MOLECULAR PHYLOGENETIC CHARACTERIZATION OF SYMBIOTIC MICROBIOTA IN THE INTESTINAL TRACTS OF WILD LEPIDOPTERAN STEM BORER *ELDANA SACCHARINA* WALKER (PYRALIDAE)

JAMES GITARI KABII

I56/11319/04

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of Master of Science (Biotechnology), in the School of Pure and Applied Sciences of Kenyatta University.

October, 2011

Kabii, James Gitari Molecular phylogrnryic



KENYATTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

DECLARATION

The experimental work described in this thesis is my own. The contents of this thesis have not been submitted for any other award.

James Gitari Kabii Sign themi Date 24th October 2011.

This thesis has been submitted for examination with our approval as Supervisors:

Dr. Daniel K. Masiga. Department of Biochemistry and Biotechnology Kenyatta University P.O Box 43844 Nairobi, 00100 Kenya

Sign 19 Date 24/10/2011

Prof. Eucharia U. Kenya Department of Biochemistry and Biotechnology Kenyatta University P.O Box 43844 Nairobi, 00100 Kenya

Date 24th October 2011 Sign

Dr. Wilber Lwande. International Center of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) P.O. Box 30772, Nairobi, 00100 Kenya

Sign Firmele Date 24th October 2011

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of the late Professor Thomas R. Odhiambo (1931-2007). His vision of an African Centre of Excellence in Insect Science continues to inspire and transform the lives of many.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to *icipe* for granting me the opportunity and financial support to undertake this study under the *icipe* Staff Development Programme. I am equally indebted to Diversa Corporation USA (now Verenium), for providing research supplies for the project.

Special thanks go to my Supervisors, Dr. Daniel K. Masiga, Professor Eucharia U. Kenya and Dr. Wilber Lwande for their valuable guidance and encouragement during the entire study period. I am also indebted to Dr. Gerardo Toledo formerly of Diversa Corporation and Dr. Matilda Oketch for advice on microbiology and bioassay screening. A word of gratitude also goes to Dr. Fathiya Khamis and colleagues at *icipe* for assistance rendered in various ways in the course of the project; Mr. Francis Onyango and ARCU staff for providing laboratory reared *Eldana saccharina* larvae; Ms Edda Wasike and *icipe* Library staff for assistance with reference Journals; Mssrs. Paul Mungai and Royford Mwenda of Kenya Wildlife Service; Mark Kimondo and Priscillar Mutungi of Applied Bioprospecting Programme as well as members of the Molecular Biology and Biotechnology Department.

I sincerely thank my wife Joyce and daughters Judy and Abigail for their moral support, prayers and patience especially when project work in this study demanded staying long hours away from the family.

Finally I thank the Almighty God within whose Will and Purpose all things hold together in time and space.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	iX
List of Plates	X
Acronyms and Abbreviations	Xiv
Abstract	Xvi
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background to the study	1
1.2. Economic importance of <i>Eldana saccharina</i>	2
1.3. Biological significance of symbiotic microbiota	3
1.4. Justification	5
1.5. Hypothesis	6
1.6. General objective	6
1.7. Specific objectives	6
1.8. Significance and anticipated outputs	7
CHAPTER TWO	9
LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1. Ecology and Host Range of <i>Eldana saccharina</i>	9
2.2. Insect metabolic micro-biomes.	10
2.3. Intestinal symbioses.	

2.4. The insect gut structure and chemical environment
2.5. Tools in Molecular Phylogeny
2.5.1. Small Sub Unit rRNA-PCR
2.5.2. Fluorescence In -Situ Hybridization (FISH)
CHAPTER THREE16
MATERIALS AND METHODS16
3.1. Insect larvae collection and dissections
3.2. Culture dependent characterization
3.2.1. Gut homogenization and serial dilutions
3.2.2. Microbial isolation and growth media
3.2.3. Bioassays for utilization of cellulose and lignocellulose as sole organic
carbon source
3.3. Molecular characterization of bacterial isolates
3.3.1. DNA extraction and amplification of bacterial 16S rRNA gene
3.3.2. Phylogenetic analysis of isolates' 16S rRNA gene sequences
3.4 Culture independent characterization
3.4.1 Total DNA extraction
3.4.2 PCR amplification of bacterial 16S rRNA gene
3.4.3 Cloning PCR products and Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism
(RFLP) analysis
3.4.4 Phylogenetic analysis of clonal sequences
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS
4.1 Enumeration of microbial isolates
4.2 Morphological characterization of microbial isolates

4.3 Screening bacterial isolates for utilization of alpha cellulose and sugarcane	
Bagasse	19
4.4.0 Molecular characterization of bacterial isolates 4	14
4.4.1 Amplification and sequence analysis of the 16S rRNA gene 4	4
4.4.2 Phylogenetic analysis of 16S rRNA sequences from bacterial isolates4	17
4.5 Culture independent characterization	51
4.5.1 Amplification of the 16S rRNA gene by PCR	51
4.5.2 PCR-Cloning and Restriction Fragment Length Analysis	52
4.5.3 Phylogenetic analysis of 16S rRNA gene sequences	55
CHAPTER FIVE 6	61
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS	51
5.1 Discussion	51
5.2 Conclusions.	70
5.3 Recommendations.	71
REFERENCES	2

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Cumulative total cellular protein of bacterial isolates from <i>E.saccharina</i> gut
homogenates cultured in liquid mineral medium in the presence of alpha cellulose as sole
source of organic carbon
Figure 2: Cumulative total cellular protein of bacterial isolates from E.saccharina gut
homogenates cultured in liquid mineral medium in the presence of sugarcane bagasse as
sole source of organic carbon
Figure 3a: Amplification of the 16S rRNA gene from genomic DNA of GAESP bacterial
isolates obtained from homogenized guts of Eldana saccharina larvae
Figure 3b: 1% agarose gel profile representative of purified 16S rRNA fragments
amplified from GAESP bacterial isolates from gut homogenates of E.saccharina
larvae
Figure 4: Percent distribution of Phylogroups from microbial isolates obtained from
homogenized guts of <i>E.saccharina</i> larvae
Figure 5: Neighbor-Joining tree (Saitou & Nei, 1987) based on near complete 16S
rRNA gene sequences of bacteria isolated from guts of Eldana saccharina larvae 50
Figure 6: PCR amplification of 16S rRNA representative of gut homogenates of E.
saccharina larvae collected from sugarcane host plants
Figure 7: PCR amplification of 16S rRNA representative of gut homogenates of E.
saccharina larvae collected from papyrus host plants
Figure 8a-c: RFLP profiles of PCR inserts cloned into pCR [®] 2.1 plasmid digested with a
cock-tail of five Restriction enzymes
Figure 9: Percentage relative abundance of bacterial Phylogroups from cloned 16S
rRNA genes derived from <i>E.saccharina larval</i> gut homogenates
Figure10: Neighbor-Joining tree (Saitou & Nei, 1987) based on near complete 16S
rRNA cloned gene sequences from gut homogenates of Eldana saccharina larvae

viii

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Enumeration of microbial culture colonies from E. saccharina larval gut
homogenates
Table 2: Poisson regression analysis on the effect of host plant on microbial
abundance in guts of <i>E. saccharina</i> larvae
Table 3: Bioassay screening for utilization of alpha cellulose by selected bacterial
isolates from <i>E. saccharina</i> larval gut homogenates
Table 4: Bioassay screening for utilization of sugarcane bagasse by selected bacterial
isolates from <i>E. saccharina</i> larval gut homogenates
Table 5: BLASTn search results for 16S rRNA gene sequences of bacterial isolates from
Eldana saccharina gut homogenates detected by16S rRNA primers UN 27forw and
1392rev
Table 6: BLASTn search results for 16S rRNA cloned gene sequences from E.
saccharina gut homogenates detected by16S rRNA primers UN 27forw and
1392rev

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1: Life cycle of Eldana saccharina. 2
Plate 2: a). A stem borer infested sugarcane stem with deposition of flass between
nodes
Plate 2: b) Dissected sugarcane stem showing tunneling by E. saccharina larvae
with red fungal discoloration
Plate 3: Dissected umbel rays of Cyperus papyrus showing Eldana saccharina
larvae
Plate 4: A digital image of a dissected whole gut of a late instar Eldana saccharina
Larva and pH profiles along the gut lumens of two lepidoperan species13
Plate 5A-C: Laboratory dissection of infested sugarcane stems to recover
Eldana saccharina larvae
Plate 6: a) Isolate GAESP-1 single bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol Salts Agar
(AGSA) culture medium
Plate 6: b) Gram stained slide Culture of GAESP-1 showing mycelial branching and
shape of spore bearing sporophores at the tips of the mycelia network
Plate 7: a) Isolate GAESP-2 bacterial colonies on Arginine Glycerol Salts Agar
(AGSA) culture medium, showing gray aerial sporulation on white Surface mycelia
Plate 7: b) Isolate GAESP-2 original streak culture colony showing spots of
secondary aerial vegetative growth covered with white mycelia
Plate 7: c) Isolate GAESP-2 Gram stained slide culture showing mycelial
branching and convoluted pattern of sporophores
Plate 8: a) Isolate GAESP-4 single bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar
(AGSA) culture medium showing white aerial mycelia and a 'halo'-ring formation
in the medium surrounding the colony
Plate 8: b) Gram stained slide culture showing filament branching with arrows
indicating position and curled shape of the spore bearing sporophores

Plate 9: a) Isolate GAESP-5 bacterial colonies on Arginine Glycerol Salts Agar (AGSA) Plate 9: b) Isolate GAESP-5 Gram stained slide culture showing characteristic Plate 10: a) Isolate GAESP-10 bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing white sporulation on beige aerial mycelia and straw Plate 10: b) Isolate GAESP-10 Gram stained slide culture showing filament branching and rod-shaped chain of the sporophores with gram stain variable spore vacuoles......33 Plate 11: a) Isolate GAESP-11 single bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing gray aerial sporulation on white surface mycelia and a Plate 11: b) Isolate GAESP-11 Gram stained slide culture showing mycelial branching Plate 12: a) Isolate GAESP-15 bacterial colonies on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing white aerial sporulation centrally located on purplish-Plate 12: b) Isolate GAESP-15 Gram stained slide culture showing mycelial branching Plate 13: Isolate GAESS-1 single colony showing cream aerial mycelia with gray Plate 14: Isolate GAESS-2 bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing beige dry-looking aerial mycelia surrounded by radial rings of beige sporulation. Colony shows a generally rounded shape with a serrated Plate 15: Isolate GAESS-3 bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing a slightly raised colony with cream leathery aerial mycelia, Plate 16: Isolate GAESS-6 single colony, showing beige dry-powdery looking aerial

Plate 17: Isolate GAESS-12 mature colony showing beige-cream aerial mycelia with Plate 18: Isolate GAESS-14 single colony showing a round colony with cream aerial mycelia and well defined entire margin; a white mass of white fluffy hyphae, raised Plate 19: a) Isolate KMESP-1 single bacterial colony on Kenya Minimal culture medium Plate 20: a) Isolate KMESP-1 bacterial colony on Kenya Minimal culture medium Plate 20: b) A Gram stained glass slide of isolate KMESP-1 showing Gram negative Plate 21: a) Isolate KMESP-2 bacterial colonies on Kenya Minimal culture medium (KMM1), showing cream colored, raised, oval colonies, with entire an Plate 22: a) Isolate KMESP-5 bacterial colonies on Kenya Minimal culture medium Plate 23: a) Isolate KMESS-2 bacterial colony on Kenya Minimal culture medium Plate 24: a) PDA ESP-2 plate colonies showing raised, cream coloured yeast colonies Plate 24: b) A Gram stained slide of PDA ESP-2 showing Gram positive coccids with Plate 25: a) PDA ESP-4 plate colony showing raised, cream coloured colony with a Plate 25: b) A gram stained slide of PDA ESP-4 showing Gram positive cocco-bacilli, Plate 26: a) PDA ESS-2 plate colony showing raised, cream coloured, round colony with

xii

Plate 26: b) A Gram stained slide of PDA ESS-2 showing Gram positive rod shaped	
yeast cells with some dividing Gram variable cells	
Plate 27: a) Isolate PDA ESS-5 colony showing a yellowish-cream, raised, round	
colony with an entire margin	
Plate 27: b) A Gram stained slide showing Gram variable rod shaped yeast cells, with	
cells joined to form pseudo-hyphae	
Plate 28: a) Isolate PDA ESS-7 plate colony showing a yellowish-cream, raised, round	
colony with a serrated margin	
Plate 28: b) A Gram stained slide of PDA ESS-7 showing Gram positive ovoid yeast	
cells	

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ARCU	Animal Rearing and Containment Unit
BLAST	Basic Local Alignment Search Tool
BLASTn	Nucleotide Basic Local Alignment Search Tool
BSA	Bovine Serum Albumin
CFU	Colony forming units
DMF	Dimethyl formamide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
eDNA	environmental DNA
FISH	Fluorescence In -Situ Hybridization
AGSA	Arginine Glycerol salts agar
GAESS	Actinobacteria isolated from E. saccharina larval guts
	from sugarcane host plants using AGSA culture medium
GAESP	Actinobacteria isolated from E. saccharina larval guts
	from Papyrus host plants using AGSA culture medium
icipe	International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology
KMESC	Unicellular bacteria isolated from laboratory reared
	E.saccharina larvae using KMM1 medium
KMESP	Unicellular bacteria isolated from E. saccharina larvae
	from Papyrus host plants using KMM1 medium
KMESS	Unicellular bacteria isolated from E. saccharina larvae
	from sugarcane host plants using KMM1 medium
KMM1	Kenya Minimal Medium
MEGA	Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
mV	Milli volt
NCBI	National Council for Biotechnology Information
NEB	New England Biolabs
OTU	Operational Taxonomic Unit
PBS	Phosphate Buffered Saline

xiv

PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
PDA	Potato Dextrose Agar
PDAESP	Culture isolates obtained from E. saccharina larvae from
	Papyrus host plants cultured on Potato Dextrose Agar medium
PDAESS	Culture isolates obtained from E. saccharina larvae from
	Sugarcane host plants cultured on Potato Dextrose Agar medium
RDP	Ribosomal Database Project
RFLP	Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism
Redox	Oxidation-Reduction
rRNA	Ribosomal Ribonucleic Acid
rpm	Revolutions per Minute
S.O.C medium	Super Optimal Catabolite repressed broth
TAE	Tris-acetate Ethylene diaminetetraacetic acid

ABSTRACT

Intestinal tracts of plant feeding insects are potentially important sources of novel biocatalysts. However, the microbial populations in these guts, especially in the Lepidoptera, are not well characterized. In this study, thirty two (32) bacterial isolates from homogenized guts of late instar larvae of Eldana saccharina from papyrus rhizomes and infested sugarcane stalks were assayed for their ability to utilize alpha cellulose and sugarcane bagasse as sole carbon sources. All isolates were viable for 14 days in liquid fermentation cultures. The microbial isolates were also characterized by a combination of microbiological and 16S rRNA gene sequence analysis. In addition, microbial communities in the gut homogenates were investigated by extracting total genomic DNA from eviscerated larval guts, followed by PCR amplification of the 16S rRNA gene. The diversity of the gut symbiotic bacteria was characterized by genetic profiling of the partial bacterial 16S rRNA gene by the Small Sub Unit PCR-Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (SSU-RFLP) technique followed by clonal sequencing and phylogenetic analysis. A total of 48 cloned 16S rRNA gene sequences together with 16S rRNA gene sequences from 32 bacterial isolates obtained by two different culture methods were compared with sequences in the GenBank database. Seventeen (17) of the clonal sequences were closely affiliated to the alpha Proteobacteria subdivision of the Kingdom Bacteria, followed by gamma Proteobacteria (15), Firmicutes (9), Actinobacteria (5) and Beta Proteobacteria (2). In culture dependent studies, most of the isolates obtained were affiliated to the high G+C content, Gram positive bacteria in the Actinobacteria subdivision, represented by the Streptomyces operational taxonomic unit (18 isolates), Microbacterium (4 isolates) and the Cellulosimicrobium (1 isolate). In addition, five (5) isolates clustered closely with the γ - Proteobacteria, three (3) with α -Proteobacteria and one (1) isolate was affiliated to the Firmicutes group. Only three bacterial taxa were isolated from gut homogenates of laboratory reared control larvae. Furthermore, only five bacterial taxa were detected in common by both culture dependent and independent methods. The results show a high microbial diversity in the guts of wild E. saccharina larvae and demonstrate that multiple approaches are necessary to characterize microbial diversity in a complex micro-biome like the insect gut. The results further suggest mutual benefits between microbial isolates and the host E. saccharina larvae and infer their potential applications in biotechnology. Moreover, these results provide the first comprehensive description of microbial diversity in the guts of the African Sugarcane stem borer and demonstrate that insect diet and habitat influence the composition of the gut microbial communities.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Plants constitute the largest and most readily available source of food for terrestrial insect communities. Herbivorous insect species are very abundant and comprise perhaps half of all individuals found in nature (May, 1988). However, out of 32 insect orders, only nine feed on living plants, suggesting a formidable evolutionary barrier that most groups have not been able to overcome (Bernays and Chapman, 1994; Borror et al., 1989). Among the nine orders of phytophagous insects is the Lepidoptera, the second largest order which comprises the moths, butterflies and skippers. Two pairs of membranous, scaled wings with much diversity in color and wing pattern characterize the adult members of this order. They undergo complete metamorphosis in their life cycle, with a developmental cycle that takes between 25 and 60 days depending on the species (Plate 1). Eldana saccharina Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) is reported to develop up to six generations in one year without larval diapause (Overholt et al., 2001). Lepidopteran larvae, commonly called caterpillars, are eruciform, having a welldeveloped head and a cylindrical body with 13 segments (3 thoracic and 10 abdominal). Each of the thoracic segments bears a pair of legs while abdominal segment numbers 3 to 6 and 10 usually bear a pair of prolegs. These prolegs differ from the thoracic legs by being fleshier, differently segmented and by possessing a number of tiny hooks, at the apex, which are called crochets.



Plate 1: Life cycle of *Eldana saccharina*. The developmental cycle varies between 25 and 60 days.

1.2 Economic importance of Eldana saccharina

The larvae of most lepidopteran species are phytophagus, with many being serious pests of cultivated crops. Many cause damage to stored grain while some attack fiber in clothing. Lepidopteran caterpillars are endowed with strong mandibular surfaces for chewing and grinding plant tissues. Their chewing action on foliage results in leaves that are skeletonized, riddled with holes, eaten around the edges or entirely consumed (Borror *et al.*, 1989). The term stem borer refers to larvae of certain moths and beetles that bore into live plant stems as they feed. *Eldana saccharina* Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) is a serious pest of sugarcane in Southern Africa (Atkinson, 1980), and of both maize and sugarcane in West Africa, with yield losses in maize being estimated at 20% (Bosque-Perez and Mareck, 1991). In sugarcane the stem borers can destroy the meristematic tissues of the shoots leading to the death of the shoot, in a condition called

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

'dead heart'. In older cane, the larva bores into and tunnels the stalk without killing it (Plate 2). This reduces the sugar content of the sugarcane, in some cases rendering the damaged cane to be unsuitable for milling. Recoverable sugar loss attributed to E. saccharina infestation is estimated at US\$ 332.10/ha (Simpson and Kumar, 1985). In addition, cane-tunneling increases the vulnerability of the crop to other pests, pathogens and parasites.





