

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.

**Metabarcoding of the rhizosphere microbiome of
perennial ryegrass in response to *Epichloë*
festucae var. *lolii* infection**

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

Master of Science

in

Microbiology

At Massey University, Palmerston North

New Zealand

Sam Mahoney-Kurpe

2017

Abstract

Epichloë endophytes inhabit the intercellular spaces of cool-season pasture grasses, and can confer upon their hosts agriculturally desirable benefits such as heightened resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses. The mechanisms underlying many of these benefits are not well understood. Previously observed *Epichloë*-associated impacts towards the rhizosphere microbiome of their hosts could be a contributing factor, however the overall extent to which specific taxa in the rhizosphere microbiome of perennial ryegrass are affected by *Epichloë festucae* var. *lolii* infection remains to be elucidated. To assess this, two independent experiments were carried out in which clonal perennial ryegrass (NuiD) plants inoculated or uninoculated with *E. festucae* var. *lolii* (Lp19) originating from sterile tissue culture were grown in soil collected from a natural ryegrass pasture. After approximately two months of growth under controlled conditions in a growth cabinet, their prokaryotic and fungal rhizosphere microbiomes were compared using high-throughput metabarcoding.

For prokaryotes, endophyte infection had no significant impact on species richness or evenness of the rhizosphere microbiome of their hosts in either experiment. A very minor but significant shift in overall community composition was shown in the first experiment but not the second. At the level of phyla, aside from a minor 1.1% increase in the relative abundances of Bacteroidetes in the rhizosphere of infected compared with uninfected plants in the first experiment but not the second, there were no other significantly differentially abundant prokaryotic phyla due to endophyte infection. At the genus level rhizospheres of infected and uninfected plants showed a high degree of similarity in both experiments, with little variability between replicates within treatments. At the level of operational taxonomic units (OTUs), in the first experiment there was only one significantly differentially abundant OTU in the rhizosphere depending on endophyte infection, and nine in the second. However, all of which had relatively low abundances (<0.3%), and none were consistently significantly differentially abundant in both experiments.

For fungi, there were no significant impacts of endophyte infection on species richness or evenness of the rhizosphere in either experiment, nor were there any significant

endophyte-associated shifts detected in overall rhizosphere community composition. Taxonomic analyses found that in both experiments endophyte infected plants had decreased abundances of a single abundant OTU compared with uninfected plants, which was found to be significant across both experiments ($P= 0.026$). The OTU sequence mapped with moderate (76-90%) homology to a number of reference sequences assigned as belonging to the class Sordariomycetes. Given previously observed endophyte-associated effects on arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi, reads assigned as belonging to AM were filtered and analysed separately. This showed that there were no significant effects of endophyte infection towards AM diversity nor overall community composition in both experiments, although there was an endophyte-associated increase in the abundance of the AM family Acaulosporaceae in the first experiment but not the second.

Thus, aside from an endophyte-associated antagonism towards an abundant OTU in the rhizosphere likely of the class Sordariomycetes, *E. festucae* var. *lolii* had an otherwise minor impact on the prokaryotic and fungal rhizosphere microbiome of their perennial ryegrass hosts. The minor magnitude of endophyte-associated effects was further emphasized by analyses consistently showing that both prokaryotic and fungal rhizosphere community composition differed to a greater extent between plants of each experiment irrespective of endophyte infection than between plants of differing endophyte status within each experiment- at least in this cultivar-endophyte strain interaction under the conditions of this study.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank Dr Jan Schmid for providing me with the opportunity to work on this project- I couldn't have asked for a better introduction to research. I've appreciated your continual guidance and support, but also for pushing me to make decisions for myself and always being encouraging of my ideas. I would also like to thank my cosupervisors Dr Dragana Gagic and Dr Richard Johnson for their continual support.

