

Mycosphaerella podagrariae—a necrotrophic phytopathogen forming a special cellular interaction with its host *Aegopodium podagraria*

Uwe K. Simon · Johannes Z. Groenewald ·
York-Dieter Stierhof · Pedro W. Crous · Robert Bauer

Received: 3 June 2009 / Revised: 12 August 2009 / Accepted: 14 August 2009 / Published online: 19 September 2009
© German Mycological Society and Springer 2009

Abstract We present a new kind of cellular interaction found between *Mycosphaerella podagrariae* and *Aegopodium podagraria*, which is remarkably different to the interaction type of the obligate biotrophic fungus *Cymadothea trifolii*, another member of the Mycosphaerellaceae (Capnodiales, Dothideomycetes, Ascomycota) which we have described earlier. Observations are based on both conventional and cryofixed material and show that some features of this particular interaction are better discernable after chemical fixation. We were also able to generate sequences for nuclear ribosomal DNA (complete SSU, 5.8 S and flanking ITS-regions, D1–D3 region of the LSU) confirming the position of *M. podagrariae* within Mycosphaerellaceae.

Keywords Dothideomycetes · ITS · LSU · Molecular phylogeny · SSU

Introduction

Mycosphaerellaceae (Capnodiales, Dothideomycetes) is one of the most species-rich groups of ascomycotan fungi, containing species that are saprobic, endophytic, biotrophic, necrotrophic, and hemibiotrophic (Verkley et al. 2004; Aptroot 2006; Crous et al. 2006). Recent DNA phylogenetic studies using the nuclear ribosomal RNA operon as well as house-keeping genes have revealed its extreme genetic diversity (Arzanlou et al. 2007; Crous et al. 2007a, b). In spite of the size and economic importance of the Mycosphaerellaceae, cellular interactions of this family with various host plants are still poorly documented. However, Simon et al. (2004) described a very intricate interaction between the obligate biotrophic sooty blotch disease of clover *Cymadothea trifolii* (= *Mycosphaerella killiani*) and its *Trifolium* host species. There, the fungus forms a highly complex interaction apparatus in its own hyphae opposite to which the plant plasma membrane invaginates to form a bubble. Both structures are linked by a tube of electron dense material leading through the cell walls of either organism. Within the tube, the plant cell wall is partially but not totally degraded as shown by Simon et al. (2005a). The plant cell reacts by applying cell wall appositional material onto the site of interaction, which, consequently, comes to an end. Both pathogen and host cell survive and the whole process may be repeated, or other plant cells may be attacked. Here, we report the cellular interaction between the necrotrophic *Mycosphaerella podagrariae* and *Aegopodium podagraria* using both chemically and cryofixed infected plant material. To determine the

U. K. Simon (✉)
Institut für Pflanzenwissenschaften,
Universität Graz,
Schubertstraße 51,
A-8010 Graz, Austria
e-mail: uwe.simon@uni-graz.at

J. Z. Groenewald · P. W. Crous
Fungal Biodiversity Centre,
Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures,
P.O. Box 85167, 3508 AD Utrecht, The Netherlands

Y.-D. Stierhof
Zentrum für Molekularbiologie der Pflanzen,
Universität Tübingen,
Auf der Morgenstelle 5,
72076 Tübingen, Germany

R. Bauer
Lehrstuhl Spezielle Botanik, Universität Tübingen,
Auf der Morgenstelle 1,
72076 Tübingen, Germany

phylogenetic position of this fungus, we sequenced the complete small subunit (SSU; 18S nrDNA), the complete internal transcribed spacer regions including the 5.8S nrRNA gene (ITS), and the D1-D3 region of the large subunit (LSU; 28S nrDNA) of the nuclear ribosomal DNA operon. See Table 1 for details of fungal strains used in this study.

Materials and methods

Fungus material

Material used in this study was collected from:

Germany: Baden-Württemberg: Kirnbachtal (near Bebenhausen/Tübingen), on *Aegopodium podagraria*, July 2007, Herbarium TUB 019186.

Fixation, sectioning of resin-embedded material, post-staining and TEM analysis Chemical and cryofixation as well as freeze-substitution, sectioning, post-staining and TEM analysis with a ZEISS EM 109 at 80 kV was done as described by Simon et al. (2005b). Interaction sites were scrutinized via serial sectioning, and at least 100 interactions sites were studied.

DNA extraction and amplification

DNA extraction was performed using the DNAeasy Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions after mechanically breaking up cell walls with a mixer mill. Polymerase chain reactions (PCR) were performed in a total volume of 50 µl containing 5 µl 10× PCR-buffer (Life Technologies, Eggenstein, Germany), 34.1 µl H₂O, 2 µl MgCl₂ (50 mM stock; Life Technologies), 2 µl dNTPs (5 mM stock; Life Technologies), 1 µl forward and 1 µl reverse primers (25 pmol/µl stock each), 0.2 µl Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA; Sigma-Aldrich, Munich, Germany, 1 % stock), 0.2 µl *Taq* polymerase (5 units/µl stock; Life Technologies) and 5 µl DNA extract diluted 1:10. The following primers were used for amplification: SSU: NS17 - NS24 (Gargas and Taylor 1992); ITS: V9G (de Hoog and Gerrits van den Ende 1998) and ITS 4 (White et al. 1990); LSU: LROR and LR5 (Vilgalys and Hester 1990). Amplifications were carried out on a thermal cycler (Applied Biosystems) equipped with a heated lid. PCR parameters were as follows: 35 cycles with initial denaturation at 94°C for 5 min followed by 30 s at 94°C, 90 s at either 45, 50, 55°C, or 60°C (depending on primers), 4 min at 72°C, plus a final 7-min extension at 72°C with subsequent cooling down to 4°C.

Table 1 Species names, culture collection and GenBank accession numbers of fungal strains used in this study. The GenBank accession number is for the concatenated 18S nrDNA, ITS1, 5.8S nrDNA, ITS2 and partial 28S nrDNA sequence. *Mycosphaerella podagrariae* is indicated in bold

Species	Strain no. ^a	GenBank no. ^b
<i>Ascochyta fabae</i>	CBS 114.36	EU167566
<i>Ascochyta viciae-villosae</i>	CBS 255.92	EU167560
<i>Asteroma alneum</i>	CBS 109840	EU167609
<i>Bagnisiella examians</i>	CBS 551.66	EU167562
<i>Davidiella macrospora</i>	CBS 138.40	EU167591
<i>Davidiella tassiana</i>	CBS 723.79	EU167558
<i>Didymella bryoniae</i>	CBS 233.52	EU167573
<i>Didymella exitialis</i>	CBS 446.82	EU167564
<i>Dothidea berberidis</i>	CBS 186.58	EU167601
<i>Dothidea muelleri</i>	CBS 191.58	EU167593
<i>Guignardia vaccinii</i>	CBS 114751	EU167584
<i>Kabatiella caulivora</i>	CBS 242.64	EU167576
<i>Kabatiella microsticta</i>	CBS 342.66	EU167608
<i>Mycosphaerella aleuritidis</i>	CBS 282.62	EU167594
<i>Mycosphaerella arbuticola</i>	CBS 355.86	EU167571
<i>Mycosphaerella berberidis</i>	CBS 324.52	EU167603
<i>Mycosphaerella brassicicola</i>	CBS 174.88	EU167607
<i>Mycosphaerella coacervata</i>	CBS 113391	EU167596
<i>Mycosphaerella crystallina</i>	CBS 681.95	EU167579
<i>Mycosphaerella flageoletiana</i>	CBS 114302	EU167597
<i>Mycosphaerella fragariae</i>	CBS 719.84	EU167604
<i>Mycosphaerella gregaria</i>	CBS 110501	EU167580
<i>Mycosphaerella grossulariae</i>	CBS 235.37	EU167588
<i>Mycosphaerella handelii</i>	CBS 113302	EU167581
<i>Mycosphaerella harthensis</i>	CBS 325.52	EU167602
<i>Mycosphaerella laricina</i>	CBS 326.52	EU167595
<i>Mycosphaerella linorum</i>	CBS 261.39	EU167590
<i>Mycosphaerella microsora</i>	CBS 100352	EU167599
<i>Mycosphaerella milleri</i>	CBS 541.63	EU167577
<i>Mycosphaerella podagrariae</i>	TUB 019186	EU386700
<i>Mycosphaerella populicola</i>	CBS 100042	EU167579
<i>Mycosphaerella pseudoellipsoidea</i>	CBS 114709	EU167585
<i>Mycosphaerella punctata</i>	CBS 113315	EU167582
<i>Mycosphaerella punctiformis</i>	CBS 113265	EU167569
<i>Mycosphaerella pyri</i>	CBS 100.86	EU167606
<i>Mycosphaerella rosigena</i>	CBS 330.51	EU167586
<i>Mycosphaerella rubi</i>	CBS 238.37	EU167589
<i>Mycosphaerella stromatosa</i>	CBS 101953	EU167598
<i>Phoma exigua</i> var. <i>exigua</i>	CBS 118.94	EU167567
<i>Phoma sojicola</i>	CBS 567.97	EU167568
<i>Pleiochaeta setosa</i>	CBS 496.63	EU167563
<i>Teratosphaeria microsora</i>	CBS 101951	EU167572
<i>Teratosphaeria molleriana</i>	CBS 118359	EU167582

^a CBS CBS Fungal Biodiversity Centre, Utrecht, The Netherlands

^b All sequences used in this work apart from those of *M. podagrariae* were obtained during our previous study (Simon et al. 2009)

Sequencing

For cycle sequencing the same primers were applied as for PCR using the ABI PRISM Dye-Terminator Cycle Sequencing Kit v. 3.1 (Applied Biosystems) according to the manufacturer's protocol, but with a reaction volume of 10 μ L and the enzyme diluted 1:6 with the supplied dilution buffer. Electrophoresis and data sampling were performed on an automated sequencer (ABI 3100; Applied Biosystems). Sequences were manually edited with SEQUENCHER™ v. 4.1.2 (Gene Codes Corporation, Ann Arbor, Mi, USA).

Phylogenetic analyses

Concatenated SSU, ITS, and LSU sequences were automatically aligned using MAFFT v. 6.240 (Katoh et al. 2002;

Katoh and Toh 2007). The MAFFT alignment was subsequently treated with Gblocks v. 0.91b (Castresana 2000) using the -b5=h option to only retain positions with gaps in up to half of the sequences. To estimate phylogenetic relationships alignments were analysed with (1) BIONJ (Gascuel 1997) as implemented in PAUP v. 4.0b10 (Swofford 2003) using the TamNei+I+G substitution model as suggested by Modeltest v. 3.6 (Posada and Crandall 1998) and ties broken taxon-order dependently; (2) heuristic maximum likelihood (ML) analysis as implemented in RAxML (Stamatakis 2006) using the GTRMIX substitution model and 100 independent heuristic searches combined with a ML bootstrap analysis (1,000 bootstrap replicates); and (3) with a Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) approach as implemented in MrBayes v. 3.1.2 (Ronquist and Huelsenbeck 2003) with two independent runs of four incrementally heated simulta-

Fig. 1 Chemically fixed samples of *Aegopodium podagraria* leaves infected with *M. podagrariae*. **1, 2** Early stages of the interaction. Partly electron opaque material is applied onto the host wall opposite to a localized thickening of the fungal wall from which some electron dense substance seems to be secreted. The plant cell appears to be still healthy as indicated by well-preserved organelles such as chloroplasts and Golgi apparatus. *Bars 1* 0.5 μ m, *2* 0.2 μ m. **3** The plant cell is visibly degenerated. Much more and darker electron dense substance is found at the interaction site and both in and secreted from the pathogen wall (*star*). *Bar* 0.2 μ m. **4** Septum of *M. podagrariae* with 3 pores (*medium-sized arrows*) plugged with Woronin bodies (*WB*). *Bar* 0.5 μ m. *Chl* Chloroplast, *ER* endoplasmic reticulum, *F* fungus, *GA* Golgi apparatus, *Mi* mitochondrion, *Nu* nucleus, *PI* plant, *WB* Woronin body; *large arrows* point at material appositioned onto the plant cell wall, *small arrows* at electron dense substance within the latter, and *arrowheads* at fungal cell wall thickenings





Fig. 2 Cryofixed samples of *A. podagraria* leaves infected with *M. podagrariae*. **5** A killed host cell which had been attacked by several hyphae as shown by interaction sites. **Bar** 1 μm . **6** Early stage of interaction. Organelles such as chloroplasts and endoplasmic reticulum are well preserved. The material applied onto the plant cell wall during the interaction appears free of the electron dense substance. **Bar** 0.5 μm . **7** Later stage of interaction. Applied material includes large vacuoles and some electron dense substance which is also present to a lesser degree in the opposite cell wall area of the pathogen. **Bar** 0.5 μm . **8, 9** Most (**8**), finally all (**9**) of the cell wall appositional material in the plant cell is now filled with the electron dense substance. **Bars** 8 0.5 μm , 9 1 μm . *Chl* Chloroplast, *ER* endoplasmic reticulum, *F* fungus, *GA* Golgi apparatus, *Mi* mitochondrion, *Nu* nucleus, *PI* plant, *WB* Woronin body; *large arrows* point at material appositioned onto the plant cell wall, *small arrows* at electron dense substance within the latter, and *arrowheads* at fungal cell wall thickenings



neous Monte Carlo Markov chains each over four million generations using random starting trees and the GTR+I+G substitution model (Huelsenbeck and Rannala 2004). Model parameters were sampled during MCMC. Trees were acquired every 100 generations resulting in 40,000 trees per run, from which the first 10,000 of each run were discarded (burn in). The remaining 60,000 trees (twice 30,000) were pooled and a majority rule consensus tree was computed to get estimates for the posterior probabilities. Stationarity of the process was assessed using Tracer v. 3.1 (Rambaut and Drummond 2003). All sequences except those of *M. podagrariae* were obtained in an earlier study (Simon et al. 2009). Trees were rooted with *Asteroma alneum* (Sordariomycetes) as outgroup taxon.


Results

Electron microscopy

Both heavily and less severely infected leaf areas were analyzed (Figs. 1 and 2), but no difference in the

Fig. 3 BIONJ tree of an alignment of complete nuclear ribosomal SSU, complete ITS, and partial LSU (D1-D3) sequences for *M. podagrariae* and 42 additionally species based on the TamNei+G+I substitution model. The tree was rooted with *Asteroma alneum* as outgroup species. Numbers on branches denote bootstrap support values (values below 50% were omitted). The relevant order and class names are given on the right with family designations included for Capnodiales. *Botryosph.* Botryosphaerales, *D* Dothideomycetes, *S* Sordariomycetes

NJ






Fig. 4 Phylogenetic tree based on heuristic maximum likelihood analyses. Numbers on branches designate maximum likelihood bootstrap values (left) and MCMC estimates of posterior probabilities (right values below 0.5 were omitted). Abbreviations as in Fig. 3

appearance of the cellular interaction could be observed. In apparently earlier stages of infection, when plant cells seemed still intact, the interaction was characterized by a slightly increased thickness of the pathogen cell wall and, opposite to it, accumulation of membranous material onto the host cell wall, including some electron dense substance (Figs. 1 parts 1, 2, and 2 parts 6, 7). In later stages (Figs. 1 part 3, and 2 parts 5, 8, 9) these membranes were difficult to discriminate and the electron dense substance made up a large proportion of the material applied onto the plant cell wall. In chemically fixed samples we could find a few interaction sites where the wall of the fungus contained and/or secreted an electron dense substance (Fig. 1 parts 1, 3). This phenomenon was less pronounced in cryofixed samples, but found here as well (Fig. 2 part 7). In both plant and fungal cells, nuclei and endoplasmic reticulum (ER) were usually close to the site of interaction (Figs. 1 parts 1, 2, and 2 part 6). As seen in Fig. 2 part 5, one plant cell could be attacked by several hyphae of the pathogen. We never observed instances of the fungus entering a host cell. Figure 1 part 4 shows a multipored septum of the fungus with Woronin bodies as pore plugs.

