

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Meta Gene



Isolation and identification of culturable bacteria from honeydew of whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* (G.) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) $\stackrel{\sim}{\asymp}$



Roopa H.K.^{a,*}, Rebijith K.B.^b, Asokan R.^b, Riaz Mahmood^c, Krishna Kumar N.K.^{d,**}

^a Division of Entomology and Nematology, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake P.O Karnataka, Bengaluru 560 089, India

^b Division of Biotechnology, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake P.O Karnataka, Bengaluru 560 089, India

^c Department of Biotechnology and Bioinformatics, Kuvempu University, Jnanasahyadri, Shankaraghatta, Shimoga 577 451, India

^d Division of Horticulture, ICAR, Krishi Anusandhan Bhawan-II, New Delhi 110 012, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 20 September 2013 Received in revised form 21 November 2013 Accepted 21 November 2013 Available online 14 January 2014

Keywords: Bemisia tabaci 16Sr DNA Bacillus endophyticus Bacillus niacini Roseomonas species

ABSTRACT

Bemisia tabaci (G.) is an important pest and a vector of Gemini viruses infecting plants. During the process of feeding B. tabaci excretes honeydew which is rich in nutrients, and an excellent medium for microbial growth. Recent report proved that volatile emitted by the honeydew associated bacteria of aphid, Acyrthosiphon pisum Harris was involved in natural enemy calling. Thus understanding the honeydew associated bacteria is of paramount importance from the non-chemical method of insect pest management. In this perspective, very less information is available on bacteria associated with the honeydew excreted by B. tabaci. Therefore, in the present study we have isolated and characterized three culturable bacteria from the honeydew of B. tabaci viz. Bacillus endophyticus, Bacillus niacini and Roseomonas species by employing 16Sr DNA BLASTx analyses which revealed that both *B. endophyticus* and *B. niacini* had high similarity (>99%) to the respective species, while Roseomonas sp. showed only 95% similarity to the existing Roseomonas sp. specificity of honeydew

2214-5400/\$ - see front matter © 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mgene.2013.11.002

[†] This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works License, which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

^{*} Correspondence to: H.K. Roopa, Division of Entomology and Nematology, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta Lake Post, Bangalore 560 089, India.

^{**} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: roopa21hk@gmail.com (R. H.K.), rebijith@gmail.com (R. K.B.), asokaniihr@gmail.com (A. R.), riaz_sultan@yahoo.com (R. Mahmood), kumarhort@icar.org.in (K.K. N.K.)

association of *Roseomonas* sp. was confirmed by developing specific primers as this genus is reported from immunocompromised persons and recently from ticks and mites. The present study also indicated the possible host-plant origin of these honeydew associated bacteria. © 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Among the agriculturally important insect pests, sap sucking ones are assuming greater importance in post Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) phase and impending climate change. In this regard, sap sucking insects like thrips, aphids, mealybugs, leafhoppers, whiteflies inflict damage by direct feeding and as a vector of many plant viruses. Among them, Bemisia tabaci (Gennadius) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae), is devastating globally as a vector for a number of Gemini viruses (Brown, 1990; Jones, 2003). It is highly polyphagous infesting crops such as cotton, tomato, soyabean, tobacco, radish etc., which primarily feed on the phloem sap that is rich in sugars. Like other homopterans *B. tabaci* also excretes copious amount of honeydew (complex mixture of sugars, organic acids, amino acids and some lipids), which is also an excellent medium for microbial growth (Mittler, 1958; Bargen et al., 1998; Leroy et al., 2011b; Thibout et al., 1993). During its development, immature stages such as nymphs actively participate in feeding phloem sap and excrete large amount of sugary rich honeydew, which helps in developing sooty mold thus the reduction of host plant photosynthesis (Byrne and Bellows, 1991). The nutritional quality of honeydew to natural enemies depends on plant species and its physiological status, (Blackmer and Byrne, 1999; Crafts-Brandner, 2002), which is also influencing the whitefly parasitoid species feeding on plant and insect nectar (Burger et al., 2005; Stapel et al., 1997). That is how honeydew plays an important role in tri-trophic interaction (plantpest-natural enemy), being excellent source of nutrients for certain kind of ants which in turn protect them from the natural enemies.