From Massey, I like to thank all other members of Jan Schmid's lab for being great to work around, especially Dr Ningxin Zhang and Asad for helping me overcome the molecular issues I had. Thanks to Olaf Greiwaldt for building the plant holders and associated equipment. Thanks to the Massey Genome Service/NZGL for their advice on sequencing and bioinformatics-related aspects of the project, particularly Dr Dave Wheeler and Associate Professor Patrick Biggs. Thanks also to Mauro Truglio for carrying out preliminary treatment and demultiplexing of the sequence data, and to Associate Professor Geoff Jones for carrying out the regression analysis.

From AgResearch, I'd like to thank Kim Richardson for supplying the plant material used for the project, Dr Jim Crush (AgResearch Ruakura) for advice regarding what plant growth conditions to use, and Anouck de Bonth for helping with the plantlet inoculation and for processing immunoblot sheets.

I am very grateful to the C. Alma Baker and Joan Dingley Memorial trusts for their financial support in 2016.

Table of contents

Abstract	I
Acknowledgements	III
Abbreviations	VIII
List of figures	X
List of tables	XI
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The plant microbiome: A multi-compartmented ‘second genome’	2
1.1.1 Determinants of rhizosphere community composition	4
1.1.1.1 Abiotic factors	4
1.1.1.2 Biotic factors.....	5
1.1.1.3 Anthropogenic factors.....	7
1.1.2 Effects of the root microbiome on their hosts	8
1.1.2.1 Microbial mechanisms of plant growth promotion.....	9
1.1.2.2 The importance of the rare biosphere	10
1.1.2.3 The importance of the microbiome as a whole.....	11
1.2 <i>Epichloë</i>-Grass symbiosis	12
1.2.1 Effects of <i>Epichloë</i> endophytes on their hosts	13
1.2.2 Novel insights through comparative omics’	15
1.2.3 <i>Epichloë</i>-induced impacts towards the root microbiome	16
1.2.3.1 Effects of endophyte infection towards arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungi	17
1.2.3.2 Cultivation-independent studies	18
1.2.3.3 High-throughput studies	19
1.3 Project outline	19
2 Materials and Methods	21
2.1 Materials	22
2.1.1 Media.....	22
2.1.2 Buffers	22
2.2 Methods	23
2.2.1 Plantlet propagation and inoculation	23
2.2.1.1 Screening inoculated plantlets for endophyte infection	24

2.2.2	Collection and processing of soil	25
2.2.3	Determining field capacity of soil.....	26
2.2.4	Plant growth	26
2.2.4.1	Experiment one	27
2.2.4.2	Experiment two	28
2.2.5	Harvesting and sampling of plants	29
2.2.5.1	Determination of aboveground biomass.....	30
2.2.6	DNA extraction.....	30
2.2.7	PCR and sequencing.....	31
2.2.8	Bioinformatics	32
2.2.9	Statistical analyses	34
3	 Results	35
3.1	Development of experimental design	36
3.1.1	Using plants originating from tissue culture	36
3.1.2	Introducing sterile plantlets into natural soil.....	37
3.1.3	Growing plants in controlled conditions in a growth cabinet	37
3.1.4	Sampling the rhizosphere	38
3.1.5	Selection of PCR primers.....	38
3.1.5.1	Prokaryotic 16S rRNA primers 515F/806R.....	38
3.1.5.2	Fungal ITS1 primers ITS1-F_KYO2/ITS2_KYO2	39
3.2	No significant effect of endophyte infection on plant growth.....	40
3.2.1	Experiment one	40
3.2.2	Experiment two.....	41
3.2.3	State of plants at the time of sampling.....	43
3.3	DNA extraction	46
3.4	PCR	46
3.5	Bioinformatic analyses.....	47
3.5.1	Normalization of sequencing depths using rarefaction	48
3.5.2	Alpha-diversity analyses	51
3.5.2.1	Prokaryotic and fungal species richness of the rhizosphere microbiome is not significantly affected by endophyte infection	51
3.5.2.2	Higher prokaryotic species richness in the rhizosphere than in bulk soil.....	52
3.5.2.3	Differences in species richness between each experiment irrespective of endophyte infection.....	52

