

Antixenosis in *Glycine max* (L.) Merr against *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Harris)

Katarzyna Stec (✉ katarzyna.rozycka1985@interia.pl)

University of Zielona Góra

Bożena Kordan

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

Iwona Sergiel

University of Zielona Góra

Magdalena Biesaga

University of Warsaw

Joanna Gasik

University of Warsaw

Jan Bocianowski

University of Life Sciences in Poznań

Beata Gabryś

University of Zielona Góra

Research Article

Keywords: plant resistance, soybean, pea aphid, flavonoids, probing behavior

Posted Date: February 9th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-177193/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Scientific Reports on July 27th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-94703-6>.

Abstract

To reveal the antixenosis potential against the pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Harris) (Hemiptera: Aphididae) we analyzed the pea aphid survival and probing behavior, and the quantitative and qualitative variation of flavonoids in the leaves of selected soybean *Glycine max* (L.) Merr (Fabaceae) cultivars 'Aldana', 'Annushka', 'Augusta', 'Madlen', 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta', and 'Viorica'. Aphid survival was drastically impeded on all cultivars. The electronic monitoring of aphid probing using the Electrical Penetration Graph (EPG) technique revealed that on all soybean cultivars, *A. pisum* readily probed into leaf tissues but the probes were usually terminated before reaching vascular tissues, which demonstrates the activity of antixenosis mechanisms in peripheral tissues epidermis and/or mesophyll in soybean leaves. The potency of antixenosis factors differed among soybean cultivars, which was reflected in differences in aphid survival and frequency and duration of phloem sap ingestion. Seven flavonoids were found: apigenin, daidzein, genistein, glycitein, isorhamnetin, kaempferol, and rutin, which occurred in different amount and proportion in individual cultivars. The content of apigenin and genistein in all soybean cultivars studied probably made them relatively unacceptable to *A. pisum*. Kaempferol in 'Aldana' might be responsible for the observed strong antixenosis resistance of this cultivar to *A. pisum*.

Introduction

The pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Harris) (Hemiptera: Aphididae) is an oligophagous species with relatively narrow host plant range that is limited mainly to the members of the family Fabaceae¹. Basically, the pea aphid populations are associated with peas *Pisum sativum* L., broad beans *Vicia faba* L., lentils *Lens culinaris* Medik., lucerne *Medicago sativa* L. and clover *Trifolium* spp.² but *A. pisum* has also been recorded from species of 13–15 other plant families^{3–5}. Among Fabaceae, grain legumes are currently a major part of many people's diet worldwide and an important element in peoples' food security, especially in semi- and arid climates^{6–7}. *A. pisum* is considered one of the most important pest insects of leguminous plants worldwide^{1,8}. The pea aphid affects plant condition directly due to the removal of nutrients and is able to transmit over 40 different plant pathogenic viruses, including the globally important viruses, such as *Cucumber mosaic virus* (CMV), *Pea enation mosaic virus* (PEMV), and *Bean leafroll virus* (BLRV)^{9–11}. There are significant differences in susceptibility to *A. pisum* among potential host plants. On the less preferred hosts, *A. pisum* shows a limited ability to feed and reproduce, which may be due to the variation in plant characteristics depending on plant taxonomical position^{12–15}. In our previous studies, we have demonstrated that the *P. sativum*-derived *A. pisum*, the most abundant pea aphid biotype in agroecosystems, is able to successfully infest and feed upon various forage and grain legumes that are not basic host plants of this aphid^{16–18}. At the same time, we found that the level of plant susceptibility differs not only among plants of higher taxonomic units (tribes) but also within a genus or a species. Such intraspecific variation in susceptibility to *A. pisum* occurs in lupines *Lupinus* spp.¹⁶. While on highly susceptible plant species or cultivars, the pea aphid probing and feeding activities are not impeded, on moderately susceptible plants aphids have difficulty to attain the feeding phase, and on resistant plants, the probing time is shortened, non-probing intervals between probes are long, and the success rate in reaching the feeding phase is very low or none^{16–18}.

Soybean *Glycine max* (L.) Merr. (Fabaceae) is one of the most important world crops in both the temperate and tropical areas. In 2017, the world production was over 352.6 million tons from the area of over 123.5 million ha and is still increasing¹⁹. In Poland alone, the acreage of soybeans cultivation increased from nearly 0.0 ha in 2015 to 9,300 ha in 2017¹⁹. The growing demand for soybean derives from its multiple uses for human and animal consumption due to high content of protein and oil, industrial application such as biodiesel, and as a nitrogen-fixing ground cover²⁰. Soybean is also a source of biologically active substances for medicinal application. The anti-microbial, anti-inflammatory, antioxidant, and anti-tumor activities of soybean flavonoids and saponins are broadly known^{21–22}. Two

legume-associated aphid species: *A. pisum* and the soybean aphid *Aphis glycines* Matsumura are crucial in the transmission of the major destructive viral pathogens in soybean production worldwide *Soybean mosaic virus* (SMV) and *Soybean dwarf virus* (SbDV)²³⁻²⁴. *A. glycines* has gained considerable attention of researchers in the recent years due to mass occurrence, role in virus transmission, and expansion to all regions of soybeans cultivation²⁵⁻²⁷. The resistance potential of soybeans against *A. glycines* has been explored²⁷⁻²⁸ and the role of flavonoids in *A. glycines* – soybean interaction has also been studied²⁹⁻³⁰, but the soybeans – *A. pisum* relationship remains largely unknown. While investigating the susceptibility of various species of grain legumes to *A. pisum*, we discovered a strong antixenosis potential against the pea aphid in soybean cv. ‘Aldana’ which was manifested in a shortened aphid probing time, long non-probing intervals between probes, and very low success rate in reaching phloem phase¹⁸. These findings motivated us to explore a wider spectrum of soybean cultivars in respect to their ability to restrain the pea aphid probing and feeding. The duration and within plant scale of aphid probing, especially the reluctance to probe beyond the epidermis and mesophyll, may reduce the direct impact of the pea aphid on the yield and contribute to the limitation of the transmission of semi-persistent and persistent viruses³¹. On the other hand, a susceptible cultivar may become a reservoir for *A. pisum* population in agroecosystems. Antixenosis is a mechanism by which the plant deters herbivores or reduces their colonization by affecting their behavior³². Antixenosis depends on the chemical composition of plant tissues, mainly on the content of secondary plant compounds. Flavonoids, which occur abundantly in the soybean, are well-known mediators of plant-insect interactions and represent the major line of defense against herbivory³³.

The aim of the present study was to reveal the antixenosis potential against the pea aphid in selected soybean cultivars that represent various regions of origin in Eastern and Central Europe and belong to different maturity groups. We monitored the pea aphid probing behavior using the Electrical Penetration Graph (EPG) technique, which is crucial in determining the localization of antixenosis factors in peripheral as well as in vascular plant tissues and the influence of these factors on particular phases of aphid probing^{14,31,34}. We analyzed also the survival of the pea aphid and the quantitative and qualitative variation of flavonoids in the leaves of the soybean cultivars studied to evaluate the potential of these chemicals as resistance factors against *A. pisum* in *G. max*. The effect of the soybeans intraspecific variation on the susceptibility to *A. pisum* has not been studied before.