Various non-chemical insect pest management strategies available are Biological control (Fariaa and Wraight, 2001), Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) (Agrawal and Bhatnagar, 2003), Nuclear Polyhedrosis Virus (NPV) (Erayya et al., 2013) etc. However, natural enemy calling is an ingenious way in developing a non-chemical insect pest management strategy, whereas a non-prey food such as honeydew used by predators and parasitoids explores implications for biological pest control programs (Wackers et al., 2008). Mandour et al. (Mandour et al., 2005) demonstrated that whitefly parasitoid Eretmocerus sp. nr. furuhashii (Aphelinidae: Hymenoptera) is attracted more towards trehalulose and trehalose, which are the main components of host honeydew. Thus honeydew will serve as food and host searching cue (kairomone) for the parasitoids. Predators and parasitoids of aphids exploit honeydew as a host-location kairomone and an oviposition stimulus (Bargen et al., 1998; Hagvar and Hofsvang, 1991). The volatiles produced by the honeydew associated bacteria in aphid, A. pisum enhanced the efficacy of the hoverfly, Episyrphus balteatus, by driving prey location and ovipositional preferences (Leroy et al., 2011a). It is important to find alternative pesticide free management strategies for B. tabaci considering high levels of resistance developed for various classes of insecticides (Kranthi et al., 2002; El Kady and Devine, 2003). In this regard, it is also essential to identify the microflora particularly bacteria associated with honeydew for its utility in managing *B. tabaci*. Therefore, in the present study, we are reporting for the first time the culturable bacteria associated with the honeydew of B. tabaci of which no information is available. Further identifying the volatiles from these bacteria of *B. tabaci* honeydew will open up a new avenue in eco-friendly management of the same and also on other insect pests.

Materials and methods

Stock culture

B. tabaci was reared on cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) according to Salvucci et al. (Salvucci et al., 1997) in wooden cages $(2' \times 2')$ at room temperature (27–30 °C) with RH 70–90%.

Collection of honeydew

Cotton leaf infested with nymphs was placed on to the petriplate lid with the abaxial surface exposed. Honeydew was collected from the nymphs on the sterile petriplate inside the laminar hood and stored in -20 °C until further use.

Isolation and identification of honey associated culturable bacteria

Honeydew was serially diluted (1:10) using sterile double distilled water and was spotted on Nutrient Agar, Yeast Extract Agar and Potato Dextrose Agar, individually (Thomas et al., 2012) and incubated at 28 ± 2 °C and 37 ± 2 °C. Observations were made on colony growth till seven days and were purified by employing single colony isolation. Morphological analyses were carried based on Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology (Logan et al., 2009; Schreckenberger et al., 2007; Nagel and Andreesen, 1991).

DNA isolation and Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)

Genomic DNA was extracted according to Sambrook et al. (Sambrook et al., 1989) and was treated with 5 µl of RNase. The bacterial isolates were characterized by employing 16Sr RNA gene specific primers (Table 1) resulting in an amplicon size of 1500 bp. Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) was carried out in 25 µl total reaction volume, that contained the following components: 5–10 µl of template (50 ng/µl), 20 pmol of each primer, 10 mM Tris–HCl (pH-8.3), 50 mM KCl, 2.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.25 mM of each dNTP and 0.5 U of Taq DNA polymerase (Fermentas Life Sciences, EU) and the rest was made up with DNase and RNase free water (Sigma, USA). PCR was carried out in a thermal cycler (Veriti, Applied Biosystems, USA) with the following cycling parameters; 94 °C for 4 min as initial denaturation followed by 35 cycles of 94 °C for 30 s, 55 °C for 45 s 72 °C for 45 s and 72 °C for 20 min as final extension. The amplified products were resolved in 1.5% agarose gel, stained with ethidium bromide (10 µg/ml) and visualized in a gel documentation system (UVP, UK).

Cloning and sequencing

PCR amplified products were eluted and ligated into T/A cloning vector pTZ57R/T (Fermentas Life Sciences, EU) and transformed into *Escherichia coli* cells (DHA5α). The cells were spread on LB agar containing X-gal (300 µg/ml), IPTG (120 µg/ml) and ampicillin (100 µg/ml) and incubated at 37 °C overnight. Blue/white selection was carried out on the following day and plasmids were isolated from the positive clones using GeneJET[™] Plasmid Miniprep Kit (Fermentas Life Sciences, EU) according to manufacturer's protocol. Sequencing was carried out in an automated sequencer (ABI Prism 310; Applied Biosystems, USA) using M13 Universal primers in both directions. Homology search was carried out using BLAST (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) and the differences in nucleotide sequences of various bacteria were determined employing the sequence alignment editor 'BioEdit' and further analyzed employing MEGA 5.0 (Tamura et al., 2011). The Neighbor-Joining (NJ) trees were constructed using the Kimura-2-parameter (K2P) distance model (Kimura, 1980; Saitou and Nei, 1987). All the sequences generated in the present study were deposited in NCBI-GenBank. The other GenBank accession numbers used to construct the trees are HM770880, HM770881, JX290085, JX307684, KC153529, JF281737, AM231587, AJ786000, JN377653, AY220740, AY360348, AF538712, EF368368, EU867313, AY150050, AY150046, X73820, JX966451, KC153529 and JX290085, JX307684.