3.5.2.4	No significant effect of endophyte infection on species evenness of the rhizosphere microbiome	54
3.5.3	Beta-diversity analyses	56
3.5.3.1	Mild endophyte-associated shift in the prokaryotic rhizosphere community in the first experiment but not the second.....	57
3.5.3.2	No significant endophyte-associated impacts on the fungal rhizosphere microbiome.....	57
3.5.3.3	Significant differentiation of prokaryotic and fungal communities depending on sample type and experiment	58
3.5.4	Taxonomic analyses.....	59
3.5.4.1	Minor impact of endophyte infection on prokaryotic rhizosphere community composition...	60
3.5.4.2	Endophyte-associated effects towards rhizosphere fungi largely limited to reductions in abundances of a single OTU likely of the class Sordariomycetes in both experiments.....	64
3.5.4.3	Comparatively larger differences in prokaryotic and fungal rhizosphere community composition between experiments than between rhizospheres of plants of differing endophyte status within each experiment.....	70
3.5.4.4	Significant differences in relative abundances of a range of prokaryotic and fungal phyla between bulk soil and rhizosphere samples within each experiment	74
3.5.5	Targeted analyses of arbuscular mycorrhiza.....	77
3.5.5.1	No significant effects of endophyte infection on alpha-diversity of the AM community in the rhizosphere.....	78
3.5.5.2	No significant impact of endophyte infection on overall community composition of arbuscular mycorrhiza in the rhizosphere.....	80
3.5.5.3	Endophyte-associated promotion of Acaulosporaceae in the first experiment but not the second	81
4 	Discussion and Conclusion.....	87
4.1	Minor impact of endophyte infection on prokaryotic rhizosphere community composition	88
4.2	Endophyte-associated effects towards rhizosphere fungi largely limited to a single abundant OTU.....	90
4.3	Endophyte-associated impacts on the rhizosphere microbiome were dwarfed by effects due to variation between experiments	93
4.4	Structural differentiation of the rhizosphere microbiome from bulk soil irrespective of endophyte infection.....	95
4.5	Limitations of experimental design	98
4.6	Future directions.....	99
4.7	Conclusion	102

References103

Appendices122

A1 Immunoblot sheets 122

A2 Physico-chemical characteristics of soil 123

A3 *Bacillus thuringiensis* treatment in experiment two did not increase relative abundances of *Bacillus* OTUs in rhizosphere or bulk soil samples 124

A4 Concentrations of DNA extracts..... 125

A5 Numbers of reads and OTUs in unrarefied and rarefied OTU tables..... 126

A6 Rarefaction curves of prokaryotic and fungal samples rarefied to 70,000 reads per sample.....128

A7 Figure 18, prokaryotic phyla legend..... 129

A8 OTU 1 representative sequence and BLAST results 130

A9 Significantly differentially abundant OTUs between rhizospheres of plants of each experiment..... 132

Abbreviations

μL	Microliter(s)
16S	Prokaryotic small subunit ribosomal RNA gene
3D	Three-dimensional
AM	Arbuscular mycorrhiza
BLAST	Basic local alignment search tool
bp	Base-pairs
BS	Bulk soil
Bt	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>
D	Simpson's diversity index
DGGE	Denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
dNTP	Deoxynucleotide triphosphate
E	Simpson's evenness index
E+	Endophyte-infected
E-	Endophyte-uninfected
E1	Experiment one
E2	Experiment two
EMP	Earth Microbiome Project
FC	Field capacity
FDR	False discovery rate
g	Gram(s)
h	Hour(s)
H₂O	Water
HCl	Hydrochloric Acid
ISR	Induced systemic resistance
ITS	Internal transcribed spacer region of the eukaryotic ribosomal RNA gene cluster
mg	Milligram
MHB	Mycorrhiza helper bacteria
MS	Murashige and Skoog medium

ng	Nanogram
OTU	Operational taxonomic unit
P	Phosphorus
PCoA	Principal coordinate analysis
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PDA	Potato dextrose agar
PERMANOVA	Permutational multivariate analysis of variance
PF	Plant-free
ppm	Parts per million
QIIME	Quantitative Insights into Microbial Ecology
qPCR	Quantitative PCR
R	Rhizosphere
RO	Reverse osmosis
rpm	Revolutions per minute
rRNA	Ribosomal RNA
<i>spp.</i>	Species
TBE	Tris-borate-EDTA
UNITE	User-Friendly Nordic ITS Ectomycorrhiza Database
VOCs	Volatile organic compounds
x g	G-force

