

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

USDA Forest Service / UNL Faculty Publications U.S. Department of Agriculture: Forest Service --
National Agroforestry Center

2012

Abundance and dynamics of filamentous fungi in the complex ambrosia gardens of the primitively eusocial beetle *Xyleborinus saxesenii* Ratzeburg (Coleoptera: Curculionidae, Scolytinae)

Peter H.W. Biedermann
University of Bern, pbiedermann@ice.mpg.de

Kier D. Klepzig
USDA Forest Service, kklepzig@fs.fed.us

Michael Taborsky
University of Bern, michael.taborsky@iee.unibe.ch

Diana L. Six
University of Montana - Missoula, diana.six@cfc.umt.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdafsfacpub>

Biedermann, Peter H.W.; Klepzig, Kier D.; Taborsky, Michael; and Six, Diana L., "Abundance and dynamics of filamentous fungi in the complex ambrosia gardens of the primitively eusocial beetle *Xyleborinus saxesenii* Ratzeburg (Coleoptera: Curculionidae, Scolytinae)" (2012). *USDA Forest Service / UNL Faculty Publications*. 222.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdafsfacpub/222>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the U.S. Department of Agriculture: Forest Service -- National Agroforestry Center at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in USDA Forest Service / UNL Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Abundance and dynamics of filamentous fungi in the complex ambrosia gardens of the primitively eusocial beetle *Xyleborinus saxeseni* Ratzeburg (Coleoptera: Curculionidae, Scolytinae)

Peter H.W. Biedermann^{1,2}, Kier D. Klepzig^{2,3}, Michael Taborsky¹ & Diana L. Six⁴

¹Department of Behavioural Ecology, Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland; ²Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Pineville, LA, USA; ³Southern Research Station, US Forest Service, Asheville, NC, USA; and ⁴Department of Ecosystem and Conservation Sciences, College of Forestry and Conservation, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT, USA

Correspondence: Peter H.W. Biedermann, Research Group Insect Symbiosis, Max Planck Institute for Chemical Ecology, Hans-Knöll-Straße 8, D-07745 Jena, Germany. Tel.: 0049 3641 57 1803; fax: 0049 3641 57 1810; e-mail: pbiedermann@ice.mpg.de

Received 30 June 2012; revised 10 September 2012; accepted 3 October 2012.

DOI: 10.1111/1574-6941.12026

Editor: Wietse de Boer

Keywords

ambrosia fungus gardens; insect agriculture; mycangium; mutualism; social behaviour; mycophagy.

Abstract

Insect fungus gardens consist of a community of interacting microorganisms that can have either beneficial or detrimental effects to the farmers. In contrast to fungus-farming ants and termites, the fungal communities of ambrosia beetles and the effects of particular fungal species on the farmers are largely unknown. Here, we used a laboratory rearing technique for studying the filamentous fungal garden community of the ambrosia beetle, *Xyleborinus saxeseni*, which cultivates fungi in tunnels excavated within dead trees. *Raffaella sulfurea* and *Fusicolla acetilerea* were transmitted in spore-carrying organs by gallery founding females and established first in new gardens. *Raffaella sulfurea* had positive effects on egg-laying and larval numbers. Over time, four other fungal species emerged in the gardens. Prevalence of one of them, *Paecilomyces variotii*, correlated negatively with larval numbers and can be harmful to adults by forming biofilms on their bodies. It also comprised the main portion of garden material removed from galleries by adults. Our data suggest that two mutualistic, several commensalistic and one to two pathogenic filamentous fungi are associated with *X. saxeseni*. Fungal diversity in gardens of ambrosia beetles appears to be much lower than that in gardens of fungus-culturing ants, which seems to result from essential differences in substrates and behaviours.

Introduction

Mycophagy by insects has evolved in several lineages including springtails, flies, moths, wood wasps, termites, ants and beetles (Wheeler & Blackwell, 1984; Martin, 1987; Wilding *et al.*, 1989). Among these, only attine ants, macrotermite termites and curculionid ambrosia beetles evolved advanced fungus agriculture (Mueller *et al.*, 2005). This involves (1) obligate nutritional dependence on fungal food for adults and their brood, (2) translocation of their fungal crops by spore- or propagule-carrying organs within nests and when founding new nests and (3) cultivation and management of the fungal crops (i.e. continuous monitoring, management and protection, weeding, control of alien microorganisms). As the latter can be easier managed by a group of individuals partitioning the labour, advanced fungus agriculture is

often associated either with a subsocial (most ambrosia beetles) or with a eusocial life strategy (all farming ants and termites, one ambrosia beetle; Mueller *et al.*, 2005).