Results

Survival of the pea aphid on soybean cultivars

The average survival of 1st instar nymphs of the pea aphid ranged from 1.0 (± 0.0) day on cv. ‘Aldana’ to 2.2 (± 1.4) days on cv. ‘Madlen’. Survival on ‘Simona’ and ‘Violetta’ was 1.5 (± 0.5) and 1.5 (± 0.7) days, respectively, and differed significantly from ‘Madlen’ but was similar to the survival on ‘Aldana’, ‘Annushka’, ‘Augusta’, ‘Mavka’, and ‘Viorica’ (Figure 1).

Probing behavior of the pea aphid on soybean cultivars

The 8-hour EPG monitoring of pea aphid probing on soybean cultivars revealed activities defined as no-probing (= aphid stylets outside plant tissues), pathway phase (= aphid stylets in epidermis and mesophyll), xylem phase (aphid stylets in xylem vessels), and phloem phase (= aphid stylets in sieve elements) (Table 1). Generally, no-probing predominated over pathway, xylem, and phloem phases on all soybean cultivars during the entire monitoring period (Figure 2). The highest proportion of no-probing occurred in aphids on ‘Viorica’, ‘Simona’, ‘Aldana’, and ‘Violetta’ (80 %, 78 %, 75 %, and 75 % of experimental time, respectively) and the lowest on ‘Madlen’ (61 %), while on the remaining cultivars, the proportion of no-probing ranged from 63 % on ‘Augusta’ to 71 % on ‘Annushka’ and ‘Mavka’ (Table 1, Figure 2). The activities in non-phloem tissues were divided into pathway stylet penetration in epidermis and mesophyll and sap

ingestion from xylem vessels. The longest duration of xylem phase occurred on 'Madlen' (0.9 ± 1.1 h) and shortest on 'Viorica' (0.1 ± 0.3 h). The mean number of probes, the mean duration of probes, and the duration of the first probe were similar in all aphids on all soybean cultivars (Table 1). The shortest time to reach phloem phase from the onset of probing occurred in aphids on 'Annushka', and 'Augusta' and 'Violetta' (4.6 ± 3.4 and 5.1 ± 3.1 , and 5.1 ± 3.0 hours, respectively) (Table 1). However, on all cultivars except 'Aldana' and 'Mavka' there were individuals that were able to reach phloem phase as early as during the first hour after access to plants (Figure 2). The overall success rate in reaching phloem vessels was highest on 'Augusta' and 'Annushka' (60 % and 50 % aphids showed phloem phase) and lowest on 'Aldana' (12.5 %). On 'Madlen', 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta' and 'Viorica', similar proportion of aphids reached phloem phase (from 31 % on 'Simona' to 44 % on 'Viorica') (Figure 3). As a result, the proportion of phloem phase in the studied pea aphid population was lowest on 'Aldana' (0.12 %) and highest on 'Annushka, Violetta, and Madlen' (17.7 %, 17.6 %, and 14.1 %, respectively) (Figure 4). The number of probes that included the phloem phase was highest in aphids on 'Augusta' (1.0 ± 1.1) and lowest on 'Aldana' (0.1 ± 0.3) (Table 1). The frequency of phloem phase was low in all aphids on all soybean cultivars. The number of phloem phases per aphid ranged from 0.1 ± 0.3 on 'Aldana' to 1.3 ± 1.4 on 'Augusta'. While on 'Aldana' the phloem phase included only the activity associated with salivation into sieve elements, on the remaining soybean cultivars the phloem phase consisted of both salivation and ingestion activities, including the periods of ingestion longer than 10 minutes (Table 1).

Flavonoids in leaves of soybean cultivars

Total amount of flavonoids in leaves of soybean cultivars ranged from 1.80 ± 0.21 $\mu\text{g/g}$ dry weight (d.w.) in 'Annushka' to 26.14 ± 1.94 $\mu\text{g/g}$ d.w. in 'Augusta' (Table 2). Seven flavonoids were found: apigenin, daidzein, genistein, glycitein, isorhamnetin, kaempferol, and rutin, which occurred in different amount and proportion in individual cultivars (Figure 5). Apigenin and genistein occurred in all cultivars, daidzein occurred in 'Madlen' and 'Violetta', glycitein occurred in 'Mavka', isorhamnetin was detected in 'Augusta', kaempferol was found in 'Aldana' and 'Augusta', and rutin occurred in 'Aldana'. In 'Aldana' and 'Augusta', which had the most diverse flavonoid spectrum, the most abundant flavonoids were rutin and kaempferol, respectively (Table 2, Figure 5).

Correlation analysis

The correlation analysis revealed significant positive correlation between: the total duration of phloem phase and the proportion of phloem phase in total probing ($r=0.854$), the number of probes and the total flavonoids ($r=0.790$), time from first probe to first phloem phase and the number of probes before first phloem phase ($r=0.753$), the total duration of non-probing before first phloem phase and the number of probes before first phloem phase ($r=0.850$) as well as apigenin and genistein ($r=0.792$). The negative correlation coefficient was obtained for the proportion of phloem phase in total probing and time from first probe to first phloem phase ($r=-0.818$).

Distribution of eight soybean cultivars in terms of the first two principal components of 15 survival observations was presented in Figure 6A. The first two principal components accounted for 73.14% of total multivariate variability between soybean cultivars. Distribution of soybean cultivars in terms of the first two principal components of nine observed traits of EPG was presented in Figure 6B. The first two principal components accounted for 84.34% of total multivariate variability between studied cultivars. Distribution of eight soybean cultivars in terms of the first two principal components of three flavonoids traits was presented in Figure 6C. The first two principal components accounted for 99.85% of total multivariate variability between eight soybean cultivars.

