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs (2 and 4 h) and bdEVs (4 h) appeared to negatively impact conidial viability (Fig. 6a). At the later time points (16 and 24 h), significantly more viable cells were observed in the EV-exposed cultures. Notably, bdEVs exhibited a more pronounced effect ( $P \leq 0.001$ ) on cell viability compared to p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs ( $P \leq 0.002$ ) during these time intervals. This suggests that the impact of bdEVs on cell viability may be stronger and longer-lasting than that of p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs. However, unlike pdEVs, neither of the EV treatments significantly affected conidial germination (Fig. 6b). Pre-exposure to *F. circinatum*-derived EVs enhanced biofilm formation in this fungus (Fig. 7). Although the pre-treatment with p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs and bdEVs had mixed effects on biofilm biomass, the impact was marginally significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) for p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs and highly significant ( $P \leq 0.002$ ) for bdEVs (Fig. 7a). Additionally, we found that pre-treatment with both EV types, but especially bdEVs, significantly promoted ECM production (Fig. 7b). In terms of the abundance and distribution of matrix components relative to cellular biomass, we also observed a stimulatory effect of *F. circinatum*-derived EVs; for both with p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs and bdEVs, significantly higher ECM-to-biomass ratios compared to the control groups were observed (Fig. 7c-d).

## Discussion

Germ tube formation demonstrates the potential for fungi to form intricate hyphal clusters (mycelia), which are predominant in biofilms (16, 19, 22, 38, 42, 43). Furthermore, in fungi such as *C. albicans*, the transition to the hyphal form is one of the key requirements for the establishment of both infections and a fungal biofilm (40), with both spores and hyphal cells often found wrapped in the ECM (matrix) of a fungal biofilm (44). Therefore, targeting spore germination could serve as a crucial strategy in effectively combating fungal infections. Several studies have reported the potential inhibitory effects of plant cell EVs (pdEVs) against spore germination in several fungal pathogens (39, 45, 46). For instance, rdEVs of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) plants were found to inhibit spore germination in *Botrytis cinerea*, *F. oxysporum*, and *Alternaria alternata* (46). Similar findings were reported earlier using vesicles derived from a sun flower plant (39). In line with these studies, we found that *P. patula* EVs isolated from seedling needles and roots not only inhibited cell viability and germ tube formation in *F. circinatum* (Fig. 3), with rdEVs seemingly showing more inhibition than ndEVs. We also demonstrated that the inhibition of spore viability and germination results in impaired colony growth on nutrient agar and pigmentation (Fig. 4a), radial growth (Fig. 4b), and significant impairments in hyphal growth (Fig. c).

However, previous studies only investigated the impact of vesicles on spore germination and not on biofilm formation (37, 39, 45, 46), which left a gap in terms of how the host-derived EVs interact with and influence surface-associated complex community structures such as biofilms. Indeed, during biofilm formation in the presence of pdEVs, we found that rdEVs of *P. pautula* inhibited biomass of *F. circinatum* biofilms (Fig. 5a), one of the most important biofilm trait previously demonstrated to be crucial in response to abiotic factors (38). This data also suggests that spore germination may be a key step in biofilm initiation in *F. circinatum*. In *C. albicans*, a common opportunistic human fungal pathogen that forms biofilms on various surfaces (19), the initiation of biofilm formation involves germ tube and hyphal formation (47). Furthermore, many genes involved in hyphal growth also hold great significance in biofilm formation (48). However, it is important to mention that *F. circinatum* is different from *C. albicans* due to the absence of a yeast phase. This means that the *circinatum* spores serve as reproductive propagules, and if they fail to germinate, the fungus is practically dead. This contrasts with *albicans*, which can still thrive in its yeast state. Overall, our results on uptake of pdEVs by *F. circinatum* spores suggest that pdEVs have the potential to be harnessed as an effective biocontrol agent against *F. circinatum* infections.