Table I					
Primers	employed	in	the	current	study.

Tabla 1

Primer name	Sequence	PCR amplicon	Reference
16SP0 16SP6	5'-GAAGAGTTTGATCCTGGCTCAG-3' 5'-CTACGGCTACCTTGTTACGA-3'	1500 bp	Brown (1990)

Sl. No.	Nucleotide identity	NCBI-GenBank accession number	Bacterium	Isolate #
1	99%	KC818119	Bacillus niacini	BTH#1
2	99%	KC818118	Bacillus endophyticus	BTH#2
3	95%	KC818120	Roseomonas sp.	BTH#3

 Table 2

 Details of 16S rDNA sequences for honeydew associated bacteria of *B. tabaci* with its nucleotide identity percentage.

Results and discussion

In the present study we have isolated three culturable bacteria viz. *Bacillus endophyticus*, *Bacillus niacini* and *Roseomonas* sp. by 16S rDNA sequencing. BLAST search for these isolates showed the highest hit for the respective species and the sequences were deposited with NCBI-GenBank (Table 2). The phenotypic characteristics of these three isolates are as follows: *B. niacini* (isolate BTH#1) is a Gram positive, motile, long chain. On Nutrient Agar, the colonies were smooth with light beige center surrounded by translucent areas of variable extension and showed positive to both oxidase and urease tests. *B. endophyticus* (isolate BTH#2) was Gram positive, non-motile, rods. On Nutrient Agar colony appeared as slimy white of 1–3 mm in diameter and was positive for oxidase and negative for urease test. On the other hand, *Roseomonas* sp. (isolate BTH#3) was Gram negative, motile, cocci, pale-pink mucoid with 1–3 mm diameter. It was positive for both oxidase and urease tests (Table 3) (Logan et al., 2009; Schreckenberger et al., 2007; Nagel and Andreesen, 1991).

Sequence comparison of *B. endophyticus* sequence with those deposited with NCBI-GenBank showed 99.5% similarity with seven mismatches out of 1455 bp. This sequence similarity was further supported by the 100 bootstrap values in the Maximum Parsimony (MP) tree (Fig. 1b). Recent studies reported the presence of B. endophyticus in the foregut of white leg shrimp, Litopenaeus vannamei larvae (NCBI-GenBank accession numbers HM770880 and HM770881). Further sequence comparison revealed that, the B. endophyticus 16Sr DNA sequences showed 80% and above percent similarity with those of B. endophyticus isolated from soil, polluted water etc. (Supplementary Fig. 1). Similar comparisons were made for *B. niacini* 16Sr DNA sequences from our study with the sequence of *B. niacini* isolated from the mealybug gut (NCBI-GenBank accession number [X966451), which revealed 98.33% similarity with 16 mismatches out of 902 bp, which was supported by 100 bootstrap value of the MP tree (Fig. 1a). Considering the potential of bacteria from aphid honeydew in attracting and enhancing the efficacy of natural enemies (Leroy et al., 2011a), these bacterial strains could become candidates for commercial bio-control agent. Extensive studies that have been carried out on the isolation and characterizations of various endosymbiotic bacteria associated with B. tabaci are listed in Supplementary Table 1. However, the present study is the first report on isolation and characterization of bacteria associated with the honeydew from *B. tabaci*. In the present study, we tried to track the possible origin of these honeydew associated bacteria. In this connection, the above mentioned three honeydew associated bacteria were not reported previously as an endosymbionts from *B. tabaci* (Supplementary Table 1). However, the previous studies on plant tissues proved that many of the endosymbionts associated with the insects were originally from the vascular tissues of the plant and picked up by the insects while sucking the phloem sap (Reva et al., 2002). In this regard, both B. endophyticus and B. niacini have been reported previously as endophytes of cotton

Table 3

Distinguishing phenotypic characteristics of the honeydew associated bacteria of B. tabaci.