Discussion

Generally, *A. pisum* was willing to probe into leaf tissues of all soybean cultivars studied presently. However, the probes were usually terminated within less than four to seven minutes. In consequence, no-probing was the main activity of the pea aphid on soybeans and the success rate in finding the sieve elements was very low or aphids did not reach phloem phase at all within the 8-hour period of access to plants. In those rare cases that the pea aphid did find phloem vessels, the phloem phase was very short. The new-born nymphs of the pea aphid did not survive beyond one or two days on all soybean cultivars studied. To understand and provide the possible explanation of the pea aphid behavior on soybeans, the analysis of behavioral events that lead to host-plant selection and acceptance must be considered. There are two major phases in this process: (i) the host-plant location in the environment and (ii) the examination of plant features once the prospective host-plant has been traced and approached³⁵. In our study, we concentrated upon the latter phase that comprises the assessment of plant internal traits, mainly of chemical nature^{34,36}. In contrast to herbivore insects with biting-chewing mouthparts that are equipped with external contact taste receptors, aphids possess sucking-piercing mouthparts that lack such sensory elements³⁴. The essential taste organ is located in the pharynx³⁶, therefore aphids need to take samples of plant sap during probing with their stylets to assess the suitability of the potential host plant³⁴. Consequently, aphid probing behavior reflects the susceptibility of plants to aphid infestation on the one hand and aphid ability to overcome plant defenses on the other¹⁴. Generally, aphids respond to the quality of plant sap by either continuing or terminating stylet penetration³⁷⁻³⁸. The time required by aphid stylets to pass one layer of cells is approximately two to three minutes³⁹. Stylet withdrawal by aphids after a short probe in the outer leaf tissues suggests the presence of probing deterrents in these tissues. This is often observed in incompatible plant-aphid associations¹⁴, on resistant plant cultivars³⁸, or when the non-acceptable xenobiotics are applied to aphid host-plants³⁹⁻⁴⁰. The soybean genotypes studied evoked a spectrum of behavioral responses from *A. pisum*. We demonstrated that the pea aphids withdrew their stylets four to seven minutes after the beginning of a probe, which means that the probing aphids must have encountered the deterrent factors either in the first (epidermis) or second/third (mesophyll) tissue layer in soybean leaves. This was especially noticeable in the cultivar 'Aldana', on which the proportion of no-probing time in relation to other aphid activities was highest as compared to other soybean cultivars studied. The mean duration of a probe was approximately four minutes and almost all aphids on this cultivar failed to reach phloem vessels and commence feeding during eight hours of access to the plants, which means that the probes included chiefly stylet activities in non-phloem tissues and points at the strong activity of antixenosis factors in the outer leaf tissues. The described characteristic behavior was also typical of *A. pisum* probing on resistant lupine cultivars and unpalatable species of forage and grain legumes, on which non-probing activities prevailed over stylet penetration, the probes were terminated usually 3-5 minutes after stylet insertion in plant tissues, and the phloem phase was short or did not occur^{12,16-18,38}. Low number of probes before the first phloem phase, short duration of non-probing, relatively short time to reach phloem phase, and sap ingestion sustained over many hours with no interruption indicate that little or no antixenosis factors are present in tissues encountered before reaching sieve elements and in the phloem vessels by *A. pisum* on susceptible legumes^{16-18,38}. The predominance of non-probing activities occurred also on soybean cultivars 'Annushka', 'Augusta', 'Madlen', 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta', and 'Viorica'. However, aphids on these cultivars were able to reach phloem and commence feeding. Among these cultivars, the frequency of phloem sap ingestion phase on 'Annushka' and 'Augusta' was higher than in 'Madlen', 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta', and 'Viorica' while the total duration of phloem phase was highest in 'Madlen'. The reduced duration of phloem sap uptake results in the impediment of aphid survival and development, which happened to the cabbage aphid *Brevicoryne brassicae* L. on resistant rapeseed cultivars⁴¹. Among soybean cultivars studied, the lowest survival of newborn nymphs was on 'Aldana' and highest on 'Madlen'.

Aphids on all soybean cultivars showed stylet activities associated with the ingestion of sap from xylem vessels. Generally, the mean duration of xylem phase was comparable to the duration of the phloem phase. However, on 'Aldana' the xylem phase was the key activity associated with ingestion from vascular tissues, as the phloem phase was

practically absent on this cultivar. Water uptake by aphids is generally considered as an osmoregulatory strategy in response to phloem sap dietary osmotic pressure and dehydration caused by drought⁴². On the other hand, it has been proposed that xylem sap ingestion is initiated to reduce the negative impact of plant toxins⁴³, which may also have been the case in the present study.

Plant antixenosis against aphids is based mainly on bioactive compounds, such as hydroxamic acids, alkaloids, polyphenols, flavonoids, terpenoids or saponins⁴⁴. In our study, we concentrated on flavonoids which are well known for their detrimental effect on insect herbivores including the pea aphid⁴⁵⁻⁴⁹. The correlation analysis revealed that the total amount of flavonoids did not affect the pea aphid probing behavior significantly. It was especially noticeable in cultivar 'Augusta', on which the aphid feeding success was relatively high despite the highest observed content of flavonoids of all soybean cultivars studied. The most common flavonoids in the soybeans cultivars studied were apigenin and genistein, which were detected in all cultivars. Both apigenin and genistein are known for their anti-herbivore properties. Apigenin is highly toxic to larvae of southern house mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say (Diptera: Culicidae), affects the fecundity, mortality, and food consumption of Formosan termite *Coptotermes formosanus* Shiraki (Blattodea: Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae), shows antifeedant activity against striped flea beetles *Phyllotreta striolata* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae)⁵⁰⁻⁵². Apigenin reduced the pea aphid abundance and phloem sap ingestion on alfalfa, caused a reduction in the number and duration of probes when added to saponin mixtures in artificial diets, and was accumulated in vegetative parts of aphid-infested pea plants^{47,53}. In soybean, genistein had negative effects on the behavior and biology of *Anticarsia gemmatilis* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera: Erebiidae), *Piezodorus guildinii* (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae), and *Trichoplusia ni* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶. The application of genistein in artificial diet decreased the feeding efficiency and reduced the survival rate of *A. pisum* and the increases in genistein conferred resistance against the pea aphid in *M. sativa*^{47,57}. Considering the presence of both genistein and apigenin in all soybean cultivars studied it is reasonable to infer that these flavonoids are responsible for the general negative response of the pea aphid to *G. max*. The observed subtle differences in the acceptability of soybean cultivars may be due to the content of daidzein, glycitein, isorhamnetin, kaempferol and rutin, which were identified in individual cultivars. However, the detected flavonoids differ in their role in constitutive and induced plant resistance against biotic stressors. Daidzein and genistein are associated with the observed antibiosis resistance of soybeans to the soybean aphid and are induced in soybean leaves by the feeding of *S. litura* and *Anticarsia gemmatilis* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)⁵⁸⁻⁶⁰. In the present study, daidzein was found in the only one relatively acceptable to the pea aphid cultivar 'Madlen' and relatively non-accepted 'Violetta'. Glycitein is induced by the feeding of *A. gemmatilis* but not by *S. litura*^{59,61}. In our research, we detected glycitein in the relatively non-accepted cultivar 'Mavka'. Isorhamnetin is associated with the resistance of cowpea *Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp. against *Aphis fabae* (Scop.) and has promising potential as an anthelmintic against *Haemonchus contortus* (Rudolphi, 1803) Cobb (Nematoda: Trichostrongylidae)⁶²⁻⁶³. In our study, isorhamnetin was found in the relatively acceptable cultivar 'Augusta'. Kaempferol occurs in higher quantity in cowpea cultivars resistant to cowpea aphid as compared to susceptible cultivars⁶². An increase in the content of kaempferol was observed due to the feeding of *A. gemmatilis* on soybeans and *Phenacoccus manihoti* Matt. Ferr. (Homoptera, Pseudococcidae) on cassava *Manihot esculenta* Crantz (Euphorbiaceae)^{55,63}. The level of kaempferol in broccoli did not change due to herbivory of *B. brassicae* and *M. persicae*⁶⁴ and did not correlate with the number of *A. pisum* colonizing *P. sativum* seedlings⁶⁵. In our study, kaempferol was detected only in the cultivar 'Aldana' that was the least acceptable soybean cultivar to *A. pisum* in the present study. Rutin is generally considered as associated with plant resistance against herbivores⁶⁶. High concentration of rutin was found in soybean cultivars resistant to *P. guildinii* and *A. gemmatilis*^{55,61} and in cassava cultivars resistant to *P. manihoti*⁶³. Rutin is toxic to the woolly apple aphid *Eriosoma lanigerum* (Hausmann)⁶⁷. In our study, rutin occurred in cultivars 'Aldana', 'Augusta', and

'Viorica', which differed in their susceptibility to *A. pisum*, 'Aldana' being relatively least acceptable and 'Augusta' relatively most acceptable cultivar to the pea aphid.