1.3 Biological significance of symbiotic microbiota

Wetland cyperaceous plants and a variety of wild grasses like *Panicum maximum*, *Pennisetum purpuream*, and Sudan grass provide natural refugia for *E. saccharina* from where invasions to cultivated crops occur. Besides sugarcane and maize, *E. saccharina* also attacks sorghum and rice (Atkinson, 1980; Khan *et al.*, 1997). *Eldana saccharina* is widely distributed in most parts of sub-Saharan Africa, where it accounts for up to 65% of stem borer pest populations in some countries (Maes, 1998). This wide distribution and abundance of *E. saccharina* could be attributable to its ability to utilize recalcitrant structural plant components found in both cultivated and natural host plant species. Hydrolysis of plant structural polymers like cellulose and hemi-cellulose is critical to the nutrition of phytophagous insects. These polysaccharides are resistant to degradation and the insect is not able to secrete all the digestive enzymes to hydrolyze β - linkages in the polymers (Brennan et al., 2004). To overcome this, insects have evolved consortia of microbial symbionts like bacteria, protozoa and yeast which secrete enzymes that hydrolyze the polymers (Kaltenpoth, 2009; Scharf and Tartar, 2008; Brune and Friedrich, 2000; Martin, 1991). Microorganisms possess metabolic properties that are absent in insects and in this way act as 'metabolic brokers', enabling phytophagous insects to overcome biochemical barriers to herbivory (Berenbaum, 1988; Douglas, 1992). The consortia of gut bacteria are believed to adapt in the host insect by transfer of plasmids and trans-conjugation between bacterial strains within the insect gut (Watanabe and Sato, 1998). Some insect species provide ideal conditions for bacterial conjugation making the insect gut a 'hotspot' for gene transfer (Hoffmann et al., 1998). Other possible roles that can be attributed to symbiotic microbiota in the insect gut include nitrogen fixation, synthesis of protein from nitrogenous waste materials and the provision of vitamins (B complex), sterols and amino acids (Campbell, 1990), and defense against pathogens and predators (Cardoza et al., 2006).

A lot of scientific research has been done on insects' herbivory and their nutritional ecology (Bernays and Chapman, 1994; Hochuli, 1996; Martin, 1991; Slansky, 1992). However, little has been done to describe and characterize the microbial flora in the gut of the African graminivorous lepidopteran insects. Recent work in other insects supports the proposition that symbiotic microbiota might play an essential role in the stem borers' metabolic utilization of plant structural polymers among other metabolic

4

benefits (Gündüz & Douglas, 2009; Brennan et al., 2004; Kaufman and Klug, 1991; Gijzen et al., 1994).

This study investigated the diversity and role of in-*vivo* biotic factors that may be responsible for the fitness and survival of the sugarcane stem borer on wild and cultivated host plants.

1.4 Justification

The microbiology of the insect gut has been studied for many decades (Steinhaus, 1960; Breznak, 1982; Brune & Friedrich, 2000). Until recently, progress on the molecular characterization of insect gut symbionts has been slow, largely because many gut microbes are unculturable and are consequently intractable to the traditional methods of microbiology based on axenic cultivation. Studies of various types of environments estimate that more than 99% of microorganisms seen microscopically cannot be cultivated by routine techniques (Amann et al., 1995). This represents a vast microbial metagenome that remains unexploited for biotechnological applications. However, nucleic acid sequence-based techniques are now available that can classify microbes without the need for culturing. As opposed to metabolic properties this sequence-based approach can be applied to the study of natural microbial ecosystems hither-to little known (Pace, 1997; Ohkuma, 2002). Using this approach, new possible genotypes and classes in the eubacteria and archaea domains may be identified from the intestinal tracts of wild strains of E. saccharina and other species. An understanding of the metabolic properties of the studied symbiotic microbes can provide insights for targeted industrial applications. Unlike conventional microbiological methods this approach is faster, accurate and is increasingly being used in studying natural microbial communities in order to avoid the largely unrepresentative nature of microbial cultivation.

1.5 Hypothesis

The gut of *Eldana saccharina* is inhabited by diverse microbial communities which are influenced by colonized host plant species.

1.6 General objective

The overall objective of this study was to investigate and assess the potential biotechnological applications of symbiotic microorganisms from the intestinal tracts of wild strains of *Eldana saccharina* larvae.

1.7 Specific objectives:

1. To determine and compare the bacterial diversity in the guts of 5th – 6th instar larvae of *Eldana saccharina* from papyrus and sugarcane host plants using culture dependent and sequence based techniques, and to compare these to laboratory reared controls;

2. To determine the hydrolysis of plant structural polymeric components (cellulose, lignocellulose) by *in-vitro* bioassays using gut extracts and culture isolates from eviscerated *E. saccharina* larvae.

1.8 Significance and anticipated outputs

This study on the diversity and properties of microbial communities in the gut of E. saccharina is aimed at providing new taxonomic information about microbial associations in the guts of the stem borer, to infer their contributions to the stem borer's survival and resilience and to find their practical applications in biotechnology. The insect gut is increasingly becoming an important source of microbial secondary metabolites that may offer attractive characteristics for targeted industrial use (Kaltenpoth, 2009; Piel, 2009; Brennan et al, 2004; Ohkuma, 2003). Through use of direct cloning techniques, environmental DNA (eDNA) libraries from microbial genomes can be generated, that could provide a format for expression screening for targeted activities and discovery of unique enzymes and other metabolites (Short, 2001). The discovery of novel microbial enzymes from wild strains of E. saccharina can present useful agricultural and industrial applications. For instance, microbial cellulases and xylanases have the potential of being used as feed additives to enhance utilization of high crude fiber plant materials in livestock feeds through improved feed digestibility. Efficient utilization of cereals in feed formulations would minimize wastage and thus assure availability of more grain for the rising human population. Actinomycetes are well known for their ability to decompose complex molecules, particularly lignocellulose components, which makes them important agents in decomposition processes (Lacey, 1997; Abdulla & El-Shatoury, 2007). The anaerobic conversion of cellulose results in various fermentation end products including ethanol, organic acids, carbon dioxide and hydrogen (Lynd et al., 2002). Novel microbial cellulolytic enzymes would find applications in the industrial production of bioethanol and polylactic acid from sugarcane

7

and other cereal crop biomass such as maize stover, barley, rice and wheat straw (Olsson *et al.*, 1999; Garde *et al.*, 2000; Zaldivar *et al.*, 2001). In addition to extracellular cellulase secretion, aerobic cellulolytic bacteria produce high cell yields typical of aerobic respiratory growth, a feature that could be an attractive source of microbial single cell protein from waste cellulosic biomass (El-Nawwi and El-Kader, 1996). Screening of symbiotic microbial isolates from *E. saccharina* larvae for anti-infective compounds would provide an important application in human health because the compounds involved, being produced for protection of the eukaryotic host insect would be less likely to have harmful side effects on humans (Kaltenpoth, 2009). Several novel compounds with antimicrobial activity have been isolated from mutualistic bacteria, particularly those that protect their insect host against pathogens (Kaltenpoth *et al.*, 2005; Piel, 2009). Knowledge on the diversity of indigenous microbial species in *E. saccharina* guts could also find useful applications in designing classical biological control strategies against the stem borer (Conlong, 2001).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Ecology and Host Range of Eldana saccharina

Eldana saccharina Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) is indigenous to Africa, where it has existed naturally in numerous wetland sedges and indigenous grasses (Conlong, 1994; Atkinson, *et al.*, 1981; Girling, 1972); (Plate 3). *E. saccharina* has become a pest of increasing proportions in South African sugarcane since 1971, and is spreading throughout the African continent (Carnegie, 1974; Way, 1994; Horton *et al.*, 2002). This shift by *E. saccharina* from its indigenous host plants to crop hosts is thought to have occurred due to a disturbance in the ecological balance arising from increased opening up of swampy areas for cultivation of graminaceous crops, thereby providing alternative host plants for the insects' colonization (Atkinson, 1980; Assefa *et al.*, 2008).



Plate 3: Dissected umbel rays of *Cyperus papyrus* showing *Eldana saccharina* larvae (green circle), with brown discoloration of the base indicating commencement of downward tunneling of the culm for pupation and eventual exit of the moth. On the right is an infested *papyrus* inflorescence with yellow discoloration of the pseudo leaves that is indicative of an infestation.

2.2 Insect metabolic micro-biomes

The diversity of the insecta is reflected in the large and varied microbial communities inhabiting the gut. Insect gut microbiota represents all aspects of microbial relationships from pathogenic to obligate mutualism. Indigenous gut bacteria also play an important role in withstanding the colonization of the gut by non-indigenous bacteria including pathogens (Dillon and Dillon, 2004). Like in the human gut (Kurokawa et al., 2007; Turnbaugh et al., 2007) many insect species are inhabited by large diverse communities of microorganisms that could out-number their own cells and with considerable metabolic activity (Brooks, 1963; Dasch et al., 1984; Gündüz & Douglas, 2009). With the exception of the termite, few studies on the functional role of the insect gut microbiota have been done (Brune and Friedrich, 2000; Warnecke et al., 2007; Scharf & Tarter, 2008). This may partly be due to the complexity of insect gut symbioses. There are also difficulties in recognizing beneficial relationships that are often intermittent or may completely be absent in laboratory-reared insects (Dillon and Dillon, 2004). Lederberg and McCray (2001) coined the term 'microbiome' to describe the collective genome of the indigenous microbiota, their genetic elements (genomes), and environmental interactions in a defined environment. The completion of a number of insect and microbial genome sequencing projects and introduction of other molecular techniques and bioinformatics now provide useful tools for detailed studies of insect microbiomes.

2.3 Intestinal symbioses.

A symbiotic relationship of a microbe with its insect host can be defined as the acquisition and maintenance of the microorganism that results in novel structures or metabolism (Klepzig et al., 2009; Zook, 1998). This interaction can be positive or negative. Commensalism and mutualism characterize a positive association while parasitism and insect pathogens characterize negative symbioses (Daida et al., 1996). A symbiotic relationship should be defined after careful consideration of the time range and resource conditions in which it is examined (Klepzig et al., 2001b). Similarly, isolation and characterization of insect intestinal microbiota should be correlative either with the ability of the host to control its biota or the effect of the biota on the host's physiology (Brooks, 1963). In the insect an indigenous biota should be present in all individuals of the species and should maintain stable climax communities. Though many insect species are believed to derive their microbiota from the phylloplane of food plants, the degree of persistent strains of the ingested species is largely unknown (Dillon and Dillon, 2004). It is, therefore, necessary to show whether strains of these species occupy particular niches in the gut and colonize gut epithelia or whether they are present in all of the same insect species. In insects the most important distinction is the ability of a microbial species to colonize the gut habitat. Colonizing microbes should be able to multiply at a rate that equals or exceeds the rate of elimination from the gut.

2.4 The insect gut structure and chemical environment

The diversity of symbiotic microbiota relates in part to the variety of specialized structures present in the gut as well as the effect of pH and redox conditions, digestive

enzymes present and the type of food ingested. Insects with a simple, straight digestive tract are believed to possess a less diverse microbiota whereas those with more complex structures like paunches, diverticula and caeca have a wide variety of mutualistic microorganisms (Bignell, 1982; Tanada and Kaya, 1993). The digestive tracts of lepidopteran larvae have for long been thought not to have specialized structures that are usually associated with microorganisms. Some of these folivores are also characterized by rapid food throughputs. Gut microorganisms in such insects were assumed to play little part in nutrition and digestion (Appel, 1994). However, it is now known that herbivorous insects with a food throughput time as rapid as 1.5hr can harbor indigenous microbiota (Dillon and Charnley, 1991). For instance, despite the absence of specialized structures, there is a substantial population of bacteria residing on the locust hindgut cuticle (Hunt and Charnley 1981). Bacteria have also been found occupying the gut lumen of the tobacco hornworm Manduca sexta and colonizing the hindgut epithelia (Toth-Prestia and Hirshfield, 1988). Moreover, bacterial division in the insect gut can occur as often as every twenty minutes with viable bacterial mutations being generated during every cycle, allowing the indigenous microbiota to adapt rapidly to changes in the gut environment (Dillon and Dillon, 2004).

The pH and redox potential inside the gut lumen are important in selecting and enriching for certain species of bacteria. Most bacteria have a growth pH optimum of 6.0 -7.0 but numerous exceptions include lactic acid bacteria that can grow at acidic pH. Strictly aerobic microbes grow only at positive redox potentials whereas anaerobes grow at negative redox potentials. Multiple solutions are developed in the guts of insects to enable efficient digestion of the insects' diets. The great variation in pH and redox

12

potential in the insect gut are part of this adaptation (Plate 4). Lepidopterans and sawflies possess alkaline gut conditions of pH 8 to 10, with widely differing redox potentials ranging from + 400mV to - 200mV (Appel, 1994). Large microbial populations are sometimes evident in insects with extreme pH levels (Dillon and Charnley, 1991; Bignell and Eggleton, 1995).



Plate 4: A digital image of a whole dissected gut from a late instar *Eldana saccharina* larva, showing the fore gut (1); an extensive mid gut with five partitions (2i-2v) and the hind gut (3). Arrows show a network of malpighian tubules mainly attaching to the mid gut. (X1000 Magnification). The graph below shows pH profiles along the gut lumens of two lepidoperan species, *Lichnoptera felina* (circles) and *Manduca sexta* (triangles).

Source:http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bookshelf/br.fcgi.

2.5 Tools in Molecular Phylogeny

2.5.1 Small Sub Unit rRNA-PCR

Nucleic acid sequence based approaches particularly those using 16S rRNA genes enable definition of the microbial community of insects (Brauman *et al.*, 2001). In one study, two thirds of clonally isolated 16S rDNAs from the gut microbiota of the termite *Reculitermes speratus* had less than 90% sequence identity with any known bacterial species, with ten of the clones failing to show close similarity with any recognized bacterial phyla (Kudo, *et al.*, 1998; Okhuma and Kudo, 1996).

The quickest way to survey the constituents of microbial ecosystems is through the use of Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) (Saiki *et al.*, 1988). The highly conserved nature of rRNA genes allows for the use of universal primers that can anneal to sequences conserved in the ribosomal RNA from all the three phylogenetic domains namely, archaea, bacteria and eucarya (Woese, 1987; Pace, 1997). In principle, PCR carried out with these primers amplifies the rRNA genes of all types of microorganisms present in an environmental sample. Individual types of genes in the mixture are separated by a cloning step and then sequenced. A molecular phylogenetic assessment of uncultivated microorganisms can provide insights into many properties and functions of the microbe through comparison with its studied relatives.

2.5.2 Fluorescence In -Situ Hybridization (FISH)

Fluorescein or Digoxigenin labeled specific oligonucleotide probes can be used to visualize phylotypes, establish morphology and to determine the number and spatial arrangement of cells in the gut. In-situ localization of the bacterial community on cryosections of the hindgut of lower termites was achieved using domain-specific rRNA

Fluorescein probes (Berchtold *et al.*, 1999). Similarly, two intracellular symbiotic bacteria from the mulberry psyllid *Anomoeura mori* were characterized using digoxigenin labeled oligonucleotide probes (Fukatsu and Nikoh, 1998). Using fluorescently labeled probes in a survey of gut microbiota of five cricket species it was possible to identify unculturable *Bacteroides* and *Prevotella* species as well as detect changes in the profile of microbial community due to dietary changes (Santo Domingo *et al.*, 1998).

CHAPTER THREE

MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1. Insect larvae collection and dissections

A total of one hundred mature E. saccharina larvae were randomly sampled from rhizomes, culms and umbel rays of Cyperus papyrus host plants at Luanda-Nyamasare, Homa Bay County, along the shores of Lake Victoria (GPS: 00 ° 27.641'S; 034° 16.681' E; 7327ft ASL). An equal number was sampled from infested sugarcanes in smallholder farms at Kibisi swamp (GPS 0° 46.617' N; 34° 43.989' E; 5406ft ASL); Marofu swamp (GPS 0° 43.870' N; 34° 46.848' E; 5523ft ASL) and Sinoko river swamp (GPS: 0° 48.590'N; 34° 47.059' E; 5544ft ASL), all in the Bungoma County of Western Kenya). The larvae were maintained on pieces of the host plants while being transported to the laboratory. The larvae were surface sterilized by three washes in 20% (V/V) bleach, each lasting three minutes, followed by one wash in 70% ethanol. Whole guts from the two populations were separately eviscerated by aseptically pulling out the gut from the anal segment using a pair of sterile fine tip forceps while holding the head with the second pair (plate 5). To obtain a wide coverage of microbial species composition, ten pools of 10 individual guts were placed into sterile 1.5ml epitubes containing 500µl of chilled 1x Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) pH 7.4. Laboratory reared control E. saccharina 5th instar larvae, reared on artificial diet, were acquired from the Animal Rearing and Containment Unit (ARCU) at *icipe* and dissected the same way.





Plate 5: A. Laboratory dissection of infested sugarcane stalks to recover *Eldana saccharina* larvae. The arrow shows a late stage larva emerging from a split piece of infested sugarcane. B. Late stage *E.saccharina* larvae in a Petri plate; C. Eviscerated whole gut from late stage *E.saccharina* larva.

3.2 Culture Dependent Characterization

3.2.1 Gut homogenization and serial dilutions.

Ten pools of dissected *E. saccharina* larval whole guts from papyrus and sugarcane host plants as well as laboratory reared controls were placed in 1.5ml epitubes and homogenized in 0.5ml of sterile 1x PBS pH 7.4, using plastic pestles in the presence of fine glass beads. PBS was composed of NaCl [8.0g]; KCl [0.2g], Na₂HPO₄ [1.44g], KH₂PO₄ [0.24g] per litre of distilled water. The homogenates were further vortex mixed at high speed for five minutes in the presence of one larger glass bead (size 710-1180 μ m, Sigma Aldrich Inc, USA) in every tube. Larval gut homogenates from papyrus and sugarcane were code named ESP and ESS respectively while ESC was used for laboratory controls. The homogenates were initially diluted at 1/100 and then subjected to ten fold serial dilution steps up to a final dilution of 10⁻⁵.

3.2.2 Microbial isolation and growth medium

Four dilutions [10⁻², 10⁻³, 10⁻⁴ and 10⁻⁵] of the gut homogenates were inoculated separately in three different microbiological isolation media as follows: Kenya minimal agar medium (KMM1) for isolation of aerobic bacteria (Mackenzie, et al., 2007), with slight modifications as described below; Arginine Glycerol Salts (AGS) agar medium for selective isolation of actinobacteria (Moustafa and Lechevalier, 1963), and Potato dextrose agar medium (PDA) for selective isolation of yeast and fungi. KMM1 contained NaCl [1.7g], KCl [6.5g], MgCl₂.6H₂O [0.5g], CaCl₂.2H₂O [0.1g], NH₄Cl [5.6g], KH₂PO₄ [1.0g], NaSO₄ [1.0] and Bacto agar [15g] per liter of distilled water. The medium was supplemented with 0.1% each of Gelatin, Glucose, Casamino acids and yeast extract [Difco, Detroit, MI, USA] and autoclaved at 121°C for 20 minutes. After cooling to 50°C the medium was further supplemented with 2ml each of the following 0.2 micron filter sterilized stock solutions: Biotin[10µg/ml], Folic acid [50 µg/ml], Riboflavin [62.5 μg/ml], Thiamin [50 μg/ml]; Isobutyric acid [25mM], Isovaleric acid [25mM] and Lipoic acid [1mM]. The medium was plated in 90mm disposable Petri dishes (Greiner Inc, Austria) under sterile conditions and allowed to solidify at room temperature. Arginine Glycerol Salts agar medium had the following composition per litre of distilled water: NaCl [1.0g], K₂HPO₄ [1.0g], MgSO₄.7H₂O [0.5g], FeSO₄.7H₂O [0.01g], CuSO₄.5H₂O [0.001g], ZnSO₄.7H₂O [0.001g], MnSO₄.7H₂O [0.001g], Glycerol [12.5g; Fisher, UK] and L-(+)- Arginine monohydrochloride [1g; J.T Baker, Japan]. Agar (2% w/v) was added as solidifying agent. The medium was autoclaved for 20 minutes, allowed to cool to 40°C and then plated on 90mm Petri dishes as described above. PDA was prepared by dissolving 39g of Potato dextrose agar powder [DIFCO™, USA] in 1 liter of distilled

water and autoclaving at 121°C for 20 minutes. After cooling the medium to 40°C, filter sterilized Kanamycin sulfate [50mg/ml; Fluka Biochemika] was added to a final concentration of 100μ g/ml. The medium was gently mixed on a roller mixer for 5 minutes and then plated as described above.