Phylogenetic analyses

All phylogenetic algorithms produced similar tree topologies for Mycosphaerellaceae (Figs. 3 and 4). Although this family as such was well supported, some subgroups showed little or no support or appeared paraphyletic. However, all three methods clearly placed *M. podagrariae* in Mycosphaerellaceae with *M. brassicicola* as nearest relative. Interestingly, Dothideales were either placed in a sister relationship to Botryosphaerales/Pleosporales (NJ; Fig. 3), or to Capnodiales (RaXML/MCMC, Fig. 4).

Discussion

The interaction between *M. podagrariae* and *A. podagraria* is remarkable in that it is the first of its kind in Dothideomycetes characterized by accumulation of material onto the cell walls of both organisms. An increasing amount of an unknown electron dense substance is integrated into the material applied onto the host wall. The host cell seems to get killed by the fungus (finally, most of the leaf area is necrotic; not shown), though the mechanism behind this remains currently not understood. However, toxins could be involved in this process as speculated for *M. graminicola* (Palmer and Skinner 2002).

With respect to the electron dense substance detected in interaction zones, it is difficult to decide whether it is of fungal origin as observed by Bauer et al. (1995) for *Ustacystis waldsteiniae*, or a defense reaction of the attacked plant cell, or both. The proximity of nuclei and ER to the site of interaction in pathogen and plant cell at least indicates high metabolic activity at this location. It is noteworthy that the same host cell can be attacked by several hyphae as is the case for *Trifolium repens* leaves infected with *C. trifolii* (Simon et al. 2005b). Both *C. trifolii* and *M. podagrariae* never invade the plant cell itself. However, in contrast to the first, which is an obligate biotrophic pathogen, *M. podagrariae* kills the host cell.

The comparison of two embedding techniques shows that chemical fixation may elucidate features less evident after cryofixation, although structural preservation is much better in the latter method. However, the electron dense substance present in the wall appositional material in the plant cell and, to a lesser degree, in the fungal wall was much easier to detect in chemically fixed samples, probably because of the stronger contraction of material during this kind of fixation. Therefore, both techniques may have their value in the study of plant–pathogen interactions.

We were also able to obtain genetic information for this fungus which has not been sequenced until now. Phylogenetic results based on sequencing the complete SSU and ITS region, and the D1–D3 region of the LSU produced conflicting results for the position of Dothideales, grouping them either with Botryosphaerales/Pleosporales or with Capnodiales. Taking into account the data obtained by Schoch et al. (2006), who additionally used protein-coding genes for their phylogenies, the latter is more likely to reflect true relationships. Nevertheless, all topologies unequivocally show that *M. podagrariae* is a true member of Mycosphaerellaceae s.str. However, it is clearly not closely related to *C. trifolii*, which groups with *M. rosigena* and *M. aleuritidis* (Simon et al. 2009), but has not been included in the present study because we failed to obtain ITS sequences for this pathogen. Instead, it clustered with *M. brassicicola* in all three phylogenetic algorithms applied. This further strengthens our hypothesis that different life strategies within Mycosphaerellaceae—probably mirrored by specific types of cellular interaction—may form separate clusters within this family (Simon et al. 2009).

Acknowledgements We are grateful to Heinz Schwarz, Max-Planck-Institute for Developmental Biology, Tübingen, Germany, for help with cryofixation. U.K.S. was funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). We thank two anonymous reviewers for their critical reading and valuable suggestions.