The statistical analysis (PCA) performed independently for aphid probing, development and plant chemistry showed no similarities in the groupings of soybean cultivars studied. Therefore, no unequivocal classification of cultivars that would have included all analyzed traits was possible. Nevertheless, taking into account the pea aphid probing behavior and relative feeding success as well as the survival of newborn nymphs, the soybean cultivars studied can be categorized according to *A. pisum* preferences and the assumed backgrounds of these preferences into four groups. Group I – relatively susceptible – cultivar 'Madlen', on which the pea aphid feeding success and nymph survival were highest. Group II – medium susceptible – 'Annushka' and 'Augusta', on which the feeding success and survival were lower than in 'Madlen' but higher than in 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta', and 'Viorica'. Group III – medium resistant – 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta', and 'Viorica', on which the feeding success and survival were lower than in 'Annushka' and 'Augusta' but higher than in 'Aldana'. Group IV – highly resistant – 'Aldana' on which the pea aphid feeding success and the survival were lowest.

In conclusion, we have confirmed that soybean is a relatively unsuitable host for the pea aphid, which we have cautiously determined in our previous studies¹⁸. On all soybean cultivars, *A. pisum* readily probed into leaf tissues but the probes were usually terminated before reaching vascular tissues. In consequence, the phloem phase was significantly delayed or did not occur, the ingestion of phloem sap was limited or prevented, and aphid survival was drastically impeded. Thus, the existence of antixenosis factors in peripheral leaf tissues of all soybean cultivars studied is inferred. The potency of antixenosis factors differs among soybean cultivars, which was reflected in slight differences in the acceptance of these cultivars by *A. pisum*. In our opinion, the spectrum and not the total content of flavonoids in soybean leaves was responsible for the varying pea aphid response to individual cultivars. The content of apigenin and genistein in all soybean cultivars studied probably made all of them relatively unacceptable to *A. pisum*. We hypothesize that kaempferol in 'Aldana' might be responsible for the observed strong antixenosis resistance of this cultivar to *A. pisum*. However, the impact of individual soybean flavonoids needs a further study. There was no knowledge on the background of susceptibility or resistance of soybean cultivars to *A. pisum* infestation prior to our study. The results of our survey provide the first detailed data that can be used for reference studies in the future.

Materials And Methods

Plants and aphids

Eight cultivars of genetically unmodified soybeans were studied: 'Aldana', 'Annushka', 'Augusta', 'Madlen', 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta', and 'Viorica'. These cultivars were selected because they represent various regions of origin in Eastern and Central Europe: Bulgaria ('Simona'), Lithuania ('Violetta'), Poland ('Aldana', 'Augusta', 'Madlen', 'Mavka'), Romania ('Viorica'), and Ukraine ('Annushka') [68], and belong to different maturity groups in these regions: 'Annushka' and 'Augusta' are very early maturing cultivars, 'Aldana', 'Simona', 'Violetta', 'Viorica' – early, 'Mavka' – semi-early, and 'Madlen' – late maturing cultivars [69]. The seeds were provided by Hodowla Soi Agroyoumis Sp. z o. o. (Kordeckiego 20, 37-420 Rudnik nad Sanem, Poland). Plants were grown in commercial soil in 9 cm diam. plastic pots, in the chamber Sanyo MLR-351H (Sanyo Electronics Co. Ltd.) at 20°C, 65% r.h., and L16:8D photoperiod. The plants were watered regularly and no fertilizers were applied.

The laboratory culture of *Acyrtosiphon pisum* was maintained on *Pisum sativum* cv. 'Milwa' in the laboratory at 20°C, 65% r.h., and L16:8D photoperiod.

Survival tests

One adult apterous female of *A. pisum* was placed on a plant at 14 BBCH growth stage (trifoliate leaf on the 4th node unfolded) [70] for 24 hours. After 24 hours, the female and all progeny except one nymph were removed. Each plant was isolated within a plastic cylinder with a fine mesh on top. The development of the nymph was monitored daily. The experiment was replicated 15 times for each soybean cultivar. The tests were conducted in an environmental chamber Sanyo MLR-351H (Sanyo Electronics Co. Ltd.) at L16:D8 photoperiod, 21 ± 1 °C, and 70% r.h.

Aphid probing behavior

The probing and feeding behaviors of *A. pisum* were monitored using the technique of electronic registration of aphid probing in plant tissues, known as Electrical Penetration Graph (EPG)³⁴. Aphid and plant are made parts of an electric circuit, which is completed when the aphid inserts its stylets into the plant. Weak voltage is supplied in the circuit, and all changing electric properties are recorded as EPG waveforms that can be correlated with aphid activities and stylet position in plant tissues⁷¹. In the present study, aphids were attached to a golden wire electrode with conductive silver paint and starved for 1 h prior to the experiment. Probing behavior of *A. pisum* on soybean cultivars was monitored for 8 h continuously with 4- and 8-channel DC EPG recording equipment. Signals were saved on the computer and analyzed using the PROBE 3.1 software provided by W. F. Tjallingii (www.epgsystems.eu). The following aphid behaviors were distinguished: no penetration (waveform 'np' – aphid stylets outside the plant), pathway phase – penetration of non-phloem tissues (waveforms 'ABC'), detailed stylet movements (waveform 'F'), salivation into sieve elements (waveform 'E1'), ingestion of phloem sap (waveform 'E2'), and ingestion of xylem sap (waveform 'G'). The E1/E2 transition patterns were included in E2. 'F' waveforms occurred sporadically, therefore these events were combined with pathway activities in all calculations and defined as non-phloem activities. The waveform patterns that were not terminated before the end of the experimental period (8 h) were included in the calculations. In sequential parameters, when time to waveforms related to phloem phase (E1 or E2) was calculated, the time from the 1st probe until the end of the recording was used if no phloem phase occurred. In non-sequential parameters, when a given waveform had not been recorded for an individual, the duration of that waveform was given the value of 0.

Aphids for EPG experiments were 2-3 days old (2-3 days after the final moult) viviparous apterous *A. pisum*. The plants of *G. max* used in the bioassays were at 14 BBCH growth stage (trifoliate leaf on the 4th node unfolded)⁷⁰. Each aphid was given access to a freshly prepared plant. Each plant-aphid set was considered as a replication and was tested only once. The number of replications for each plant cultivar/aphid combination was 24. However, only the replications that included complete 8-hour recording were kept for analysis, which were: 'Aldana', n=16; 'Annushka', n=16; 'Augusta', n=22; 'Madlen', n=16; 'Mavka', n=13; 'Simona', n=16; 'Violetta', n=15; 'Viorica', n=18. Recordings that terminated due to aphid falling from the plant or where EPG signal was unclear were discarded from analysis. All bioassays started at 10:00–11:00 h MEST (Middle European Summer Time). Aphids show distinct diurnal feeding activity, with peak activity during day time, independently of host plants^{34,71-72}.