Triplicate inoculations were separately applied for the three isolation media by pour plating 0.1ml of the appropriate dilution in the middle of the agar plate and then spreading the inoculums evenly on the agar surface with a sterile glass spreader. Control plates were inoculated with sterile distilled water. Cultures were incubated at 30°C under aerobic conditions in the dark. Colony forming units were enumerated under dissecting microscope and colonies described according to their morphological features. Colonies with unique observable morphological characteristics in shape, color and elevation were selected, streak-plated onto fresh medium and isolated into pure cultures. Cell and Gram staining characteristics were observed under a compound microscope. Slide cultures were grown to observe hyphae and spore chain characteristics for the Actinobacteria. Data on colony forming unit counts was subjected to Poisson regression analysis to test for effect of host plants and isolation media on microbial abundance.

3.2.3 Bioassays for utilization of cellulose and lignocellulose as sole organic carbon source

GAESS and GAESP isolates were separately inoculated in sterile mineral medium containing alpha cellulose and sugarcane bagasse respectively, to test their abilities to utilize the two substrates as sole carbon source. The mineral medium contained the following salts per liter of distilled water: NaCl [1g], K₂HPO₄ [1g], MgSO₄.7H₂O [0.5g],

CuSO₄ [1mg], ZnSO₄.7H₂O [10mg], FeSO₄.7H₂O [100mg], CaCl₂ [0.1g], (NH4)₂SO₄ [6g] and 2ml of trace elements. 100 ml volumes of the mineral medium were distributed in duplicates into appropriately labeled 250 ml baffled Erlenmeyer flasks. For cellulose degradation test, 0.5g of commercial alpha cellulose (Sigma Aldrich Inc, USA) was added to individual flasks with mineral medium, mixed and autoclaved for 30 minutes at 121°C covered with cotton wool layered with aluminum foil. For bagasse testing, 0.1g of freshly milled sugarcane waste, collected from Muhoroni Sugar Factory, was added to individual flasks. The bagasse had previously been washed in 10 changes of hot distilled water to remove traces of soluble sugars, dried in an oven and then milled to powder with a kitchen mill (Sanyo Inc, Japan), and autoclaved as described for alpha cellulose. Control flasks were prepared wherein the organic carbon source was omitted.

After cooling to room temperature, the medium was separately inoculated with 10 % (v/v) of the individual bacterial isolates under aseptic conditions and incubated at 30°C in a shaker incubator set at 150 rpm for up to 14 days (Ponce-Noyola & de la Torre, 2001; Ponce-Noyola & de la Torre, 1995). Evaluation of viability of the isolates was based on turbidity of the fermentation broth, gas formation (including Geosmin production), and recovery of viable isolates in fresh medium after 14 days by the pour plate technique. Microbial cell biomass was assessed by determining total protein by the Bicinchoninic acid (BCA) assay method (Smith *et al.*, 1985), using Bovine serum albumin as a standard.
3.3 Molecular Characterization of Bacterial Isolates

3.3.1 DNA extraction and amplification of bacterial 16S rRNA gene

Genomic DNA was extracted from the microbial isolates GAESP 1-25; GAESS 1-17; KMESP1-11, KESS1-7 and KMESC 1-5 respectively, using the Fast DNA[®] Spin Kit for Soil (Qbiogene, Inc. USA), according to instructions supplied. The DNA was resolved on a 1% agarose gel containing 1x Tris Acetic acid EDTA (TAE) and stained with ethidium bromide to assess the yield and quality (Sambrook *et al.*, 1989).

Genomic DNA from individual isolates was used as template for amplification of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene. Amplifications were performed using the HotStar Tag® Master Mix kit (Qiagen, Inc, USA) following the manufacturer's instructions. The PCR reaction was done in 25µl reaction volumes comprising of 1 template DNA, 12.5µl of 2x HotStar Tag Master mix, and 0.5µmol each of universal primers 27F 5'-TAG AGT TTGATC CTG GCT CAG-3' forward and 1392R 5'- GAC GGG CGG TGT GTA CAT CCT GGC TCA G-3' reverse primer, based on the E. coli 16S rRNA gene sequence (Lane et al., 1985; Wang & Qian, 2009). A further 10.5µl of DNase free water was added to the master mix to a final volume of 25µl. The PCR programme, performed using a PTC-100 thermal cycler (MJ Research Inc, USA), comprised of an initial enzyme activation at 95°C for 15 minutes followed by 29 repeated cycles of denaturation at 94°C for 30 seconds, annealing at 55°C for 90 seconds, primer extension at 72°C for 60 seconds and a final extension step of 72°C for 10 minutes. The PCR products were resolved on 1% agarose TAE gel electrophoresis and visualized by ethidium bromide staining. The amplified fragment of approximately 1365bp from each set of samples was excised from the gel and purified in individual 1.5ml epitubes using the QIAquick[®] gel

extraction kit (Qiagen Inc, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The purified PCR fragments were submitted to a commercial sequencing service provider for sequencing.

3.3.2 Phylogenetic analysis of isolates' 16S rRNA gene sequences

Sequencing of purified PCR products was done using Macrogen commercial sequencing services (http://dna.macrogen.com/eng/order/seq/order std step1.jsp). The Sequencing reactions were performed in both directions without cloning. Sequence trace viewing and sequence editing were performed with the BioEdit Sequence Alignment Editor Software (Hall, 1999). The CHECK-CHIMERA program (http://rdp.cme.msu.edu/) of the Ribosomal Database Project (Maidak et al., 2001; Cole et al., 2003) was used to check the sequences for presence of possible chimeric artifacts. Sequence data was analyzed with RDP online software package (Release 10.13; Cole et al., 2009). The new sequences were added to the myRDP space of the database (Cole et al., 2007), aligned in sync with the RDP Public database sequences (http://rdp.cme.msu.edu/), using the SeqMatch Tool and tested for anomalies with the Pintail online software trained on the infernal secondary structure aware alignment tool (Cole et al., 2009; Ashelford et al., 2005). The 16S rRNA gene sequences were compared to sequences in the public nucleotide database using Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLASTn) on the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) website (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) for similarities to sequences in the GenBank database (Altschul et al., 1990; Shayne et al., 2003). GenBank sequences with highest similarities to the query sequences in the study were retrieved and used in

the construction of phylogenetic trees. Phylogenetic analyses were conducted using MEGA Version 4 (Tamura *et al.*, 2007). The Maximum composite likelihood model was used for Neighbour joining tree constructions (Saitou & Nei, 1987) with bootstrap confidence of 1000 replicate samplings (Tamura *et al.*, 2004; Felsenstein, 1985).

3.4 Culture Independent Characterization

3.4.1 Total DNA extraction

Total microbial DNA was extracted from the eviscerated *E. saccharina* larval guts using the Fast DNA[®] Spin Kit for Soil (Qbiogene, Inc., USA), according to manufacturer's instructions. DNA concentration and purity were determined by absorbance ratio at 260/280 nm, and quality visualized by ethidium bromide stained agarose gel electrophoresis (Sambrook *et al.*, 1989). The DNA suspensions were stored at -20°C until they were required for PCR and further analysis.

3.4.2 PCR amplification of bacterial 16S rRNA

Purified total DNA from the two wild stem borer populations and a laboratory-reared control were separately used as templates for the amplification of the 16S rRNA gene, using universal primers 27F 5'-TAG AGT TTGATC CTG GCT CAG-3' forward and 1393R 5'- GAC GGG CGG TGT GTA CAT CCT GGC TCA G- 3' reverse primer, based on the *E. coli* 16SrDNA gene sequence (Lane *et al.*, 1985; Wang & Qian, 2009). The PCR was carried out using HotStar Taq Master Mix kit (Qiagen Inc, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The PCR reaction was performed in 25µl reaction comprising of 1µl template DNA, 12.5µl of 2x HotStar Taq Master Mix, and 0.5µmol each of the primers. The amplification comprised of an initial enzyme activation at 95°C

for 15 minutes followed by 29 repeated cycles of denaturation at 94 °C for 30 seconds, annealing at 55°C for 90 seconds, primer extension at 72°C for 60 seconds and a final extension step of 72°C for 10 minutes. The PCR products were verified by 1% agarose gel electrophoresis and visualized by ethidium bromide staining. The bands of PCR products from each set of samples were excised from the gel and purified using the QIAquick[®] gel extraction kit (Qiagen Inc, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The gel purified PCR products were resolved on a 1% agarose gel to check for purity. Products showing a single band of approximately 1365 bp were used for cloning and subsequent sequencing.

3.4.3 Cloning PCR products and Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (PCR-RFLP)

The purified PCR products were cloned using the TOPO-TA cloning kit (Invitrogen, USA) following the manufacturer's instructions. The ligation mix for each *E. saccharina* population consisted of 3μ l of gel purified PCR product, 1μ l of salt solution, 1μ l of pCR[®] 2.1 TOPO vector and 1μ l of sterile water to make a total of reaction volume of 6μ l. The cloning reactants were mixed gently and incubated at room temperature for 30 minutes. Chemically competent *E. coli* cells were transformed by adding 3μ l of each TOPO cloning reaction to three separate vials of the DH5 α^{TM} -T1 strain of *E. coli* cells with gentle mixing. The transformation mix was incubated on ice for 30 minutes after which the cells were heat-shocked by placing the tubes for 30 seconds in a water bath set at 42°C. The tubes were immediately transferred to an ice bath after which 250µl of S.O.C medium was added and the tubes incubated for one hour at 37°C with horizontal shaking

at 200 rpm. The transformation mix was plated on pre-warmed Lauria-Bertani (LB) agar medium using Kanamycin sulfate (50µg/ml) as selection marker and incubated overnight at 37°C. Prior to plating, every LB agar plate was layered with 40µl of X-gal (40mg/ml in DMF). Individual white bacterial colonies bearing the PCR construct were picked with a sterile tooth pick and inoculated into tubes with 3ml of LB broth containing 50µg/ml Kanamycin sulfate. The liquid cultures were incubated for 16 hrs at 37°C with shaking (150 rev / minute). Plasmid DNAs bearing the 16S rRNA gene constructs were purified using the Qiaquick miniprep kit (QIAGEN Inc, USA) following the Manufacturer's directions. The purified plasmids were digested with a cocktail of 5 restriction enzymes, namely Aval, BamHI, Hind III, KpnI and XbaI, (New England Biolabs, USA) all of which only cut the plasmid once. The digestion reaction contained 0.2µl of each restriction enzyme, 2µl of 10X NEB Buffer 2, 1µl of 1:100 diluted BSA, 8µl plasmid DNA and 8.8µl of sterile water to make a 20µl reaction volume. Incubation was done overnight at 37°C in a water bath. Plasmids from a few blue colonies were also included in the digestions as controls. Clones were selected on the basis of their band polymorphism on a 1.2% agarose gel. Sequencing of clones with unique band profiles was outsourced from Macrogen Corporation, South Korea. Sequencing reactions were performed in both directions separately using M13 Forward and M13 Reverse primer set. Sequence trace viewing and editing were performed with the BioEdit Sequence Alignment Editor Software (Hall, 1999).

3.4.4 Phylogenetic analysis of clonal sequences

The cloned sequences were checked for Vector contamination using the VecScreen software from NCBI (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/VecScreen/VecScreen.htm). The CHECK-CHIMERA program (http://rdp.cme.msu.edu/) of the Ribosomal Database Project (Maidak et al., 2001; Cole et al., 2003) was used to check the sequences for presence of possible chimeric artifacts. Sequence data was analyzed with RDP online software package Release 10.13 (Cole et al., 2009) offered by the Centre for Microbial Ecology, Michigan State University, USA. The new sequences were added to the myRDP space of the database (Cole et al., 2007), aligned in sync with the RDP Public database sequences using the SeqMatch Tool and tested for anomalies with the Pintail online software trained on the infernal secondary structure aware alignment tool (Cole et al., 2009; Ashelford et al., 2005). The 16S rRNA gene sequences were compared to sequences in the public database using the nucleotide Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLASTn) on the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) website (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) for similarities to sequences in the GenBank (Altschul et al., 1990; Shayne et al., 2003). GenBank sequences with highest similarities to the query sequences in the study were retrieved and used in the construction of phylogenetic trees. Phylogenetic analyses were conducted using MEGA Version 4 (Tamura et al., 2007). The Maximum composite likelihood model was used for Neighbour joining tree constructions (Saitou & Nei, 1987) with bootstrap confidence of 1000 replicate samplings (Tamura et al., 2004; Felsenstein, 1985).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1 Enumeration of microbial isolates

All colonies from the KMM1, AGSA and PDA plate cultures were counted and calculation of CFU/ml determined as follows using the formula: CFU/ ml = CFU/ plate x dilution factor x 1/aliguot (Table 1)

Table 1: Enumeration of Microbial culture colonies from *E. saccharina* larval gut homogenates

		Culture plate counts per 10 ⁻⁵ dilution					
e of <i>E. saccharina</i>	KMM1		ASGA		PDA		
	Mean Plate	CFU/ml	Mean	CFU/ml	Mean plate	CFU/ml	
	count	l of	plate		count		
	a stille and s	5 K., 19 K.	count				
us rhizomes	178	1.78x10 ⁵	17	1.7x10 ⁴	9	9.0x10 ³	
cane stalks	226	2.26x10 ⁵	17	1.7x10 ⁴	9	9.0x10 ³	
eared control	90	9.0x10 ⁴	0	Nil	5	5.0x10 ³	

KMM1culture isolates from larval gut homogenates of *E. saccharina* collected from infested sugar cane host plants had the highest number of colony forming units for 10⁻⁵ dilution followed by isolates from papyrus, while isolates from laboratory reared controls yielded two and half fold lower CFUs/ml. AGSA and PDA isolation media gave the same number of CFUs/ml of isolates from papyrus and sugarcane host plants. Regression analysis on the effect of host plant on microbial counts in larval guts *Eldana saccharina*

showed an overall significantly higher abundance of microbial isolates from papyrus and sugarcane host plants compared to laboratory reared control larvae (p - value < 0.0001; Table 2). However, there was no significant difference in number of isolates between papyrus and sugarcane host plants (p-value = 0.1851; Data set 2, Table 2).

Table 2: Poisson regression analysis on the effect of host plant on microbial abundance in guts of *Eldana saccharina* larvae

Dataset 1			an a	
Factor	Risk ratio(RR)	944 (PR)	95% CI for RR	<i>p</i> -value
Intercept		85.17	(75.17 - 95.76)	< 0.00001
Host plant				
Papyrus		2.15	(1.87 - 2.47)	< 0.00001
Sugarcane		2.65	(2.31 - 3.04)	< 0.00001
Isolation Medium				
PDA		0.05	(0.04 - 0.06)	< 0.00001
AGSA		0.07	(0.06 - 0.08)	< 0.00001

Papyrus Vs sugarcane: Chi-square = 14.9, df = 1, p-value = 0.00011

Significant overall host plant effect: X2 = 197.6, df = 2, p-value< 0.0001 Significant overall isolation medium effect: X2 = 1236.8, df = 2, p-value=0.0001

Dataset 2

Significant effect of the isolation medium on the number of counts found in each host plant: p-value = 0.005349 (by Fisher exact test)

Within AGSA the proportions for papyrus and sugarcane were significantly higher than in Lab control, p-value=0.00000002373, but no significant difference between papyrus and sugar, p-value = 0.1851

Within KMM1, there was no significant difference among the two host plants, p-value = 0.2231

Within PDA, both sugarcane and papyrus were both significantly higher than the Lab control (p-values equal 0.002935 and 0.04654, respectively), but not significantly so from one another (p-value= 0.4328)

4.2 Morphological Characterization of Microbial Isolates

Morphological features of majority of the isolates obtained from the pour plate culture characterization were similar to those of members of the Actinobacteria (Plates 6-18). All the 41 colonies isolated in Arginine Glycerol Salts Agar medium showed rapid growth and sporulation at a temperature range of 28-32°C under aerobic culture conditions. GAESP culture isolates revealed a diversity of colored pure colonies with a smooth to tough, leathery and filamentous appearance, and production of colored pigments, in the form of secretions into the culture medium within a few days of incubation. The colonies also produced the characteristic fresh earthy odour which is attributed to Geosmin production that is commonly associated with most members of the Actinobacteria (Wood *et al.*, 2001).

Several colonies had secretory structures on the aerial mycelia which secreted droplets of metabolites onto the surface of colonies prior to sporulation (Plates 9, 10, 13 and 17). Gram stained slide cultures of the isolates revealed a branched network of mycelia with characteristically shaped sporophores forming at the apexes of aerial mycelia (Plates 7b-13b). Some isolates had spores that stained dark red with Gram stain (Plate 6b and 9b); while a few had spore vacuoles which remained colorless in the presence of the Gram stain (Plates 10b and 12b).

Isolates GAESS 1-16 were obtained from *E. saccharina* larvae from sugarcane host plants. Like their Papyrus counterparts, the isolates had varied unique morphological characteristics that differentiated them from one another but they showed colony characteristics and growth patterns similar to those of the actinobacteria (Plates 13-18).

Morphological examination of the KMM1 culture isolates revealed bacterial colonies that had cream and yellow pigments (Plates 19-23). Microscopic examination showed unicellular bacteria, majority of which were Gram negative bacilli and Cocci (Plates 19-21), while two isolates, KMESP-5 and KMESS-2 had gram positive Cocci and bacilli respectively (Plates 22 and 23). PDA isolated colonies mostly had non filamentous colonies, characterized by white to cream-yellow colony forming units, which were generally larger than the KMM1 isolates (Plates 24-28). Some of the isolates had a network of root-like growths on the colony margin extending into the culture medium (plates 25a and 26a). The colonies had a raised elevation with a smooth surface though few had a flaky surface appearance. Microscopic examination revealed Gram positive, single yeast cells, with shapes varying from round, ovoid to rods. The cell sizes were larger than bacteria, with some cells joining to form pseudo-hyphae (Plates 24 and 27). One isolate had a brown secretion on the colony surface (Plate 24).



6a

Plate 6: a) Isolate GAESP-1 single bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing cream substrate mycelial growth with 'halo'-ring like formation in the medium and white aerial mycelia bearing gravish spore structures. 6b) Gram stained slide culture of GAESP-1 showing tributary-like mycelial branching and y-shape of sporophores at the tips of the mycelia network.



Plate 7: a) Isolate GAESP- 2 bacterial colonies on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing gray aerial sporulation on white surface mycelia. 7b) Original streak culture colony showing spots of secondary aerial vegetative growth covered with white mycelia (arrow).

7b



Plate 7: c) Isolate GAESP- 2 Gram stained slide culture showing mycelial branching. Arrow indicates position and the characteristic convoluted pattern of the sporophores at the tips of the mycelia network



8a.

7a



Plate 8: a) Isolate GAESP- 4 single bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium. Notice the 'halo'-ring formation in the medium around the colony and white aerial mycelia. 8b) Gram stained slide culture showing filament branching. Arrow shows position and curled shape of the sporophores.



Plate 9: a) Isolate GAESP- 5 bacterial colonies on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing white aerial sporulation on pink mycelia. Colonies on the right show different stages of growth, with one colony showing secretory structures on the aerial mycelia (indicated by an arrow).



Plate 9: b) Isolate GAESP-5 Gram stained slide culture showing characteristic near perpendicular alternate mycelial branching. Arrows indicate position and shape of the sporophores at the tips of the mycelia network.



Plate 10: a) Isolate GAESP-10 bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing white sporulation on beige aerial mycelia. Arrows show straw coloured secretory products on the aerial hyphae of an order colony.



10b

Plate 10: b) Isolate GAESP-10 Gram stained slide culture showing filament branching. Arrows indicate rod-shaped chain of the sporophores with Gram variable spore vacuoles.



11a

Plate 11: a) Isolate GAESP-11 bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing gray aerial sporulation on white surface mycelia.



11b

Plate 11: b) Isolate GAESP-11 Gram stained slide culture showing mycelial branching and Gram positive segmented spore chains.

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



Plate 12: a) Isolate GAESP-15 bacterial colonies on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing white aerial sporulation centrally located on purplish-gray colony mycelia. Colonies show a rounded shape with a serrated margin. 12b). Gram stained slide culture showing mycelial branching. Arrows indicate position of sporophores with Gram variable (colorless) spores.