Fungus agriculture has been well studied in the fungus-farming ants and termites, but is little understood in ambrosia beetles. These beetles dwell in the wood of (usually) recently dead or weakened trees, where they construct tunnel systems (galleries) upon the walls of which they nurture ambrosia gardens. Ambrosia gardens consist of fungi the beetles carry into trees in their guts or, more commonly, in specialized structures called mycangia or mycangia (Francke-Grosmann, 1956, 1975). This vertical transmission of ambrosia fungi from the beetle's natal galleries to newly founded nests can support co-evolution between fungi and beetles and a species-specific association between partners (Six, 2003). For many species, healthy fungus gardens are dominated by

mutualistic ambrosia fungi of the genera *Raffaelea* and *Ambrosiella* (Ascomycota) (Harrington *et al.*, 2010). These species usually show an ambrosial growth form within the gardens forming nutrient-rich fruiting structures (e.g. conidiospores) that are grazed by adult beetles and their offspring. Gardens also contain a complex of other filamentous fungi, yeasts and bacteria (e.g. Haanstad & Norris, 1985), which are often transmitted by spores sticking to the body of founding females (Francke-Grosmann, 1967). The effects of these microorganisms are largely unknown, but antibiotic roles of some bacteria similar to those found in scolytine bark beetles (Adams *et al.*, 2008; Scott *et al.*, 2008) may occur.

The full community of associated fungi of only three of the approx. 3500 ambrosia beetle species worldwide has yet been investigated (Kajimura & Hiji, 1992; Harrington & Fraedrich, 2010; Endoh *et al.*, 2011), and the fungal dynamics in mycangia and galleries have been studied only in one ambrosia beetle, *Xylosandrus mutillatus* (Kajimura & Hiji, 1992). Management of fungal associates by ambrosia beetles within their tunnels has not yet been studied, but there are hints that both adults and larvae are able to influence the composition of the fungal community of their ambrosia gardens (e.g. Beaver, 1989; Cardoza *et al.*, 2006; Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011); this might happen in a similar manner as in fungus-farming ants (Mueller *et al.*, 2001). Adult ambrosia beetles are particularly attracted to their primary ambrosia fungus and repelled by fungal pathogens (Hulcr *et al.*, 2011). An observational study of ambrosia beetle behaviours within their nests revealed that adults and larvae interact closely with their gardens (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). Larvae were observed to cooperate in various duties, which is exceptional for holometabolous insects (larval workers are only known from termites (e.g. Korb, 2008)); *Xyleborinus saxesenii* larvae enlarge the gallery by digging and thereby create space for the fungi to spread, and they fertilize fungi with their excretions, clean colony members and gallery walls that prevent the spreading of mould, and participate in the removal of waste from the tunnel system (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). Adults were observed to block tunnels, thus potentially regulating the microclimate of the gardens (Kirkendall *et al.*, 1997), to graze their gardens which apparently induces ambrosial growth (French & Roeper, 1972) and potentially also affects species composition (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011) and to deposit and remove waste from the gallery (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). Ambrosia fungi have been shown to dominate gardens in recently founded galleries and newly built tunnel systems and to decrease in abundance relative to invading weed fungi at the end of gallery life when beetles leave the nest, and in old parts of the tunnel system (e.g. Fischer, 1954; Kajimura & Hiji,

1992). The relative prevalence of various fungi may positively or negatively affect the brood. For example, fungal associates of *Xyleborus ferrugineus* (Fabricius) vary considerably in sterol, lipid and amino acid content and thus in their nutritional quality for the developing brood (Kok & Norris, 1972a, b, 1973).