We have also discovered that pdEVs had no impact on matrix production in *F. circinatum* biofilms (Fig. 5b-c). The matrix is a network of extracellular polymeric substances produced by fungal cells within the biofilm and has several key functions including providing structural support and protection (24). In *C. albicans*, EVs majorly influence fungal matrix production, dispersal, and antifungal resistance (7–9, 40, 41). For these reasons, we wanted to find out if vesicles of *F. circinatum* pathogen may be involved in countering the effects of pdEVs. We argued that pathogen-derived vesicles may play a crucial role in enhancing the structural integrity and protective properties of the biofilm. To achieve this goal, we looked at whether planktonic cell-derived EVs (p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs) and biofilm-derived EVs (bdEVs) can enhance matrix production in the biofilms of this fungus. Indeed, our results supported this notion, showing that, although both p<sup>kc</sup>dEVs and bdEVs showed no significant negative or positive impact on early growth (Fig. 6), they nonetheless promoted matrix production when applied to *F. circinatum* biofilms (Fig. 7). This suggests that EVs from *F. circinatum* biofilms are potentially involved in antifungal resistance, and according to a recent study, biofilms are possibly involved *F. circinatum* resistance to azole antifungals (33).

The fact that pdEVs fail to inhibit matrix production in *F. circinatum* may have serious implications for field isolates. In a recent study exploring the possibility of biofilm growth on wheat, it was predicted that fungal biofilms on plant surfaces are probably harmless (epiphytic) (49). The rationale behind this is that these biofilms experience exposure to various physical factors, such as UV light and fungicides used to combat infectious fungi, which may prompt the biofilms to prioritize survival over pathogenesis. Similarly, enteric pathogens like *Salmonella enterica* and *Escherichia coli* can form persistent biofilms on plant surfaces (50), which may give rise to numerous outbreaks associated with fresh produce. The ability of these human and animal pathogens to establish biofilm communities on plant surfaces may enable them to evade host surveillance systems such as vesicles released by the plant as they are covered in the matrix. Furthermore, as we demonstrated in this study and previously (33), heightened matrix production

could play a role in sustaining pathogenic biofilms on plant surfaces. It is also important to consider that under specific favourable conditions, which may facilitate biofilm dispersal and allow the matrix-encased cells to break free from the biofilm structure (51), fungi growing within the biofilm on plant surfaces could potentially act as a more effective inoculum for invasion and in the process, alter plant immunity through the biofilm matrix.

Applying this knowledge to the context of *P. patula*'s interaction with *F. circinatum*, biofilm formation is thus anticipated to play a significant role in disease progression. Specifically, considering that *P. patula* is known to be highly susceptible to *F. circinatum* infections compared to other pines within the same genus (28–30), the formation of biofilms is likely to enhance the pathogen's persistence and ability to colonize and cause disease in the susceptible host (49). Our results are thus intriguing as the EVs from this pine species failed to inhibit matrix production in the biofilm of this fungus. This may point towards a nuanced interaction between the host and the pathogen; while the inhibition of biomass by EVs could signify the host's defense mechanism targeting the pathogen's growth and proliferation within the biofilm, the failure to curtail matrix production might reflect the pathogen's ability to sustain its protective matrix despite the host's countermeasures, potentially serving as a survival strategy. Indeed, we observed that EVs isolated from both planktonic cells and biofilms promoted matrix production, which may partly explain why pdEVs were unable to reduce matrix production in *F. circinatum* biofilms. As EVs are known to play an important role in defence against pathogens and often in part mirror the biology of their parent cells (7–9, 52–54), our data suggest that *P. patula* may be prone to infections associated with the biofilm, given that infectious propagules may take cover under the matrix during a period when conditions are unfavourable. In addition, the biofilm-associated vesicles may carry compounds or enzymes that may later mobilize the biofilm-embedded cells (51, 55), perhaps to seed a new biofilm, or to even penetrate the same surface hosting the matrix-embedded biofilm community.