Plate 13: Isolate GAESS -1 bacterial colonies on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing cream aerial mycelia with white sporulation scattered peripheral to the colony. Colonies have straw coloured secretory products (arrow).



Plate 14: Isolate GAESS-2 bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing beige dry-looking aerial mycelia surrounded by radial rings of beige sporulation. Colony shows a generally rounded shape with a serrated margin.



Plate 15: Isolate GAESS-3 bacterial colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium, showing a slightly raised colony with cream leathery aerial mycelia, surrounded by curls of white sporulation.



Plate 16: Isolate GAESS-6 single colony, on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium showing beige dry-powdery looking aerial mycelia spreading outwards to form an irregular colony margin. In the middle of the colony is development of vegetative structures from the substrate mycelia.



Plate 17: Isolate GAESS-12; mature colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium showing beige-cream aerial mycelia with white sporulation and an irregular colony margin. Notice cream secretion on colony (arrow).



Plate 18: Isolate GAESS-14 single colony on Arginine Glycerol salts agar (AGSA) culture medium showing a round colony with cream aerial mycelia and well defined entire margin. In the middle is a white mass of white fluffy hyphae, raised above the aerial mycelia as secondary growth.



Plate 19: a) Isolate KMESP-1 single bacterial colony on Kenya Minimal culture medium (KMM1), showing yellow, raised, round colony, with an entire margin. 19b). Gram stained slide of KMESP-1, showing Gram negative bacilli (X1000magnification)



Plate 20: a) Isolate KMESP-2 bacterial colonies on Kenya Minimal culture medium (KMM1), showing cream colored, raised, oval colonies, with an entire margin. 20b) Gram stained slide of isolate KMESP-2 showing Gram negative cocco-bacilli (X1000Magnification)



Plate 21: a) Isolate KMESC-2 bacterial colony on Kenya Minimal culture medium (KMM1), showing cream colored, raised, oval colonies, with an entire margin. 21b). Gram stained slide of isolate KMESC-2 showing Gram negative Cocco-bacilli(X 1000 magnification)







Plate 22: a) Isolate KMESP-5 bacterial colonies on Kenya Minimal culture medium (KMM1), showing cream colored, raised, round colonies, with an entire margin. 22b). Gram stained slide of isolate KMESP-5 showing Gram positive Cocco-bacilli (X1000 magnification).



Plate 23: a) Isolate KMESS-2 bacterial colony on Kenya Minimal culture medium (KMM1), showing cream colored, raised, round colonies, with an entire margin. 23b is a slide showing Gram positive bacilli (X1000 magnification)



Plate 24: a) Isolate PDA ESP-2 plate colonies showing raised, cream coloured colonies with an irregular margin. Notice the orange-brown coloured secretion from the colony surface. 24b). Gram stained slide showing Gram positive round-ovoid yeast cells. Arrows show cells joined to form pseudo-hyphae (X1000 magnification).



Plate 25: a) PDA ESP-4 plate colony showing raised, cream coloured colony with a serrated margin. 26b is a gram stained slide showing Gram positive cocco-bacilli with cells joining to form chains or clusters. (X1000 magnification).



Plate 26: a) PDA ESS-2 plate colony showing raised, cream coloured, round colony with an entire margin. Notice the peripheral root-like growth in to the medium. 26b). Gram stained slide of isolate PDA ESS-2 showing Gram positive rod shaped yeast cells with some dividing Gram variable cells. (X1000 magnification).



Plate 27: a) Isolate PDA ESS5 colony showing a vellowish-cream, raised, round colony with an entire margin. 27b is a Gram stained slide showing Gram variable rod shaped yeast cells. Arrows show cells joined to form pseudo-hyphae.







28b

Plate 28: a) PDA ESS-7 plate colony showing a yellowish-cream, raised, round colony with a serrated margin. 28b is a Gram stained slide of PDA ESS-7 showing Gram positive ovoid yeast cells. (X1000 magnification).

4.3 Screening bacterial isolates for utilization of alpha cellulose and sugarcane bagasse

Isolates GAESS1-15 grew successfully on mineral medium in the presence of alpha cellulose and sugarcane bagasse, as respective carbon sources (Tables 2 and 3). Growth in the inoculated cultures was evidenced by an increase in turbidity in shake flask cultures, gas production, and secretion of pigments in the liquid cultures; and recovery of viable isolates after 14 days of fermentation (Parekh, et al., 1999; Novitsky and Morita, 1976). As shown in Figures 1 and 2, all isolates showed a cumulative increase in cell biomass in the two substrates, with sugarcane bagasse giving a higher level of cellular

biomass. No viable colonies were recoverable from control flasks after 14 days. The cumulative cellular protein in the control flasks was several orders of magnitude lower than the test samples in the two organic substrates (Figures 1 and 2).

Isolate	Mean Cellular Protein after 14 days (µg/ml)	Culture Pigmentation	Cell viability after 14 days fermentation CFUs / plate	Gas bubbling /Geosmin production	Turbidity
GAESS1	13.8	Cream	168	***	++++
GAESS2	9.5	Brown	70	**	+++
GAESS3	10.8	Purple/Brown	139	**	++++
GAESS4	11.8	Light brown	143	***	++++
GAESS5	8.6	Off white	69	***	+++
GAESS6	12.2	Cream/light brown	165	***	++++
GAESS7	11.8	Dark brown	147	***	++++
GAESS8	9.04	Off white	73	***	++
GAESS9	14.4	Cream/pink	75	***	++++
GAESS10	8.2	Cream	160	***	++++
GAESS11	13.8	Off white	170	***	++++
GAESS12	8.7	Cream/light brown	100	***	+++
GAESS13	9.4	Dark brown	120	**	+++++
GAESS14	14	Light brown	150	**	++++
GAESS15	12	Light brown	135	***	++++
NC	1.76	1			

Table 3: Bioassay screening f	or utilization	of alpha	cellulose	by bacterial	isolates	from
E. saccharina larval gut homo	ogenates					

Score Key:

**** High gas bubbling; strong Geosmin odour

*** Moderate gas bubbling / Geosmin odour

** Low gas bubbling

++++ Opaque supernatant > 100 viable CFUs/plate recovered after 14 days.

+++ Translucent supernatant 50-100 viable CFUs / plate

++ Slightly cloudy suspension 50 CFUs / plate

- No gas formation, clear suspension; No viable colonies

Table 4: Bioassay screening for utilization of sugarcane bagasse by bacterial isolates

 from E. saccharina larval gut homogenates

Isolate	Mean cellular		Cell	Gas	Turbidity
	protein after 14	Culture	viability	bubbling /	
	days(BCA)	Pigmentation.	after 14	Geosmin	
	$(\mu g/ml)$		days	production	
			fermentation		
		See Second and	CFUs / plate		
GAESS1	44.3	Cream	80	***	+++
GAESS2	48.3	Brown	125	***	++++
GAESS3	45.6	Purple/Brown	100	****	+++
GAESS4	55.7	Light brown	140	***	+++
GAESS5	57.3	Off white	150	****	++++
GAESS6	53.7	Cream	145	****	+++
GAESS7	59.7	Dark brown	130	****	++++
GAESS8	48.7	Off white/cream	54	**	++
GAESS9	57.3	Cream	150	***	++++
GAESS10	53	Cream	130	****	+++
GAESS11	48	Off white	110	****	++++
GAESS12	64.7	Cream	185	****	+++
GAESS13	37.7	Dark brown	130	***	++++
GAESS14	66	Light brown	200	***	++++
GAESS15	47.7	Light brown	85	****	+++
GAESS16		Light brown	150	****	+++++
	61.7	/cream (secretory)			
NC	5				

Score Key:

-

**** High gas bubbling; strong Geosmin odour

*** Moderate gas bubbling / Geosmin odour

** Low gas bubbling

++++ Opaque supernatant > 100 viable CFUs/plate recovered after 14 days.

+++ Translucent supernatant 50-100 viable CFUs / Plate

++ Slightly cloudy suspension 50 CFUs / plate

No gas formation, clear suspension; No viable colonies



264hrs
 216hrs
 144hrs

96hrs 24hrs

Microbial Cell Biomass From Cellulose Fermentation

Figure 1: Cumulative total cellular protein of bacterial isolates from *E. saccharina* gut homogenates cultured in liquid mineral medium in the presence of alpha cellulose as sole source of organic carbon (GAESS1-15). Control culture (NC) contained mineral medium but no

cellulose. The chart shows a rapid increase in cell biomass after 24hrs of fermentation.



Microbial Cell Biomass From Sugarcane Bagasse

Figure 2: Cumulative total cellular protein of bacterial isolates from *E. saccharina* gut homogenates cultured in liquid mineral medium in the presence of sugarcane bagasse as sole organic carbon source (GAESS1-15). Control culture (NC) contained mineral medium but no sugarcane bagasse. The chart shows a rapid increase in cell biomass after 24hrs of fermentation

4.4.0 Molecular Characterization of Bacterial Isolates

4.4.1 Amplification and sequence analysis of 16S rRNA gene

16S rRNA genes from the genomic DNA of individual isolates from

homogenized E. saccharina guts were successfully amplified using universal eubacteria

primers 27F and 1392R to yield products of approximately 1365bp long (fig.3 and 4).



Figure 3a: Amplification of the 16S rRNA gene from genomic DNA of GAESP bacterial isolates obtained from homogenized guts of *E. saccharina* larvae. Amplified profiles resolved on 1% agarose gel. Lanes 2-28 are samples GAESP 1-25 corresponding to isolates 1-25. M is Gene RulerTM 1Kb DNA ladder (Fermentas Inc, Germany) used as size marker. Lanes 21 and 28 are controls.



Figure 3b: 1% agarose gel profile representative of purified 16S rRNA fragments amplified from GAESP bacteria isolates from gut homogenates of *E. saccharina* larvae. M is Gene RulerTM1kb DNA ladder (Fermentas Inc, Germany), used as size marker. Lanes 2-20 show purified fragments of approximately 1365bp for isolates GAESP 1-19.

Alignment of the sequences with the SeqMatch online software of the Ribosomal Database project and BLAST search of the 16S rRNA gene sequences confirmed that all the isolates belonged to the Eubacteria domain. Query sequences that had the highest BLASTn search scores compared to GenBank sequences were assigned to operational taxonomic units (OTUs) so that every sequence in a specific OTU had the highest similarity score for the matching GenBank sequence (Table 4). The Actinobacteria division, which represented 71.9% of the isolates, dominated the sequences. It was followed by γ -Proteobacteria (15.6%), α - Proteobacteria (9.4%), and Firmicutes (3.1%), (Figure 4). Eighteen (18) of the isolates in the Actinobacteria division had highest similarity scores to the *Streptomyces* OTU, four (4) with *Microbacterium* while one (1) isolate was placed in the *Cellulosimicrobium* OTU. Two (2) Isolates in the γ - subdivision of the Proteobacteria each represented sequences in the Enterobacter and Klebsiella OTUs respectively, while one (1) isolate represented Stenotrophomonas. Query sequences from three (3) isolates represented the Ochrobactrum OTU in the α subdivision of the Proteobacteria and the Firmicutes division had one (1) sequence representing the Enterococcus OTU.

Table 5: Nucleotide BLAST search results for 16S rRNA gene sequences of bacterial isolates from *E. saccharina* gut homogenates detected by16S rRNA primers UN 27forw and 1392rev

ate	Closest hit in GenBank (Accession No)	Phylogenetic	Percentage	E-value
ry		amiliation	similarity	
FSD1	Strantomycas zaomycaticus (AB18/3/6.1)	Strentomycetaceae	00.0	0.0
ESP3	Streptomyces zaomyceticus (AB184346.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP13	Streptomyces zaomyceticus (AD104540.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
251 15	(EU593738.1)	Streptomycetaceae	90.0	0.0
ESP17	Streptomyces zaomyceticus (EF178685.1)	Streptomycetaceae	98.0	0.0
ESP23	Streptomyces zaomyceticus (EF178685.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP2	Streptomyces drozdowiczii (EF654097.1)	Streptomycetaceae	97.0	0.0
ESP4	Streptomyces fradiae (AB184253.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP5	Streptomyces rubrogriseus (AF503501.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP6	Streptomyces sampsonii (AB362247.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP8	Streptomyces sampsonii (AB362247.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP9	Streptomyces sampsonii (AB362247.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP7	Streptomyces albidoflavus (FJ600729.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP19	Streptomyces albidoflavus (FJ600729.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP10	Streptomyces celluloflavus (AB184476.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP11	Microbacterium sp. OUTC 4	Microbacteriaceae	99.0	0.0
	(FJ210845.1)			
ESP15	Microbacterium oxydans (GQ152132.1)	Microbacteriaceae	93.0	0.0
ESP24	Microbacterium oxydans (FJ950590.1)	Microbacteriaceae	87.0	0.0
ESP25	Microbacterium oxydans (GQ279110.1)	Microbacteriaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP12	Streptomyces venezuelae (AY703449.1)	Streptomycetaceae	94.0	0.0
ESP14	Streptomyces eurocidicus (AY999748.1)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP16	Streptomyces phaeochromogenes	Streptomycetaceae	94.0	0.0
	(EU594476.1)			
ESP18	Streptomyces sp. (FJ001754)	Streptomycetaceae	99.0	0.0
ESP20	Cellulosimicrobium cellulans	Promicromonospor	89.0	0.0
	(EU287931.1)	acea		
ESP1	Ochrobactrum sp. (EF465412.1)	Brucellaceae	89.0	0.0
ESP11	Ochrobactrum haematophilum(T)	Brucellaceae	97.0	0.0
	(AM422370.1)			
ESC5	Ochrobactrum anthropi (AM490611.1)	Brucellaceae	94.0	0.0
ESP2	Klebsiella sp. (HM462444.1)	Enterobacteriaceae	89.0	0.0
ESP7	Klebsiella oxytoca (AJ871862.1)	Enterobacteriaceae	88.0	0.0
ESP4	Bacterium B28. (FJ628394.1)	Unclassified	84.0	0.0
ESC2	Enterobacter sp. (EU430751.1)	Enterobacteriaceae	92.0	0.0
ESP5	Enterococcus casseliflavus (FJ915804.1)	Enterococcacae	97.0	0.0
ESC1	Stenotrophomonas maltophilia	Xanthomonadacea	99.0	0.0
	(AB294557.1)			



Figure 4: Percentage distribution of Phylogroups from microbial isolates obtained from homogenized guts of *E. saccharina* larvae

4.4.2 Phylogenetic analysis of 16S rRNA sequences from bacterial Isolates

Phylogenetic analysis of the 16S rRNA gene sequences placed the isolates into four (4) main clusters in the Eubacteria domain, namely *Streptomyces*, *Proteobacteria*, *Microbacterium* and *Cellulosimicrobium/Cellulomonas*, as shown in Figure 5. Sequences from culture Isolates GAESP-1, GAESP-3; GAESP-17 and GAESP-23 clustered with *Streptomyces zaomyceticus* Accession numbers AB184346.1 and EF178685.1 respectively, with sequence similarity scores of 98-99%. *Streptomyces zaomyceticus* produces Zaomycin, an acidic lipopeptide antibiotic with activity against Gram positive bacteria (Borders *et al.*, 2006; Hinuma, 1954). Isolates GAESP-6, GAESP8 and GAESP-9 formed a cluster with *Streptomyces sampsonii*, AB362247.1 and had a sequence similarity of 99%. Isolate GAESP-2 clustered together with *Streptomyces drozdowiczii*, (EF654097.1) with a similarity score of 97% and bootstrap support of 78%. Isolates GAESP-7 and GAESP-19 both clustered with *Streptomyces albidoflavus* (FJ600729.1) with sequence similarities of 99% to GenBank sequences. Isolate GAESP-5 had close relatedness to *Streptomyces rubrogriseus* (AF503501.1) and the affiliation was supported by a bootstrap value of 97% and a sequence similarity of 99%. *S. rubrogriseus* had originally been described as *Actinomyces rubrogriseus* by Kurylowicz and co-workers and was validated in 1986 as combined species after Terekhova and co-workers (IJSB, 1986; Gause *et al.*, 1983). Isolate GAESP 10 clustered closely with *Streptomyces celluloflavus* (AB184476.1), with a high sequence similarity of 99% and a bootstrap support of 93%. *S. celluloflavus* is a cellulolytic actinomycete that has previously been shown to play a significant role in cellulose degradation and litter feeding by the woodlouse *Porcellio scaber* (Ihnen and Zimmer, 2008).

Isolate GAESP-20 branched separately to form a lone cluster together with *Cellulosimicrobium cellulans* (EU287931.1), with bootstrap confidence and sequence similarity of 89%., respectively.

Isolates GAESP-11, GAESP-15, GAESP-24 and GAESP-25 branched to form the *Microbacterium* cluster, with bootstrap supports of up to 90% and sequence similarity score values ranging from 87 to 99%. Members of this cluster belong to the phylogenetically separate branch in the family of Microbacteriaceae.

Nearly all the unicellular isolates were affiliated to the proteobacteria cluster, with representatives of the α -Proteobacteria and γ - Proteobacteria subdivisions while one isolate, KMESP-5 belonged to the Firmicutes division (Figure 5). Isolates KMESP-1,

KMESC-5 and KMESP-11 were affiliated to the genus *Ochrobactrum*, and had sequence similarities ranging from 87% to 97% with database sequences. Two isolates, KMESP-2 and KMESP-7 formed a cluster with the genus *Klebsiella* with sequence similarities of 87% and 89% respectively, while KMESC-2 showed relatedness to unidentified species in the genus *Enterobacter* (EU430751.1). Isolate KMESC-1 had close sequence relatedness to *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* (AB294557.1), with bootstrap value and sequence similarity of 99% respectively. The only close affiliate to the Firmicutes division, isolate KMESP-5, showed close sequence relatedness to *Enterococcus sp.* (FJ965843.1) with a high bootstrap value of 99% and a similarity of 97% to database sequences.



4.5 Culture Independent Characterization

4.5.1 Amplification of the 16SrRNA gene by PCR

The 16S rRNA gene was successfully amplified from total DNA extracted from gut homogenates of the three groups of *Eldana saccharina* larvae. The amplification with universal eubacteria 16S rRNA primer set UN 27f and 1392R yielded PCR fragments that were approximately 1365 bp as shown on figures 6 and 7. The amplicons were resolved on a 1% agarose gel and visualized by ethidium bromide staining.



Figure 6: PCR amplification of 16S rRNA representative of gut homogenates of *E. saccharina* larvae collected from sugarcane host plants. Amplified profile resolved on 1% agarose gel shows fragment approximately 1365 bp. M is Gene Ruler[™]1kb DNA ladder (Fermentas Inc,), used as molecular size marker. Lane 2 is negative control. Lanes 3-5 correspond to samples GESS 1-3.



Figure 7: PCR amplification of 16S rRNA representative of gut homogenates of *E. saccharina* larvae collected from papyrus host plants. Amplified profile resolved on 1% agarose gel shows fragments approximately 1365 bp. M is Gene RulerTM 1kb DNA ladder (Fermentas Inc,), used as molecular size marker. Lanes 2-7 are samples GESP 1-6

4.5.2 PCR-Cloning and Restriction Fragment Length Analysis (PCR-RFLP)

Gel purified 16SrRNA genes from the PCR products were successfully cloned into the 2.1 pCR[®] -TOPO vector and the transformation efficiency of the chemically competent DH5 α -T1 strain of *E. coli* cells confirmed by growth of a large number of white colonies on LB medium in the presence of X-gal. Restriction digestion analysis of the positive clones from the three populations of *E. saccharina* with a cocktail of five restriction enzymes revealed a high degree of polymorphic bands as shown in figures 8a and 8b. The plasmids bearing the PCR construct had an approximate molecular size of 5.2kb. The restriction digestion generated fragments ranging from 200 bp to approximately 1.3 kb,

with a few clones showing overlapping patterns. However, digestion of plasmid constructs from the laboratory reared *E. saccharina* larvae revealed a lower level of polymorphism as shown in Figure 8c. Restriction digestion of the uncloned 16S rRNA gene from the gut homogenates produced five fragments of approximately 750 bp, 1 kb, 1.2 kb and 1.3 kb (Figure 8c). Thirty five (35) clones with unique restriction fragment profiles were selected from the Papyrus group of *E. saccharina* for sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene while sixteen (16) clones were selected from the laboratory reared control group.



