

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.

**Development of Methods allowing
Correlation of *Dothistroma* and
Dothistromin *In Planta***

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

in

Biochemistry

at Massey University, Manawatu,
New Zealand

Timothy J. Owen

2010

Abstract

Dothistroma septosporum is a fungal pathogen of pines with a worldwide distribution. It is responsible for the disease red band needle blight, in which necrotic lesions appear on infected needles. The red colour of the disease is due to the presence of the mycotoxin dothistromin. This toxin is structurally related to the better characterised mycotoxins aflatoxin and sterigmatocystin. The function of these toxins is unknown, but dothistromin is hypothesised to act as a competition factor. While much work has been done on *D. septosporum* and dothistromin in broth culture, *in planta* work has been limited by the methods available.

This work focused first on the development of a method for the reliable and high yield extraction of DNA from infected lesions, as previously used methods were found to be inadequate. It was found that the addition of an enzyme lysis step to the Qiagen DNeasy protocol and the replacement of its column purification with chloroform purification gave a greatly increased yield of DNA with an acceptable loss of purity.

To allow quantification of dothistromin from the same lesion samples, previously used assay systems were optimised and compared in their accuracy and sensitivity. An HPLC-fluorescence method was found most effective, and was able to accurately quantify dothistromin at single lesion quantities.

The developed methods were used to give a correlation between *Dothistroma* biomass and dothistromin in lesions at various stages of development. While this correlation was not found to be statistically significant, continuation of this work should allow valid conclusions to be drawn.

To give insight into the evolution of dothistromin biosynthesis, the genomes of other dothideomycetes were examined for the presence of dothistromin biosynthesis gene homologs. While no homologs were conclusively identified, a number of genes were shown to have similarity to known toxin biosynthesis genes.

In summary, while not all research hypotheses were able to be proven or disproven, this work sets a firm basis for future investigation in these areas using the methods developed, and strongly suggests the direction continued study should take.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, my sincere thanks to my supervisor, Rosie Bradshaw, not only for giving so much guidance and support in my work, but also for putting up with my constant misuse of the word ‘significantly’.

Thank you to Rose Motion, for giving up so much of your time to help me with the chemistry side of things, of which I still know far too little about.

Thank you to the past and present members of the Fungal Jungle who have been so helpful; Carole, for always knowing where everything is, especially if it’s right in front of me; Arne, for pointing me in the right direction; Rebecca, for running the real time PCR and always having such good advice; Shuguang, for showing me through the methods; Melissa, for showing that there is light at the end of the tunnel; Kabir, for all his help with the pine seedling work; and to Adam, Shuiying, Yanfei, and Pranav for answering my mostly inane questions.

Thank you to everyone from IMBS for being so friendly and so willing to give up your time to help someone else. Unfortunately there is no way I can name all of you!

Thanks to Robert and Rex for giving me excellent advice on working with dothistromin. It was a privilege to have benefit of such experience. Thanks to Karl and Scott of AgResearch for the MS work.

More personally, thanks Kerry for being amazing, and thanks Mum and Dad for all the support.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 HISTORY, HOSTS, AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE.....	1
1.2 IDENTIFICATION, DIFFERENTIATION, AND DNA EXTRACTION	2
1.3 THE CHEMISTRY AND BIOSYNTHESIS OF DOTHISTROMIN.....	3
1.4 DOTHISTROMIN AS A MYCOTOXIN.....	5
1.5 THE BIOLOGICAL ROLE OF DOTHISTROMIN.....	6
1.6 PURIFICATION AND QUANTIFICATION OF DOTHISTROMIN	8
1.7 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	12
1.8 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	12
CHAPTER 2: MATERIALS AND METHODS	14
2.1 DNA EXTRACTION AND PURIFICATION	14
2.1.1 DNA extraction; needles and fungal mycelia	14
2.1.2 Sampling and freeze drying	14
2.1.3 Grinding.....	14
2.1.4 Qiagen DNeasy DNA extraction	15
2.1.5 Nucleon Phytopure DNA extraction	16
2.1.6 Combined DNA extraction method	16
2.1.7 Glucanex enzyme incubation.....	16
2.1.8 Fastprep bead beater	17
2.1.9 DNA quantification	17
2.1.10 PCR conditions	17
2.1.11 Surface sterilisation	18
2.1.12 Nested PCR.....	18
2.1.13 DNA gels	19
2.2 DOTHISTROMIN EXTRACTION AND QUANTIFICATION	19
2.2.1 Broth cultures	19
2.2.2 Solvent extraction	19
2.2.3 Dothistromin	20
2.2.4 ELISA.....	20
2.2.5 Thin Layer Chromatography	21
2.2.6 HPLC	22
2.2.7 Mass Spectrometry	23
2.3 DOTHISTROMA LESION SAMPLING	23
2.3.1 Seedling inoculation	23
2.3.2 Labelling.....	23
2.3.3 Quantification	24
2.4 BIOINFORMATICS:	25
2.4.1 Cluster location:.....	25
2.4.2 Alignment:	25
CHAPTER 3: DEVELOPMENT OF DNA EXTRACTION METHODS	27
3.1 INTRODUCTION	27