List of figures

Figure 1. Niche differentiation at the root-soil interface.	3
Figure 2. Schematic representation of possible rhizospheric interactions mediated by root exudates.	6
Figure 3. Differences in factors impacting rhizosphere community composition in natural versus agricultural settings.	7
Figure 4. Species interactions at diverse scales can influence soil biome composition, structure and functioning.	12
Figure 5. Growth of <i>Epichloë</i> endophytes within their grass hosts.	13
Figure 6. Spatial separation of <i>Epichloë</i> endophytes and AM fungi within their hosts.	18
Figure 7. Endophyte isolation and plantlet inoculation.	25
Figure 8. Plant growth tubes and associated equipment.	29
Figure 9. Sampling of plant rhizospheres.	30
Figure 10. Plant tillering rates.	45
Figure 11. Plants at the time of harvesting.	45
Figure 12. Purified 16S and ITS amplicons.	46
Figure 13. Numbers of reads and OTUs per sample in unrarefied OTU tables.	48
Figure 14. Rarefaction curves of rarefied OTU tables.	50
Figure 15. Species richness comparisons.	53
Figure 16. Species evenness comparisons.	55
Figure 17. Principal coordinates analysis plots of Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrices.	58
Figure 18. Relative abundance taxa plots of individual samples.	63
Figure 19. Reduced abundances of OTU 1 in the rhizosphere of infected versus uninfected plants.	67
Figure 20. Comparison of rhizosphere samples based on endophyte status within experiments versus between experiments irrespective of endophyte infection.	72
Figure 21. Rarefaction curves of AM.	77
Figure 22. Alpha-diversity of AM communities.	79
Figure 23. Beta-diversity of AM communities.	80
Figure 24. Relative abundance taxa plots of AM families.	83

Appendix figures

Figure A.1. Immunoblot results.	122
Figure A.2. Average abundances of OTUs assigned to the genus <i>Bacillus</i> between experiments.	124
Figure A.3. Concentrations of DNA extracts.	125
Figure A.4. Rarefaction curves of species richness at 70,000 reads per sample.	128
Figure A.5. Full legend for Figure 18 a containing all prokaryotic phyla.	129
Figure A.6. Representative sequence of OTU 1 and results of BLAST alignments.	131

List of tables

Table 1. Aboveground biomass of replicates at the time of harvesting.....	44
Table 2. PERMANOVA comparisons of beta-diversity between sample groupings.	59
Table 3. Comparisons of relative abundances of prokaryotic and fungal phyla between rhizosphere samples of infected and uninfected plants.	68
Table 4. Significantly differentially abundant prokaryotic OTUs between rhizospheres of infected and uninfected plants.	69
Table 5. Between-experiment comparisons of relative abundances of prokaryotic and fungal phyla.....	73
Table 6. Within-experiment comparisons of prokaryotic and fungal phyla between bulk soil and rhizosphere samples.	75
Table 7. PERMANOVA comparisons of beta-diversity of AM fungi.	81
Table 8. Relative abundances of Glomeromycotan families in rhizosphere samples of infected versus uninfected plants.	84
Table 9. Relative abundances of Glomeromycotan families between each experiment.	85

Appendix tables

Table A.1. Physico-chemical composition of soil used in each experiment.	123
Table A.2. Number of reads, OTUs, Chao1 richness estimates and estimated OTU coverage rates in unrarefied samples.	126
Table A.3. Number of reads, OTUs, Chao1 richness estimates and estimated OTU coverage rates of rarefied samples.	127
Table A. 4. Significantly differentially abundant prokaryotic OTUs in rhizospheres of plants between each experiment.	132
Table A. 5. Significantly differentially abundant fungal OTUs in rhizospheres of plants between each experiment.	135