Figure 8a: RFLP profiles of PCR inserts cloned into pCR[®] 2.1 plasmid and digested with a cocktail of five Restriction enzymes, *AvaI*, *BamHI*, *Hind* III, *KpnI* and *XbaI*. Digested clones from *E. saccharina* larval gut homogenates derived from papyrus host plants. Fragments resolved on 1.2% TAE ethidium bromide stained agarose gel. M is 1kb DNA ladder used as size marker. Lanes 2 and 27 are unligated plasmid controls. Lanes 3 - 26 represent digested constructs; lane 28 is blank while lane 29 represents Λ DNA digested with the same enzyme cocktail.



Figure 8b: RFLP profiles of PCR inserts cloned into pCR[®] 2.1 plasmid and digested with a cocktail of five Restriction enzymes, *AvaI*, *BamHI*, *Hind* III, *KpnI* and *XbaI*. Digested clones from *E. saccharina* gut homogenates derived from sugarcane plants. Fragments resolved on 1.2% TAE ethidium bromide stained agarose gel. M and M1 are 1Kb and 100bp DNA ladders used as size markers. Lane 2 is undigested plasmid while lanes 3 and 29 show linearized, un-ligated plasmids. Lanes 4-27 represent digested GESS clones while lane 28 shows digestion of the uncloned PCR product using the same enzyme cocktail.



Figure 8c: RFLP profiles of PCR inserts cloned into pCR[®] 2.1 plasmid and digested with a cocktail of five Restriction enzymes, *AvaI*, *BamHI*, *Hind* III, *KpnI* and *XbaI*. Digests of clones derived from larval gut homogenates of laboratory reared *E. saccharina*. Fragments resolved on 1.2% TAE, ethidium bromide stained agarose gel. Lanes 2-18 are GESC 1-17 clonal digests while lane 19 shows digested 16S rRNA gene from the gut homogenates with five fragments of approximately 750 bp, 1000 bp, 1.2 kb and 1.3 kb.

4.5.3 Phylogenetic analysis of 16S rRNA gene sequences

Phylogenetic analysis of the cloned 16S rRNA gene placed the sequences into seven main clusters covering ten orders in the Eubacteria domain (Figure 10 and Table 5). The Rickettsiales order was largest with 27.7 % of the clonal sequences and it was followed by the Enterobacteriales with 21.3% of the sequences (Figure 10). The Actinomycetales and Lactobacillales had 10.7% of the sequences each, followed by Bacillales, Xanthomonadales, Caulobacterales, Rhizibiales, Burkholderiales and Pseudamonadales orders. The Proteobacteria division was the largest Phylogroup with members from the alpha and βeta subdivisions.

The seven identified clusters represented five Phylogenetic sub-divisions of the Eubacteria domain, namely the Actinobacteria, alpha-Proteobacteria, ßeta-Proteobacteria and gamma-Proteobacteria and the Firmicutes (Figure 10). The α -Proteobacteria comprised of seventeen clones, with 13 of the clones clustering closely with Wolbachia endosymbiont taxa (EU096232.1). This affiliation was supported by a bootstrap confidence of 99% and a similarity score of 94 to 99% to the closest GenBank sequences. Clones GESP-2 and GESP-4 clustered together with Ochrobactrum haematophilum (GenBank accession number AM422370.1), while GESP-32 and GESP-33 were affiliated to the *Caulobacter* genus. Both affiliations had a bootstrap value of up to 99% and the sequences shared similarities of 90-98% with the closest known GenBank The Actinobacteria sub-division was represented by Clones GESP-8, GESPsequence. 29, GESP-31, GESP-35 and GESC-6 all of which were closely affiliated to the Actinobacteria cluster, with all the nodes being supported by bootstrap values of 95-99%. GESP-8 clustered closely with the GenBank sequence of Gordonia Clone

polyisoprenivorans (DQ154925.1), with a bootstrap confidence of 99% and a sequence similarity of 93% to the nearest neighbour in the GenBank and RDP databases. Clones GESP-29, GESP-31, GESP-35 and GESC-6 showed close sequence relatedness with high G+C content Gram positive bacterial sequences for *Microbacterium aurum*, *Nocardioides hankookensis*, *Plantibacter flavus* and *Propionibacterium acnes* respectively.

The Firmicutes sub-division had representatives in the Bacillus and Enterococcus clusters. Clone GESC-4 and GESC-15 were identical and they clustered closely with Bacillus sp. (AY461752.2), with bootstrap value of 54% and sequence similarities of 95% and 96 % respectively. Clones GESC-14, GESP-12, GESP-14 and GESP-17 clustered closely with members of the genus Enterococcus and were supported by a bootstrap value of 99% and sequence similarities greater than 98%, except for GESP-13, which had a similarity of 92% to the nearest relative both in the GenBank and the Ribosomal Databases. In the γ - sub division of the Proteobacteria were clones closely affiliated to the Klebsiella, Serratia and Stenotrophomonas taxa. Clones GESP-1, GESP-5, GESP-7, GESP-9, GESP-10, GESP-28 and GESP-34 clustered under Klebsiella pneumoniae (EU301772) and had sequence similarities of 97% -99% to their respective closest relatives in the GenBank data base. Clones GESC-2, GESC-11 and GESC-12 branched alone to form a cluster under Stenotrophomonas taxon (AY 162068.1) with a bootstrap support of up to 98% and sequence similarities of 89-98%. Clones GESC-3 and GESC-16 were affiliated to Achromobacter xylosoxidans with bootstrap values of 99% and 93% respectively and sequence similarities of 98%. These two clones were the only representatives of the β -Proteobacteria sub-division.
Table 6: Nucleotide BLAST search results for 16S rRNA cloned gene sequences fromEldana saccharina gut homogenates detected by16S rRNA primers UN 27forw and1392rev

Query sequence	Closest GenBank Sequence hit and Accession Number	Phylogenetic affiliation	Percent similarity	E- value
GESP1	Klebsiella pneumoniae (GI:206564770)	Enterobacteriales	99.0	0.0
GESP5	Uncultured bacterium (EU301772)	Enterobacteriales	99.0	0.0
GESP7	Klebsiella pneumoniae (FJ796201.1)	Enterobacteriales	98.0	0.0
GESP9	Klebsiella pneumoniae 342 (CP000964.1)	Enterobacteriales	97.0	0.0
GESP10	Uncultured bacterium clone (EF509951.1)	Enterobacteriales	98.0	0.0
GESP28	Klebsiella pneumoniae 342 (CP000964.1)	Enterobacteriales	96.0	0.0
GESP34	Klebsiella sp. strain zlmy (U32868.1)	Enterobacteriales	99.0	0.0
GESP2	Ochrobactrum sp. (AB490238.1)	Rhizibiales	95.0	0.0
GESP4	O. haematophilum (AM422370.1)	Rhizibiales	98.0	0.0
GESP32	Uncultured bacterium (DQ202243.1)	Caulobacterales	97.0	0.0
GESP33	Caulobacter sp. (DQ337547.1)	Caulobacterales	90.0	0.0
GESP11	Wolbachia sp. (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	98.0	0.0
GESP 15	Wolbachia pipientis (EU096232.1)	Rickettsiales	98.0	0.0
GESP 16	Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	99.0	0.0
GESP 18	<i>Wolbachia sp.</i> wRi (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	98.0	0.0
GESP 19	Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	98.0	0.0
GESP 20	Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	98.0	0.0
GESP 21	Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	99.0	0.0
GESP 22	Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	94.0	0.0
GESP 23	Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)	Rickettsiales	95.0	0.0

QueryGenbank int/accession numberPrivingenetic <th< th=""><th>0</th><th>CarDarl hit / accession number</th><th>Dhulaganatia</th><th>Doroont</th><th>E</th></th<>	0	CarDarl hit / accession number	Dhulaganatia	Doroont	E
SequenceAttinationstimitarityvalueGESP 24Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales99.00.0GESP 25Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales97.00.0GESP 26Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales99.00.0GESP 27Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales99.00.0GESP 3Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1)Enterobacteriales100.00.0GESP3Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1)Enterobacteriales94.00.0GESP3Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales93.00.0GESP3Gordonia polyisoprenivorans (DQ154925.1)Actinomycetales93.00.0GESP39Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (EU151765.1)Actinomycetales96.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus sacseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales92.00.0GESP14Enterococcus scasseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas gp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU373389.1)Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans<	Query	GenBank mt / accession number	Affiliation	Percent	E-
GESP 24Woldachia sp. WR1Rickettsiales 99.0 0.0 GESP 25Wolbachia sp. WRiRickettsiales 97.0 0.0 GESP 26Wolbachia sp. wRiRickettsiales 97.0 0.0 GESP 27Wolbachia sp. wRiRickettsiales 99.0 0.0 GESP 27Wolbachia sp. wRiRickettsiales 99.0 0.0 GESP 27Wolbachia sp. wRiRickettsiales 99.0 0.0 GESP3Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1)Enterobacteriales 100.0 0.0 GESP4Uncultured γ - proteobacteriumEnterobacteriales 94.0 0.0 GESP3Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales 99.0 0.0 GESP3Gordonia polyisoprenivoransActinomycetales 93.0 0.0 GESP3Gordonia polyisoprenivoransActinomycetales 92.0 0.0 GESP3Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales 92.0 0.0 GESP3Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales 96.0 0.0 GESP13Nocardioides hankookensis (EU151765.1)Actinomycetales 96.0 0.0 GESP13Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales 99.0 0.0 GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (A1301831.1)Lactobacillales 99.0 0.0 GESP17Enterococcus gallinarum (A330833.1)Lactobacillales 99.0 0.0 GESC2Stenotrophomonas gp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales 98.0 <td< td=""><td>sequence</td><td></td><td>Annation Distantista</td><td>similarity</td><td>value</td></td<>	sequence		Annation Distantista	similarity	value
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{GESP 25} & Wolbachia sp. \text{wRi} \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \text{GESP 26} & Wolbachia sp. \text{wRi} \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \text{GESP 26} & Wolbachia sp. \text{wRi} \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \text{GESP 27} & Wolbachia sp. \text{wRi} \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \text{GESP 3} & Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1) \\ \text{GESP 4} & Interobacteriales \\ Uncultured \gamma- proteobacterium \\ (EF071131.1) \\ \text{GESP 3} & Serratia p. (EU781738.1) \\ \text{GESP 3} & Serratia p. (EU781738.1) \\ \text{GESP 4} & Gordonia polyisoprenivorans \\ (Gordoniacea) \\ \text{GESP 4} & Gordonia polyisoprenivorans \\ (EU714343.1) \\ \text{GESP 5} & Microbacterium aurum \\ (EU714343.1) \\ \text{GESP 5} & Nocardioides hankookensis \\ (EF55584.1) \\ \text{GESP 3} & Nocardioides hankookensis \\ (EF55584.1) \\ \text{GESP 3} & Plamibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) \\ \text{GESP 4} & Actinomycetales \\ Propionibacterium acnes \\ (Attinomycetales \\ 99.0 \\ (EU515765.1) \\ \text{GESP 12} & Enteroccus casseliflavus \\ (EU515765.1) \\ \text{GESP 13} & Enteroccus casseliflavus \\ (EU51765.1) \\ \text{GESP 14} & Enteroccus casseliflavus \\ (U30931.1) \\ \text{GESP 14} & Enterocccus casseliflavus \\ (Af639899.1) \\ \text{GESP 17} & Enteroccus casseliflavus \\ (Af639899.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) \\ \text{Xanthomonadales } 98.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (AI301833.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CU373389.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CEU373389.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CEU373389.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CEU37388.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CEU37388.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CEU37388.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CEU37388.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Intured hacter rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (CEU37388.1) \\ \text{GES 2} & Interochacken rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ \text{GES 2} & Interochacken rylosoxidans \\ \text{Burkholderiales } $	GESP 24	Wolbachia sp. WK1	Rickettstates	99.0	0.0
$ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{GESP}{25} & Wolbachia sp. wRi \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{26} & Wolbachia sp. wRi \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{27} & Wolbachia sp. wRi \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{27} & Wolbachia sp. wRi \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{3} & Serratia macrescens (EU407551.1) \\ \operatorname{Enterobacteriales} & 99.0 \\ (CP001391.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{3} & Serratia macrescens (EU407551.1) \\ \operatorname{Enterobacteriales} & 94.0 \\ (EF071131.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{3} & Serratia p. (EU781738.1) \\ \operatorname{Enterobacteriales} & 99.0 \\ (DQ154925.1) \\ \operatorname{GeSP}{3} & Gordonia polyisoprenivorans \\ (DQ154925.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{3} & Gordonia polyisoprenivorans \\ (EU714343.1) \\ \end{array} $ $\begin{array}{c} \operatorname{GESP}{3} & Nocardioides hankookensis \\ (EF555584.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{3} & Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{4} & Enterococcus casseliflavus \\ (U30931.1) \\ \operatorname{GESP}{4} & Enterococcus casseliflavus \\ \operatorname{CU}{3} & \operatorname{Lactobacillales} & 99.0 \\ \operatorname{CU}{3} & \operatorname{C}{3} \\ \operatorname{C}{3} & \operatorname{C}{3} \\ \operatorname{C}{3} $	OF OF AS	(CP001391.1)	D: 1 : 1	07.0	
$ \begin{array}{c} (CP001391.1) \\ GESP 26 & Wolbachia sp. wRi \\ (CP001391.1) \\ GESP 27 & Wolbachia sp. wRi \\ (CP001391.1) \\ GESP 3 & Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1) \\ GESP 4 & Uncultured \gamma- proteobacterium \\ (EF071131.1) \\ GESP 3 & Serratia sp. (EU781738.1) \\ GESP 4 & Uncultured \gamma- proteobacterium \\ (EF071131.1) \\ GESP 3 & Serratia sp. (EU781738.1) \\ GESP 4 & Gordonia polyisoprenivorans \\ (DQ154925.1) \\ GESP 4 & Gordonia polyisoprenivorans \\ (EU714343.1) \\ \\ GESP 5 & Microbacterium aurum \\ (EF555584.1) \\ GESP 3 & Nocardioides hankookensis \\ (EF555584.1) \\ GESP 4 & Nocardioides hankookensis \\ (EF555584.1) \\ GESP 5 & Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) \\ GESP 4 & Actinomycetales \\ Propionibacterium acnes \\ (AB041617.3) \\ GESP 1 & Interococcus casseliflavus \\ (EU151765.1) \\ GESP 1 & Enterococcus casseliflavus \\ (EU151765.1) \\ GESC 1 & Enterococcus casseliflavus \\ (Ar03989.1) \\ GESC 2 & Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) \\ Xanthomonadales \\ 98.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (EU37389.1) \\ GESC 2 & Lincultured hacterium(DO675028.1) \\ Pseudamonadales \\ 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ (EU37389.1) \\ CESC 1 & Lincultured hacterium(DO675028.1) \\ Pseudamonadales \\ 92.0 \\ 0.0 \\ CEUT 5 \\ $	GESP 25	Wolbachia sp. wRi	Rickettsiales	97.0	0.0
GESP 26Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales99.00.0GESP 27Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales99.00.0GESP3Serratia maccescens (EU407551.1) (EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales100.00.0GESP6Uncultured γ - proteobacterium 		(CP001391.1)			
GESP 27Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales99.00.0GESP3Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1) Uncultured γ - proteobacterium (EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales100.00.0GESP30Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1) Uncultured γ - proteobacterium (EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales94.00.0GESP30Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivorans (DQ154925.1)Actinomycetales93.00.0GESP29Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF555584.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus casseliflavus (LatobacillalesLactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (Al301833.1)Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU37389.1)Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU37389.1)Desendamonadales98.00.0	GESP 26	Wolbachia sp. wR1	Rickettsiales	99.0	0.0
GESP 27Wolbachia sp. wRi (CP001391.1)Rickettsiales99.00.0GESP3Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1) (EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales100.00.0GESP4Uncultured y- proteobacterium (EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales94.00.0GESP30Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivorans (DQ154925.1)Actinomycetales93.00.0GESP29Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AstinomycetalesActinomycetales99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (LatobacillalesLactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU373389.1)Burkholderiales98.00.0		(CP001391.1)			
(CP001391.1)GESP3Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1) (EF071131.1) GESP30Enterobacteriales100.0 94.00.0GESP6Uncultured γ - proteobacterium (EF071131.1) GESP30Enterobacteriales94.00.0GESP30Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivorans (DQ154925.1)Actinomycetales93.00.0GESP29Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF555584.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EV151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU373389.1)Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP 27	Wolbachia sp. wRi	Rickettsiales	99.0	0.0
GESP3Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1)Enterobacteriales100.00.0GESP6Uncultured γ - proteobacteriumEnterobacteriales94.00.0(EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP30Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivoransActinomycetales93.00.0(DQ154925.1)(Gordoniacea)0.00.0(EU714343.1)(Gordoniacea)92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensisActinomycetales92.00.0(EF555584.1)(Nocardioidaceae)0.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)(GeSP13Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(AT039899.1)GESC1Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(AT301833.1)GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(CP001391.1)			
GESP6Uncultured γ- proteobacterium (EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales94.00.0GESP30Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivorans (DQ154925.1)Actinomycetales93.00.0GESP29Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF55584.1)Actinomycetales86.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus casseliflavus (U30931.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (Lactobacillales99.00.00.0GESC1Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU373389.1)Burkholderiales92.00.0	GESP3	Serratia marcescens (EU407551.1)	Enterobacteriales	100.0	0.0
(EF071131.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP30Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales93.00.0(GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivoransActinomycetales93.00.0(DQ154925.1)(Gordoniacea)(Gordoniacea)92.00.0(EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0(EU714343.1)(Nocardioides hankookensisActinomycetales99.00.0(ESP31Nocardioides hankookensisActinomycetales99.00.0(ESS5584.1)(Nocardioidaceae)99.00.0(GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0(GESC6Propionibacterium acnesActinomycetales96.00.0(BESP12Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)(GeSP13Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)(EU151765.1)GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)(GeSP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(AF039899.1)GESC1Enterococcus gallinarumLactobacillales99.00.0(AJ301833.1)(GeSC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0(EU373389.1)(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP6	Uncultured y- proteobacterium	Enterobacteriales	94.0	0.0
GESP30Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)Enterobacteriales99.00.0GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivoransActinomycetales93.00.0(DQ154925.1)(Gordoniacea)92.00.0(EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensisActinomycetales92.00.0(EF555584.1)(Nocardioidaceae)0.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESC6Propionibacterium acnesActinomycetales96.00.0(EU151765.1)(Propionibacteriaceae)0.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)0.0(U30931.1)0.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(AF039899.1)0.0(AF039899.1)0.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0(EU37338.1)(GESC5Uncultured boxetrium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(EF071131.1)			
GESP8Gordonia polyisoprenivorans (DQ154925.1)Actinomycetales93.00.0GESP29Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF555584.1)Actinomycetales86.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU373389.1)Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacter imm(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP30	Serratia sp. (EU781738.1)	Enterobacteriales	99.0	0.0
GESP29(DQ154925.1) Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)(Gordoniacea) Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF555584.1) GESP35Actinomycetales (Nocardioidaceae)86.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales Actinomycetales99.00.0GESC6Propionibacterium acnes (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales (Propionibacteriaceae)99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (U30931.1)99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (AF039899.1)99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ30183.1)Lactobacillales (AJ30183.1)99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU373389.1)Xanthomonadales (Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DQ675028.1) (EU37389.1)Pseudamonadales (Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP8	Gordonia polyisoprenivorans	Actinomycetales	93.0	0.0
GESP29Microbacterium aurum (EU714343.1)Actinomycetales92.00.0GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF555584.1)Actinomycetales86.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AstinomycetalesActinomycetales99.00.0GESC6Propionibacterium acnes (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus sascharolyticus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales92.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU37389.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DQ675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(DQ154925.1)	(Gordoniacea)		
(EU714343.1)(EU714343.1)GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF555584.1)Actinomycetales (Nocardioidaceae)86.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AJ301417.1)Actinomycetales (Actinomycetales99.00.0GESC6Propionibacterium acnes (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales (Propionibacteriaceae)99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (U30931.1)99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (BESP1499.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales (AF039899.1)99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales (BESC299.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU373389.1)Xanthomonadales (Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured hacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales (Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP29	Microbacterium aurum	Actinomycetales	92.0	0.0
GESP31Nocardioides hankookensis (EF555584.1)Actinomycetales (Nocardioidaceae)86.00.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1) (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales (Propionibacteriaceae)99.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (U30931.1)99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus casseliflavus (U30931.1)Lactobacillales (EU151765.1)99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (EU151765.1)99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (EU151765.1)99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales (EU151765.1)99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales (EU151765.1)98.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU37389.1)Xanthomonadales (EU37389.1)98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales (PSeudamonadales92.00.0		(EU714343.1)			
GESP31Nocardioides hankookensisActinomycetales86.00.0(EF555584.1)(Nocardioidaceae)(Nocardioidaceae)0.0GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESC6Propionibacterium acnesActinomycetales96.00.0(AB041617.3)(Propionibacteriaceae)(Propionibacteriaceae)0.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)(U30931.1)0.00.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)0.00.00.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)0.00.00.00.0GESC1Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales98.00.0(AF039899.1)0.00.00.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	Sec. 19				
(EF555584.1)(Nocardioidaceae)GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESC6Propionibacterium acnesActinomycetales96.00.0(AB041617.3)(Propionibacteriaceae)(Propionibacteriaceae)0.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Lactobacillales92.00.0(U30931.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0(ESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales98.00.0(AF039899.1)GESC1Enterococcus gallinarumLactobacillales99.00.0(AJ301833.1)GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP31	Nocardioides hankookensis	Actinomycetales	86.0	0.0
GESP35Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)Actinomycetales99.00.0GESC6Propionibacterium acnesActinomycetales96.00.0(AB041617.3)(Propionibacteriaceae)(Propionibacteriaceae)0.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Enterococcus saccharolyticusLactobacillales92.00.0(U30931.1)GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales98.00.0(AF039899.1)GESC1Enterococcus gallinarumLactobacillales99.00.0(AJ301833.1)GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales92.00.0		(EF555584.1)	(Nocardioidaceae)		
GESC6Propionibacterium acnes (AB041617.3)Actinomycetales (Propionibacteriaceae)96.00.0GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus saccharolyticus (U30931.1)Lactobacillales92.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU373389.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacter xylosoxidans (EU373389.1)Burkholderiales92.00.0	GESP35	Plantibacter flavus (AJ310417.1)	Actinomycetales	99.0	0.0
(AB041617.3)(Propionibacteriaceae)GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Itactobacillales92.00.00.0(U30931.1)Itactobacillales92.00.00.0(EU151765.1)Itactobacillales99.00.00.0(EU151765.1)Itactobacillales99.00.00.0(EU151765.1)Itactobacillales98.00.00.0(AF039899.1)Itactobacillales98.00.00.0(AF039899.1)Itactobacillales99.00.00.0(AJ301833.1)Itactobacillales99.00.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)Itacultured bacterium(DQ675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESC6	Propionibacterium acnes	Actinomycetales	96.0	0.0
GESP12Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP13Enterococcus saccharolyticus (U30931.1)Lactobacillales92.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU373389.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(AB041617.3)	(Propionibacteriaceae)		
(EU151765.1)(EU151765.1)GESP13Enterococcus saccharolyticusLactobacillales92.00.0(U30931.1)(U30931.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)(EU151765.1)0.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales98.00.0(AF039899.1)0.0(AF039899.1)0.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarumLactobacillales99.00.0(AJ301833.1)0.00.00.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)0.00.00.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP12	Enterococcus casseliflavus	Lactobacillales	99.0	0.0
GESP13Enterococcus saccharolyticusLactobacillales92.00.0(U30931.1)(U30931.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales98.00.0(AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarumLactobacillales99.00.0(AJ301833.1)GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(EU151765.1)			
(U30931.1)(U30931.1)(U30931.1)GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales99.00.0(EU151765.1)Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales98.00.0(AF039899.1)Enterococcus gallinarumLactobacillales99.00.0(AJ301833.1)GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP13	Enterococcus saccharolyticus	Lactobacillales	92.0	0.0
GESP14Enterococcus casseliflavus (EU151765.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU373389.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(U30931.1)			
(EU151765.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavusLactobacillales98.00.0(AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarumLactobacillales99.00.0(AJ301833.1)GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP14	Enterococcus casseliflavus	Lactobacillales	99.0	0.0
GESP17Enterococcus casseliflavus (AF039899.1)Lactobacillales98.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU373389.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(EU151765.1)			
(AF039899.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) (EU373389.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESP17	Enterococcus casseliflavus	Lactobacillales	98.0	0.0
GESC1Enterococcus gallinarum (AJ301833.1)Lactobacillales99.00.0GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidans (EU373389.1)Burkholderiales98.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0		(AF039899.1)			
(AJ301833.1)(AJ301833.1)GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESC1	Enterococcus gallinarum	Lactobacillales	99.0	0.0
GESC2Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)Xanthomonadales98.00.0GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)(EU373389.1)0.00.0		(AJ301833.1)			
GESC3Achromobacter xylosoxidansBurkholderiales98.00.0(EU373389.1)(EU373389.1)0.00.0GESC5Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1)Pseudamonadales92.00.0	GESC2	Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)	Xanthomonadales	98.0	0.0
(EU373389.1) GESC5 Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1) Pseudamonadales 92.0 0.0	GESC3	Achromobacter xylosoxidans	Burkholderiales	98.0	0.0
GESC5 Uncultured bacterium(DO675028.1) Pseudamonadales 92.0 0.0	-	(EU373389.1)			
1 SLSSS $1 Orbital and Orbital a$	GESC5	Uncultured bacterium(DQ675028.1)	Pseudamonadales	92.0	0.0
GESC11 Stenotrophomonas sp. (AY162068.1) Xanthomonadales 98.0 0.0	GESC11	Stenotrophomonas sp. (AY162068.1)	Xanthomonadales	98.0	0.0
GESC12 Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1) Xanthomonadales 89.0 0.0	GESC12	Stenotrophomonas sp (AY162068.1)	Xanthomonadales	89.0	0.0
GESC16 Ralstonia sp. (AY162057.1) Burkholderiales 98.0 0.0	GESC16	Ralstonia sp. (AY162057.1)	Burkholderiales	98.0	0.0
GESC10 Bacillus cereus (AB247137.1) Bacillales 98.0 0.0	GESC10	Bacillus cereus (AB247137.1)	Bacillales	98.0	0.0
GESC4 Bacillus cereus (FJ685763.1) Bacillales 95.0 0.0	GESC4	Bacillus cereus (FJ685763.1)	Bacillales	95.0	0.0
GESC13 Bacillus sp.(AY461752.2) Bacillales 96.0 0.0	GESC13	Bacillus sp.(AY461752.2)	Bacillales	96.0	0.0
GESC15 Bacillus cereus(CP001407.1) Bacillales 96.0 0.0	GESC15	Bacillus cereus(CP001407.1)	Bacillales	96.0	0.0







