Genomics of prokaryotes, handling the data analysis bottleneck. Glimpses at Pan-Genomes.



Effect of the Legume Plant Host on Rhizobial Soil Population Dynamics

<u>A. Soenens¹, B. Jorrín¹ & J. Imperial^{1,2}.</u>

E-mail: a.s.martinezdemurguia@gmail.com

1. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid. Centro de Biotecnología y Genómica de Plantas, Pozuelo de Alarcón, 28223 Madrid (Spain). 2. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Rhizobium leguminosarum by viciae (Rlv) is a soil bacterium able to establish specific root-nodule symbioses with legumes of four different genera: Pisum, Vicia, Lens and Lathyrus. Rlv isolates from nodules of any of these legumes can nodulate any of them; however, it has been shown that plants select specific rhizobial genotypes from those present in the soil (1,2). We have previously shown this at the genomic level by following a population genomics approach. Pool genomic sequences from 100 isolates from each of four plant species: P. sativum, L. culinaris, V. faba and V. sativa, show different, specific profiles at the single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) level for relevant genes. In this work, the extent of RIv selection from a well-characterized soil population by different legume plant hosts: P. sativum, L. culinaris, V. faba and V. sativa, after a medium-term mesocosm study is described. Direct soil isolates from each of these mesocosm studies have been tested for specific rhizobial genes (glnll and fnrN) and symbiotic genes (nodC and nifH). Different populations were characterized further by Sanger sequencing of both the rpoB phylogenetic marker gene and the symbiotic genes *nodC* and *nifH*. The distribution and size of the rhizobial population for each legume host showed changes during the medium-term mesocosm study. Particularly, a non-symbiotic group of rhizobia was enriched by all four hosts, in contrast to the symbiotic rhizobia profile, which was specific for each legume plant host.

Funded by MICINN (MICROGEN, Consolider-Ingenio 2010 CSD2009-00006) to JI.

1) G. Laguerre et al. 2003. App. Environ. Microbiol. 69(4): 2276

2) L. Mutch & P.W. Young. 2004. Mol. Ecol. 13(8): 2435-2444