High-performance liquid chromatography of flavonoids

The dried soybean leaves, of different botanical varieties, i.e., 'Annushka', 'Aldana', 'Augusta', 'Madlen', 'Mavka', 'Simona', 'Violetta' and 'Viorica' (1.2 g of each) were homogenized in an aqueous ethanol solution (80%) using a Diax 900 homogenizer. The resulting suspension was centrifuged (12000 rpm, 10 min) and the supernatant solution was collected in a graduated flask and the pellet was reconditioned. This operation was repeated three times, and the obtained extracts were combined. The homogenization procedure in combination with the extraction was carried out in

such a way that the final volume of the extract was 100 ml. From the prepared ethanol extracts, 10 ml was taken and evaporated to dryness in a rotary evaporator under reduced pressure at 40 °C. The dry extracts were dissolved in 100% methanol to a volume of 1 ml. Resulting methanolic extracts containing flavonoids compounds were analyzed by HPLC–ESI-MS/MS.

The content of: ampelopsin, apigenin, daidzein, glycitein, hesperetin, hesperidin, isorhamnetin, kaempferol, luteolin, naringin, quercetin, rutin, taxifolin was determined. The selection of the flavonoid spectrum for analysis was based on literature data⁷³⁻⁷⁷.

Individual pure flavonoids were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich (Poland). Ethanol, HPLC gradient grade methanol and acetonitrile were supplied by Merck (Germany). Formic acid was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Poland). Stock standard solutions of individual flavonoids (50 mg/1) were prepared by dissolving appropriate amounts of solid reagents in methanol. Mixed working standard solutions of flavonoid compounds at 20, 10, 5, 2.5 and 1 mg/1 or lower concentrations were prepared by appropriate dilutions of stock standard solutions.

The chromatographic analysis was carried out with a Shimadzu LC system, comprising a LC20-AD binary pump, a DGU-20A5 degasser, a CTO-20AC column oven and a SIL-20AC autosampler, connected to a 3200 QTRAP hybrid triple quadrupole (Applied Biosystem, MDS SCIEX, USA) with electrospray ionization source (ESI) operated in negative-ion mode. Phenolic compounds were separated on a Phenomenex Luna C-18 column (100 × 2.0 mm × 3.0 µm) with a pre-column, both maintained at 30 °C. A 7.4 mmol/l solution of formic acid (pH 2.8, eluent A) and acetonitrile (eluent B) were used. The mobile phase was delivered at 0.2 ml/min in a linear gradient mode as follows: 0–2 min 10% B, 30 min 60% B, 40 min 100% B, 55 min 10% B. Flavonoids were identified by comparing their retention times and m/z values of precursor and resulting fragmentation product ions in their MS and MS/MS spectra, respectively, to those obtained for respective standard solutions analyzed under the same conditions. The quantification of flavonoids was done using calibration curves obtained in the SRM (single reaction mode) mode⁷⁸⁻⁷⁹.

Statistical analysis

All statistical calculations were performed using StatSoft, Inc. (2014) STATISTICA (data analysis software system), version 12. Parameters of aphid performance were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis test and post-hoc multiple comparisons of mean ranks for all groups (Dunn's test). EPG parameters describing aphid probing behavior were calculated manually and individually for every aphid and the mean and standard errors were subsequently calculated using the EPG analysis Excel worksheet created by the authors especially for this study. Data thus obtained were analyzed by Kruskal-Wallis test and post-hoc multiple comparisons of mean ranks for all groups (Dunn's test). Additionally, the relationships among all the traits were estimated on the basis of correlation coefficients. The graphic distribution of cultivars, described by means of the 24 observed traits, was obtained by means of the principal components analysis (PCA). Correlation and PCA analyses were done in GenStat 18.

Declarations

Author contributions statement. KS, BK, IS, MB, JG conceived, designed, and conducted research; JB performed statistical analysis, KS and BG wrote the manuscript, all Authors contributed to analysis of data, read and approved manuscript.

Additional information. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Blackman, R. L., Eastop, V. F. Taxonomic Issues in *Aphids as crop pests* (ed. van Emden, H. F., Harrington, R.) 1-36 (CABI, 2017).
2. Wilkinson, T. L., Douglas, A.E., Plant penetration by pea aphids (*Acyrtosiphon pisum*) of different plant range. *Exp. Appl.* **87**, 43–50 (1998).
3. Holman, J. *Host plant catalog of aphids, Palaearctic Region*. (Elsevier, 2009)
4. Favret, C., Miller, G. L. AphID. Identification Technology Program, CPHST, PPQ, APHIS, USDA, Fort Collins, CO; <http://AphID.AphidNet.org/> (2012).
5. *Acyrtosiphon pisum* in *Invasive species compendium*. <https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/3147#tab1-nav> (2017).
6. Sinclair, T. R., Vadez, V. The future of grain legumes in cropping systems. *Crop Pasture Sci.* **63**, 501-512 (2012).
7. Chibarabada, T. P., Modi, A. T., Mabhaudi, T. Expounding the value of grain legumes in the semi- and arid tropics. *Sustainability.* **9**, 60 (2017).
8. Wale, M., Jembere, B., Seyoum, E. Occurrence of the pea aphid, *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Harris) (Homoptera: Aphididae) on wild leguminous plants in West Gojam, Ethiopia. *Sinet. An Ethiopian Journal of Science.* **26**, 83-87 (2003).
9. Chan, C. K., Forbes, A. R., Raworth, D. A. Aphid-transmitted viruses and their vectors of the world. *Agriculture Canada Technical Bulletin 1991-3E*. 1-216 (1991).
10. Brunt, A. A., Crabtree, K., Dallwitz, M. J., Gibbs, A. J., Watson, L., Zurcher, E. J. (eds.) 'Plant Viruses Online: Descriptions and Lists from the VIDE Database. Version: 16th January 1997.' URL <http://sdb.im.ac.cn/videre/refs.htm> (1996 onwards). [Accessed 12 February 2018].
11. Rashed, A., Feng, X., Prager, S. M., Porter, L. D., Knodel, J. J., Karasev, A., Eigenbrode, S. D. Vector-borne viruses of pulse crops, with a particular emphasis on North American cropping system. *Entomol. Soc. Am.* **111**, 205-227 (2018).
12. Caillaud, M. C., Via, S. Specialized feeding behavior influences both ecological specialization and assortative mating in sympatric host races of pea aphids. *Nat.* **156**, 606-621 (2000).
13. Ferrari, J., Godfray, H. C., Faulconbridge, A. S., Prior, K., Via, S. Population differentiation and genetic variation in host choice among pea aphids from eight host plant genera. *Evolution* **60**, 1574-1584 (2006).
14. Powell, G., Tosh, C. R., Hardie, J. Host plant selection by aphids: behavioral, evolutionary, and applied perspectives. *Rev. Entomol.* **51**, 309-330 (2006).
15. Mitku, G., Damte, T. Development, reproduction, and host preference of *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Harris) (Homoptera: Aphididae) on selected lentil genotypes and resistance index of these selected lentil genotypes to pea aphid. *J. Entomol. Res.* **4**, 16-22 (2019).
16. Kordan, B., Gabryś, B., Dancewicz, K., Lahuta, L., Piotrowicz-Cieślak, A., Rowińska, E. 2008. European yellow lupine *Lupinus luteus* and narrow-leaf lupine *Lupinus angustifolius* as hosts for the pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *Exp. Appl.* **128**, 139-146 (2008)
17. Kordan, B., Stec, K., Słomiński, P., Giertych, M. J., Wróblewska-Kurdyk, A., Gabryś, B. Susceptibility of forage legumes to infestation by the pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Harris) (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *Crop Pasture Sci.* **69**, 775-784 (2018).
18. Kordan, B., Stec, K., Słomiński, P., Laszczak-Dawid, A. Antixenosis potential in pulses against the pea aphid (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *Econ. Entomol.* **112**, 465-474 (2019).