60

0.1

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS

5.1 Discussion

Morphological examination of the KMM1 and PDA culture isolates from homogenized guts of Eldana saccharina larvae revealed bacterial and yeast colonies with variety of pigmentation and colonial morphologies while microscopic examinations showed unicellular microorganisms with diverse cell morphologies and Gram staining properties (Plates 19-.28). Among the Actinobacteria, all the 41 culture isolates produced extensively branched primary mycelia which transformed during the life cycle into aerial mycelia bearing the typical spore. Some of the colonies formed a secondary growth zone around the primary colony, a feature that is common among the Streptomyces (Manteca and Sanchez, 2009). The most common mycelial colours were grey and beige in addition to cream, brown, and white, while the spores had white, grey, pink and beige colours above the aerial mycelial network (Plates 6-18). This diversity of colony morphology and colour under similar culture media conditions provided a preliminary basis for differentiating the isolates. The morphologic differentiation of the isolates was further supported by microscopic examination of slide cultures of the different isolates, which revealed differences in mycelial branching patterns, spore chain morphology and Gram stain properties of the sporophores and spores for the Actinobacteria (Plates 7-13).

Sequence analysis of the microbial isolates and the cloned 16S rRNA gene further revealed a high diversity of bacterial communities as identified by the different characterization methods used. Several phylogenetic divisions of the Kingdom Bacteria were represented among the sequences, in which most of the cloned sequences were closely affiliated to the Proteobacteria division. The highest number of clones represented the α -Proteobacteria subdivision while a few members of the β -Proteobacteria were also detected (Figure 10). Members of Actinobacteria sub-division, spanning five major families of the Actinomycetales were prevalent among the sequences from clones and culture isolates, with the rest representing γ -Proteobacteria, α -Proteobacteria, and the Firmicutes (Figures 4, 5 and 10). These findings closely concur with previous reports on microbial associations in the larval guts of the long horn Cerambycid beetles (Grünwald *et al.*, 2009), larval midguts of the Gipsy moth (Broderick *et al.*, 2004) and oral secretions of bark beetles (Cardoza *et al.*, 2009) but with differences at the genus and species profiles.

In this study, thirteen clones in the α -Proteobacteria subdivision had closest sequence matches to the *Wolbachia* operational taxonomic unit (Table 4). Previous occurrence of *Wolbachia* species in insects has been reported among the pyralid *Paraponyx sp.* (Werren *et al.*, 1995), as well as the Mediterranean flour moth *Ephestia kuehniella* (Fujii *et al.*, 2001). This is an interesting observation owing to the fact that the larvae of *Paraponyx sp.*, like those of *E. saccharina* feed on plants found in aquatic habitats which could have been a possible source of endosymbiont acquisition. *Wolbachia* species are unculturable, maternally-transmitted obligate intracellular bacteria that are known to invade and maintain themselves in numerous arthropods and nematodes through the induction of *Wolbachia* in *E. saccharina* is not clear though members of the *Wolbachia* genus are estimated to occur in nearly 70% of all insects and other arthropods, where they have been implicated in cytoplasmic incompatibility, parthenogenesis, feminization and male killing (Vera, *et al.*, 2009; Lo *et al.*, 2007; Werren and Windsor 2000). It is worthy to note that no *Wolbachia* species were detected from the culture isolated sequences, a finding that affirms the importance of using a combination of detection methods in studying microbial diversity (Bramucci *et al.*, 2003).

Other OTUs detected in the α -Proteobacteria included *Ochrobactrum* and *Caulobacter*. The *Ochrobactrum genus* is recognized as a highly versatile *proteobacterium* with ability to colonize an exceptionally wide variety of habitats. Strains of *Ochrobactrum anthropi* have previously been reported to support larval development of *Musca domestica* (Zurek *et al.*, 2000) and the same metabolic role could be possible for *E. saccharina*. *Caulobacter* species are known to possess the ability to receive and transfer plasmids (Ely, 1979), a phenomenon that could play both defensive and nutritive roles for *E. saccharina* larvae (Feldhaar and Gross, 2009).

The second largest Phylogroup from the cloned and culture isolated sequences was γ - Proteobacteria, being represented by the *Enterobacter, Klebsiella, Serratia* and *Stenotrophomonas* taxa. These phylotypes are quite ubiquitous in nature, occurring in fresh water, soil, plants and animals, including insect guts (Feldhaar and Gross, 2009; Oliveira *et al.*, 2000, Zayed and Bream 2004). Members of the *Stenotrophomonas* genus have previously been reported to colonize midguts of divergent insect lineages including the sand fly, *Lutzomyia longipalpis* (Gouveia *et al.*, 2008) and the Diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella* (Indiragandhi, *et al.*, 2007). The detection of these members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family in *E. saccharina* concurs with previous reported presence of this group as endosymbionts in several other insect species (Rani *et al.*, 2009; Gouveia *et al.*, 2008; de Vries *et al.*, 2008; Andreote *et al.*, 2004). This presence is further supported by the reported characteristic of most members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* to utilize a wide variety of carbohydrate substrates (Holt *et al.*, 1994; Ngugi *et al.*, 2007), such as those associated with feeding habitats of *E. saccharina*.

The Firmicutes Phylogroup had a notably higher representation among the cloned sequences as compared with the culture derived sequences. Six (6) clones shared close sequence relatedness with the genus *Enterococcus* while four (4) clones represented *Bacillus cereus*. Only one culture-isolated sequence (KMESP-4) had a close match with the genus *Enterococcus*. Diverse *Enterococcus* phylotypes have previously been identified from the larval guts of the gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar*, a polyphagous Lepidopteran insect whose larval midguts have been recorded to exhibit typically high pH profiles, ranging from 8.0 to 10.0 (Brinkmann *et al.*, 2008; Broderick *et al.*, 2004).

Analysis of the 16S rRNA gene sequences placed the culture isolates into three main phylotypes in the Actinobacteria division, namely *Streptomyces* (18 isolates), *Microbacterium* (4 isolates) and the *Cellulosimicrobium* (1 isolate). On the other hand, the cloned sequences, GESP 29, GESP 31, GESP 35 and GESC 6 were closely related to five different actinobacteria taxa, namely *Gordonia polyisoprenivorans, Microbacterium acurum, Nocardioides hankookensis, Plantibacter flavus* and *Propionibacterium acnes* respectively (Tables 4 and 5). Previous studies have reported *Gordonia polyisoprenivorans* to exhibit capabilities to degrade complex organic polymeric compounds including Polyisoprene rubber (Linos *et al.*, 1999). *G. polyisoprenivorans* has

also been reported to secrete exopolysaccharides which have emulsifying activity for mono-aromatic petroleum hydrocarbons like Benzene and Toluene (Fusconi et al., 2010). Such attributes demonstrate the potential for biotechnological application of G. polyisoprenivorans in the breakdown of environmental contaminants (Arenskötter et al., 2004), and further affirm the importance of insects as potential sources of novel microbial resources of industrial importance (Kaltenpoth, 2009). Similar occurrences of the genera Gordonia, Microbacterium and Nocardioides have been reported in the larval gut systems of the long-horned Cerambycid beetles (Grünwald et al., 2009) and the Longicorn beetle (Park et al., 2007). The E. saccharina larvae used for this study were collected from humid sites with a lot degrading vegetative matter, especially the papyrus rhizomes, and this may have provided ideal habitats for the proliferation and acquisition of the coryneform bacteria Plantibacter and the Propionibacterium. Members of the two genera have previously been reported to be involved in energy metabolism in insects and the higher animals (Cruden & Markovetz, 1987). Detection of the presence of these two members in E. saccharina gut homogenates could suggest a possible role in mobilizing energy for the late stage larvae from cellulosic matter and also from fatty body reserves in preparation for pupation and eclosion (Wu et al., 2009; McFarlane and Alli, 1995; Jarvis et al., 1998).

Results from sequence analysis showed dominance of the *Streptomyces* genus in the culture isolated sequences both in abundance and species diversity. Several reasons may have been responsible for this finding. Firstly, the culture method and isolation medium used in this study were selective for streptomycetes due to their relative rapid growth over other actinobacteria under similar conditions (Lazzarini *et al.*, 2000).

Streptomycetes are also known to abound in agricultural soils and aquatic habitats especially in environments that are rich in organic matter such as were the sites from where the larvae for this study were sampled. Thus the acquisition of streptomycetes by E. saccharina and the successful development of a symbiotic association may be reflected in the diversity and abundance of the Streptomyces genus as observed in this study. Their possible role in the nutrition of E. saccharina larvae especially in enabling survival of the insect on nutritionally poor diets like those found in the papyrus rhizomes could also partly explain the relatively higher diversity of Streptomyces isolates in the gut micro flora of *Eldana saccharina*. The larvae of *E. saccharina* are known to ingest large amounts of plant fibres as they tunnel through the sugarcane stalks or papyrus rhizomes (Plate 2). The microbial digestion of this cellulosic biomass would play an important role in the survival of E. saccharina, especially those living on high fibre, low nutrient papyrus rhizomes. Fungi and certain Actinobacteria are the only microorganisms that have developed a strategy for nutrient recycling through enzymatic breakdown of lignocellulose (McCarthy, 1987). Diverse Actinomycetes with ability to degrade hemicellulose (xylan) and pectin have also been isolated from guts of Longicorn beetles (Park et al., 2007). Streptomyces are the most successful genus in the Actinomycetales order. They are metabolically diverse, with capabilities to digest many organic compounds, including the more complex recalcitrant components of plant fibres, through production of extracellular hydrolytic enzymes (Goodfellow & Williams, 1983; McCarthy & Williams, 1992). Diverse species of Streptomyces with cellulolytic activity have previously been isolated from agricultural and forest soils (Semêdo et al., 2004).

Streptomycetes are also of medical and industrial importance because they synthesize antibiotics, enzymes and a host of other metabolites (Nakashima *et al.*, 2005; Omura *et al.*, 2001). Several theories have been suggested to explain antibiotic and other secondary metabolites production. The most widely accepted theory is that antibiotics help the host insect to compete with other organisms in the relatively nutrient-depleted environment of the soil by antagonizing deleterious competitors (Kaltenpoth, 2009).

Recent findings indicate that symbiotic microorganisms that produce a large variety of secondary metabolites (Kaltenpoth, 2009) and several novel compounds with antimicrobial activity have been isolated from mutualistic bacteria, particularly those that protect their hosts against pathogens (Piel, 2009). For example, Cardoza and co-workers (2006) reported isolation of antifungal compounds from *Streptomyces* and a number of other actinobacteria in oral secretions of the spruce beetle, which were active against antagonistic fungi that invade the beetles' ovipositional and larval feeding galleries.

Besides Streptomyces, other Actinobacteria taxa identified from the isolates included the Microbacterium and Cellulosimicrobium. The genus Microbacterium was unified with the genus Aureobacterium with which it forms a monophyletic association (Takeuchi and Hatano, 1998). Microbacterium species have previously been isolated from midguts of wild Culex quinquefasciatus mosquitoes (Pidiyar, et al., 2004), oral secretions of the Spruce bark beetle, Dendroctonus ponderosae Hopkins (Cardoza et al., 2009), and from phyllosphere of grasses and mulch swards (Behrendt, et al., 2002). Cellulolytic strains of Cellulosimicrobium have previously been isolated from the guts of larvae and adults of the red Turpentine beetle, Dendroctonus valens Laconte (Morales-Jiménez et al., 2009); and in the hind gut of the Australian termite Mastotermes

darwiniensis Froggatt, (Bakalidou *et al.*, 2002). Strains of *Cellulosimicrobium cellulans* have also been shown to exhibit yeast-lytic β -1, 3-glucanase activity (Ferrer, 2006), a feature that would find useful applications in screening for anti-fungal agents. *Cellulosimicrobium* belongs to the Promicromonosporacea family of actinomycetes.

In this study it was observed that several isolates consistently exhibited secretory structures in plate cultures, which secreted products on the colonies (Plates 9, 10, 13, 17 and 24). This interesting phenomenon is the subject of further investigation into the biochemical properties of the secretions and their functions first at the insect physiology level and then their potential application in biotechnology. Similarly, all the Actinobacteria isolates tested in this study were able to grow in α -cellulose and sugarcane bagasse for up to 14 days and to produce cellular biomass (Figures 1 and 2). Streptomycetes are well recognized for their role in the degradation of lignocelluloses in decomposition of plant litter in diverse environments (Williams, 1978). Therefore, the observed abundance and diversity of Streptomyces in the guts E. saccharina larvae is of considerable metabolic significance. Moreover, the finding of Actinobacteria in E. saccharina from sugarcane and papyrus host plants further supports the nutritional versatility of this bacterial Phylogroup, enabling the host insect to thrive on nutrient- rich and nutrient poor substrates, the ability to degrade complex compounds and the potential to antagonize competitors through production of antibiotics and other metabolites (Kaltenpoth, 2009; Wood et al., 2001). These attributes are of considerable significance to the survival of the host insect due to the fact the natural habitats for E. saccharina are also inhabited by a vast diversity of microorganisms many of which would be pathogenic to the insect. Production of antibiotics and other metabolites could also protect E.

saccharina from parasitoids and predators (Kaltenpoth *et al.*, 2005). The ability of the Actinobacteria isolates to utilize cellulose and sugar cane bagasse further suggests a possible role of these bacteria in the energy metabolism for *E. saccharina*. Similar associations and role have been observed in the spruce bark beetles *Dendroctomus ponderosae* (Cardoza *et al.*, 2009) and the litter feeding woodlouse *Porcellio scaber* (Ihnen and Zimmer, 2007), among others.