References

- Aptroot A (2006) *Mycosphaerella* and its Anamorphs: 2. Conspectus of *Mycosphaerella*. CBS Biodiversity Series 5, Utrecht, The Netherlands
- Arzanlou M, Groenewald JZ, Gams W, Braun U, Shin H-D, Crous PW (2007) Phylogenetic and morphotaxonomic revision of *Ramichloridium* and allied genera. *Stud Mycol* 58:57–93
- Bauer R, Mendgen K, Oberwinkler F (1995) Cellular interaction of the smut fungus *Ustacystis waldsteiniae*. *Can J Bot* 73:867–883
- Castresana J (2000) Selection of conserved blocks from multiple alignments for their use in phylogenetic analysis. *Mol Bio Evol* 17:540–552
- Crous PW, Wingfield MJ, Mansilla JP, Alfenas AC, Groenewald JZ (2006) Phylogenetic reassessment of *Mycosphaerella* spp. and their anamorphs occurring on *Eucalyptus*. II. *Stud Mycol* 55:99–131
- Crous PW, Braun U, Groenewald JZ (2007a) *Mycosphaerella* is polyphyletic. *Stud Mycol* 58:1–32
- Crous PW, Braun U, Schubert K, Groenewald JZ (2007b) Delimiting *Cladosporium* from morphologically similar genera. *Stud Mycol* 58:33–56
- Gargas A, Taylor JW (1992) Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) primers for amplifying and sequencing nuclear 18S rDNA from lichenized fungi. *Mycologia* 84:589–592
- Gascuel O (1997) BIONJ: an improved version of the NJ algorithm based on a simple model of sequence data. *Mol Bio Evol* 14:685–695
- de Hoog GS, Gerrits van den Ende AHG (1998) Molecular diagnostics of clinical strains of filamentous Basidiomycetes. *Mycoses* 41:183–189
- Huelsenbeck JP, Rannala B (2004) Frequentist properties of Bayesian posterior probabilities of phylogenetic trees undersimple and complex substitution models. *Sys Biol* 53:904–913
- Katoh K, Toh H (2007) PartTree: an algorithm to build an approximate tree from a large number of unaligned sequences. *Bioinformatics* 23:372–374
- Katoh K, Misawa K, Kuma KI, Miyata T (2002) MAFFT: a novel method for rapid multiple sequence alignment based on fast Fourier transform. *Nucl Acids Res* 30:3059–3066
- Palmer C-L, Skinner W (2002) *Mycosphaerella graminicola*: latent infection, crop devastation and genomics. *Mol Plant Pathol* 3 (2):63–70
- Posada D, Crandall KA (1998) Modeltest: testing the model of DNA substitution. *Bioinformatics* 14:817–818
- Rambaut A, Drummond A (2003) Tracer MCMC trace analysis tool, version 1.3. University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. [<http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/>]
- Ronquist F, Huelsenbeck JP (2003) MrBayes 3: Bayesian phylogenetic inference under mixed models. *Bioinformatics* 19:1572–1574
- Schoch CL, Shoemaker RA, Seifert KA, Hambleton S, Spatafora JW, Crous PW (2006) A multigene phylogeny of the Dothideomycetes using four nuclear loci. *Mycologia* 98:1041–1052
- Simon UK, Bauer R, Oberwinkler F (2004) The unique cellular interaction between the leaf pathogen *Cymadothea trifolii* and *Trifolium repens*. *Mycologia* 96:1210–1218
- Simon UK, Bauer R, Rioux D, Simard M, Oberwinkler F (2005a) The intercellular biotrophic leaf pathogen *Cymadothea trifolii* locally degrades pectins, but not cellulose or xyloglucan in the cell walls of *Trifolium repens*. *New Phytol* 165:243–260
- Simon UK, Bauer R, Rioux D, Simard M, Oberwinkler F (2005b) The vegetative life cycle of the clover pathogen *Cymadothea trifolii* as seen in the electron microscope. *Mycol Res* 109:764–778
- Simon UK, Groenewald JZ, Crous PW (2009) *Cymadothea trifolii*, an obligate biotrophic parasite of *Trifolium*, belongs to the Mycosphaerellaceae as shown by nuclear ribosomal DNA analyses. *Personia* 22:49–55
- Stamatakis A (2006) RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihood-based phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. *Bioinformatics* 22:2688–2690
- Swofford DL (2003) PAUP*. Phylogenetic analysis using parsimony (*and other methods). Version 4. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA, USA
- Verkley GJM, Crous PW, Groenewald JZ, Braun U, Aptroot A (2004) *Mycosphaerella punctiformis* revisited: morphology, phylogeny, and epitypification of the type species of the genus *Mycosphaerella* (Dothideales, Ascomycota). *Mycol Res* 108:1271–1282
- Vilgalys R, Hester M (1990) Rapid genetic identification and mapping of enzymatically amplified ribosomal DNA from several *Cryptococcus* species. *J Bacteriol* 172:4238–4246
- White TJ, Bruns T, Lee S, Taylor J (1990) Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. In: Innis MA, Gelfand DH, Sninsky JJ, White TJ (eds) PCR protocols: a guide to methods and applications. Academic, San Diego, pp 315–322