Sl. No.	Bacterial isolate	Description					
		Gram staining		Oxidase test		Urease test	
1	Bacillus niacini (BTH#1)	Pa	-	SP ^b	-	SP ^b	-
2	Bacillus endophyticus (BTH#2)	P ^a	-	P ^a	-	-	N ^c
3	Roseomonas sp. (BTH#3)	-	N ^c	SP ^b	-	P ^a	-

^a P = Positive.

^b SP = Slightly positive.

^c N = Negative.



Fig. 1. (a) Phylogenetic tree showing the evolutionary position of *B. endophyticus* with other two NCBI-GenBank accessions reported from foregut of shrimp in Mexico. (b) Maximum Parsimony (MP) tree showing the evolutionary relationship of *B. niacini* from the current study with JX966451, isolated from mealybug gut. (a&b) The tree was constructed with MP algorithm in MEGA 5. 0 (Tamura et al., 2011) with 1000 bootstrap replicates. *B. cereus, B. anthracis* and *B. thuringiensis* are served as the out groups. Bootstrap values $\geq 65\%$ are shown. The isolate obtained in the present study indicated in shaded rectangle.

and maize (Reva et al., 2002). Thus our studies revealed the possibility of host plant origin of these honeydew associated bacteria viz. *B. endophyticus* and *B. niacini*. However, in the case of *Roseomonas* sp. BLAST search showed a score of 95%, which only indicated the Genus, *Roseomonas*. Hence, we retrieved all the available 16Sr DNA sequences reported for *Roseomonas* species and were compared. The phylogenetic analysis showed that, *Roseomonas* sp. isolated in the present study is closely related to *Roseomonas cervicalis* which was earlier isolated from ticks and marine sponges in China and India respectively (Liu et al., 2010); NCBI-GenBank Accession Number–JF281737). None of the members of the Genus *Roseomonas* were reported as endophytes of plants. The sequence analysis clearly indicated that the *Roseomonas* sp. which was reported in the current study could be a novel species of the Genus *Roseomonas* (Fig. 3). We designed the *Roseomonas* sp. specific primers (Table 4) in order to determine the origin. Thus our primers produced an amplicon of approximately 700 bp directly from diluted honeydew as a template. Further cloning and sequencing were carried out and the BLASTx results of the sequences clearly demonstrated the presence of *Roseomonas* sp. in the honeydew. (See Fig. 2.)

Approaches such as *Bt*-transgenics and the futuristic RNA interference etc. hold enormous potential in insect pest management programs (Asokan et al., 2012). Recently, Pascal et al. (Leroy et al., 2011a)



Fig. 2. MP tree based on 16SrDNA gene sequences of *Roseomonas spp.* Tree constructed employing MEGA 5.0 (Tamura et al., 2011) and MP method with 1000 bootstrap replications. The *Roseomonas* spp. from this current study showed more similarity to *R. cervicalis* (JF281737) isolated from marine sponge in India. Bootstrap value \geq 65% is shown in the figure. The isolate obtained in this study indicated in shaded rectangle.