3.2 RESULTS	28
3.2.1 DNA extraction optimization.....	28
3.2.2 Extraction from small pine needle samples	32
3.2.3 Extraction from needles infected with <i>D. septosporum</i>	32
3.2.4 Extraction from herbarium specimens	33
3.2.5 Fungal DNA extractions	33
3.3 DISCUSSION	34
CHAPTER 4: DEVELOPMENT OF DOTHISTROMIN EXTRACTION AND QUANTIFICATION METHODS	37
4.1 INTRODUCTION	37
4.2 RESULTS	38
4.2.1 Extraction.....	38
4.2.2 TLC.....	39
4.2.3 HPLC	42
4.2.4 Internal standard	47
4.2.5 ELISA.....	48
4.2.6 Summary of tested methods.....	49
4.3 DISCUSSION	50
CHAPTER 5: DOTHISTROMIN <i>IN PLANTA</i>	54
5.1 INTRODUCTION	54
5.2 RESULTS	54
5.2.1 Lesion development and categorization.....	54
5.2.2 PCR biomass quantification.....	57
5.2.3 Dothistromin-biomass relationship	58
5.3 DISCUSSION	61
CHAPTER 6: BIOINFORMATIC INVESTIGATION OF RELATED ORGANISMS	65
6.1 INTRODUCTION	65
6.2 RESULTS	65
6.2.1 Bioinformatics	65
6.2.2 Toxin assay	78
6.3 DISCUSSION	79
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY	82
CHAPTER 8: APPENDIX	83
8.1 GEL ELECTROPHORESIS	83
8.2 ELISA BUFFERS	83
8.3 LIST OF COMPARED GENES	84
8.4 ALTERNATIVE BUFFERS TESTED	89
8.5 TLC BACKGROUND	90
8.6 CAFFEIC ACID HPLC	91
8.7 LESION COMPONENT VARIATION	92
8.8 SAMPLE GROUP DISTRIBUTION	93
CHAPTER 9: BIBLIOGRAPHY	94