Furthermore, the findings from pathogen-derived EVs, as depicted in Fig. 6–7, clearly demonstrates a distinct divergence between p<sup>k</sup>dEVs and bdEVs in terms of their impact on matrix production. This distinction is a direct reflection, albeit partial, of the unique characteristics of their respective parent cells i.e., planktonic cells and biofilms. Specifically, bdEVs demonstrated a significantly higher capacity to enhance matrix production compared to p<sup>k</sup>dEVs (Fig. 5a-b), which was also evident when considering the ratios of these characteristics (Fig. 5e-f). Therefore, there is a clear divergent response exhibited by EVs derived from planktonic cells and biofilms that may reflect the difference between their parent cells in *F. circinatum*, consistent with other studies (7). Recently (38), we provided evidence of the superior heat-resistance attributes of *F. circinatum* biofilms compared to planktonic cells, among other attributes (13). This further strengthens the observed differentiation in EV-mediated effects exhibited by these distinct cell types. The demonstrated heat-resistance superiority of *F. circinatum* biofilms suggests the significance of biofilms in this fungal species, and likewise, that of their corresponding EVs. These results also suggest that bdEVs maybe more involved in shaping the biofilm architecture, an idea that is quite logical since the biofilm environment significantly modifies the metabolic profiles of its constituent cells (15, 24, 56). Consequently, EVs released from these biofilm cells are expected to elicit distinct effects

compared to cells situated outside the biofilm environment, which is what we observed. Therefore, our findings enhance current understanding of the specific functions and behaviours of EVs in *F. circinatum*, shedding some light on the intricate dynamics within biofilm communities of plant pathogens.

Taken together, our findings are crucial as they shed light on how a tree pathogen may exploit biofilms as a survival strategy and they could inform the development of targeted interventions to control such infections in *P. patula* and other susceptible species.

## Conclusions

Typically, interactions entailing plant hosts and microbial colonizers are predominantly investigated from the perspective of microbial cells obtained from nutrient agar or sometimes from shaken flasks, both of which do not fully support biofilm formation. As a result, our understanding of how plants interact with microbial cells enveloped in biofilm-produced matrices remains highly limited. As we showed in this study, the application of EVs holds immense promise in unravelling the intricate interplay between plant hosts and complex community structures such as biofilms. For instance, pathogen-derived vesicles of *F. circinatum* promoting its matrix production could signify the pathogen's strategy to fortify the structural integrity of the biofilm, potentially aiding in its resilience and protection against external stresses. Enhancing biomass production, on the other hand, increased biofilm formation and energy utilization, potentially enabling the pathogen to divert resources towards other activities such as immune evasion or host exploitation. As a result, the pathogen's matrix is not affected by the EV-mediated response of the host. This underscores the intricate arms race between the pathogen's persistence and the host's defense strategies. Our results therefore highlight the need for further investigation to decipher the underlying molecular mechanisms governing these interactions, which could potentially offer insights into developing novel strategies for disease control and management. For this reason, the findings provide a foundation to highlight the importance of a biofilm lifestyle in contributing to infections caused by filamentous plant fungal pathogens. This is crucial considering that this lifestyle maybe a preferred mode of living for microbes in their natural environments (23, 57, 58). Additionally, our study opens up exciting possibilities for utilizing EVs as tools for studying fungal biology and plant-fungal interactions in non-model systems such as pine, which differ significantly from model systems like the thale cress and tobacco in terms of their growth habit, life cycle, and ecological context.

## Declarations

### Credit authorship contribution statement

TEM, QC, BDW, and ETS: Conceptualization, methodology, manuscript and editing, resources, supervision and funding acquisition. FMR and SK: Methodology, investigation, and analysis.

### Funding details

Thuthuka funding instrument (Grant no. 129580) of the South African National Research Foundation (NRF), and the South African National Department of Science and Innovation-NRF Centres of Excellence programme and South African Research Chairs Initiative (Grant No. 98353).