Culture isolation using selective PDA medium yielded yeast isolates from the three groups of *E. saccharina* larvae (Plates 26-30) and only one fungal isolate from the sugarcane group of *E. saccharina* larvae. Yeasts isolated from xylophagous insects have been evaluated for their ability to degrade xylan and assimilate D-xylose (Grünwald *et al.*, 2009; Nguyen *et al.*, 2006).

For control experiment, 16th generation larvae of *E. saccharina* were used in this study. Our inability to isolate Actinobacteria from these laboratory reared control *E. saccharina* larvae coupled with a relatively low microbial diversity and abundance by culture dependent or sequence based approaches (Table 2; Figure 8c) may partly be due to controlled anti-bacterial treatment of the artificial diet at the *icipe* insect mass rearing unit (Onyango and Ochieng'-Odero, 1994; McCarthy *et al.*, 1978). Moreover, the fact that no *Wolbachia* species were identified from clonal sequences of laboratory reared control *E. saccharina* (Table 4) similarly suggests a possible loss of the symbionts from founder colonies through a succession of generations of laboratory rearing.

From available literature there is no previous recorded in-depth study report on the microbial diversity in the intestinal tracts of *E. saccharina* or any of the African graminivorous stem borers using a combination of culturing and culture independent

69

approaches. The information obtained in this study will therefore be a valuable resource in furthering our understanding of the interaction between *E. saccharina* and its symbionts in the design and implementation of Integrated Pest Management strategies (Conlong and Rutherford, 2009; Gounou *et al.*, 2008; Conlong, 2001).

5.2 Conclusions

In summary, cultivation dependent and sequence-based profiling of the 16S rRNA gene used in this study has revealed a high microbial diversity from gut homogenates of E. saccharina with the dominance of the Proteobacteria and Actinobacteria phylogroups. These methods have the potential to explore complex insect gut metagenomes and to investigate interactions between insects and microorganisms as they take place in nature. In this study, 32 culture isolates and 48 clonal sequences from the intestinal tracts of E. saccharina larvae were characterized to genus and species level on the basis of sequence homology search results from the GenBank. The observed polymorphism in the 16S rRNA RFLP profiles from the papyrus and sugarcane-derived E. saccharina larvae compared with the laboratory controls suggest that the insects' habitat and diet had an influence on species composition and diversity of the gut microbial communities. The study also revealed significant differences in abundance between microbial isolates from wild and laboratory reared E. saccharina larvae. Thirty two (32) of the tested Actinobacteria isolates were able to grow on cellulose and sugarcane bagasse respectively, as sole carbon sources. In addition the study revealed bacterial and yeast isolates with secretory products as potential microbial candidate isolates for further investigation and application of the metabolites secreted. The search and development of natural products in diverse insect microbiomes remain an indispensable and unparalleled source of biologically active compounds. Thus, research into the diversity of symbiotic microbiota in the larval guts of *E. saccharina* has helped to shed some light on the extant microbial communities associated with this economically important and biologically versatile insect. Microorganisms are currently accepted as the best renewable source for bioactive compounds, and the exploration of yet under-explored sources, such as the insect symbiotic systems and associations, has a great potential for discovery of novel bioactive producing microbial genes that would be useful for further development as enzymes and drug candidates.

5.3 Recommendations

Further work will be necessary to:

- Complete characterization to sequence level of the isolates derived from *E*. saccharina larvae feeding on sugarcane stalks as well as the yeast isolates in order to assign identities to the isolates and thus provide a more complete view of the microbial diversity in *E. saccharina*.
- 2. Employ archaea specific primers to screen for members of the Archaea domain in order to give further insights into the complete microbial community and species structures in the guts of *E. saccharina*.
- Explore the Wolbachia phylogenetic super groups present in E. saccharina using Wolbachia specific primers.
- 4. Characterize the metabolites produced in the observed microbial secretions and to elucidate the sequence motifs, pathways and functions of the genes responsible.

REFERENCES

Abdulla, H. and El-Shatoury, S. (2007). Actinomycetes in rice straw decomposition. *Waste Manag.*, 27:850-853

Altschul, S. F., Gish, W., Miller W., Myers, E.W. and Lipman, D.J. (1990). Basic local alignment search tool. *J Mol Biol.* 215(3):403-10.

Amman, R.I., Ludwig, W., Schleifer K.H. (1995). Phylogenetic identification and insitu detection of individual microbial cells without cultivation. *Microbiol. Rev.* 59: 143-169.

Appel, H.M. (1994). The chewing herbivore gut lumen: physicochemical conditions and their impact on plant nutrients, allelochemicals and insect pathogens. In *Insect-Plant Interactions*, ed. EA Bernays, 5: 209-221

Andreote, F.D., Gullo, M.J.M., Lima, A.O.S., Maccheroni, W. Jr., Azevedo, J.L. and Araújo, W.L. (2004). Impact of genetically modified *Enterobacter cloacae* on indigenous endophytic community of *Citrus sinensis* seedlings. *J. Microbiol.* 42 (3) 169-173.

Arenskötter, M., Bröker, D. and Steinbüchel, A. (2004). Biology of the metabolically diverse genus *Gordonia*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 70: 3195–3204.

Ashelford, K. E., Chuzhanova, N. A., Fry, J. C., Jones, A. J. and Weightman, A. J. (2005). At Least 1 in 20 16S rRNA sequence records currently held in public repositories is estimated to contain substantial anomalies. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 71 (12): 7724-7736.

Assefa, Y., Conlong, D.E., Van Den Berg, J., Le Ru, B.P. (2008). The wider distribution of *Eldana saccharina* (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) in South Africa and its potential risk to maize production. *Proc S Afr Sug Technol Ass* **81**: 290-297

Atkinson, P. R. A., Carnegie, A. J. M. and Smaill, R. J. (1981). A history of the outbreaks of *Eldana saccharina* Walker in Natal. *Proc. S. Afr. Sugar Technol. Assoc.* 55:111-115.

72

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Atkinson, P. R. (1980). On the biology, distribution and natural host-plants of Eldana saccharina Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). Journal of the Entomological Society of Southern Africa 43: 171-194

Bakalidou, A., Kampfer, P., Berchtold, M., Kuhnigk, T., Wenzel, M. and Konig, H. (2002). *Cellulosimicrobium variabile sp. nov.*, a cellulolytic bacterium from the hindgut of the termite *Mastotermes darwiniensis*. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology*, **52**: 1185–1192.

Behrendt, U., Ulrich, A., Schumann, P., Naumann, D. and Suzuki, K. (2002). Diversity of grass-associated *Microbacteriaceae* isolated from the phyllosphere and litter layer after mulching the sward; polyphasic characterization of *Subtercola pratensis* sp.

nov., Curtobacterium herbarum sp. nov. and Plantibacter flavus gen. nov., sp. nov. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology, **52**: 1441-1454.

Berchtold, M., Chatzinotas, A., Schönhuber, W., Brune, A., Amann, R., Hahn, D. and Konig, H. (1999). Differential enumeration and in-situ localization of microorganisms in the hindgut of the lower termite *Mastotermes darwiniensis* by hybridization with rRNA-targeted probes. *Arch Microbiol* 172: 407–416.

Berenbaum, M. R. (1988). Micro-organisms as mediators of intertrophic and intratrophic interactions. In *Novel Aspects of Insect-Plant Interactions*, ed. P. Barbosa, D. K. Letourneau, pp 91-123. New York: Wiley.

Bernays, E. A. and Chapman, R. F. (1994). Patterns of Host Plant-Use. *Host-plant* selection by phytophagous insects. Pp 4-14. New York: Chapman and Hall

Bignell, D. E. and Eggleton, P. (1995). On the elevated intestinal pH of higher termites (Isoptera, Termitidae). *Insectes Soc.* **42**:57–69.

Bignell, D. E (1982). The arthropod gut as an environment for microorganisms. In *Invertebrate- Microbial interactions*, ed. JM Anderson, ADM Rayner, DWH Walton, pp. 205-27. Exeter, UK: Cambridge Univ. press.

Borders, D. B., Francis, N. D. and Fantini, A. A. (2006). Extractive purification of lipopeptide antibiotics. *United States Patent* 7138487.

Borror, D. J., Triplehorn, C. A. and Johnson, N.F. (1989). Order Lepidoptera. In *An introduction to the study of insects.* 6th edition. *Saunders College publishing*.pp588-664

Bosque-Perez, N. A and Mareck J. H. (1991). Effect of the stem borer *Eldana* saccharina (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) on the yield of maize. *Bullet. Entomolo.Res.* 81 (243): 243-247.

Bramucci, M., Kane, H., Chen, M. and Nagarajan, V. (2003). Bacterial diversity in an industrial wastewater bioreactor. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol.* **62**:594–600.

Brauman, A., Dore, J., Eggleton, P., Bignell, D., Breznak, J. A., and Kane M. D. (2001). Molecular phylogenetic profiling of prokaryotic communities in guts of termites with different feeding habits. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* **35**: 27-36.

Brennan, Y. L., Callen, W. N., Christoffersen, L., Dupree, P., Goubet, F., Healey, S., Hernandez, M., Keller, M., .Li, K, Palackal, N., Sittenfield, A., Tamoya, G., Wells, S., Hazlewood, G.P., Marthur, E. J., Short, J. M., Robertson, D. E and Steer, B. A. (2004). Unusual Microbial Xylanases from Insect Guts. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*. 70: (6) 3609-3617.

Breznak, J. A. (1982). Intestinal microbiota of termites and other xylophagous insects. Ann. Rev. Microbiol. 36: 323-43.

Brinkmann, N., Martens, R. and Tebbe, C. C. (2008). Origin and Diversity of Metabolically Active Gut Bacteria from Laboratory-Bred Larvae of *Manduca sexta* (Sphingidae, Lepidoptera, Insecta). *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 74 (23): 7189–7196.

Broderick, N. A., Raffa, K. F., Goodman, R. M. and Handelsman, J. (2004). Census of the bacterial community of the Gypsy moth larval midguts by using culturing and culture-independent methods. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*. **70** (1) 293-300.

Brooks, M. A. (1963). The microorganisms of healthy insects. In *Insect Pathology: An Advanced Treatise*, ed. EA Steinhaus, pp. 215–50. London: Academic

Brune, A. and Friedrich M. (2000). Micro ecology of the termite gut: structure and function on a micro scale. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*. **61**: 2681-2687.

Campbell, B. C. (1990). On the role of microbial symbiotes in herbivorous insects. In *Insect-plant interactions*, ed. E.A. Bernays 1:1-44. Boca Raton, FL:CRC press.

Cardoza, Y. J., Vasanthakumar, A., Suazo A. and Raffa K. F. (2009). Survey and phylogenetic analysis of culturable microbes in the oral secretions of three bark beetle species. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, **131** (2): 138-147.

Cardoza, Y. J., Klepzig, K. and Raffa, K. F. (2006). Bacteria in oral secretions of an endophytic insect inhibit antagonistic fungi. *Ecological Entomology* **31**, 636–645.

Carnegie, A.J.M. (1974). A recrudescence of the borer *Eldana saccharina* Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Proc. South Afr. Sugar Technol. Assoc.* 48: 107–110.

Cole, J. R., Wang, Q., Cardenas, E., Fish, J., Chai, B., Farris, R. J., Kulam-Syed-Mohideen, A. S., McGarrell, D. M., Marsh, T., Garrity, G. M. and Tiedje J. M. (2009). The Ribosomal Database Project: improved alignments and new tools for rRNA analysis. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 37 (Database issue): D141-D145; doi: 10.1093/nar/gkn879. [Oxford University Press].

Cole, J. R., Chai, B., Farris, R.J., Wang, Q., Kulam-Syed-Mohideen, A. S., McGarrell D. M., Bandela A. M., Cardenas E., Garrity, G. M., Tiedje, J. M., *et al.*, (2007). The ribosomal database project (RDP-II): introducing myRDP space and quality controlled public data. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 35:D169–D172. (doi: 10.1093/nar/gkl889).

Cole, J. R., Chai, B., Marsh, T. L., Farris, R. J., Wang, Q., Kulam, S. A., Chandra, S., McGarrell, D. M., Schmidt, T. M., Garrity, G. M. and Tiedje, J. M. (2003). The Ribosomal Database Project (RDP-II): previewing a new auto aligner that allows regular updates and the new prokaryotic taxonomy. *Nucleic Acids Res.***31** (1):442-443.

Conlong, D. E. and Rutherford, R. S (2009). Conventional and new biological and habitat interventions for Integrated Pest Management Systems: Review and Case Studies using *Eldana saccharina* Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) *Integrated Pest Management: Innovation-Development Process* 241-261

Conlong, D. E. (2001). Biological control of indigenous African stem borers: What do we know? *Insect Sci. Applic.* 21 (4):267–274.

Conlong, D. E. (1994). A review and perspectives for the control of the African sugar cane stalk borer *Eldana saccharina* Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, **48:** 9-17.

Cruden, D. L. and Markovetz, A. J. (1987). Microbial Ecology of the Cockroach Gut. Ann. Rev. Microbiol. 41:617-43

Daida, J. M., Grasso, C. S., Stanhope, S. A. and Ross, S. J. (1996). Symbionticism and complex adaptive systems I: Implications of having symbiosis occur in nature. In

Evolutionary Programming V: Proceedings of the fifth Annual Conference on Evolutionary programming, Cambridge: The MIT Press, pp. 177–186.

Dasch, G. A., Weiss, E. and Chang, K. P. (1984). Endosymbionts of insects. Pp 811-833. In Krieg, N. R. and Holt, J.G. (Eds): *Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology*, Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, USA.

de Vries, E. J., Van der Wurff, A. G., Jacobs, G. and Breeuwer, J. J. (2008). Onion thrips, *Thrips tabaci*, have gut bacteria that are closely related to the symbionts of the western flower thrips, *Frankliniella occidentalis*. *Journal of Insect Science* **8**(23): 1538-2442.

Dillon, R. J. and Dillon, V. M. (2004). The gut bacteria of insects: Non-pathogenic interactions. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* 49: 71-92.

Dillon, R. J. and Charnley, A. K. (1991). The fate of fungal spores in the insect gut. In *The Fungal Spore and Disease Initiation in Plants and Animals* (eds Cole, G.T. and Hoch, H.C.), 129-156 (Plenum Press, New York).

Douglas, A. E. (1992). Microbial brokers of insect-plant interactions. *Proc.* 8th Int. symp. *Insect-plant Relationships*, pp. 329-36.

El-Nawwi, S. A. and El-Kader, A. A. (1996). Production of single-cell protein and cellulase from sugarcane bagasse: effect of culture factors. *Biomass Bioenerg*.11:361-364.

Ely, B. (1979). Transfer of drug resistance factors to the dimorphic bacterium *Caulobacter crescentus*. *Genetics* 91:317-380.

Feldhaar, H. and Gross, R. (2009). Genome degeneration affects both extracellular and intracellular bacterial endosymbionts. *Journal of Biology* 8:31.

Felsenstein, J. (1985). Confidence limits on phylogenies: An approach using the bootstrap. *Evolution* 39:783-791

Ferrer, P. (2006). Revisiting the *Cellulosimicrobium cellulans* yeast-lytic β -1, 3-glucanases toolbox: A review. *Microbial Cell Factories.* **5:**10.

Fujii, Y., Kageyama, D., Hoshizaki, S., Ishikawa, H. and Sasaki, T. (2001). Transfection of Wolbachia in Lepidoptera: the feminizer of the adzuki bean borer *Ostrinia scapulalis* causes male killing in the Mediterranean flour moth *Ephestia kuehniella*. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B.* 268: 855-859.

Fukatsu, T. and Nikoh, N. (1998). Two intracellular symbiotic bacteria from the mulberry psyllid Anomoneura mori (Insecta, Homoptera) Appl Environ Microbiol.
64:3599–3606

Fusconi, R., Assunção, R. M. N., de Moura, G. R., Filho, G. R. and da Hora A. M. E. (2010). Exopolysaccharide produced by *Gordonia polyisoprenivorans* CCT 7137 in GYM commercial medium and sugarcane molasses alternative medium: FT-IR study and emulsifying activity. *Carbohydrate Polymers* .79 (2):403-408.

Garde, A., Johnsson, G., Schmidt, A. S., Ahring, B. K., (2000). Lactic acid production from wheat straw hemicellulose hyrolysate by *Lactobacillus pentosus* and *Lactobacillus brevis*. *Applied Environmental Microbiology*. **81** (3) 217-223.

Gause, G. F., Preobrazhenskaya, T. P., Sveshnikova, M. A., Terekhova, L. P. and Maximova, T. S. (1983). A guide for the determination of actinomycetes. Genera *Streptomyces, Streptoverticillium, and Chainia.* 137-138.

Gijzen, H. J., Vanderdrift C., Barugahare, M. and Opdencamp, H. J. M. (1994). Effect of host diet and hindgut microbial composition on cellulolytic activity in the hindgut of the American cockroach, *Periplaneta americana*. *Applied Environmental Microbiology*. **60**: 1822-26.

Girling, D.J. (1972). Eldana saccharina Walker (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae), a pest of sugarcane in East Africa, Proc. Int. Soc. Sugarcane Technologists 14: 429-434.

Goodfellow, M. and Williams, S.T. (1983). Ecology of Actinomycetes. Ann. Rev. Microbiol.37:189-216.

Gordon J. I. (2007). The Human Microbiome Project. *Nature* 449, 804-810 (Isoptera, Termitidae). *Insectes Soc.* 42:57–69.

Gounou, S., Chabi-Olaye A., Poehling, H-M and Schulthess, F. (2008). Reproductive compatibility of several East and West African *Cotesia sesamiae* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) populations and their crosses and backcrosses using *Sesamia calamistis* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) as the host. *Biocontrol Science and Technology*.

Gouveia, C., Asensi, M. D., Zahner, V., Rangel, E. F. and De Oliveira, S. M.P (2008). Study on the bacterial midgut microbiota associated to different Brazilian populations of *lutzomyia longipalpis* (Lutz & Neiva) (Diptera: Psychodidae). *Neotropical Entomology*, **37**(5):597-601.

Gündüz, E. A. and Douglas, A. E. (2009). Symbiotic bacteria enable insects to use anutritionally inadequate diet. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 276: 987-991.

Grünwald, S., Pilhofer, M. and Höll, W. (2009). Microbial associations in gut systems of wood and bark-inhabiting long-horned beetles [Coleoptera: Cerambycidae]. *Systematic and Applied Microbiology* 33 (1): 25-34.

Hoffmann, A., Thimm, T., Droge, M., Moore, E. R. B., Munch J. C. and Tebbe, C. C. (1998). Intergeneric transfer of conjugative and mobilizable plasmids harbored by *Escherichia coli* in the gut of the soil micro arthropod *Folsomia candida* (Colembola). *Applied* Environmental Microbiology. 64: 2652-2659.

Hall, T. A. (1999). BioEdit: a user friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. Nucl. Acids Symp. 41: 95-98.

Hinuma, Y. (1954). Zaomycin, a new antibiotic from a Streptomyces sp. *J Antibiot*, 7 (4):134-6. Tokyo.

Hochuli, D. F (1996). The ecology of plant / insect interactions: implications of digestive strategy for feeding by phytophagous insects. *Oikos*, 75: 133-141.