Here, we report a comprehensive survey of the filamentous fungi closely associated with the ambrosia beetle, *X. saxesenii* Ratzeburg, and their dynamics in relation to the life history of this beetle, which hints on the functional relationships between specific fungi and their beetle host. In addition, we report which fungal associates of *X. saxesenii* are carried in the mycangia and guts of females during their dispersal flight. On the basis of previous studies, we expected to find *Raffaelea sulfurea* (L.R. Batra) T.C. Harr. (previously *Ambrosiella sulfurea*; Harrington *et al.*, 2010) as the primary symbiont (Francke-Grosmann, 1956, 1975; Batra, 1967; Roeper *et al.*, 1980; Roeper & French, 1981), but hitherto the identity of other fungal associates has been unknown. To follow the dynamics of the fungal community within the beetle gardens and their effect on the brood, we sampled garden material over the entire developmental period of a brood and recorded brood numbers and offspring development. This was possible through the use of a laboratory rearing technique that allowed us to observe the beetles within their galleries (Biedermann *et al.*, 2009). Furthermore, we identified (1) fungi removed from the galleries by adults (to the dumps; i.e. the material disposed of out of the entrance tunnel) and (2) detrimental fungi growing on the bodies of beetles. Finally, we discuss our results in comparison with fungal communities found within gardens of fungus-growing ants.

Materials and methods

Study species

Xyleborinus saxesenii is one of the most common ambrosia beetles in temperate zones worldwide. Originally native to Eurasia, over the last 200 years, it has been introduced into parts of Africa, Oceania, as well as South and North America (for the actual distribution see <http://xyleborini.tamu.edu/public/site/scolytinae/home>). The species is still spreading, facilitated by the shipment of timber products around the world and by characteristics of its own biology. *Xyleborinus saxesenii* shows little host tree preference and a mating system in which sib-mating between haploid brothers and diploid sisters in their natal nest is the rule (comparable with *Xylosandrus germanus*; Peer & Taborsky, 2004, 2005). Therefore, the translocation of a single already mated female may be sufficient for the successful establishment of a new population.

Galleries of *X. saxesenii* are founded by single females that dig a vertical entrance tunnel extending a few centimetres into a tree trunk. They inoculate gallery walls with fungi, lay eggs when fungal gardens have established, and later care for the developing brood. The larvae feed on fungus-infested wood and in this way gradually enlarge the tunnel to a flat brood chamber (Roepert, 1995). This xylomycetophagous feeding is typical for larvae in the genus *Xyleborinus* and likely serves to reduce kin competition, as it increases the space for ambrosia gardens to grow and improves the breakdown of wood by enzymes (De Fine Licht & Biedermann, 2012). Wood passes through the guts of larvae without being digested, but in the process, it is finely ground into a form readily utilized by the fungi. Such woody frass is partly spread on the ambrosia garden microorganisms, which probably recycle and fully breakdown this material (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011).

Overlapping generations are typical in *X. saxesenii* nests, because adult females delay dispersal after maturation and fertilization by a brother (Peer & Taborsky, 2007; Biedermann *et al.*, 2012). During this time, they engage in brood and fungus care, thereby increasing gallery productivity (Peer & Taborsky, 2007; Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). Additionally, fungal gardens benefit from the recycling of their excretions (Abrahamson & Norris, 1970). About 20% of daughters also reproduce in their natal nest (Biedermann, 2007; Biedermann *et al.*, 2012).

Beetle collection and laboratory breeding

About 100 *X. saxesenii* females were caught live in Lindgren funnel traps baited with ethanol in Pineville, LA, USA (38 m asl; 31°20', 92°24') during the summer of 2007. Collection cups were filled with damp sterile filter paper and emptied twice daily to avoid microbial contamination of the beetles (Benjamin *et al.*, 2004). In the laboratory, we surface-sterilized the beetles by rinsing them twice for a few seconds, first with 70% ethanol and afterwards with deionized water. This treatment does not harm the fungal spores of the cultivar within the mycetangium, but reduces external contamination by eliminating some of the spore-load sticking to the body surface of the beetles (e.g. moulds). It is necessary for laboratory breeding of ambrosia beetles, because these contaminants establish more easily in standardized artificial medium than under natural conditions (Biedermann *et al.*, 2009), where beetles largely surface-sterilize themselves boring through bark rich in fungitoxins and other antibiotic substances (Berryman, 1989). Surface sterilization – both in the laboratory and in the field – is incomplete, however, because specific contaminants eventually takeover old

galleries (Kajimura & Hiji, 1992), which are transmitted initially as sticky spores in pits of the exoskeleton.

Apart from 13 females used for fungal isolations (see below), the collected females were placed singly on an agar-sawdust-based rearing medium in glass tubes (for details on this technique and ingredients of the *modified medium* see Biedermann *et al.*, 2009). Tubes were closed with plastic caps, stored vertically and wrapped in paper in a way that allowed light to penetrate the tube only from the top. This way beetles frequently bored tunnels next to walls of the glass tube, allowing observations of brood development when the paper was removed (Biedermann, 2007; Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). Tubes were kept at 23 °C.

Fungus isolations from adult females captured during dispersal flight

After surface sterilization, we aseptically dissected mycetangia from 13 adult females using fine tweezers under a microscope (6.4×–40× magnification). The mycetangium in *X. saxesenii* is a paired cavity at the basis of the females' elytra; for isolating the spores present in the mycetangia, we removed the two elytra and placed their bases on malt agar (MA: 25 g malt extract, 20 g agar, 1 L deionized H₂O) Petri dish plates. Elytral mycetangia were too small to be dissected completely, so we cannot exclude that our isolations also contained fungi sticking to the upper and bottom sides of the elytra. Guts of the beetles were dissected and squashed in a sterile Petri dish. Gut material was then spread across the surface of MA plates using a sterile metal loop. All cultures were then incubated at 25 °C in dark for about 2 weeks and purified by subculturing.

Fungal isolations from laboratory galleries

After introduction into tubes, the foundress usually bored an entrance tunnel and inoculated the medium with fungi. Females start egg-laying shortly after fungal layers appear on gallery walls (e.g. Kingsolver & Norris, 1977). In *X. saxesenii*, the foundress and/or her offspring will continue egg-laying as long as the ambrosia gardens proliferate (P.H.W. Biedermann, unpublished data). Previous laboratory studies have documented that on average four periods of gallery development can be discerned: (1) three to 5 days with only the foundress and eggs present, (2) at least 10 days with foundress, eggs and immatures (larvae and pupae) present, (3) about 40 days with eggs, immatures and adult offspring present and (4) the nest-leaving phase, when the foundress has died and offspring have matured and gradually disperse (Biedermann *et al.*, 2012). We timed our sampling of brood and fungi in

accordance with this gallery development pattern: we dissected eight galleries in period 1, 10 galleries in period 2 and nine galleries in period 4. We performed no dissections during period 3, because our sample size was limited and we expected only minor changes in the abundance of fungi between periods 2 and 3 relative to the periods before and after (as only the number of adults changes between periods 2 and 3). Additionally, we dissected eight galleries that did not produce brood within 1 month post introduction of the female, and nine galleries where all larvae died. From each of the galleries, we took eight samples from the gallery wall of the entrance tunnel (which is the oldest part of the gallery) and eight samples from the gallery wall of the brood chamber (where most inhabitants were present), using a sterile needle. These samples were used to determine the prevalence of the respective fungi within the sampled galleries (see 'Statistical analysis' below). Four of these samples were placed on MA and four on cycloheximide–streptomycin–malt agar (CSMA: 10 g malt extract, 15 g agar, 20 mL filter-sterilized CSMA stock solution containing 2 mg of cycloheximide and 1 mg streptomycin and 1 L deionized H₂O) plates. MA is an unselective medium for growing fungi, whereas CSMA selectively suppresses most fungi except species that are cycloheximide tolerant like ophiostomatoid ambrosia fungi (= *Raffaella* sp.; Cassar & Blackwell, 1996).

Additional isolations

Single, live and healthy larvae from five different galleries were squashed in sterile Petri dishes and then plated on MA and CSMA agar using sterile metal loops. The body surface of living adult ambrosia beetles, especially of solitary foundresses, is frequently covered with a biofilm that can be harmful and kill beetles, if not groomed off by other group members (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). We aimed to isolate the fungi forming this biofilm by scrapping parts off with a sterile needle from four living adult females where it was clearly visible (see Fig. 1) and which we had removed from their laboratory galleries. Four samples from each insect were plated on MA. The fungal composition of eight gallery dumps sampled during period 2 (i.e. frass and sawdust shuffled out of the nest by female beetles onto the surface of the medium) was analysed by plating four samples each on MA and CSMA.

Identification of filamentous fungus isolates

Fungi isolated from beetles were initially identified based on colony characteristics in culture (i.e. morphology and colour of mycelium and fruiting structures). Representative




Fig. 1. Living adult female of *Xyleborinus saxesenii* covered with a fungal biofilm made up of *Fusicolla acetilerea* and *Paecilomyces variotii*.

samples from single spore isolates were used for DNA sequencing. To extract DNA, a small amount of mycelium and conidia was scraped from the surface of young, relatively unmelanized colonies growing on MA, or hyphae were taken from cultures grown in 2% malt extract broth. The mycelium was macerated in 200 µL PrepMan Ultra (Applied Biosystems), incubated at 95 °C for 10 min and then centrifuged. The supernatant containing DNA was then used for PCR amplification of a portion of the ribosomal RNA encoding region and partial β-tubulin gene with the primer pairs ITS3 (White *et al.*, 1990) and LR3 (Vilgalys & Hester, 1990), and Bt2b (Glass & Donaldson, 1995) and T10 (O'Donnell & Cigelnik, 1997). PCR conditions used have been described previously (Six *et al.*, 2009). Amplicons were purified using a High Pure PCR Product Purification Kit (Roche, Germany), and sequencing was performed on an ABI 3130 automated sequencer (Perkin–Elmer Inc) at the Murdock Sequencing Facility (University of Montana, Missoula, MT). DNA sequences of representative isolates were deposited in GenBank (Table 1). Contigs of forward and reverse sequences obtained with each primer pair were aligned in MEGA5 (Tamura *et al.*, 2007). BLAST searches were carried out with sequences of each isolate in the NCBI GenBank database (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>). Cultures of the three most consistent species from this study were deposited in the culture collection of Diana Six (DLS) at the University of Montana, and the Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures (CBS), Utrecht, the Netherlands (Table 1). The remaining isolates were deposited in the culture collection of Diana Six for further study.

Statistical analysis

Using all 16 samples taken from each laboratory gallery, we determined whether a fungus was present or not in the eight samples taken from the entrance tunnel and the

Table 1. DNA regions sequenced, GenBank accession numbers and culture accession numbers for fungi isolated from *Xyleborinus saxesenii* in this study

Fungus species	Gene region	GenBank accession no.	Closest match GenBank accession no. (% similarity)	CBS accession no.	DLS Collection
<i>Raffaelea sulfurea</i>	ITS	JX565086	<i>Raffaelea sulphurea</i> EU984292 (100)	CBS 132735	DLSPB 146
	β -tubulin	JX565092	<i>R. sulphurea</i> EU977467 (100)		
<i>Fusicolla acetilerea</i> *	ITS	JX565088	<i>Fusarium merismoides</i> var. <i>acetilereum</i> EU860058 (100)	CBS 133245	DLSPB 148
	β -tubulin	JX565095	<i>Fusarium domesticum</i> EU926353 (85)		
<i>Paecilomyces variotii</i>	ITS	JX565087	<i>P. variotii</i> JF922032 (100)	CBS 132734	DLSPB 158
	β -tubulin	JX565093	<i>P. variotii</i> GU968679 (99)		
<i>Penicillium decaturense</i>	ITS	JX565090	<i>P. decaturense</i> AY313619 (100)		DLSPB 157
	β -tubulin	JX565091	<i>P. decaturense</i> JN606683 (100)		
Unknown sp. A	ITS		n/a (less than 125 bp)		DLSPB 152
	β -tubulin	JX565094	No informative match		
Unknown sp. B	ITS	JX565089	No informative match		DLSPB 151
	β -tubulin	JX565096	No informative match		

*Formerly *Fusarium merismoides* var. *acetilereum*.

brood chamber of each gallery (i.e. a binomial variable). Additionally, we estimated the prevalence of each fungal species per gallery (i.e. the rate of detection between 1/16 and 16/16). For each fungal species, we analysed how its presence and prevalence (dependent variables) were affected by the culture medium (MA, CSMA), the location within the gallery (brood chamber, entrance tunnel) and the period of offspring development (foundress with eggs, foundress with larvae, only adult progeny; fixed factors) by controlling for gallery of origin (random factor). Using data from the first two periods only (foundress with eggs, foundress with larvae), we also tested whether numbers of eggs and larvae correlated with the abundance of fungi. Analyses were carried out using generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs; lmer in R) or generalized linear models (GLMs; glm in R) using R (version 2.12.1; R Development Core Team, 2008). GLMMs are an extension of GLMs and allow for controlling the variation between observations from a single gallery. In most cases, this was necessary because of variation in sample sizes between galleries, as plates had to be excluded from the analyses if they did not yield microbial growth.