19. FAOSTAT Food and Agriculture Organisation Statistical Database <http://www.fao.org> <http://www.apps.fao.org/> (2018) (Accessed 19 Jan 2020).
20. Pagano, M.C., Miransari, M. The importance of soybean production worldwide in *Abiotic and Biotic Stresses in Soybean Production. Volume 1*. (ed. Miransari, M.) 1-26. (Academic Press, 2016).
21. MacDonald, R. S., Guo, J. Y., Copeland, J., Browning, J. D., Sleper, D., Rottinghaus, G. E., Berhow, M. A. Environmental influences on isoflavones and saponins in soybeans and their role in colon cancer. *Nutr*, **135**, 1239–1242 (2005).
22. Tidke, S. A., Mahajankatti, A., Devasurmutt, Y., Devappa, R., Vasist, K. S., Kosturkova, G., Aswathanarayana, R. G. Assessment of anticancer, anti-inflammatory and antioxidant properties of isoflavones present in soybean. *J. Phytochem*. **12**, 35-42 (2018).
23. Hill, J. H., Whitham, S. A. Control of virus diseases in soybeans. *Virus Res*. **90**, 355-390 (2014).
24. Tian, B. *et al.* Host adaptation of soybean dwarf virus following serial passages on pea (*Pisum sativum*) and soybean (*Glycine max*). *Viruses* **9**, 155 (2017).
25. Wang, R. Y., Kritzman, A., Hershman, D. E., Ghabrial, S. A. *Aphis glycines* as a vector of persistently and nonpersistently transmitted viruses and potential risks for soybean and other crops. *Plant Dis*. **90**, 920-926 (2006).
26. Hesler, L. S., Dashiell, E., Jonathan, A. E., Lundgren, G. Characterization of resistance to *Aphis glycines* in soybean accessions. **154**, 91–99 (2007).
27. Baldin, E. L. L. *et al.* Feeding behavior of *Aphis glycines* (Hemiptera: Aphididae) on soybeans exhibiting antibiosis, antixenosis, and tolerance resistance. *Entomol*. **101**, 223-228 (2018).
28. Chang, H-X., Hartman, G. L. Characterization of insect resistance loci in the USDA soybean germplasm collection using genome-wide association studies. *Plant Sci*. **8**, 670. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2017.00670 (2017).
29. Klein, A. T. *et al.* Investigation of the chemical interface in the soybean–aphid and rice–bacteria interactions using MALDI-Mass Spectrometry Imaging. *Chem*. **87**, 5294-5301 (2015).
30. Hohenstein, J. D. *et al.* Transcriptional and chemical changes in soybean leaves in response to long-term aphid colonization. *Plant Sci*. **10**, 310 (2019).
31. Martin, B., Collar, J. L., Tjallingii, W. F., Fereres, A. Intracellular ingestion and salivation by aphids may cause the acquisition and inoculation of non-persistently transmitted plant viruses. *Gen. Virol*. **78**, 2701-2705 (1997)
32. Onstad, D. W., Knolhoff, L. Arthropod resistance to crops in *Insect Resistance Management* (ed. Onstad, D. W.) 293-326 (2014).
33. Simmonds, M. S. J. Flavonoid-insect interactions: recent advances in our knowledge. *Phytochemistry*. **64**, 21-30 (2003).
34. Pettersson, J., Tjallingii, W. F., Hardie, J. Host-plant selection and feeding in *Aphids as Crop Pests* (ed. van Emden, H. F., Harrington, R.) 173-195. (CABI, 2017).
35. Klingauf, F. A. Host plant finding and acceptance in *Aphids, Their Biology, Natural Enemies and Control Vol. 2B* (ed. Minks, A. K., Harrewijn, P.) 209-223 (Amsterdam, 1987).
36. Tjallingii, W. F., Mayoral, A. M. Criteria for host plant acceptance by aphids in *8th Int. Symp. Insect-Plant Relationships* (ed. Menken, S. B. J., Visser, J. H., Harrewijn, P.) 280-282 (Dordrecht, 1992).
37. Wensler, R. J., Filshie, B. K. Gustatory sense organs in the food canal of aphids. *Morph*. **129**, 473-492 (1969).
38. Gabryś, B., Tjallingii, W.F. The role of sinigrin in host plant recognition by aphids during initial plant penetration. *Exp. Appl*. **104**, 89–93 (2002)
39. Philippi, J. *et al.* Correlation of the alkaloid content and composition of narrow-leafed lupins (*Lupinus angustifolius*) to aphid susceptibility. *J. Pest Sci*. **89**, 359-373 (2016).
40. Van Hoof, H. A. *An investigation of the biological transmission of a non-persistent virus*. (Alkmaar, 1958).

41. Dancewicz, K., Szumny, A., Wawrzęczyk, C., Gabryś, B. Repellent and antifeedant activities of citral-derived lactones against the peach potato aphid. *J. Mol. Sci.*, **21**, 8029; doi:10.3390/ijms21218029 (2020).
42. Kordan, B., Wróblewska-Kurdyk, A., Bocianowski, J., Stec, K., Jankowski, K., Gabryś, B. Variation in susceptibility of rapeseed cultivars to the peach potato aphid. *Journal of Pest Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-020-01270-2> (2020).
43. Pritchard, J., Vickers, L. H. Aphids and stress in *Aphids as Crop Pests* (ed. Van Emden, H. F., Harrington, R.) 132-147 (Wallingford Oxfordshire, 2017).
44. Pompon, J., Pelletier, Y. Changes in aphid probing behaviour as a function of insect age and plant resistance level. *Entomol. Res.* **102**, 550-557 (2012).
45. van Emden, H. F. Host-plant resistance in *Aphids as crop pests* (ed. van Emden, H. F., Harrington, R.) 515-532 (CABI, 2017).
46. Gould, K. S., Lister, C. Flavonoid functions in plants in *Chemistry, Biochemistry and Applications* (ed. Andersen, Ø. M., Markham, K. R.) 397-442 (Boca Raton, 2006).
47. Goławska, S., Kapusta, I., Łukasik, I., Wójcicka, A. Effect of phenolics on the pea aphid, *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Harris) population on *Pisum sativum* (Fabaceae). *Pestycydy*. **3-4**, 71-77 (2008).
48. Goławska, S., Łukasik, I. Antifeedant activity of luteolin and genistein against the pea aphid, *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *Pest Sci.* **85**, 443-450 (2012).
49. Hikal, W. M., Baeshen, R. S., Said-Al Ahl, H. A. H. Botanical insecticide as simple extractives for pest control. *Cogent Biology*. **3**, 1404274; <https://doi.org/10.1080/23312025.2017.1404274> (2017).
50. Goławska, S., Sprawka, I., Łukasik, I. Effect of saponins and apigenin mixtures on feeding behavior of the pea aphid, *Acyrtosiphon pisum* *Biochem. Syst. Ecol.* **55**, 137-144 (2014).
51. Johnson, A. D., Singh, A. Larvicidal activity and biochemical effects of apigenin against filarial vector *Culex quinquefasciatus*. *J. Life. Sci. Scienti. Res.* **3**, 1315-1321 (2017).
52. Boué, S. M., Raina, A. K. Effects of plant flavonoids on fecundity, survival, and feeding of the formosan subterranean termite. *Chem. Ecol.* **29**, 2575-2584 (2003).
53. Xu, D. *et al.* Antifeedant activities of secondary metabolites from *Ajuga nipponensis* against adult of striped flea beetles, *Phyllotreta striolata*. *Pest Sci.* **82**, 195-202 (2009).
54. Goławska, S., Łukasik, I., Goławski, A., Kapusta, I., Janda, B. Alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*) apigenin glycosides and their effect on the pea aphid (*Acyrtosiphon pisum*). *Polish J. Environ. Stud.* **19**, 913- 919 (2010).
55. Zavala, J. A., Scopel, A. L., Ballaré, C. L. Effects of ambient UV-B radiation on soybean crops: impact on leaf herbivory by *Anticarsia gemmatilis*. *Plant Ecol.* **156**, 121-130 (2001).
56. Bentivenha, J. P. F. *et al.* Role of the rutin and genistein flavonoids in soybean resistance to *Piezodorus guildinii* (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae). *Arthropod Plant Interact.* **12**, 311-320 (2018).
57. Yuan, E., Yan, H., Gao, J., Guo, H., Ge, F., Sun, Y. Increases in genistein in *Medicago sativa* confer resistance against the *Pisum* host race of *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *Insects.* **10**, 97; doi:10.3390/insects10040097 (2019).
58. Hoffmann-Campo, C. B., Harborne, J. B., McCaffery, A. R. Pre-ingestive and post-ingestive effects of soya bean extracts and rutin on *Trichoplusia ni* *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **98**, 181-194 (2001).
59. Meng, F. *et al.* QTL underlying the resistance to soybean aphid (*Aphis glycines* Matsumura) through isoflavone-mediated antibiosis in soybean cultivar 'Zhongdou 27'. *r Appl. Genet.* **123**, 1459-1465 (2011).
60. Murakami, S. *et al.* Insect-induced daidzein, formononetin and their conjugates in soybean leaves. *Metabolites.* **4**, 532-546 (2014).

61. Gómez, J. D., Vital, C. E., Oliveira, G. A., Ramos, H. J. O. Broad range flavonoid profiling by LC/MS of soybean genotypes contrasting for resistance to *Anticarsia gemmatilis* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *PLOS ONE*. **13**, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0205010> (2018).
62. Lattanzio, V., Arpaia, S., Cardinali, A., Di Venere, D., Linsalata, V. Role of endogenous flavonoids in resistance mechanism of *Vigna* to aphids. *Agric. Food Chem.* **48**, 5316-5320 (2000).
63. Delgado-Núñez, E. J. *et al.* Isorhamnetin: a nematocidal flavonoid from *Prosopis laevigata* leaves against *Haemonchus contortus* eggs and larvae. *Biomolecules*. **10**, 773 (2020).
64. Khan, M. A. M., Ulrichs, C., Mewis, I. Effect of water stress and aphid herbivory on flavonoids in broccoli (*Brassica oleracea italica* Plenck). *J. Appl. Bot. Food Qual.* **84**, 178-182 (2011).
65. Morkunas, I. *et al.* Pea aphid infestation induces changes in flavonoids, antioxidative defence, soluble sugars and sugar transporter expression in leaves of pea seedlings. *Protoplasma*. **253**, 1063-1079 (2016).
66. Bale, J. S., Ponder, K. L., Pritchard, J. Coping with stress in *Aphids as crop pests* (ed. van Emden, H. F., Harrington, R.) 287-309 (CABI, 2007).
67. Atteyat, M., Abu-Romman, S., Abu-Darwish, M., Ghabeish, I. Impact of flavonoids against woolly apple aphid, *Eriosoma lanigerum* (Hausmann) and its sole parasitoid, *Aphelinus mali* (Hald.). *Agric. Sci.* **4**, 227-236 (2012).
68. Common Catalogue of Varieties of Agricultural Plant Species [CCA] – 37th complete edition. Official Journal of the European Union C 13/1 (2019) (Accessed: 20 January 2020).
69. Porejestrowe doświadczałnictwo odmianowe. Charakterystyka odmian. <http://www.coboru.pl/DR/charaktodmiany.aspx>. (2019) (Accessed 20 January 2020).
70. Meier, U. Growth stages of mono- and dicotyledonous plants: BBCH. Monograph. (Julius Kühn-Institut, 2018).
71. Beer, K., Joschinski, J., Sastre, A. A., Kraus, J., Helfrich-Forster, C. A damping circadian clock drives weak oscillations in metabolism and locomotor activity of aphids (*Acyrtosiphon pisum*). *Rep.* **7**, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-15014-3> (2017)
72. Joschinski J, Beer K, Helfrich-Forster C, Krauss J (2016) Pea aphids (Hemiptera: Aphididae) have diurnal rhythms when raised independently of a host plant. *Insect. Sci.* **16**, 1–5.
73. Graham, T. L. Flavonoid and isoflavonoid distribution in developing soybean seedling tissues and in seed and root exudates. *Plant Physiol.* **95**, 594-603 (1991).
74. Iwashina, T., Benitez, E. R., Takahashi, A. Analysis of flavonoids in pubescence of soybean near-isogenic lines for pubescence color loci. *Hered.* **97**, 438-443 (2006).
75. Lee, J. H. *et al.* Characterization of isoflavones accumulation in developing leaves of soybean (*Glycine max*) cultivars. *Korean Soc. Appl. Biol. Chem.* **52(2)**, 139-143 (2009).
76. Magarelli, G. *et al.* Rutin and total isoflavone determination in soybean at different growth stages by using voltammetric methods. *J.* **117**, 149-155 (2014).
77. Perlatti, B. *et al.* Application of a quantitative HPLC-ESI-MS/MS method for flavonoids in different vegetables matrices. *Braz. Chem. Soc.* **27(3)**, 475-483 (2016).
78. Biesaga, M., Pyrzyńska, K. Stability of bioactive polyphenols from honey during different extraction methods. *Food Chem.* **136**, 46-54 (2013)
79. Sergiel, I., Pohl, P., Biesaga, M. Characterisation of honeys according to their content of phenolic compounds using high performance liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry. *Food Chem.* **145**, 404-408 (2014).