### Conflict of interest.

None

## References

1. Yáñez-Mó M, Borràs FE, Buzas EI, Buzas K, Casal E, Cappello F, Carvalho J, Colás E, Cordeiro-da A, Fais S, Falcon-Perez JM, Ghobrial IM, Giebel B, Gimona M, Graner M, Gursel I, Gursel M, Hendrix A, Kierulf P, Kokubun K, Kosanovic M, Kralj-Iglic V, Krämer-Albers E-M, Laitinen S, Lässer C, Lener T, Ligeti E, Linē A, Lipps G, Llorente A, Manček-Keber M, Marcilla A, Mittelbrunn M, Nolte ENM, Olivan M, Oliveira C, Pállinger É, Rigau M, Rohde E, Sammar M, Sánchez F, Santarém N, Schallmoser K, Ostefeld MS, Stoorvogel W, Stukelj R, Wauben MHM, Wever OD. Biological properties of extracellular vesicles and their physiological functions 62.
2. Wang H, Oliveira-Garcia E, Boevink PC, Talbot NJ, Birch PRJ, Valent B. 2023. Filamentous pathogen effectors enter plant cells via endocytosis. Trends in Plant Science S1360138523002625.
3. He B, Wang H, Liu G, Chen A, Calvo A, Cai Q, Jin H. 2023. Small RNAs from fungal pathogen *Botrytis cinerea* ride in extracellular vesicles to enter plant cells through clathrin-mediated endocytosis. preprint. Plant Biology.
4. Ofir-Birin Y, Heidenreich M, Regev-Rudzki N. 2017. Pathogen-derived extracellular vesicles coordinate social behaviour and host manipulation. Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology 67:83–90.
5. Chalupowicz L, Mordukhovich G, Assoline N, Katsir L, Sela N, Bahar O. 2023. Bacterial outer membrane vesicles induce a transcriptional shift in arabidopsis towards immune system activation leading to suppression of pathogen growth in planta. J of Extracellular Vesicle 12:12285.
6. Ñahui Palomino RA, Vanpouille C, Costantini PE, Margolis L. 2021. Microbiota–host communications: Bacterial extracellular vesicles as a common language. PLoS Pathog 17:e1009508.
7. Zarnowski R, Sanchez H, Covelli AS, Dominguez E, Jaromin A, Bernhardt J, Mitchell KF, Heiss C, Azadi P, Mitchell A, Andes DR. 2018. Candida albicans biofilm–induced vesicles confer drug resistance through matrix biogenesis. PLoS Biol 16:e2006872.
8. Zarnowski R, Noll A, Chevrette MG, Sanchez H, Jones R, Anhalt H, Fossen J, Jaromin A, Currie C, Nett JE, Mitchell A, Andes DR. 2021. Coordination of fungal biofilm development by extracellular vesicle cargo. Nat Commun 12:6235.
9. Zarnowski R, Sanchez H, Jaromin A, Zarnowska UJ, Nett JE, Mitchell AP, Andes D. 2022. A common vesicle proteome drives fungal biofilm development. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 119:e2211424119.




10. Ma G, Ding Y, Wu Q, Zhang J, Liu M, Wang Z, Wang Z, Wu S, Yang X, Li Y, Wei X, Wang J. 2022. *Yersinia enterocolitica*-Derived Outer Membrane Vesicles Inhibit Initial Stage of Biofilm Formation. *Microorganisms* 10:2357.
11. Baumgarten T, Sperling S, Seifert J, von Bergen M, Steiniger F, Wick LY, Heipieper HJ. 2012. Membrane Vesicle Formation as a Multiple-Stress Response Mechanism Enhances *Pseudomonas putida* DOT-T1E Cell Surface Hydrophobicity and Biofilm Formation. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 78:6217–6224.
12. Seike S, Kobayashi H, Ueda M, Takahashi E, Okamoto K, Yamanaka H. 2021. Outer Membrane Vesicles Released From *Aeromonas* Strains Are Involved in the Biofilm Formation. *Front Microbiol* 11:613650.
13. Goes A, Vidakovic L, Drescher K, Fuhrmann G. 2021. Interaction of myxobacteria-derived outer membrane vesicles with biofilms: antiadhesive and antibacterial effects. *Nanoscale* 13:14287–14296.
14. Johnston EL, Zavan L, Bitto NJ, Petrovski S, Hill AF, Kaparakis-Liaskos M. 2023. Planktonic and Biofilm-Derived *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Outer Membrane Vesicles Facilitate Horizontal Gene Transfer of Plasmid DNA. *Microbiol Spectr* 11:e05179-22.
15. Flemming H-C, Wingender J, Szewzyk U, Steinberg P, Rice SA, Kjelleberg S. 2016. Biofilms: an emergent form of bacterial life. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 14:563–575.
16. Motaung TE, Peremore C, Wingfield B, Steenkamp E. 2020. Plant-associated fungal biofilms—knowns and unknowns. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* 96:fiaa224.
17. Vestby LK, Grønseth T, Simm R, Nesse LL. 2020. Bacterial Biofilm and its Role in the Pathogenesis of Disease. *Antibiotics* 9:59.
18. Parsek MR, Singh PK. 2003. Bacterial Biofilms: An Emerging Link to Disease Pathogenesis. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 57:677–701.
19. Nobile CJ, Johnson AD. 2015. *Candida albicans* Biofilms and Human Disease. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 69:71–92.
20. Jacques M, Aragon V, Tremblay YDN. 2010. Biofilm formation in bacterial pathogens of veterinary importance. *Anim Health Res Rev* 11:97–121.
21. Danhorn T, Fuqua C. 2007. Biofilm Formation by Plant-Associated Bacteria. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 61:401–422.
22. Harding MW, Marques LLR, Howard RJ, Olson ME. 2009. Can filamentous fungi form biofilms? *Trends in Microbiology* 17:475–480.
23. Flemming H-C, Wuertz S. 2019. Bacteria and archaea on Earth and their abundance in biofilms. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 17:247–260.
24. Flemming H-C, van Hullebusch ED, Neu TR, Nielsen PH, Seviour T, Stoodley P, Wingender J, Wuertz S. 2023. The biofilm matrix: multitasking in a shared space. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 21:70–86.

25. Karygianni L, Ren Z, Koo H, Thurnheer T. 2020. Biofilm Matrixome: Extracellular Components in Structured Microbial Communities. *Trends in Microbiology* 28:668–681.
26. Drenkhan R, Ganley B, Martín-García J, Vahalík P, Adamson K, Adamčíková K, Ahumada R, Blank L, Bragança H, Capretti P, Cleary M, Cornejo C, Davydenko K, Diez JJ, Lehtijärvi HTD, Dvořák M, Enderle R, Fourie G, Georgieva M, Ghelardini L, Hantula J, Iloos R, Iturriza E, Kanetis L, Karpun NN, Koltay A, Landeras E, Markovskaja S, Mesanza N, Milenković I, Musolin DL, Nikolaou K, Nowakowska JA, Ogris N, Oskay F, Oszako T, Papazova-Anakieva I, Paraschiv M, Pasquali M, Pecori F, Rafoss T, Raitelaityé K, Raposo R, Robin C, Rodas CA, Santini A, Sanz-Ros AV, Selikhovkin AV, Solla A, Soukainen M, Soulioti N, Steenkamp ET, Tsopelas P, Vemić A, Vettraino AM, Wingfield MJ, Woodward S, Zamora-Ballesteros C, Mullett MS. 2020. Global Geographic Distribution and Host Range of *Fusarium circinatum*, the Causal Agent of Pine Pitch Canker. *Forests* 11:724.
27. Fru FF, Wingfield MJ, Roux J, Steenkamp ET. 2023. High diversity and clonality are hallmarks of *Fusarium circinatum* in South Africa. *Plant Pathology* 72:39–52.
28. Mitchell R, Steenkamp E, Coutinho T, Wingfield M. 2011. The pitch canker fungus, *Fusarium circinatum*: implications for South African forestry. *Southern Forests: a Journal of Forest Science* 73:1–13.
29. Visser EA, Kampmann TP, Wegrzyn JL, Naidoo S. 2023. Multispecies comparison of host responses to *Fusarium circinatum* challenge in tropical pines show consistency in resistance mechanisms. *Plant Cell & Environment* 46:1705–1725.
30. Visser EA, Wegrzyn JL, Steenkamp ET, Myburg AA, Naidoo S. 2019. Dual RNA-Seq Analysis of the Pine-*Fusarium circinatum* Interaction in Resistant (*Pinus tecunumanii*) and Susceptible (*Pinus patula*) Hosts. *Microorganisms* 7:315.
31. Wingfield MJ, Hammerbacher A, Ganley RJ, Steenkamp ET, Gordon TR, Wingfield BD, Coutinho TA. 2008. Pitch canker caused by *Fusarium circinatum* – a growing threat to pine plantations and forests worldwide. *Austral Plant Pathol* 37:319.
32. Martín-García J, Zas R, Solla A, Woodward S, Hantula J, Vainio EJ, Mullett M, Morales-Rodríguez C, Vannini A, Martínez-Álvarez P, Pinto G, Alves A, Amaral J, Wingfield MJ, Fourie G, Steenkamp ET, Ahumada R, Šerá B, Sanz-Ros AV, Raposo R, Elvira-Recuenco M, Iturriza E, Gordon TR, Diez JJ. 2019. Environmentally friendly methods for controlling pine pitch canker. *Plant Pathology* 68:843–860.
33. Ratsoma FM, Mokoena NZ, Santana QC, Wingfield BD, Steenkamp ET, Motaung TE. 2023. Characterization of the *Fusarium circinatum* biofilm environmental response role. preprint. In Review.
34. Shay R, Wiegand AA, Trail F. 2022. Biofilm Formation and Structure in the Filamentous Fungus *Fusarium graminearum*, a Plant Pathogen. *Microbiol Spectr* e00171-22.
35. Wingfield BD, Steenkamp ET, Santana QC, Coetzee MPA, Bam S, Barnes I, Beukes CW, Chan WY, De Vos L, Fourie G, Friend M, Gordon TR, Herron DA, Holt C, Korf I, Kvas M, Martin SH, Mlonyeni XO, Naidoo K, Phasha MM, Postma A, Reva O, Roos H, Simpson M, Slinski S, Slippers B, Sutherland R, Van der Merwe NA, Van der Nest MA, Venter SN, Wilken PM, Yandell M, Zipfel R, Wingfield MJ. 2012. First fungal genome sequence from Africa: A preliminary analysis. *S Afr J Sci* 108:9 pages.

36. Kunene S, Steenkamp E, Motaung T. 2023. Isolation of extracellular vesicles from pine (*Pinus* sp.) leaves and roots. preprint. In Review.
37. Garcia-Ceron D, Lowe RGT, McKenna JA, Brain LM, Dawson CS, Clark B, Berkowitz O, Faou P, Whelan J, Bleackley MR, Anderson MA. 2021. Extracellular Vesicles from *Fusarium graminearum* Contain Protein Effectors Expressed during Infection of Corn. *J Fungi* (Basel) 7:977.
38. Ratsoma FM, Mokoena NZ, Santana QC, Wingfield BD, Steenkamp ET, Motaung TE. 2023. Characterization of *Fusarium circinatum* biofilm and its matrix's environmental response role. preprint. In Review.
39. Regente M, Pinedo M, San Clemente H, Balliau T, Jamet E, de la Canal L. 2017. Plant extracellular vesicles are incorporated by a fungal pathogen and inhibit its growth. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 68:5485–5495.
40. Honorato L, Demetrio JF, Ellis CC, Piffer A, Pereira Y, Frases S, de Sousa Araújo GR, Pontes B, Mendes MT, Pereira MD, Guimarães AJ, da Silva NM, Vargas G, Joffe L, Poeta MD, Nosanchuk JD, Zamith D, dos Reis FCG, Rodrigues ML, de Toledo Martins S, Alves LR, Almeida IC, Nimrichter L. 2021. Extracellular vesicles regulate yeast growth, biofilm formation, and yeast-to-hypha differentiation in *Candida albicans*. preprint. Microbiology.
41. Bitencourt TA, Hatanaka O, Pessoni AM, Freitas MS, Trentin G, Santos P, Rossi A, Martinez-Rossi NM, Alves LL, Casadevall A, Rodrigues ML, Almeida F. 2022. Fungal Extracellular Vesicles Are Involved in Intraspecies Intracellular Communication 13.
42. Chizné Peremore, Brenda Wingfield, Quentin Santana, Emma T Steenkamp, Thabiso E Motaung. 2022. Biofilm characterization in the maize pathogen, *Fusarium verticillioides*. bioRxiv 2022.11.18.517162.
43. Harding MW, Daniels GC. 2017. In Vitro Assessment of Biofilm Formation by Soil- and Plant-Associated Microorganisms, p. 253–273. *In* Ahmad, I, Husain, FM (eds.), *Biofilms in Plant and Soil Health*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK.
44. Harding MW, Daniels GC. 2017. In Vitro Assessment of Biofilm Formation by Soil- and Plant-Associated Microorganisms, p. 253–273. *In* Ahmad, I, Husain, FM (eds.), *Biofilms in Plant and Soil Health*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK.
45. Cai Q, Qiao L, Wang M, He B, Lin F-M, Palmquist J, Huang S-D, Jin H. 2018. Plants send small RNAs in extracellular vesicles to fungal pathogen to silence virulence genes. *Science* 360:1126–1129.
46. De Palma M, Ambrosone A, Leone A, Del Gaudio P, Ruocco M, Turiák L, Bokka R, Fiume I, Tucci M, Pocsfalvi G. 2020. Plant Roots Release Small Extracellular Vesicles with Antifungal Activity. *Plants* 9:1777.
47. Tsui C, Kong EF, Jabra-Rizk MA. 2016. Pathogenesis of *Candida albicans* biofilm. *Pathogens and Disease* 74:ftw018.
48. Nobile CJ, Fox EP, Nett JE, Sorrells TR, Mitrovich QM, Hernday AD, Tuch BB, Andes DR, Johnson AD. 2012. A Recently Evolved Transcriptional Network Controls Biofilm Development in *Candida albicans*. *Cell* 148:126–138.


49. Tyzack TE, Hacker C, Thomas G, Fones HN. 2023. Biofilm formation in *Zymoseptoria tritici*. preprint. Microbiology.
50. Yaron S, Römling U. 2014. Biofilm formation by enteric pathogens and its role in plant colonization and persistence. Microbial Biotechnology 7:496–516.
51. Muthami JM, Fernández-García L, Tomás M, Wood TK. 2022. What is the fate of the biofilm matrix? Environmental Microbiology 24:4495–4499.
52. Rybak K, Robatzek S. 2019. Functions of Extracellular Vesicles in Immunity and Virulence. Plant Physiol 179:1236–1247.
53. Bahar O, Mordukhovich G, Luu DD, Schwessinger B, Daudi A, Jehle AK, Felix G, Ronald PC. 2016. Bacterial Outer Membrane Vesicles Induce Plant Immune Responses. MPMI 29:374–384.
54. McMillan HM, Zebell SG, Ristaino JB, Dong X, Kuehn MJ. 2021. Protective plant immune responses are elicited by bacterial outer membrane vesicles. Cell Reports 34:108645.
55. Ionescu M, Zaini PA, Baccari C, Tran S, da Silva AM, Lindow SE. 2014. *Xylella fastidiosa* outer membrane vesicles modulate plant colonization by blocking attachment to surfaces. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 111:E3910–E3918.
56. Flemming H-C, Wingender J. 2010. The biofilm matrix. Nat Rev Microbiol 8:623–633.
57. Penesyan A, Paulsen IT, Kjelleberg S, Gillings MR. 2021. Three faces of biofilms: a microbial lifestyle, a nascent multicellular organism, and an incubator for diversity. npj Biofilms Microbiomes 7:80.
58. Donlan RM. 2002. Biofilms: Microbial Life on Surfaces. Emerg Infect Dis 8:881–890.

## Figures




**Figure 1**

Physical properties of extracellular vesicles (EVs) as determined via scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Vesicles were purified from *Fusarium circinatum* planktonic cells and biofilms (**a**: Planktonic cell-derived vesicles; **b-c**: Biofilm-derived vesicles) and from *Pinus patula* needles and roots (**d**; photos were captured at different magnifications, indicated as 'MAG').




**Figure 2**

The physical properties of extracellular vesicles (EVs) as determined via nanoparticle tracking analysis. **a:** Vesicles purified from *Fusarium circinatum* planktonic cells (pkcdEVs) and biofilms (bdEVs); **b:** Vesicles purified from needles (ndEVs) and roots (rdEVs) of *Pinus patula* seedlings.




**Figure 3**

The impact of extracellular vesicles (EVs) on *Fusarium circinatum* hyphal growth during incubation in ¼ strength potato dextrose broth. The impact of needle-derived EVs **(a)** and root-derived EVs **(b)** on cell viability and **(a-b)** and spore germination **(c-d)**, expressed as %germ tube formation. Probability thresholds: \*,  $P \leq 0.005$ ; \*\*,  $P \leq 0.002$ ; \*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.0001$ ; NS, not significant.




**Figure 4**

Phenotypic effects of extracellular vesicles (EVs) on *Fusarium circinatum* during incubation on Potato Dextrose agar. **a.** The impact of needle-derived EVs (ndEVs) and root-derived EVs (rdEVs) on radial growth of spores exposed for 24 h. **b.** Quantification of radial growth following treatment with ndEVs and rdEVs. Radial growth was determined by measuring the diameter (cm) of colonies shown in **a**. Probability thresholds: \*,  $P \leq 0.005$ ; \*\*,  $P \leq 0.002$ ; \*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.0001$ . **c.** Cells from a 7-day- and 14-day-old radial growth plate analyzed using a light microscope at 10x magnification. Scale bar = 10  $\mu\text{m}$ .




**Figure 5**

The impact of plant-derived extracellular vesicles (pEVs) on biofilm biomass (OD = 492 nm), extracellular matrix (ECM) production (OD = 530 nm), and ECM per cellular biomass (ECM.biomass<sup>-1</sup>). Effects induced by EVs derived from the needles (**a-c**) the roots (**d-f**). Probability thresholds: \*,  $P \leq 0.005$ ; \*\*,  $P \leq 0.002$ ; \*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.0001$ ; NS, not significant.



**Figure 6**

The impact of extracellular vesicles (EVs) on *Fusarium circinatum* hyphal growth during incubation in ¼ strength Potato Dextrose Broth. The impact of planktonic cell-derived EVs (pkcdEVs) and biofilm-derived EVs (bdEVs) on Cell Viability **(a)** and spore germination **(b)**, expressed as % Germ Tube Formation. Probability thresholds: \*,  $P \leq 0.005$ ; \*\*,  $P \leq 0.002$ ; \*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.0001$ ; NS, not significant.



**Figure 7**

The impact of extracellular vesicles (EVs) (5  $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) on biofilm characteristics. **a.** EV-mediated effects induced by planktonic cell-derived EVs (pkcdEVs). **b.** EV-mediated effects induced by biofilm-derived EVs (bdEVs). **c-d.** The impact of vesicles determined as the ratio of extracellular matrix (ECM) to cellular biomass (ECM.biomass<sup>-1</sup>). PC, positive control (No EVs added); pkcdEVs<sub>ht</sub>, heat-treated pkcdEVs; bdEVs<sub>ht</sub>, heat-treated bdEVs. Probability thresholds: \*,  $P \leq 0.005$ ; \*\*,  $P \leq 0.002$ ; \*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\*,  $P \leq 0.0001$ ; NS, not significant.