

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Botanophila flies, vectors of Epichloë fungal spores, are infected by Wolbachia

Lydia Pagel^a, Thomas Bultman^{*}^a, Karolina Górzyńska^b, Marlena Lembicz^b, Adrian Leuchtmann^c, Anne Sangliana^a and Nicola Richards^d

^aBiology Department, Hope College, Holland, MI, USA; ^bDepartment of Plant Taxonomy, A. Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland; ^cInstitute of Integrative Biology, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland; ^dBiocontrol & Biosecurity, AgResearch, Lincoln Science Centre, Lincoln, Canterbury, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

Epichloë fungi are endophytes within grasses that can form stromata on culms of their hosts. *Botanophila* flies visit the stromata for egg laying and in the process can vector spermatial spores, thereby cross fertilising the fungus. Following egg hatch, larval flies consume fungal tissue and spores. Thus, *Epichloë* individuals with traits that limit larval consumption could be at a selective advantage. We assessed *Botanophila* fly larvae from sites within the United States and Europe for infection by the bacterial sexual parasite *Wolbachia* through amplification of the *Wolbachia* surface protein gene (*wsp*). Nearly 70% of fly larvae in our samples were infected by *Wolbachia*. This is the first record of infection by *Wolbachia* within *Botanophila* and could have far reaching effects on not only the fly host, but also the *Epichloë* fungi upon which *Botanophila* feeds as well as the grass host within which the fungi live. For example, infection by *Wolbachia* could limit consumption of *Epichloë* spores by *Botanophila* larvae if the bacteria promoted premature larval death.

ARTICLE HISTORY Received 25 June 2018 Accepted 19 August 2018

KEYWORDS

Ascomycota; Diptera; fungal endophyte; sexual parasite

Introduction

The relationship between Botanophila flies and Epichloë fungi has long been a subject of interest to researchers due to the fly's peculiar pollinator-like behaviour. This guasi-pollination interaction closely resembles that observed between some insects and their angiosperm hosts, such as the fig-fig wasp and yucca-yucca moth interaction, but is uncommon among fungi (Bultman 1995). Flies find stromata by tracking volatiles the fungi produce (Steinebrunner et al. 2008a.). Once they locate a stroma, they alight and feed on perithecial tissues containing spermatial spores, and then oviposit and defecate along the whole length of the stroma. Spermatia pass through the gut of the fly unharmed and are deposited on subsequent stromata the fly visits. Epichloë fungi are self-incompatible and thus, flies cross-fertilise fungi as they vector spermatia (Bultman et al. 1998). Fly larvae remain on fungal stromata until just before pupation and feed on the products of cross fertilisation; the ascospores (Bultman et al. 1995). Botanophila flies appear to be the main vectors of spores although other vectors, like slugs, have been implicated (Rao et al. 2012; Hoffman and Rao 2014).

An enigma regarding mutualisms is their observed stability (Bronstein 2001, 2009). What prevents one party from over-exploiting the other and the mutualism dissolving into an antagonistic interaction? For yuccas this may be selective abortion of ovaries that receive numerous yucca moth eggs (Pelmyr and Hurth 1994). For *Epichloë* the mechanism is not known, but a previous study showed larval death rate increased with *Botanophila* egg density on a stroma (Bultman et al. 2000).

During past investigations, researchers observed that male *Botanophila* flies are rare and that a substantial proportion (as much as 30%) of eggs can be non-viable at some sites (Górzyńska et al. 2011; Lembicz et al. 2013). This could indicate the presence of a sexual parasite in fly populations. As with fruit abortion in yucca, a sexual parasite could promote stability of the interacting mutualists by limiting exploitation of *Epichloë* by *Botanophila*. One common type of sexual parasite in insects is *Wolbachia*, a genus of rickettsiae bacteria that lives within the reproductive tissues of its hosts (Werren 1997). In general, these bacteria are thought to be reproductive parasites that may cause a variety of phenotypic changes in their hosts including cytoplasmic

CONTACT Thomas Bultman 💿 bultmant@hope.edu

^{*}Present affiliation for Thomas Bultman is Franklin Mountains State Park, El Paso, TX, USA.

^{© 2018} The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

incompatibility, parthenogenesis induction, feminisation, and male-killing (Werren et al. 2008).

Wolbachia occurs in a vast number of arthropod species as well as filarial nematodes and may be one of the most abundant intracellular genera of bacteria known (Fialho and Stevens 2000; Cordaux et al. 2001; Weeks and Breeuwer 2001; Goodacre et al. 2006), yet it has not been documented in *Botanophila* flies. If a cytoplasmic incompatibility or male-killing strain of *Wolbachia* were to occur in *Botanophila*, it could have important implications for the interaction between the flies and *Epichloë*, such as reducing larval feeding on the fungus. The purpose of our study was to screen *Botanophila* flies for *Wolbachia* infection.

Materials and methods

Sample collection and DNA extraction

We collected *Epichloë*-infected grass stems containing stroma with *Botanophila* brood chambers from sites in both Europe and the USA in May and June and stored them in 80% ethanol for transportation. The larvae were removed by cutting open the brood chambers and using forceps to transfer larvae to vials of 80% ethanol for storage until DNA extraction could be performed. DNA extraction was performed on single larvae using the DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen Inc., Valencia, CA, USA) according to manufacturer's instructions, but using a final elution volume of 50 μ L.

Identifying Botanophila species

To determine the species of *Botanophila* larvae we amplified the mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase II (COII) gene from total larval DNA using the modified primer TL2-J-3037 (5'-TAATATGGCAGATTAGTGCA-3') (Leuchtmann 2007) and primer TD-N-3885 (5'-TTTAGTTTGACATACTAATGTTAT-3') (Simon et al. 1994; Leuchtmann 2007). Polymerase chain reactions (PCR) were performed in 25 µl volumes containing 8 µl *Taq* PCR Master Mix (Qiagen Inc., Valencia, CA, USA). Amplification was conducted in an Eppendorf Pro thermocycler using a program with the following parameters: 7 min at 94°C; 45 s at 94°C, 45 s at 46°C, and 2 min at 70°C, repeated 30 times; 5 min at 70°C; hold at 4°C. Amplified products were separated using gel

electrophoresis in 1.5% agarose gels and visualised by SYBR®Green I (Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR, USA) under UV light to check for proper amplification. PCR amplicons were then purified with Wizard® SV Gel and PCR Clean-Up System (Promega Corp., Madison, WI, USA) according to manufacturer's instructions. Sequencing reactions were performed in 10 µL volumes using a BigDye Terminator Cycle Sequencing kit (PE Applied Biosystems) with recommended PCR conditions. Both strands of the product were sequenced and were separated on a capillary 3130 Genetic Analyzer (Applied Biosystems). Sequences were identified to species using a nucleotide BLAST (Altschul et al. 1990) to compare them to reference sequences of Botanophila distinguished by Leuchtmann (2007) and Leuchtmann and Michelsen (2016). Negative controls without DNA were run with each test to ensure the absence of contamination in reagents.

Assessing Wolbachia infection

We analysed total DNA extracted from larvae for the presence of Wolbachia by using PCR to amplify the Wolbachia surface protein gene (wsp) with primers wsp-F1 (GTCCAATARSTGATGARGAAAC) and wsp-R1 (CYGCACCAAYAGYRCTRTAAA) (Baldo et al. 2006). Reactions were performed in 10 µl volumes containing 5 µl Tag PCR Master Mix (Qiagen Inc., Valencia, CA, USA). Amplification was conducted in an Eppendorf Pro thermocycler using a program with the following parameters: 2 min at 95°C; 30 s at 95°C, 45 s at 53°C, and 1 min at 72°C, repeated 35 times; 6 min at 72°C; hold at 4°C. Amplicons were separated using gel electrophoresis in a 1.5% agarose gel and visualised by SYBR®Green I (Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR, USA) under UV light to determine presence or absence of Wolbachia. A positive test for Wolbachia resulted in the presence of one band at 603 bp. DNA extracted from an infected specimen of Mermessus fradeorum (Araneae) was used as a known positive control for Wolbachia (Curry et al. 2015). Negative controls without DNA were run with each test to ensure the absence of contamination in reagents.

Results

We found Botanophila larvae on Epichloë typhina infecting Puccinella distans, Brachypodium pinnatum,

Holcus mollis, Holcus lanatus, and Dactylis glomerata; Epichloë elymi infecting Elymus canadensis and Elymus virginicus; and Epichloë bromicola infecting Bromus benekeni and Elymus repens. We successfully sequenced and identified COII amplicons from 83 fly larvae. In total, we found seven different Botanophila species represented (Table 1). Representative sample sequences were submitted to the NCBI GenBank database and can be found under accession numbers MF495863 through MF495888 (NCBI Resource Coordinators 2013). By far the most common species was Botanophila dissecta, comprising 50.6% of all larvae collected (Table 1). Two unidentified fly species (B. sp.5 and B. sp. 6) were only found in the USA samples.

 Table 1. The number of each fly species found in our total sample and their rates of infection by Wolbachia.

Fly species	Ν	# Infected	Infected (%)	
B. cuspidata	1	1	100	
B. dissecta	42	35	83.3	
B. laterella	13	6	46.2	
B. lobata	12	3	25.0	
B. phrenione	6	5	83.3	
B. sp 5	4	3	75.0	
В. sp. б	5	5	100	
Totals	83	58	69.9	

N = sample size of fly larvae.

Five fly species (*B. dissecta, B. lobata, B. phrenione, B. cuspidata*, and *B. laterella*) were found in European samples. *Botanophila lobata* was the only species found in both USA and Europe (Table 2). *Botanophila cuspidata* was collected from *Epichloë typhina* infecting *Puccinella distans* (Table 1), a new record of grass/fungus host for that fly species.

Of the 83 samples, 58 were positive for the presence of Wolbachia (Table 1). The sequence from the wsp gene from Botanophila lobata can be found under accession number KR109249 (NCBI Resource Coordinators 2013). The incidence of Wolbachia infection varied among fly species, with five species (B. cuspidata, B. dissecta, B. phrenione, B. sp.5, and B. sp. 6) showing high (>75%) infection, one (B. laterella) showing intermediate (46.2%) infection, and one (B. lobata) showing low (25.0%) infection (Table 1). Comparing infection rates across continents, we found flies from Europe had higher infection (79.0% - 49/62) than those from the US (60.0% - 9/15)(Table 2). Infection rate also varied across fungal host species; larvae collected from E. typhina and E. elymi had the highest incidence of infection (75.0% – 48/64; 69.2% - 9/13, respectively), while infection of those from E. bromicola was much lower (16.7% - 1/6).

Location	GPS	Fungus	Plant	Fly Species	Ν	# Infected	Infected (%)
Poland 52° 47.397' N 18° 06.064' E 52° 46.544' N 18° 06.190' E 51° 59.29' N 17° 9.262' W 51° 54.394' N 17° 2. 587' W 52° 46.083' N 17° 92.444' W 52° 27.857' N 16° 55.868' E 52° 15. 277' N	52° 47.397′ N	E. typhina	P. distans	B. dissecta	5	2	40.0
	18° 06.064' E			B. laterella	1	1	100.0
				B. cuspidata	1	1	100.0
		E. bromicola	E. repens	B. lobata	4	0	0
	52° 46.544′ N	E. typhina	P. distans	B. phrenione	3	3	100.0
	18° 06.190' E			B. laterella	1	1	100.0
	51° 59.29′ N 17° 9.262′ W	E. typhina	B. pinnatum	B. dissecta	6	3	50.0
	51° 54.394′ N	E. bromicola	B. benekeni	B. lobata	1	1	100.0
	17° 2. 587' W			B. laterella	1	0	0
	52° 46.083′ N	E. typhina	H. mollis	B. dissecta	3	2	66.7
	17° 92.444' W			B. lobata	1	1	100.0
				B. laterlla	1	1	100.0
	52° 27.857′ N	E. typhina	D. glomerata	B. dissecta	6	6	100.0
	16° 55.868' E		H. lanatus	B. dissecta	8	8	100.0
			D. glomerata	B. phrenione	2	2	100.0
			D. glomerata	B. laterella	1	1	100.0
			H. lanatus	B. laterella	2	2	100.0
			H. lanatus	B. phrenione	1	0	0
	52° 15. 277′ N 16° 47.577′ W	E. typhina	P. nemoralis	B. dissecta	14	14	100.0
Switzerland	47° 20.566′ N 8° 37.432′ E	E. typhina	B. pinnatum	B. laterella	6	0	0
Oregon (USA)	44° 59.053′ N 122° 56.648′ W	E. typhina	D. glomerata	B. lobata	2	0	0
Missouri (USA)	40° 14.100' N	E. elymi	E. virginicus	B. sp. 5	3	3	100.0
	92° 41.042' W		-	B. lobata	4	1	25.0
				B. sp. 6	5	5	100.0
Oklahoma (USA)	36° 7.053' N 97° 6.298' W	E. elymi	E. canadensis	B. sp. 5	1	0	0
TOTAL					83	58	69.9

Table 2. The Wolbachia infection rates of Botanophila flies separated by location, fungus and plant species, and fly species.

Discussion

The reproductive fitness of sexually reproducing *Epichloë* can depend upon the service of spermatiavectoring *Botanophila* flies (Bultman et al. 1995). Here we show that *Wolbachia* bacteria are indeed present in the *Botanophila* genus, a relationship not previously recorded. This discovery may help explain the high levels of non-viable *Botanophila* eggs found in the field (Górzyńska et al. 2011; Lembicz et al. 2013) since *Wolbachia* can result in death or improper development of embryos. To confirm this effect of the parasite, further experimentation is required in which adults are cured of the bacterium, allowed to mate, and their progeny assessed.

Beyond simply confirming the presence of Wolbachia bacteria, our results give rise to important questions regarding the effect of the bacteria on Botanophila and potentially on the flies' fungal hosts. First, why do we see variation in infection rates among different Botanophila species? Our sample sizes are low and it may be that infection rates actually do not differ, so more sampling is warranted. If, however, infection rates do differ among Botanophila species, as our data suggest, this could arise due to differences in geographic location, fly species/population, or fungal species (Table 2). Second, how might the fungal species affect Wolbachia infection rates of flies? Some Epichloë species (i.e. E. typhina and E. elymi) were visited more frequently by Wolbachiainfected flies than were others (i.e. E. bromicola). It is unclear if or how fungi might promote or prevent Wolbachia infection, yet if possible, such a mechanism could strongly impact fungal fitness by modifying the amount of larval feeding on perithecia and the ascospores they contain. A possible mechanism by which Epichloë might alter the infection status of Botanophila is through production of antimicrobial agents that could disinfect Botanophila of Wolbachia. Interestingly, Epichloë are known to produce secondary compounds with antimicrobial properties and their quantities can vary dramatically among Epichloë species (Koshina et al. 1989; Steinebrunner et al. 2008b). If Wolbachia-infected flies are responsible for laying the nonviable eggs we see in the field, the fungus would benefit by receiving the service of cross fertilisation (through flies vectoring spores) while at the same time avoiding destruction of its progeny (as nonviable eggs would not produce

larvae). Such a pathway of interaction could help prevent over-exploitation of *Epichloë* by *Botanophila* and could thus lead to stability in this intriguing interaction.

Acknowledgments

C. Young and S. Rao provided larvae from Oklahoma. J. White (University of Kentucky) provided a positive control for *Wolbachia* infection. J. Li provided assistance in running the DNA sequences. National Science Foundation award NSF-IOS #1119775 and National Geographic Society award 9861-16 to T.L. Bultman provided funding.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

National Science Foundation award NSF-IOS #1119775 and National Geographic Society award 9861-16 to T.L. Bultman provided funding.

References

- Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment search tool. J Mol Biol. 215:403–410.
- Baldo L, Dunning Hotopp JC, Jolley KA, Bordenstein SR, Biber SA, Choudhury RR, Hayashi C, Maiden MCJ, Tettelin H, Werren JH. 2006. Multilocus sequence typing system for the endosymbiont *Wolbachia pipientis*. Appl Environ Microbiol. 72:7098–7110.
- Bronstein JL. 2001. The exploitation of mutualism. Ecology Let. 4:277–287.
- Bronstein JL. 2009. The evolution of facilitation and mutualism. J Ecol. 97:1160–1170.
- Bultman T, White JF Jr, Bowdish T, Welch A. 1998. A new kind of mutualism between fungi and insects. Mycol Res. 102:235–238.
- Bultman TL. 1995. Mutualistic and parasitic interactions between *Phorbia* flies and *Epichloë* : convergence between a fungus and entomophilous angiosperms. Can J Bot. 73:1343–1348.
- Bultman TL, Welch AM, Boning R, Bowdish TI. 2000. The cost of mutualism in a fly-fungus interaction. Oecologia. 124:85–90.
- Bultman TL, White JF Jr, Bowdish TI, Welch AM, Johnston J. 1995. Mutualistic transfer of *Epichloë* spermatia by *Phorbia* flies. Mycologia. 87:182–189.
- Cordaux R, Michel-Salzat A, Bouchon D. 2001. *Wolbachia* infection in crustaceans: novel hosts and potential routes for horizontal transmission. J Evol Biol. 14:237–243.

- Curry MM, Paliulis LV, Welch KD, Harwood JD, White JA. 2015. Multiple endosymbiont infections and reproductive manipulations in a linyphiid spider population. Heredity (Edinb). 115:146–152.
- Fialho RF, Stevens L. 2000. Male-killing *Wolbachia* in a flour beetle. Proc R Soc London B. 267:1469–1474.
- Goodacre SL, Martin OY, Thomas CF, Hewitt GM. 2006. *Wolbachia* and other endosymbiont infections in spiders. Mol Ecol. 15:517–527.
- Górzyńska K, Lembicz M, Olszanowski Z, Leuchtmann A. 2011. *Botanophila-Epichloë* interaction in a wild grass, Puccinellia distans, lacks dependence on the fly vector. Ann Entomol Soc Am. 104:841–846.
- Hoffman GD, Rao S. 2014. Fertilization of *Epichloë* typhina stromata by mycophagous slugs. Mycologia. 106:1–7.
- Koshina H, Togiya S, Yoshihara T, Sakamura S, Shimanuli T, Sato T, Tajimi A. 1989. New fungitoxic sesquiterpenoids, chokol A - G, from stromata of *Epichloe typhina* and the absolute configuration of chokol E. Agri Biol Chem. 53:789–796.
- Lembicz M, Gorzynska K, Olszanowski Z, Michelsen V, Leuchtmann A. 2013. The occurrence and preference of *Botanophila* flies (Diptera: Anthomyiidae) for particular species of *Epichloë* fungi infecting wild grasses. Eur J Entomol. 110:129–134.
- Leuchtmann A. 2007. *Botanophila* flies on *Epichloë* host species in Europe and North America: no evidence for coevolution. Entomol Exp Appl. 123:13–23.
- Leuchtmann A, Michelsen V. 2016. Biology and evolution of the *Epichloë*-associated *Botanophila* species found in Europe (Diptera: Anthomyiidae). Insect Syst Evol. 47:1–14.
- Pellmyr OHuth CJ. 1994. Evolutionary stability of mutualism between yuccas and yucca moths. Nature. 372:257-260.

- Rao S, Alderman SC, Kaser JM, Hoffman GD. 2012. Fertilization of *Epichloë typhina* in cultivated *Dactylis glomerata* by factors besides *Botanophila* flies. In: Young CA, Aiken GE, Mcculley RL, Strickland JR, Schardl CL, Vaillancourt L, Matthews JC, Phillips TD, Stearns B, Liu J, editors. Epichloae, endophytes of cool season grasses: implications, utilization, and biology. Ardmore (Oklahoma): The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation; p. 122–126.
- Resource Coordinators NCBI. 2013. Database resources of the National Center for Biotechnology Information. Nucleic Acids Res. 41:D8–D20.
- Simon C, Frati F, Beckenbach A, Crespi B, Liu H, Flook P. 1994. Evolution, weighting, and phylogenetic utility of mitochondrial gene sequences and a compilation of conserved polymerase chain reaction primers. Ann Entomol Soc Am. 87:651–701.
- Steinebrunner F, Schiestl FP, Leuchtmann A. 2008b. Ecological role of volatiles produced by *Epichloë*: differences in antifungal toxicity. FEMS Micro Ecol. 64:307–316.
- Steinebrunner F, Twele R, Francke W, Leuchtmann A, Schiestl FP. 2008a. Role of odour compounds in the attraction of gamete vectors in endophytic Epichloë fungi. New Phytol. 178:401–411.
- Weeks AR, Breeuwer JA. 2001. *Wolbachia*-induced parthenogenesis in a genus of phytophagous mites. Proc Biol Sci. 268:2245–2251.
- Werren JH. 1997. Biology of *Wolbachia*. Annu Rev Entomol. 42:587–609.
- Werren JH, Baldo L, Clark ME. 2008. Wolbachia: master manipulators of invertebrate biology. Nat Rev Microbiol. 6:741–751.