List of figures

FIG. 1.1: DOTHISTROMIN AND RELATED SECONDARY METABOLITES	3
FIG. 1.2 PRODUCTION OF OXYGEN RADICALS BY DOTHISTROMIN	5
FIG. 1.3: EARLY PRODUCTION OF DOTHISTROMIN	7
FIG 3.1: YIELDS OBTAINED FROM DIFFERENT DNA EXTRACTION PROTOCOLS	30
FIG 4.1: EFFECT OF INCREASED ACIDIFICATION ON DOTHISTROMIN IONISATION	39
FIG 4.2: SEPARATION OF TLC SOLVENT SYSTEMS	40
FIG 4.3: TLC DILUTION SERIES	41
FIG 4.4: SCANNING UV-VIS ABSORBANCE HPLC	43
FIG 4.5: HPLC DETECTION	44
FIG 4.6: FLUORESCENCE DETECTION DOTHISTROMIN DILUTION SERIES	45
FIG 4.7: MASS SPECTRUM OF DOTHISTROMIN PEAK	47
FIG 4.8: ELISA DOTHISTROMIN DILUTION SERIES	48
FIG 5.1: VARIATION IN MICROSCOPIC APPEARANCE OF SAMPLES	56
FIG. 5.2: AMPLIFICATION OF SAMPLE SETS	58
FIG. 5.3: DOTHISTROMIN CONTENT OF SAMPLES BY GROUP	59
FIG. 5.4: DNA VS DOTHISTROMIN	60
FIG. 6.1: <i>M. GRAMINICOLA</i> PKS7 CLUSTER	68
FIG. 6.2: <i>C. HETEROSTROPHUS</i> PKS19 CLUSTER	70
FIG. 6.3: <i>M. FIJIENSIS</i> MYCF11.E_GW1.7.973.1 CLUSTER	72
FIG. 6.4: <i>A. BRASSICOLA</i> AB06180.1 GENE CLUSTER	74
FIG. 6.5: <i>S. NODORUM</i> JAM_SNOG_06672/ JAM_SNOG_06682 CLUSTER	76
FIG. 6.6: <i>M. GRAMINICOLA</i> DOTHISTROMIN HPLC	78
FIG. 8.1: CHLOROFORM:METHANOL TLC BACKGROUND	90
FIG. 8.2: CAFFEIC ACID HPLC CHROMATOGRAM	91
FIG. 8.3: VARIATION IN HPLC FLUORESCENCE PEAKS	92
FIG. 8.4: DNA VS DOTHISTROMIN, BY SAMPLE GROUP	93

List of tables

<u>TABLE 2.1: PCR PRIMERS</u>	18
<u>TABLE 2.2: REALTIME PCR PRIMERS AND PROBES</u>	25
<u>TABLE 3.1: SUMMARY OF METHOD MODIFICATIONS</u>	31
<u>TABLE 3.2: EXTRACTION YIELD FOR SMALL SAMPLES</u>	32
<u>TABLE 3.3: EXTRACTION YIELD FOR <i>DOTHISTROMA</i> LESIONS</u>	33
<u>TABLE 3.4: EXTRACTION YIELD FROM FUNGAL MYCELIA</u>	34
<u>TABLE 4.1: TLC DILUTION SERIES</u>	42
<u>TABLE 4.2: FLUORESCENCE PEAK AREA OF DOTHISTROMIN HPLC STANDARDS</u>	46
<u>TABLE 4.3: ABSORBANCE OF ELISA STANDARDS</u>	48
<u>TABLE 4.4: DOTHISTROMIN QUANTIFICATION METHODS SUMMARY</u>	49
<u>TABLE 6.1: BIOSYNTHESIS GENE MATCHES SURROUNDING POTENTIAL PKS HOMOLOGS</u>	66
<u>TABLE 6.2: <i>M. GRAMINICOLA</i> PKS7 CLUSTER GENE MODELS</u>	69
<u>TABLE 6.3: <i>C. HETEROSTROPHUS</i> PKS19 CLUSTER GENE MODELS</u>	71
<u>TABLE 6.4: <i>M. FIJIENSIS</i> MYCF1.E_GW1.7.973.1 CLUSTER GENE MODELS</u>	73
<u>TABLE 6.5: <i>A. BRASSICOLA</i> AB06180.1 GENE CLUSTER MODELS</u>	75
<u>TABLE 6.6: <i>S. NODORUM</i> JAM_SNOG_06672/JAM_SNOG_06682 CLUSTER GENE MODELS</u>	77
<u>TABLE 8.1: <i>ALTERNARIA BRASSICOLA</i> GENE COMPARISONS</u>	84
<u>TABLE 8.2: <i>COCHLIOBOLUS HETEROSTROPHUS</i> GENE COMPARISONS</u>	85
<u>TABLE 8.3: <i>MYCOSPHAERELLA FIJIENSIS</i> GENE COMPARISONS</u>	86
<u>TABLE 8.4: <i>MYCOSPHAERELLA GRAMINICOLA</i> GENE COMPARISONS</u>	87
<u>TABLE 8.5: <i>STAGONOSPORA NODORUM</i> GENE COMPARISONS</u>	88