Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

CHARACTERISATION OF A PUTATIVE DOTHISTROMIN BIOSYNTHETIC CLUSTER.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Molecular Biology at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Seth Laarakkers

1999

ABSTRACT.

The fungus *Dothistroma pini* is a key pathogen in New Zealand (and international) softwood plantations, most notably *P. radiata*. The mycotoxin dothistromin produced by this saprophytic fungus is believed to play a major role in its pathogenesis.

Dothistromin shares functional groups and pathway intermediates with those of sterigmatocystin and aflatoxin, secondary metabolites of *Aspergillus* sp. As the sterigmatocystin and aflatoxin biosynthetic pathways are characterised this provided us with a model pathway and potential probes for the isolation of dothistromin genes.

The *ver*1 gene is critical to the completion of aflatoxin biosynthesis in *Aspergillus* sp. as its disruption prevented the synthesis of aflatoxin. Assuming similar enzymes act in the dothistromin biosynthetic pathway a probe for *ver*1 was obtained and used to probe a *D. pini* genomic library. This led to the isolation of two lambda clones named λ CGV1 and λ CGV2 (Gillman 1996). A second library screen was completed using an aflatoxin polyketide synthase (PKS) probe and led to the isolation of the lambda clone λ BMKSA (Morgan 1997).

The λ CGV1 clone has been studied in detail and shown to contain a gene similar to aflatoxin ver1 (named dkr1) and other potential dothistromin biosynthetic genes (Monahan 1998). This study looks in greater detail at the lambda clones λ CGV2 and λ BMKSA and determines whether they contain putative dothistromin biosynthetic genes and are part of the anticipated gene cluster.

In this project the lambda clone λ CGV2 was partially characterised which revealed that the other potential ver gene showed a greater similarity to the melanin biosynthetic gene phn than to the aflatoxin gene ver-1. This implied that the clone was unlikely to contain dothistromin biosynthetic genes so no further sequence was generated. However, a partial restriction map was constructed.

The other lambda clone, λ BMKSA was then further characterised. Double stranded sequence of the putative *pks* gene region was completed. The remainder of the lambda clone was subcloned and exploratory sequence revealed a gene with high similarity to *stc*W.

The next stage was to determine how the three lambda clones were related. This was approached by probing genomic Southern blots with the ends of the lambda clones to determine the presence of commonly hybridised fragments. The presence of common fragments suggests that the three clones are very close together in the genome, although the evidence which links $\lambda CGV2$ and $\lambda BMKSA$ is stronger than the evidence that links $\lambda CGV2$ and $\lambda CGV1$.

This is the first evidence that the three lambda clones isolated using aflatoxin probes are close together in the genome of *D. pini*. The genes present on these lambda clones show a high degree of similarity to their aflatoxin counterparts and could potentially contain a dothistriomin biosynthetic cluster.

Acknowledgements.

Firstly I must thank both my supervisor Rosie Bradshaw, without your encouragement and guidance this project would never have been completed, and my family for their on going support and understanding.

Thanks to everybody at Massey, in and out of the MGU, for answering my many questions and being good company. All of the suggestions, discussions (arguments!) and explanations made for my two most interesting years at Massey. The best of luck to all of you in your degrees, research and future careers.

Thanks to all of my friends away from Massey, Jim without your help I don't know what I would have done, your friendship is invaluable. Everybody else, thanks for the company, diverse conversations, and consistent laughter.

Thanks to Jaime, Eru, Tala, and all the other people I trained with for giving me time I was to busy to think about Massey! Thanks to Chuck and Benjamin for trips to remind me that NZ has the best bush and coastline in the world for us to enjoy, and providing contrast to the Massey environment, thanks also to Rhys and the teams at Flyers and Icons for all the laughter and team spirit they provided, it was always a pleasure to work with you.

Finally, thanks to Stewart for scanning all my Autorads, and everybody else who helped assemble this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	New Zealand Exotic Forest Damage.	1
	1.1.1 Dothistroma pini.	1
1.2	Infection.	2
	1.2.1 Host Invasion and Colonisation.	4
1.3	Dothistroma Blight.	5
1.4	Control of D. pini Infection.	7
	1.4.1 Quarantine.	7
	1.4.2 Spraying.	8
	1.4.3 Host Resistance in Mature Trees.	10
	1.4.3.1 Selective Breeding For Host Resistance.	10
	1.4.3.2 Clonal Forestry.	12
1.5	Host Fungi Interaction.	13
1.6	Dothistromin.	15
	1.6.1 Chemistry of Dothistromin.	16
1.7	Gene Clusters and Their Regulation.	19
1.8	Aflatoxin and Sterigmatocystin.	21
1.9	Ver Genes.	24
	1.9.1 Aspergillus Ver Genes.	24
	1.9.2 Dothistroma pini ver Genes.	26
1.1	0 Altered Expression Mutants in Fungi.	27
1.1	1 Objectives of This Project.	28

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.