Holt, G. J., Krieg, R.N., Sneath, A.H., Staley, T. and Williams, T.S. (eds.) (1994). Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology (9th ed.). Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore.

Horton, P. M., Hearne, J. W., Apaloo, J., Conlong, D. E., Way, M. J. and Uys, P. (2002). Investigating strategies for minimising damage caused by the sugarcane pest *Eldana saccharina*. *Agriculture Systems*, 72 :(2), 271-286

Hunt, J. and Charnley, A. K. (1981). Abundance and distribution of the gut flora of the desert locust, *Schistocerca gregaria*. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology*. **38**: 378–385.

Ihnen, K. and Zimmer, M. (2008). Selective consumption and digestion of litter microbes by Porcellio scaber (Isopoda: Oniscidea). *Pedobiologia*, **51**:335-342.

IJSB (1986). Validation of the Publication of New Names and New Combinations Previously Effectively Published Outside the IJSB. *Int J Syst Bacteriol*, **36**:573-576.

Indiragandhi, P., Anandham, R., Madhaiyan, M., Poonguzhali, S., Kim, G. H., Saravanan, V. S. and Tongmin S. (2007). Cultivable bacteria associated with larval

gut of Prothiofos-resistant, Prothiofos-susceptible and field-caught populations of diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella* and their potential for, antagonism towards Entomopathogenic fungi and host insect nutrition. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*. **103**: 2664–2675.

Jain, P. K. and Jain, P. C. (2004). Antifungal activity of some actinomycetes isolated from various habitats. *Hindustan Antibiot Bull.*; 45-46 (1-4):5-10.

Jarvis, G.N., Strompli, C., Moore E. R. and Theili, J. H. (1998). Isolation and characterization of obligately anaerobic, lipolytic bacteria from rumen of red deer. *Syst. Appl. Microbiol.* 21:135-143.

Kaltenpoth, M. (2009). Actinobacteria as mutualists: general healthcare for insects? *Trends in Microbiology*. 17 (12) 529-535.

Kaltenpoth, M., Gottler, W., Herzner, G. and Strohm, E. (2005). Symbiotic Bacteria Protect Wasp Larvae from Fungal Infestation. *Current Biology*, 15: 475–479

Kaufman, M. G. and Klug, M. J. (1991). The contribution of hindgut bacteria to dietary carbohydrate utilization by crickets (Orthoptera:Gryllidae). *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* A 98: 117-23.

Khan, Z. R., Chiliswa, P., Ampong-Nyarko, K., Smart, L. E., Polaszek, A., Wandera, J. and Mulaa, M. A. (1997). Utilization of wild gramineous plants for the management of cereal stem borers in Africa. *Insect Scie Applic.* 17: 143-150.

Klasson, L., Westberg, J., Sapountzis, P., Näslund, K., Lutnaes, Y., Darby, A. C.,
Veneti, Z., Chen, L., Braig, H. R., Garrett, R., Bourtzis, K. and Andersson, S. G.
E. (2009). The mosaic genome structure of the *Wolbachia wRi strain infecting* Drosophila simulans. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 106 (14) 5725–5730.

Klepzig, K. D., Moser, J. C., Lombardero, M. J., Ayres, M. P., Hofstetter, R. W., and Walkinshaw, C. J. (2001b). Mutualism and antagonism: ecological interactions among bark beetles, mites and fungi, pp. 237-267. *In* M. J. Jeger and N. J. Spence (eds.), *Biotic interactions in plant-pathogen associations. CAB International, New York*.

Klepzig, K. D., Adams, A. S., Handelsman, J. and Raffa, K. F. (2009). Symbioses: A key driver of insect physiological processes, ecological interactions, evolutionary diversification, and impacts on humans. *Environ. Entomol.* 38(1): 67-77 Kudo, T., Ohkuma, M., Moriya, S., Noda, S. and Ohkoto, K. (1998). Molecular phylogenetic identification of the intestinal anaerobic microbial community in the hindgut of the termite, *Reticulitermes speratus*, without cultivation. *Extremophiles*. 2:155-161.

Kurokawa, K., Itoh, T., Kuwahara, T., Oshima, K., Hoh, H. et al. (2007) Comparative metagenomics revealed commonly enriched gene sets in human gut microbiomes. DNA Res 14, 169–181.

Lacey, J. (1997). Actinomycetes in composts. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine* **4**: 113–121.

Lane, D. J., Pace, B., Olsen, G. J., Stahl, D. A., Sogin, M. L., Pace, N. R. (1985). Rapid determination of 16S ribosomal RNA sequences for phylogenetic analyses. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* 82: 6955-6959.

Lazzarini, A., Cavaletti, L., Toppo, G. and Marinelli, F. (2000). Rare genera of actinomycetes as potential producers of new antibiotics. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek*. 78:399-405.

Lederberg, J. and McCray, A. T. (2001). 'Ome sweet omics'- a genealogical treasury of words. *Scientist* 15:8.

Linos, A., Steinbüchel, A., Sproer, C. and Kroppenstedt, R. M. (1999). Gordonia polyisoprenivorans sp. nov., a rubber-degrading actinomycete isolated from an automobile tyre. *International Journal* of *Systematic Bacteriology*, **49**: 1785-1791

Lo, N., Paraskevopoulos, C., Bourtzis, K., O'Neill, S. L., Werren, J. H., Bordenstein, S. R. and Bandi, C. (2007). Taxonomic status of the intracellular bacterium *Wolbachia pipientis*. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **57**: 654-657.

Lynd, L. R, Weimer, P. J., van Zyl, W. H. and Pretorius, I. K. (2002). Microbial cellulose utilization: Fundamentals and Biotechnology. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*. 66: (3) 506-577.

Maes, K.V.N (1998). Pylaroidae: Crambidae, Pyralidea, pp. 87-98. In A. Polaszek (ed.) African Cereal stem borers: Economic Importance, Taxonomy, Natural enemies and Control. *CAB International*, Willingford, Oxon, UK. Maidak, B. L., Cole, J. R., Lilburn, T. G., Parcker, C. T. Jr., Saxman, P. R., Farris, R. J., Garrity, G. M., Olsen, G. J., Schmidt, T. M. and Tiedje, J. M. (2001). The RDP-II (Ribosomal Database Project). *Nucleic Acids Research*, 29: 173-174.

Mackenzie, L. M., Muigai A. T., Osir, E. O., Lwande, W. (2007). Bacterial diversity in the intestinal tracts of fungus-cultivating termites *Macrotermes michaelseni* (Sjostedt) and *Odontotermes somaliensis* (Sjostedt). *African Journal of Biotechnology*. **6** (6): 658-667.

Manteca, A. and Sanchez, J. (2009). *Streptomyces* development in colonies and soils. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* doi:10.1128/AEM.02288-08.

Martin, M. M. (1991). The evolution of cellulose digestion in insects. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond* B, 333: 281-288.

May, R. M. (1988). How many species are there on earth? Science 241:1441-1449.

McCarthy, A. J. and Williams S. T. (1992). Actinomycetes as agents of biodegradation in the environment. *Gene* 115: (1-2), 189-192.

McCarthy, A. J. (1987). Lignocellulose-degrading actinomycetes. *FEMS Microbiology* Letters. 46: (2), 145-163

McCarthy, K., Bartzokas, C. A. and Baker, B. F. (1978). Observations of the effects of formaldehyde on cockroaches and their flora: II. Prolonged survival of cockroaches drinking formaldehyde or glutaraldehyde solutions. *J. Hyg., Camb.* **80**:131-135.

McFarlane, J. E. and Alli I. (1985). Influence of sex and dietary fat on the group effect in larvae of *Acheta domesticus* (L.) *Journal of Insect Physiology*. **31**(5): 379-382.

Morales-Jiménez, J., Zúñiga, G., Villa-Tanaca, L. and Rodriguez, C. H. (2009). Bacterial Community and Nitrogen Fixation in the Red Turpentine Beetle, *Dendroctomus valens* Le Conte (Coleoptera: Curculionidae: Scolytinae). *Microbial ecology*, **58 (4):** 879-891.

Moustafa, A. E. and Lechevalier, H. A. (1963). Selective Isolation of Aerobic Actinomycetes. *Appl. Microbiol.* 11:75-77.

Ngugi, D. K., Tsanuo, M. K. and Boga, H. I. (2007). Benzoic acid-degrading bacteria from the intestinal tract of *Macrotermes michaelseni* Sjöstedt. *Journal of Basic Microbiology*, 47: 87–92.

Nguyen, N. H., Suh, S. O., Marshall, C. J. and Blackwell, M. (2006). Morphological and ecological similarities: wood-boring beetles associated with novel xylose-fermenting yeasts, *Spathaspora passalidarum* gen. sp. nov. and *Candida jeffriesii* sp. nov, *Mycol. Res.* **110**:1232–1241.

Novitsky, J. A. and Morita, R. Y. (1976). Morphological characterization of small cells resulting from nutrient starvation of a psychrophilic marine vibrio. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, **32**(4): 617-622.

Ohkuma, M. (2003). Termite symbiotic systems: efficient bio-recycling of lignocellulose. *Applied Microbial Biotechnology*. **61**: 1-9.

Ohkuma M. (2002). Symbiosis in the termite gut: culture- independent molecular approaches. In Seckbach, J. (ed.) *Symbiosis :mechanisms and model systems*. Kluwer Academic publishers, Netherlands, 717-730.

Okhuma, M. and Kudo, T. (1996). Phylogenetic diversity of the intestinal bacterial community in the termite *Reticulitermes speratus*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*. 62: 461–468.

Oliveira, S.M.P. de, Moraes, B.A., Gonçalves, C.A., Giordano-Dias, C.M., D'almeida, J.M., Asensi, M.D., Mello R.P. and Brazil, R.P. (2000). Prevalence of microbiota in the digestive tract of wild females of *Lutzomyia longipalpis* Lutz & Neiva, 1912) (Diptera: Psychodidae). *Rev. Soc. Bras. Med. Trop.* 33: 319-322.

Olsson, L., Thomsen, A. B., Ahring B. K. and Klinke H. B. (1999). Influence of inhibitors from wet-oxidized wheat straw on *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. IEA Workshop – *Biotechnology for the conversion lignocellulose*. Itala Game Reserve, South Africa.

Omura, S., Ikeda, H., Ishikawa, J., Hanamoto, A., Takahashi, C., Shinose, M., Takahashi, Y., Horikawa, H., Nakazawa, H., Osonoe, T., Kikuchi, H.,

Park, D-S., Oh, H-W., Jeong, W-J., Kim, H., Park, H-Y. and Bae K. S. (2007). A culture-based study of the bacterial communities within the guts of nine Longicorn beetle species and their exo-enzyme producing properties for degrading xylan and pectin. *The Journal of Microbiology*, 45 (5): 394-401

Onyango, F.O. and Ochieng-Odero, JPR. (1994). Continuous rearing of *Busseola fusca* on an artificial diet. *Entomologia et Applicata*, 73: 139-144

Overholt, W.A., Maes, K.V.N. and Goebel, F.R. (2001). Field guide to the stem borer larvae of maize, sorgham and sugarcane in Eastern and Southern Africa. *ICIPE science press*, Nairobi, Kenya.

Pace, N. R. (1997). A Molecular view of Microbial Diversity and the Biosphere. *Science*.276: 734-740.

Parekh, M., Formanek, J., Blaschek, H. P. (1999). Pilot scale production of butanol by *Clostridium beijerinkii* BA 101 using a low-cost fermentation medium based on corn steep water. *Applied Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **51:**152-157

Pidiyar, V. J., Jangid, K., Patole, M. S. and. Shouche, Y. S. (2004). Studies on cultured and uncultured microbiota of wild *culex quinquefasciatus* mosquito midgut based on 16S rRNA gene analysis. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.*, 70 (6):597-603.

Piel, J. (2009). Metabolites from symbiotic bacteria. Nat. Prod. Rep. 26: 338-362.

Ponce-Noyola, T. and de la Torre, M. (2001). Regulation of cellulases and xylanases from a depressed mutant of *Cellulomonas flavigena* growing on Sugarcane bagasse in continuous culture. *Bioresource Technology* **78:** 285-291

Ponce-Noyola, T. and de la Torre, M. (1995). Isolation of a high-specific-growth-rate mutant of *Cellulomonas flavigena* on sugar cane bagasse. *Applied Microbiol and Biotechnol.* **42:** 709-712.

Rani, A., Sharma, A., Rajagopal, R., Adak, T. and Bhatnagar, R. K (2009). Bacterial diversity analysis of larvae and adult midgut micro flora using culturedependent and culture-independent methods in lab-reared and field-collected *Anopheles stephensi*-an Asian malarial vector. *BMC Microbiology*, **9**:96.

Saiki, R. K., Gelfand, D. H., Stoffel, S., Scharf, S. J., Higuchi, R., Horn, G. T., Mullis, K. B. and Erlich, H. A. (1988). Primer-directed enzymatic amplification of DNA with a thermostable DNA polymerase. *Science*, 239 (4839): 487-491.

Saitou, N. and Nei, M. (1987). The neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular Biology Evolution*, 4:406-25.

Sambrook, J.E, Fritsch, F. and Maniatis, T. (1989). Molecular cloning: a laboratory manual. 2nd edn, *Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory press*, Cold Spring Harbor, NY.

Santo Domingo, J. W., Kaufman, F. G., Klug, M. J. and Tiedje, J. M. et al., (1998). Characterization of the cricket hindgut microbiota with Fluorescently labeled rRNAtargeted oligonucleotide probes. *Appl. and Environmental Microbiology*. **64**(2):752-755.

Scharf, M. E. and Tartar, A. (2008). Termite digestomes as sources for novel lignocellulases. *Biofuels, Bioprod. Bioref. DOI: 10.1002/bbb*

Semêdo, L. T. A. S., Gomes, R. C., Linhares, A. A., Duarte, G. F., Nascimento, R. P., Rosado, A. S., Margis-Pinheiro, M., Margis, R., Silva, K. R. A., Alviano, C. S., Manfio, G. P., Soares, R. M. A., Linhares, L. F. and Coelho, R. R. R. (2004). *Streptomyces drozdowiczii* sp. nov., a novel cellulolytic Streptomycete from soil in Brazil. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 54: 1323-1328.

Shayne, J. J., Hugenholtz, P., Sangwan, P., Osborne, C. and Janssen, H. P. (2003). Laboratory cultivation of widespread and previously uncultured soil bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, **69:** 7211-7214.

Slansky, F. (1992). Allelochemical-nutrient interactions in herbivore nutritional ecology. In G. A. Rosenthal and D. H. Janzen (eds.). *Herbivores, Their Interactions with Secondary Plant Metabolites,* 2nd ed. Academic Press, New York.

Short, J. M. (August 2001). Gene expression library produced from DNA from uncultivated microorganisms and methods for making the same. *US Patent* **6**, 280-926.

Simpson, M. A and Kumar, R. (1985). Borer damage and estimation of loss caused by sugarcane stem borers in Southern Ghana. *Insect Scie Applic*. 6 (6): 705-710.

Smith, P. K., Krohn, R. I., Hermanson, G. T., Mallia, A. K., Gartner, F. H., Provenzano, M. D., Fujimoto, E. K., Goeke, N. M., Olson B. J. and Klenk D. C. (1985). Measurement of protein using bicinchoninic acid. *Anal. Biochem.* 150 (1): 76– 85.

Steinhaus, E. A. (1960). The importance of environmental factors in the insect-microbe ecosystem. *Bacteriol. Rev.* 24:365-373.

Takeuchi, M. and Hatano, K. (1998). Union of the genera *Microbacterium* Orla-Jensen and *Aureobacterium* Collins *et al.* in a redefined genus *Microbacterium*. *Int. J. Syst.* 48: 739-747

Tamura, K., Dudley, J., Nei, M. and Kumar, S. (2007). MEGA4: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis (MEGA) software Version 4.0. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 24:1596-1599.

Tamura, K., Nei, M. and Kumar, S. (2004). Prospects for inferring very large phylogenies by using the neighbor-joining method. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)* 101:11030-11035.

Tanada, Y. and Kaya, H.K. (1993). Insect Pathology. Academic Press, San Diego. pp. 12-40

Toth-Prestia, C., and Hirshfield, I. N (1998). Isolation of plasmid-harboring Serratia plymuthica from facultative gut microflora of the tobacco hornworm, Manduca Sexta. Applied Environmental Microbiology. 54:1855-1857.

Vera, I. D R., Fleming, V. M., Feil, E. J. and Johannes A. J. B. (2009). How Diverse is the genus *Wolbachia*? Multiple-gene sequencing reveals a putatively new *Wolbachia* super group recovered from spider mites (Acari: Tetranychidae). *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*. 75 4:1036-1043.

Wang Y, Qian P-Y (2009) Conservative fragments in bacterial 16S rRNA genes and primer design for 16S Ribosomal DNA amplicons in metagenomic Studies. *PLoS ONE* 4(10): e7401.

Warnecke, F., Peter, L., Ivanova, N., Ghassemian, M., Richardson, T. H., Stege, J.T., Cayouette, M., McHardy, A. C., Djordjevic, G., Aboushadi, N., Sorek, R., Tringe, S. G., Podar, M., Martin, H. G., Kunin, V., Dalevi, D., Madejska, J., Kirton, E., Platt, D., Szeto, E., Salamov, A., Barry, K., Mikhailova, N., Kyrpides, N. C., Matson, E. G., Ottesen E. A., Zhang, X., Hernández, M., Murillo, C., Acosta, L. G., Rigoutsos, I., Tamayo, G., Green, B.D., Chang, C., Rubin, E. M., Mathur, E. J., Robertson, D. E., Hugenholtz, P. & Leadbetter, J. R. (2007). Metagenomic and functional analysis of hindgut microbiota of a wood-feeding higher termite. *Nature* 450: 560-565

Watanabe, K. and Sato, M. (1998). Plasmid mediated gene transfer between insect resident bacteria, *Enterobacter cloacae*, and the plant epiphytic bacteria *Erwinia herbicola*, in guts of silkworm larvae. *Current Microbiology*. **37**:352-355.

Way, M. J. (1994). Preliminary assessment of the effects of different constant temperatures on the reproduction of *Eldana saccharina* (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae), *Proc. South Afr. Sugar Technol. Assoc.* 68: 16–18.

Werren, J. H and Windsor, D.M. (2000). Wolbachia infection frequencies in insects: evidence of a global equilibrium? *Proc Biol Sci* 267, 1277–1285.

Werren, J. H., Windsor, D.M and Guo, L. (1995). Distribution of *Wolbachia* among neotropical arthropods. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* B. 262: 197-204.

Williams, S.T. (1978). Streptomycetes in the soil ecosystem, p. 137-144. In M. Mordarski, W. Kurylowicz, and J. Jeljaszewicz (ed.), Nocardia and Streptomyces. Fischer Verlag, New York, NY.

Woese, C.R. (1987). Bacterial evolution. Microbiol. Rev. 51(2) 221-271

Wood, S., Williams, S. T. and White, W. R. (2001). Microbes as a source of earthy flavours in potable water: a review, *Int. Biodeterior. Biodegrad.* 48:26–40.

Wu, L., Zhao, M., Xia, C. Ni, H. and Zhang, H. (2009). Isolation, identification and rumen fermentation characteristics of *Propionibacterium acnes*. *Acta microbiologica Sinica*, 49(2):168-73. PMID: 19445170 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

Zaldivar, J., Nielsen, J., Olsson, L. (2001). Fuel ethanol production from lignocellulose: a challenge for metabolic engineering and integration. *Appl. Microbiol Biotechnol.* 56: 17-34.

Zayed, M.E. and Bream, A.S. (2004). Biodiversity of the microbial flora associated with two strains of *Culex pipiens* (Diptera: Culicidae). *Commun. Agric. Appl. Biol. Sci.* 69: 229-234.

Zook, D. (1998). A new symbiosis language. Symbiosis News 1:1-3

Zurek, L., Schal, C. and Watson, D. W. (2000). Diversity and contribution of the intestinal bacterial community to the development of *Musca domestica* (Diptera: Muscidae) larvae. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 37(6):924-928

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY