

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.

# Molecular and bioinformatic analysis of the *perA* locus in *Epichloë*

---

This thesis is presented as a partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science (MSc)

in

Genetics

at Massey University, Palmerston North

New Zealand

**Daniel Berry**

**2011**

## Abstract

Fungal endophytes of the *Epichloë* genus form largely mutualistic symbioses with cool-season grasses, systemically colonising the intercellular spaces of the host in a strictly regulated fashion. The endophyte receives protection and sustenance from the host, and in return provides benefits such as increased growth, drought resistance and protection against herbivores. Protection against herbivory is mediated through the production of bio-protective fungal secondary metabolites (SM). Examples of these SMs include lolitrem B, the causative agent of ‘ryegrass staggers’ in stock, and the insect feeding deterrent peramine.

The genes responsible for the production of each of these SMs are usually found clustered together in the genome, and are often closely associated with a range of transposon relics. SM gene expression occurs only when the endophyte is growing *in planta*, indicating the presence of plant-fungal signalling. This study investigated the locus structure and organisation of the gene *perA* that encodes the non-ribosomal peptide synthetase PerA, which is both essential and sufficient for production of peramine. It was found that *perA* and its flanking intergenic sequences exhibit considerable transposon-mediated variability across *Epichloë*, and that this transposon activity is likely responsible for the taxonomically discontinuous production of peramine both within and across *Epichloë* spp.

The major facilitator superfamily transporter gene *EF102* is divergently transcribed from and co-regulated with *perA* (*EF103*). Transcriptome data were used to identify transcription start sites for both genes. Comparative analysis of the intergenic sequence separating *EF102/perA* from 10 *Epichloë* isolates covering six different species refined the *perA* translation start site, and identified conserved regions in the promoters of both genes proposed to be important for regulation. A motif search identified a conserved DNA motif present multiple times in the promoters of both genes.

Deletion analysis of *EF102* revealed the gene probably does not encode a peramine transporter, as was hypothesised; however the four independent  $\Delta EF102$  mutants exhibited a reduction in peramine production relative to wild type, resulting in an alternative hypothesis that *EF102* encodes a transporter for a PerA substrate precursor molecule such as glutamate.

## **Acknowledgements**

Firstly I thank my supervisor Barry Scott for his guidance and support (and funding!), without which this would not have been possible.

Thanks to my collaborator Carolyn Young, who provided much of the material and DNA sequences required for this study.

Thanks to the Scottbase members (both past and present) Ruth, Gemma, Carla, Emma, Milena, Tetsuya, Yvonne, Sarah, Matt, Sanjay for their help and guidance around the lab over the last two (and a bit) years, and to Murray for his help with the bioinformatics aspects of this study. Thanks to Mike for getting me into this area in the first place.

Thanks to the lovely people at AgResearch who keep our plants watered, and especially Wayne and Wade for their advice and work on the guttation analyses.

Thanks to IMBS and all the staff (esp. Ann, Pat and Cynthia) who have helped me along the way.

Lastly thanks to Mum and Dad for their support – both emotional and fiscal!

# Table of Contents

---

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
Common Abbreviations	x
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Epichloë endophyte life cycle</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1.1 Endophyte growth <i>in planta</i>	2
1.1.2 <i>E. festucae</i> and <i>L. perenne</i> as a model system	4
<b>1.2 Epichloë taxonomy</b>	<b>4</b>
1.2.1 Hybrid origins are common for <i>Neotyphodium</i> spp.	5
<b>1.3 Benefits of the association</b>	<b>7</b>
1.3.1 Bio-protective secondary metabolites are produced by epichloë endophytes <i>in planta</i>	7
1.3.2 Fungal secondary metabolite gene clusters are plant-regulated	8
1.3.3 Peramine: distribution and genotype effects	9
1.3.3.1 Peramine synthesis pathway and PerA protein structure	9
1.3.3.2 Conservation and distribution of <i>perA</i>	10
1.3.3.3 <i>PerA</i> locus in <i>E. festucae</i> E2368	13
1.3.3.4 Detection of peramine in the host guttation fluid	13
<b>1.4 Transcriptome analysis of a disrupted symbiosis <i>E. festucae</i> mutant</b>	<b>14</b>
1.4.1 Transcriptome analysis of the <i>E. festucae</i> F11 $\Delta sakA$ mutant	14
1.4.2 Transcriptome analysis identifies <i>EF102</i> as a potential peramine transporter	14
<b>1.5 Regulation of epichloë secondary metabolite genes</b>	<b>15</b>
1.5.1 Comparative analysis as a tool for regulatory motif identification	15
<b>1.6 Aims</b>	<b>16</b>

<b>2.</b>	<b>Materials &amp; Methods</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Biological material</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Common stocks, growth media and conditions</b>	<b>21</b>
2.2.1	Basic growth media	21
2.2.1.1	Potato Dextrose medium (PD)	21
2.2.1.2	Luria Bertani medium (LB)	21
2.2.1.3	Regeneration medium (RG)	21
2.2.1.4	Sterilization conditions	21
2.2.2	Growth conditions	21
2.2.2.1	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	21
2.2.2.2	<i>Epichloë festucae</i>	22
2.2.3	Common stock solutions	22
2.2.3.1	SDS loading dye	22
2.2.3.2	20x SSC Buffer	22
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Standard <i>E. coli</i> cell methods</b>	<b>22</b>
2.3.1	Cloning DNA fragments into an <i>E. coli</i> plasmid vector	22
2.3.2	<i>E. coli</i> transformations	22
2.3.3	Screening <i>E. coli</i> transformants	23
2.3.4	<i>E. coli</i> plasmid isolation	23
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Standard <i>E. festucae</i> cell methods</b>	<b>23</b>
2.4.1	Fungal DNA extraction	23
2.4.2	Preparation of <i>E. festucae</i> fungal protoplasts	24
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Standard plant methods</b>	<b>25</b>
2.5.1	Plant inoculation	25
2.5.2	Plant immunoblotting to confirm fungal infection	25
2.5.3	Preparation of infected ryegrass samples for confocal microscopy	26
2.5.4	Confocal microscopy	26
<b>2.6</b>	<b>Standard DNA methods</b>	<b>27</b>
2.6.1	DNA concentration measurement	27
2.6.2	Restriction enzyme digestion of DNA	27
2.6.2.1	Digestion of plasmid DNA	27
2.6.2.2	Digestion of genomic DNA for Southern blotting	27
2.6.3	DNA Sequencing	28
2.6.4	Polymerase Chain Reaction	29
2.6.4.1	Standard PCR	30
2.6.4.2	Difficult template PCR	30
2.6.4.3	Multiplex PCR	30
2.6.4.4	High fidelity PCR (Expand Hi-Fi)	31
2.6.4.5	High Fidelity PCR (Platinum <i>Pfx</i> )	31
2.6.5	Gel Electrophoresis	32
2.6.6	DNA purification following PCR or gel electrophoresis	32
2.6.7	A-tailing DNA fragments	32
2.6.8	DNA ligation	33

2.6.9	Southern Blotting	33
2.6.10	Radioactive hybridization and visualization	34
<b>2.7</b>	<b>Peramine analysis</b>	<b>34</b>
2.7.1	Peramine HPLC-UV analysis	34
2.7.2	Peramine LC-MS analysis	35
<b>2.8</b>	<b><i>EF102</i> deletion mutant creation</b>	<b>35</b>
2.8.1	Creation of <i>EF102</i> deletion construct	35
2.8.2	Transformation of <i>Epichloë festucae</i>	36
2.8.3	Screening for $\Delta EF102$ mutants	37
<b>2.9</b>	<b>Bioinformatic methods</b>	<b>38</b>
2.9.1	Multiple sequence alignments	38
2.9.2	DNA motif identification	38
<b>3.</b>	<b><i>Epichloë perA</i> Locus Comparison</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>PCR analysis of the <i>perA</i> locus in <i>epichloë</i></b>	<b>40</b>
3.1.1	Genes surrounding <i>perA</i> are highly conserved within <i>epichloë</i>	40
3.1.2	<i>PerA</i> and flanking intergenic sequences are highly variable within <i>epichloë</i>	40
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Southern blot analysis of the <i>perA</i> locus in <i>epichloë</i></b>	<b>44</b>
3.2.1	Southern blot analysis of the <i>perA</i> locus reveals considerable variation within <i>E. festucae</i>	44
3.2.2	Southern blot analysis shows variation in the intergenic regions flanking <i>perA</i> within the <i>epichloë</i> species tested	45
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Peramine production analysis of <i>E. festucae</i> isolates</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Confocal analysis of <i>E. festucae</i> infected ryegrass samples</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Analysis of the <i>perA</i> Promoter</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Analysis of the <i>EF102-perA</i> intergenic sequence in <i>epichloë</i></b>	<b>58</b>
4.1	Refining the <i>perA</i> translation start site	58
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Establishing the transcription start sites of <i>EF102</i> and <i>perA</i></b>	<b>61</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b><i>EF102</i> and <i>perA</i> promoters share a common DNA motif</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Deletion Analysis of the Major Facilitator Superfamily Transporter <i>EF102</i></b>	<b>67</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Deletion of <i>EF102</i></b>	<b>68</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b><math>\Delta EF102</math> chemotype analysis</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>74</b>

<b>6.1</b>	<b>The <i>perA</i> locus structure differs significantly within <i>E. festucae</i></b>	<b>75</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>The <i>perA</i> locus structure is conserved between putative peramine producing <i>Epichloë</i> spp</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>All <i>E. festucae</i> isolates are able to infect <i>Lolium perenne</i></b>	<b>78</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>A new translation start site was identified for <i>perA</i></b>	<b>78</b>
<b>6.5</b>	<b>Transcription start sites were identified for <i>EF102</i> and <i>perA</i></b>	<b>79</b>
<b>6.6</b>	<b>Identification of an extended region of sequence conservation upstream of the <i>perA</i> transcription start site</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>6.7</b>	<b>Potential limitations of comparative analysis within epichloë</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>6.8</b>	<b><i>EF102</i> and <i>perA</i> share a common promoter motif</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>6.9</b>	<b>A peramine transport role for <i>EF102</i> is not supported: alternative substrate transport hypothesis proposed</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>6.10</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Supplemental tables</b>	<b>87</b>
7.1.1	Gene expression changes around the <i>perA</i> locus in the $\Delta sakA$ mutant relative to wild type F11 (Eaton <i>et al.</i> , 2010)	87
7.1.2	Peramine concentrations guttation fluid samples for wild type <i>E. festucae</i> F11 and $\Delta EF102$ mutant infected plants	87
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Vector maps</b>	<b>88</b>
7.2.1	pSF15.15	88
7.2.2	pCR4-TOPO	89
<b>7.3</b>	<b>Multiple sequence alignments</b>	<b>89</b>
7.3.1	MSA of the <i>EF102-perA</i> intergenic sequence from 10 epichloë isolates	90-103
7.3.2	MSA of EF102 and homologues from <i>Periglandula Ipomea</i> , <i>Gibberella zeae</i> and <i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i> : N- and C-terminal domains show significant sequence variation.	104
<b>7.4</b>	<b>Supplemental Southern blots</b>	<b>105</b>
7.4.1	Southern blot from Fig. 3.3 probed with <i>EF102</i>	105
7.4.2	Southern blot from Fig. 3.3 probed with <i>EF104</i>	106
7.4.3	Southern blot from Fig. 3.4 probed with <i>EF102</i>	106
7.4.4	Southern blot from Fig. 3.4 probed with <i>EF104</i>	107



7.4.5	Southern blot from Fig. 3.5 probed with <i>EF102</i>	107
7.4.6	Southern blot from Fig. 3.5 probed with <i>EF104</i>	108
7.4.7	Southern blot from Fig. 3.6 probed with <i>EF102</i>	108
7.4.8	Southern blot from Fig. 3.6 probed with <i>EF104</i>	108
7.4.9	Southern blot from Fig. 3.7 probed with <i>EF102</i>	109
7.4.10	Southern blot from Fig. 3.7 probed with <i>EF104</i>	109
7.4.11	Southern blot from Fig 3.8 probed with <i>EF102</i>	110
<b>Bibliography</b>		<b>111</b>

---

# List of Tables

---

2.1	Bacterial strains, fungal strains and plant material	19
2.2	Plasmids and DNA	20
2.3:	Primers used in this study	29-30
3.1	Whole tiller peramine concentration in plants infected by different <i>E. festucae</i> isolates	53
5.1	Peramine concentrations in whole tiller and guttation fluid samples for wild type <i>E. festucae</i> F11 and $\Delta EF102$ mutant infected plants	73
6.1	Arginine and proline metabolism genes are not differentially regulated in <i>E. festucae</i>	84

# List of Figures

---

1.1	Lifecycle of epichloë endophytes	3
1.2	Epichloë phylogenetic tree	6
1.3	Domain structure of PerA and the peramine synthesis pathway	11
1.4	Synteny analysis of the <i>perA</i> locus with other filamentous fungi	12
3.1	Gene map of the <i>perA</i> locus with PCR primers annotated	42
3.2	PCR based comparative analysis of the <i>perA</i> locus within epichloë	43
3.3	Southern hybridisation of <i>Bam</i> HI digested gDNA from various <i>E. festucae</i> isolates	46
3.4	Southern hybridisation of <i>Nde</i> I digested gDNA from various <i>E. festucae</i> isolates	47
3.5	Southern hybridisation of <i>Sal</i> I digested gDNA from various <i>E. festucae</i> isolates	48
3.6	Southern hybridisation of <i>Bcl</i> II digested gDNA from various <i>E. festucae</i> isolates	49
3.7	Southern hybridisation of <i>Bam</i> HI digested gDNA from various epichloë isolates	50
3.8	The E2368 and E189 <i>perA</i> locus show identical banding patterns	51
3.9	Confocal microscopy of <i>E. festucae</i> infected perennial ryegrass samples	54-56
4.1	Refining the location of the <i>perA</i> start codon	59
4.2	Consensus Kozak sequence for epichloë	60
4.3	Transcriptome reads showing the transcription start sites of <i>EF102</i> and <i>perA</i>	63
4.4	Sequence conservation in the promoters of <i>perA</i> and <i>EF102</i>	64
4.5	A conserved DNA motif identified in the promoters of <i>EF102/perA</i>	65
4.6	Potential regulatory motifs in the promoters of <i>EF102</i> and <i>perA</i>	66
5.1	<i>EF102</i> deletion construct	70
5.2	PCR screening of potential $\Delta EF102$ mutants	71
5.3	Southern blot analysis of $\Delta EF102$ mutants	72
6.1	Known and proposed physical map of the <i>perA</i> locus in different <i>E. festucae</i> strains	76
6.2	Simplified arginine and proline metabolism pathways	83

# Common Abbreviations

---

A1/2	NRPS adenylation domain from modules 1 or 2
Amp	Ampicillin
ASW	Argentine stem weevil
ATG	ATG translational start codon
bp	base pairs
C1	NRPS condensation domain from module 1
CDS	Coding sequence
d	Days
dATP	Deoxyadenine triphosphate
DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
dNTP	Deoxynucleotide triphosphate
ECM	Extracellular matrix
EDTA	Ethylene diamine tetra-acetic acid
EF	<i>Epichloë festucae</i>
g	Gravity
gDNA	Genomic DNA
h	Hours
HGT	Horizontal gene transfer
HPLC	High-performance liquid chromatography
Hyg	Hygromycin
Indel	Insertion or deletion
kb	Kilo base pairs
KO	Knock out
LB	Luria-Bertani medium
LB	Left border
LC	Liquid chromatography
M	Molar
M1	NRPS methylation domain from module 2
min	Minutes
MITE	Miniature inverted transposable element
mRNA	Messenger RNA
MFS	Major facilitator superfamily
MS	Mass spectrophotometer
MSA	Multiple sequence alignment
NCM	Nitrocellulose membrane
ND	Not detected
NRPS	Non-ribosomal peptide synthetase
NT	Not tested
P5C	1-pyrroline-5-carboxylate
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PD	Potato dextrose medium
PKS	Polyketide synthase
R2/Rdom	NRPS reductase domain from module 2

RB	Right border
RCF	Relative centrifugal force
RE	Restriction enzyme
RG	Regeneration medium
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
ROS	Reactive oxygen species
RT-PCR	Reverse transcription PCR
SDS	Sodium dodecyl sulfate
SSC	Saline sodium citrate
SM	Secondary metabolite
SNP	Single nucleotide polymorphism
T1/2	NRPS thiolation domain from module 1 or 2
TBE	Tris Borate EDTA buffer
UV	Ultra-violet
WT	Wild type