2.1 Bacterial and Fungal Strains, Lambda Clones and Plasmids.	30
2.2 Media.	30
2.2.1 Luria-Bertaini (LB) Media.	30
2.2.2 Terrific Broth.	33
2.2.3 TB Top Agar.	33
2.2.4 NZCYM.	33
2.2.5 Dothistroma Media.	33
2.3 Growth and Maintenance of Cultures.	34
2.3.1 Fungal Cultures.	34
2.3.2 Bacterial Cultures.	34
2.4 Buffers and Solutions.	
2.4.1 TE Buffer.	35
2.4.2 1xTAE Buffer.	35
2.4.3 1xTBE Buffer.	35
2.4.4 20xSSC.	35
2.4.5 Ethidium Bromide.	36
2.4.6 RNase A.	36
2.4.7 STET Buffer.	36
2.4.8 10xGel Loading Buffer.	36
2.4.9 Hybridisation Solution.	37
2.4.10 50xDenhardt's Solution.	37
2.4.11 10xTNE Solution.	37

2.4.12 SM Buffer.	37
2.5 DNA Isolation.	38
2.5.1 Rapid Boiling Plasmid Preparation.	38
2.5.2 Alkaline Lysis Plasmid Preparation.	38
2.5.3 Modified Alkaline Lysis (PEG).	38
2.5.4 Qiagen Column Plasmid DNA preparation.	38
2.5.5 Purification of Fungal Genomic DNA.	39
2.5.6 Lambda Phage DNA Preparation.	39
2.6 Purification of DNA.	40
2.6.1 Phenol/Chloroform Extraction.	40
2.6.2 Ethanol Precipitation.	40
2.6.3 Agarose Gel Purification.	40
2.7 Determination of DNA Concentration.	41
2.7.1 By Spectrophotometric Assay.	41
2.7.2 By Fluorometric Assay.	42
2.7.3 By Gel Electrophoresis.	43
2.8 Restriction Endonuclease Digestion of DNA.	43
2.9 Agarose Gel Electrophoresis.	44
2.10 Determination of DNA Molecular Weights.	44
2.11 DNA Subcloning.	44
2.11.1 SAP Treatment of Plasmid.	45
2.11.2 DNA Ligations.	45
2.12 Transformation of E. coli.	46

	2.12.1 Calcium Chloride Transformation.	46
	2.12.2 Electroporation.	46
2.13 Southern Blotting and Hybridisation.		46
	2.13.1 Southern Blotting.	46
	2.13.2 Preparation of $[\alpha^{-32}P]$ Labelled probe.	47
	2.13.3 Southern Blot Hybridisation.	47
	2.13.4 Stripping Probe From Membranes.	48
2.14 D	NA Sequencing.	48
3. CH	ARACTERISATION OF THE λCGV2 CLONE.	51
3.1 Int	roduction.	51
3.2 Re	estriction Analysis.	52
3.3 Re	estriction Mapping.	53
3.4 Se	quencing.	63
3.5 λC	CGV2 Sequence Analysis.	66
	3.5.1 Database Comparison.	66
	3.5.2 Sequence Comparison.	69
	3.5.3 GC Content.	70
	3.5.4 Codon Usage.	70
	3.5.5 Introns.	74
3.6 Cł	napter Three Discussion.	
	3.6.1 Restriction Analysis.	74
	3.6.2 Sequence Analysis.	75
	3.6.3 Potential Functions of D. pini phn1	76

3.6.4 GC Content and Codon Analysis.	81
3.6.5 Intron Analysis.	83
3.7 Summary.	83
4. CHARACTERISATION OF THE POLYKETIDE SYNTHASE	
CONTAINING CLONE, λBMKSA.	85
4.1 Introduction.	85
4.2 Comparison of Lambda Clones.	86
42.1 Restriction Digest Comparisons.	86
4.2.2 Southern Blot Comparisons.	89
4.3 Sequencing.	92
4.4 Sequence Analysis.	
4.4.1 Database Comparison.	96
4.4.2 Conserved Domains.	96
4.4.3 GC Content and Codon Usage.	97
4.5 Discussion.	
4.5.2 Sequence Analysis.	100
4.5.2.1 Putative pks Functions.	100
4.5.2.2 Polyketide Synthase Domains.	101
5. THE GENE CLUSTER SO FAR.	104
5.1 Introduction.	104
5.2 Southern Comparison of the Lambda Clones.	
5.2.1 The Southern Blot.	106
5.2.2 Hybridisation.	106

5.3 Chapter 5 Results and Discussion.	107
5.3.1 Southern Analysis.	119
Conclusions and Future Directions.	132
Appendix 1: DNA Sequences.	135
Appendix 2: Codon Usage Tables.	149
References.	150

LIST OF TABLES.

Table 2.1 Bacterial and Fungal Strains, λ Clones and Plasmids.	31
Table 2.2 Sequencing Primers.	50
Table 3.1 Data from Restriction Mapping of Clone λCGV2.	54
Table 3.2 Clustal W Alignment Scores.	73
Table 3.3 The GC Content of All D. pini Genes Sequenced to Date.	82
Table 5.1 Southern Blotting Summary	118

LIST OF FIGURES.

17
22
55
57
59
61
62
64
67
71
78
87
90
94
98

Figure 5.1 Southern Blotted D. pini Genomic DNA Restriction Profile	
Probed With λCGV1 2.1 kb <i>Eco</i> RI Fragment.	108
Figure 5.2 Southern Blotted D. pini Genomic DNA Restriction Profile	
Probed With λCGV2 4.4 kb BamHI Fragment.	110
Figure 5.3 Southern Blotted D. pini Genomic DNA Restriction Profile	
Probed With λCGV2 1.0 kb BamHI Fragment.	112
Figure 5.4 Southern Blotted D. pini Genomic DNA Restriction Profile	
Probed With λBMKSA 2.4 kb BamHI/EcoRI Fragment.	114
Figure 5.5 Southern Blotted D. pini Genomic DNA Restriction Profile	
Probed With λBMKSA 3.0 kb <i>Bam</i> HI Fragment.	116
Figure 5.6 The Junction of $\lambda BMKSA$ and $\lambda CGV2$.	121
Figure 5.7 The Junction of λ CGV1 and λ CGV2.	124
Figure 5.8 The Distribution of Three Lambda Clones in a Putative	
Dothistromin Biosynthetic Cluster	129