а	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Researching on Henouder Perigi						.				
EF368368 Roseomonas vinaceus			.G	CC.T		TT.	G	G		
EU867313_Roseomonas aerilata	т		.G	CC.T	·····	TT	GT.	G		
JF281737 Roseomonas cervicalis	AG.GAT.		T	cc		T	G	G		
AF538712_Roseomonas mucosa	GAGA	·····C	.G	c	••••••	••••••	TG.	G	•••••	•••••
AM231587 Roseomonas aquatica			AG	СС.Т		T	G	G		
AY150050 Roseomonas genomospec	.GG AAAGTTTA.	GAGAG	.GC	c	· · · · · · · · · · · ·	TC		G		т.
AY150046_Roseomonas fauriae AJ786000 Roseomonas lacus	.GG AAAGTTTA.	GAGAG	.GC	с с			TG.	G		T .
	110	120	120	140	150	160	170	190	190	200
		1		1		1				1
Roseomonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi	ATCAGCCACACTGG	GACTGAGACAC	GGCCCAGAC	TCCTACGGGAG	GCAGCAGTG	GGGAATATTGGA	CAATGGGCG	CAAGCCTGAT	CCAGCAATGC	CGCGT
EU867313 Roseomonas aerilata	.c									
JN377653_Roseomonas frigidaqua	.c	•••••	•••••	•••••	•••••	••••••••••	•••••	••••••	•••••	•••••
AF538712_Roseomonas mucosa	.C							A		
AY220740_Roseomonas gilardii	.c	•••••	•••••	•••••		••••••	••••••	A		•••••
AY150050_Roseomonas genomospec							G.	c		
AY150046_Roseomonas fauriae			·····	•••••	·····	••••••••••	G.	c		•••••
AJ786000_Roseomonas lacus								A		
	210	220	230	240	250	260	270	280	290	300
Roseomonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi	GGGTGAAGAAGGTC	TTCGGATCGTA	AAGCCCTTT	CGGCGGGGACG	ATGATGACG	GTACCCGCAGAA	GAAGCCCCG	GCTAACTTC	TGCCAGCAGC	CGCGG
EF368368_Roseomonas vinaceus		••••••	•••••	A	•••••	· · · · · · · · T · · · ·	•••••	••••••	•••••	•••••
JN377653_Roseomonas frigidaqua		т	т			T				
JF281737_Roseomonas cervicalis	•••••	••••••	• • • • • • • • • •		• • • • • • • • • •	A		••••••	•••••	•••••
AY220740_Roseomonas gilardii						T				
AM231587 Roseomonas aquatica		T			••••••	T				
AY150046_Roseomonas fauriae	.ATC.		T	CAC.C		G.GTG				
AJ786000_Roseomonas lacus	. T	••••••	A		· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	T . T		·····	•••••	•••••
	310	320	330	340	350	360	370	380	390	400
Possermonas enn Bonauday Bamisi		CTACCOTTACT		1						
EF368368_Roseomonas vinaceus		G				TTGGTT.		TC.		G.
EU867313_Roseomonas_aerilata	•••••	G	•••••	•••••		T.TGTT.	c	TC.	T	G.
JF281737_Roseomonas cervicalis						TC		c		G.
AF538712_Roseomonas mucosa	•••••	G	••••••	••••••		GCC	c	· · · · T · · · · ·		G.
AM231587_Roseomonas aquatica		G				TT.GTT.		T		G.
AY150050 Roseomonas genomospec	•••••	.GGT.	••••••	••••••		T	CA	cc.	••••••	
AJ786000_Roseomonas lacus	•••••					TTGG.C.		T	т	G.
	410	420	430	440	450	460	470	480	490	500
				111		1				1
Roseomonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi EF368368 Roseomonas vinaceus	CTGCGCTTAAGACT	GATGTGCTTGA	GGATGGAAG	AGGGTTGTGGA	ATTCCCAGT	GTAGACGTGAAA	G.G.	ATTGGGAAGA	ACACCGGTGG	CGAAG
EU867313_Roseomonas aerilata	G.T	.CG.A	G	c		G	GG			
JN377653_Roseomonas frigidaqua JF281737_Roseomonas cervicalis	G	.TA		С.С		G	GG			
AF538712 Roseomonas mucosa	G.T	.GGT		c.c		G	GG			
A1220/40_Roseomonas gilardii AM231587_Roseomonas aquatica	G.TG	.GGT		c.c		G	GG			
AY150050 Roseomonas genomospec	.GTG.T	.gc	.TTCC.G	A .G		G	GG			•••••
AJ786000_Roseomonas lacus	G.T	. CCAG		G			GG			
200	510	520	530	540	550	560	570	580	590	60.0
				1		.				1
Roseomonas spp Honeydew Bemisi EF368368 Roseomonas vinaceus	GCGGCAACCTGGTC	CATTACTGACG	CTGAGGCGC	GATAGCGTGGG	GAGCAAACA	GGATTAGATACC	CTGGTAGTC	CACGCCGTA	ACGATGTGCG	CTGGA
EU867313_Roseomonas aerilata	G									
JN377653_Roseomonas frigidaqua	G	•••••	••••••	c	•••••	••••••	•••••	••••••		A.
AF538712_Roseomonas mucosa	G.G			c						
AY220740 Roseomonas gilardii AM231587 Roseomonas acuatica	G.G									
AY150050_Roseomonas genomospec		GGAC		A					AAT .	
AY150046_Roseomonas fauriae AJ786000 Roseomonas lacus	C.TA.0	GGAC	••••••							A
	616	600	620	640	CEO.		670	690	600	700
	610 	620 		640 		660 .	670			1
Roseomonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi	TGTTGGGGGCCCCTA	GGGTCTCAGTG	TCGTAGCCA	ACGCGGTAAGC	GCACCGCCT	GGGGAGTACGGC	CGCAAGGTT	GAAACTCAA	GGAATTGACG	GGGGC
EU867313_Roseomonas aerilata		.TCA								
JN377653 Roseomonas frigidaqua	TT.T	.AA	.TT.				••••••			
AF538712_Roseomonas mucosa		. 10A	T.							
AY220740 Roseomonas gilardii	A									·····
AY150050_Roseomonas genomospec	C.CTG.A	.CACTG	CCT.	AT	ATT			A		
AY150046 Roseomonas fauriae	C.CTG.A	.CACTG	T.	AT	ATT			A		····•
AG / COUL ROSCOMONAS TACUS	····· TT · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			• • • • • • • • • • • • • •				