Tables

Table 1. Probing behavior of *Acyrtosiphon pisum* on *Glycine max* cultivars according to the 8-hour EPG monitoring.

EPG trait / soybean cultivar	Aldana	Annushka	Augusta	Madlen	Mavka	Simona	Violetta	Viorica	LSD _{0.05}
total duration of non-probing (h)	6.0 ± 1.1 a	5.7 ± 0.9 abc	5.1 ± 1.7 bc	4.9 ± 1.8 c	5.7 ± 1.4 abc	6.2 ± 1.1 a	6.0 ± 1.0 ab	6.4 ± 1.2 a	3316.7
total duration of pathway phase (h)	1.6 ± 0.9 ab	1.3 ± 0.7 b	2.3 ± 1.6 a	1.6 ± 0.8 b	1.8 ± 1.0 ab	1.2 ± 0.8 b	1.4 ± 0.8 b	1.3 ± 0.9 b	2505.6
total duration of xylem sap ingestion G (h)	0.4 ± 0.4 bc	0.6 ± 0.8 ab	0.3 ± 0.4 bc	0.9 ± 1.1 a	0.4 ± 0.6 bc	0.3 ± 0.4 bc	0.2 ± 0.6 bc	0.1 ± 0.3 c	1520.4
total duration of phloem phase E1+E2 (h)	0.0 ± 0.0 b	0.4 ± 0.8 ab	0.3 ± 0.5 ab	0.6 ± 1.3 a	0.1 ± 0.2 b	0.3 ± 0.5 ab	0.4 ± 0.6 ab	0.2 ± 0.3 ab	1606.5
number of probes	30.1 ± 14.4 ab	26.9 ± 14.7 b	39.1 ± 17.1 a	32.5 ± 14.1 ab	27.8 ± 11.9 b	27.8 ± 11.6 b	25.1 ± 12.8 b	29.4 ± 13.2 ab	9.73
mean duration of probes (min)	4.5 ± 3.1 a	8.1 ± 9.7 a	7.0 ± 10.1 a	7.6 ± 6.2 a	5.5 ± 4.1 a	5.0 ± 6.2 a	7.4 ± 7.8 a	3.6 ± 2.7 a	290
duration of the first probe (min)	3.7 ± 6.4 a	5.7 ± 11.6 a	1.0 ± 1.2 a	0.4 ± 0.3 a	3.4 ± 6.6 a	0.6 ± 0.8 a	6.9 ± 20.2 a	3.7 ± 11.8 a	395.6
time from the first probe to the first phloem phase (h)	7.3 ± 1.1 a	4.6 ± 3.4 b	5.1 ± 3.1 b	5.7 ± 3.0 ab	6.1 ± 2.5 ab	5.7 ± 3.4 ab	5.1 ± 3.0 b	5.1 ± 3.2 b	7325.8
number of probes with phloem phase E	0.1 ± 0.3 c	0.9 ± 1.3 ab	1.0 ± 1.1 a	0.8 ± 1.3 abc	0.6 ± 1.0 abc	0.3 ± 0.5 bc	0.5 ± 0.7 abc	0.8 ± 1.3 abc	0.7166
number of phloem phases E1 and E1+E2	0.1 ± 0.3 c	1.1 ± 0.3 ab	1.3 ± 1.4 a	1.1 ± 1.4 ab	0.7 ± 1.8 abc	0.3 ± 1.0 bc	0.5 ± 0.5 abc	0.9 ± 0.7 abc	0.834
number of phloem salivation phases E1	0.1 ± 1.4 c	1.1 ± 1.4 ab	1.3 ± 1.4 a	1.1 ± 1.4 ab	0.7 ± 1.8 abc	0.3 ± 1.0 bc	0.5 ± 0.5 abc	0.9 ± 0.7 abc	0.834
number of phloem sap ingestion phases E2	0.0 ± 0.0 b	0.8 ± 1.1 a	0.6 ± 1.0 a	0.5 ± 1.0 ab	0.2 ± 0.4 ab	0.3 ± 0.4 ab	0.5 ± 0.7 ab	0.5 ± 0.9 ab	0.5416
number of sustained phloem sap ingestion periods E2>10min	0.0 ± 0.0 b	0.5 ± 0.7 a	0.4 ± 0.8 ab	0.5 ± 1.0 a	0.2 ± 0.4 ab	0.3 ± 0.4 ab	0.5 ± 0.7 a	0.4 ± 0.7 ab	0.4645

Values are means ± SD. Different letters in rows show significant differences.

Table 2. Flavonoids detected in the leaves of *Glycine max* cultivars (µg/g dry weight).

Flavonoid/Cultivar	Aldana	Annushka	Augusta	Madlen	Mavka	Simona	Violetta	Viorica
Apigenin	2.43±0.08 b	1.19±0.33 c	1.05±0.3 c	1.45±0.22 c	1.07±0.14 c	1.39±0.22 c	5.38±0.47 a	2.42±0.36 b
Daidzein	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	1.37±0.01	n. d.	n. d.	0.5955±0.0125	n. d.
Genistein	0.83±0.07 cd	0.61±0.19 d	1.78±0.34 b	1.06±0.01 c	0.68±0.05 d	0.64±0.05 d	3.05±0.21 a	0.87±0.03 cd
Glycitein	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	1.11±0.03	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.
Isorhamnetin	n. d.	n. d.	0.89±0.08	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.
Kaempferol	0.72±0.06	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.
Rutin	5.20±0.25	n. d.	22.42±1.67	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	n. d.	5.07±0.76
Total	9.18±0.24 b	1.80±0.51 d	26.14±1.94 a	3.88±0.27c	2.85±0.14 cd	2.03±0.28 cd	9.03±0.24 b	8.36±1.41 b

n.d. = not detected; different letters in rows show significant differences among cultivars (apigenin: $LSD_{0.05}=0.622$, $F=58.50$; genistein: $LSD_{0.05}=0.369$, $F=55.36$; total flavonoids: $LSD_{0.05}=2.045$, $F=163.2$).

Figures




Figure 1

Survival of 1st instar nymphs of *Acyrthosiphon pisum* on *Glycine max* cultivars. Different letters show significant differences ($LSD_{0.05}$: 0.451; ANOVA F : 4.98).




Figure 2

Temporal changes in the pea aphid probing behavior on soybean cultivars.




Figure 3

Frequency of phloem phase expressed as the proportion of *Acyrtosiphon pisum* that reached phloem sieve elements during 8-hour access to *Glycine max* cultivars according to the EPG monitoring of aphid probing. Different letters show

significant differences (LSD0.05: 0.337; ANOVA F: 1.41).




Figure 4

Proportion of phloem phase in all probing activities of *Acyrthosiphon pisum* on *Glycine max* cultivars recorded during the 8-hour EPG monitoring of aphid probing, according to the formula: $(E/C+E+G)*100\%$, where C = pathway phase, E = phloem phase, G = xylem phase. Different letters show significant differences (LSD0.05: 13.84; ANOVA F: 1.46).




Figure 5

Proportion of flavonoids in *Glycine max* cultivars.




Figure 6

Spatial distribution of eight soybean cultivars in terms of the first two principal components of A: survival, B: EPG and C: flavonoids