Fig. 3. Consensus sequences of 1227 bp from 16S ribosomal DNA (16S rDNA) genes for *Roseomonas* spp. from the present study and those retrieved from NCBI-GenBank. Dots indicate nucleotides identical throughout the species compared.

b Rosecomonas gp_Honeydew_Bemisi EF360368 Rosecomonas vinaceus EV067313 Rosecomonas aerilata JJ77653 Rosecomonas frigidaqua JT281737 Rosecomonas mucosa AV220740 Rosecomonas guicardi AV231587 Rosecomonas guatica AV150050 Rosecomonas guatica AV150050 Rosecomonas fauriae AV76000 Rosecomonas lacus	710 	720 	730 I TAATTCGAA	740 	750 	760 	770 TGGTCACGAC GT.G C C TCTTG TCC.	780 I 	790 	800] PCCCCC .T .T .T.AG .T.AG
Rosecmonas spp Roneydew Bemisi EF366356 Rosecomonas vinaceus EV867313 Rosecomonas aerilata JR377653 Rosecomonas frigidaqua JE281737 Rosecomonas mucosa MV220740 Rosecomonas gilardii MV231507 Rosecomonas aquatica AV150050 Rosecomonas gencomospec AV150046 Rosecomonas fauriae AJ786000 Rosecomonas lacus	810 	820 	830	840	850 	860	870	880 ACGAGCGCAI	890	900 1 TAGT 2 2 2 2 2 2
Rosecmonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi EF366356 Rosecmonas vinaceus EV867317 Rosecmonas aerilata JN377653 Rosecmonas frigidaqua JF261737 Rosecmonas mucosa AV220740 Rosecmonas guicosa AV220740 Rosecmonas quatica AV15050 Rosecmonas quatica AV15050 Rosecmonas fauriae AV15000 Rosecmonas fauriae AV76000 Rosecmonas lacus	910 TGCCACCACGTTGGG 	920	930 	940	950 	960	970	980 II CTCATGGCCG	990 	1000 3GGCT
Roseomonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi EF366356 Roseomonas vinaceus EV867313 Roseomonas aevilata JN377653 Roseomonas frigidaqua JF201737 Roseomonas mucosa AV220740 Roseomonas gilardii AV231507 Roseomonas aquatica AV150505 Roseomonas genamospec AV15046 Roseomonas fauriae AJ786000 Roseomonas lacus	1010	1020 II. GGCGGTGACA	1030 	1040 	1050 	1060 	1070	1080 	1090 	1100 rcccc
Roseomonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi EF366356 Roseomonas vinaceus EV867313 Roseomonas aevilata JR201737 Roseomonas aevilata JR201737 Roseomonas mucosa AV220740 Roseomonas gulatica AV150505 Roseomonas aquatica AV150505 Roseomonas fauriae AJ786000 Roseomonas lacus Roseomonas spp_Honeydew_Bemisi EF366368 Roseomonas vinaceus EV867313 Roseomonas aevilata JN377653 Roseomonas arilata JN377653 Roseomonas arilata AV220740 Roseomonas devidadus AV20740 Roseomonas devidadus AV20740 Roseomonas devidadus AV20740 Roseomonas aevilata AV20740 Roseomonas devidadus AV20740 Roseomonas gulardii AV231597 Roseomonas gulatia AV231597 Roseomonas gulatia AV150046 Roseomonas gunatica AV150046 Roseomonas fauriae AV150046 Roseomonas fauriae AV150406 Roseomonas lacus	1010 	1020 	1030 	1040 	1050 	1060 	1070 	1080 	1090 	1100

Fig. 3 (continued).

showed that the volatiles released by the honeydew associated bacteria from aphids can be employed to increase the efficacy of natural enemies, which holds a great promise in non-chemical mode of insect pest management. Therefore, in order to fine tune the effectiveness of this approach, we need to enumerate both culturable and non-culturable microbial flora associated with the honeydew of various sap sucking insect pests. This will in turn help in developing non-chemical, eco-friendly pest management approach for various sap sucking pests which are assuming serious proportion presently. Further, it is also

Roseomonas spp. specific primer details.									
Sl. no.	Primer	Binding site	Primer sequence $(5' \rightarrow 3')$	Product size (bp)					
1 2	Roseo For Roseo Rev	361-384 1035-1060	5'-GCATCAAGTTAGGCGTGAAAGTCCT-3' 5'-GATCGGCTCGGCCTCGCGACCTGGCG-3'	699 bp					

interesting to identify, synthesize and test the volatiles for non-sap sucking insect pest management programs also as many of them have developed high levels of resistance to a wider class of insecticides. In a nutshell, both *B. niacini* and *B. endophyticus* could be used as an effective candidate as Biological control agents (BCAs) for managing *B. tabaci* in both open and glasshouse conditions. Hence, our results will prompt further studies that may lead to the use of these newly identified bacteria and its associated semiochemicals for biological control against whiteflies.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mgene.2013.11.002.

Acknowledgments

Financial support received for the "Out Reach Programme on Management of Sucking pests in Horticultural Crops", from the Indian Council for Agricultural Research (ICAR), New Delhi is gratefully acknowledged. We are thankful to the Director, IIHR for the support and facilities.

References

Table 4

- Agrawal, N., Bhatnagar, R.K., 2003. Bacillus thuringiensis versus insect: face to face. In: Subramanyam, B., Ramamurthy, V.V., Singh, V.S. (Eds.), Frontier Areas of Entomological Research. Proc. Natl. Symp. pp. 439–459.
- Asokan, R., Mahadeva Swamy, H.M., Arora, D.K., 2012. Screening, diversity and partial sequence comparison of vegetative insecticidal protein (vip3A) genes in the local isolates of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Berliner. Curr. Mod. Biol. 164, 365–370.
- Bargen, H., Saudhof, K., Poehling, H.M., 1998. Prey finding by larvae and adult females of *Episyrphus balteatus*. Entomol. Exp. Appl. 87, 245–254.

Blackmer, J.L., Byrne, D.N., 1999. The effect of Bemisia tabaci on amino acid balance in Cucumis melo. Entomol. Exp. Appl. 93, 315–319.

- Brown, J.K., 1990. An update on the whitefly-transmitted geminiviruses in the Americas and the Caribbean Basin. FAO Plant Prot. Bull. 39, 5–23.
- Burger, J.M.S., Kormany, A., Van Lenteren, J.C., Vet, Lem, 2005. Importance of host feeding for parasitoids that attack honeydewproducing hosts. Entomol. Exp. Appl. 117, 147–154.

Byrne, D.N., Bellows Jr., T.S., 1991. Whitefly biology. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 36, 431-457.

Crafts-Brandner, S.J., 2002. Plant nitrogen status rapidly alters amino acid metabolism and excretion in *Bemisia tabaci*. J. Insect Physiol. 48, 33–41.

El Kady, H., Devine, G.J., 2003. Insecticide resistance in Egyptian populations of the cotton whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae). Pest Manag. Sci. 59, 865–871.

Erayya, J. Jagdish, Sajeesh, P.K., Vinod, U., 2013. Nuclear Polyhedrosis Virus (NPV), a potential biopesticide: a review. J. Agric. For. Sci. 30–33.

Fariaa, M., Wraight, S.P., 2001. Biological control of Bemisia tabaci with fungi. Crop Prot. 20, 767–778.

Hagvar, E.B., Hofsvang, T., 1991. Aphids parasitoids (Hymenoptera, Aphidiidae): biology, host selection and use in biological control. Biocontrol News Inform. 12, 13–41.

Jones, D., 2003. Plant viruses transmitted by whiteflies. Eur. J. Plant Pathol. 109, 195–219.

- Kimura, M., 1980. A simple method for estimating evolutionary rates of base substitutions through comparative studies of nucleotide sequences. J. Mol. Evol. 16, 111–120.
- Kranthi, K.R., Jadhav, D.R., Kranthi, S., Wanjari, R.R., Ali, S.S., Russell, D.A., 2002. Insecticide resistance in five major insect pests of cotton in India. Crop Prot. 21, 449–460.
- Leroy, P.D., Sabri, A., Heuskin, S., Thonart, P., Lognay, G., Verheggen, F.J., Francis, F., Brostaux, Y., Felton, G.W., Haubruge, E., 2011a. Microorganisms from aphid honeydew attract and enhance the efficacy of natural enemies. Nat. Commun. 2, 348.
- Leroy, P.D., Wathelet, B., Sabri, A., Francis, F., Verheggen, F.J., Capella, Q., Thonart, P., Haubruge, E., 2011b. Aphid-host plant interactions: does aphid honeydew exactly reflect the host plant amino acid composition? Arthropod-Plant Interactions 5, 193–199.
- Liu, W., Zhang, F., Qiu, E., Yang, J., Xin, Z., Wu, X., Tang, F., Yang, H., Cao, W., 2010. Roseomonas sp. isolated from Ticks, China. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 16, 1177–1178.
- Logan, N.A., De Vos, P., Genus, I., 2009. In: De Vos, P., Garrity, G.M., Jones, D., Krieg, N.R., Ludwig, W., Rainey, F.A., Schleifer, K.H., Whitman, W.B. (Eds.), Bacillus Cohn 1872, 174AL, 2nd edition. Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology, 3. Springer, New York, pp. 21–128.
- Mandour, N.S., Shunxiang, R., Baoli, Q., Wäckers, F.L., 2005. Arrestment response of *Eretmocerus* species (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae) near *Furuhashii* to honeydew of *Bemisia tabaci* (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae) and its component carbohydrates. Proceedings of the Sixth Arabian Conference for Horticulture, Ismailia, Egypt, 6, pp. 311–319.
- Mittler, T.E., 1958. Studies on the feeding and nutrition of *Tuberolachnus salignus* (Gmelin) (Homoptera, Aphididae). J. Exp. Biol. 35, 74–84.

- Nagel, M., Andreesen, J.R., 1991. Bacillus niacini sp. nov, a nicotinate-metabolizing mesophile isolated from soil. Int. J. Syst. Bacteriol. 41, 134–139.
- Reva, O.N., Smirnov, V.V., Petterson, B., Priest, F.G., 2002. Bacillus endophyticus sp. nov, isolated from the inner tissue of cotton plants (Gossypium sp.). Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol. 52, 101–107.
- Saitou, N., Nei, M., 1987. The neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. Mol. Biol. Evol. 4, 406-425.
- Salvucci, M.E., Wolfe, G.R., Hendrix, D.L., 1997. Effect of sucrose concentration on carbohydrate metabolism in *Bemisia argentifolii*: biochemical mechanism and physiological role for trehalulose synthesis in the silver leaf whitefly. J. Insect Physiol. 143, 457–464.
- Sambrook, J., Fritsch, E.F., Maniatis, T., 1989. Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory Manual. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, New York.Stapel, J.O., Cortesero, A.M., De Moraes, C.M., Tumlinson, J.H., Lewis, W.J., 1997. Extrafloral nectar, honeydew, and sucrose effects on
- Stapel, J.O., Cortesero, A.M., De Moraes, C.M., Tuminson, J.H., Lewis, W.J., 1997. Extrainoral nectar, noneydew, and sucrose effects on searching behavior and efficiency of *Microplitis croceipes* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) in cotton. Environ. Entomol. 26, 617–623.
- Schreckenberger, P.C., Daeshvar, M.I., Hollis, D.G., 2007. Acinetobacter, Achromobacter, Chryseobacterium, Moraxella, and other nonfermentative gram-negative rods. In: Murray, P.R., et al. (Eds.), Manual of Clinical Microbiology, 9th ed. Am Soc Microbiol, Washington, pp. 770–802 (789).
- Tamura, K., Peterson, D., Peterson, N., Stecher, G., Nei, M., Kumar, S., 2011. MEGA5: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis using maximum likelihood, evolutionary distance, and maximum parsimony methods. Mol. Biol. Evol. 28, 2731–2739.
- Thibout, E., Guillot, J.F., Auger, J., 1993. Microorganisms are involved in the production of volatile kairomones affecting the host seeking behaviour of *Diadromus pulchellus*, a parasitoid of *Acrolepiopsis assectella*. Physiol. Entomol. 18, 176–182.
- Thomas, P., Sekhar, A.C., Mujawar, M.M., 2012. Nonrecovery of varying proportions of viable bacteria during spread plating governed by the extent of spreader usage and proposal for an alternate spotting-spreading approach to maximize the CFU. J. Appl. Microbiol. 113, 339–350.
- Wackers, F.L., Van Rijn, Paul C.J., Heimpel, G.E., 2008. Honeydew as a food source for natural enemies: making the best of a bad meal? Biol. Control 45, 176–184.