Results

Our morphological data in combination with DNA sequencing revealed six species of filamentous fungi to be associated with *X. saxesenii* (Table 1). As expected, *R. sulfurea* was regularly isolated from *X. saxesenii* bodies and galleries. Both sequences (ITS and β -tubulin) generated for this fungus matched those deposited in GenBank (accessions of subject sequences) for this species at 100% (Table 1). The isolates also exhibited the distinct

morphology of this species including deeply melanized hyphae forming sporodochia and colonies tinged with a deep sulphur yellow colour. ITS sequences for the other fungus isolated regularly most closely matched sequences for *Fusicolla acetilerea* (formerly *Fusarium merismoides* var. *acetilereum*) deposited in GenBank (100%) (Table 1). There was no match for the β -tubulin sequence generated for this fungus (closest match, 85% to *Fusarium domesticum*) (Table 1). The dark morphospecies isolated from gallery dumps and biofilms found on dead insects matched morphological descriptions for *Paecilomyces variotii*. Sequences for this fungus also matched those for this species in GenBank (ITS, 100%; β -tubulin, 99% *P* difference) (Table 1). Less commonly isolated fungi included *Penicillium decaturense* (ITS and β -tubulin 100% match in GenBank), Unknown sp. A and Unknown sp. B. For Unknown sp. A, we were unable to amplify more than 125 bp of the ITS region. There was no informative match (> 90%) to the β -tubulin sequence for this fungus in GenBank. For Unknown sp. B, there was no informative match in GenBank to either the ITS or the β -tubulin sequences.

Overall, *R. sulfurea* (GLMM: $P < 0.001$), Unknown sp. A (only on CSMA) and Unknown sp. B ($P = 0.003$) were more commonly detected on CSMA than on MA, whereas the opposite was true for *F. acetilerea* ($P < 0.001$; Supporting Information, Table S1). The other species were isolated equally often from CSMA and MA.

Mycetangially transmitted fungi

Fusicolla acetilerea dominated in mycetangia of all 13 dissected females and was found in six of their guts. *Raffaelea sulfurea* was present in mycetangia of only one of these

females, but was isolated from 9 of 13 female guts (Fig. 2).

Fungus dynamics in relation to development of progeny

Raffaelea sulfurea and the *F. acetilerea* dominated the gardens of freshly founded galleries after the foundresses had started to lay eggs (period 1, Fig. 2). Egg numbers tended to increase with increasing prevalence of *R. sulfurea* (GLMM: $P_{\text{prevalence}} = 0.09$; Table 2). The presence and prevalence of single fungal species in unsuccessful galleries without any eggs did not differ from galleries with eggs ($P = 0.26$ –1, depending on species).

All six species of fungi were isolated from samples taken during the period after eggs had hatched (period 2). *Fusi-*




Fig. 2. Proportion of fungal species isolated relative to total number of samples taken. Isolations from the spore-carrying organs (transmitted in mycetangium or gut), of different gallery stages, and from other samples (larval bodies, fungal layer growing on adult beetles and the gallery dump) are displayed. N = sample size of dissected adult beetles, galleries or larvae.

colla acetilerea increased in its presence (period 1 vs. 2: $P_{\text{presence}} = 0.02$; Table S1). However, this did not relate to larval numbers ($P = 0.92$; Table 2). Instead, larval numbers were positively correlated with the prevalence of *R. sulfurea* ($P = 0.035$) and tended to correlate negatively with the prevalence of *P. variotii* ($P = 0.063$; Fig. 3, Table 2). The latter trend disappeared, however, if one outlier ($x = 0$, $y = 31.25\%$) was removed from the data (Fig. 3). Fungus composition (presence and prevalence of single species) of galleries in which all larvae died during development did not differ from galleries with successfully developing larvae ($P = 0.17$ –1, depending on species; details not shown).

Abundance of *R. sulfurea* (period 1 vs. 4: $P_{\text{prevalence}} = 0.028$) and *P. variotii* (period 2 vs. 4: $P_{\text{prevalence}} = 0.001$) was significantly lower after maturation of all offspring (Table S1). Only the presence of *P. decaturense* increased towards this period (period 1 + 2 vs. 4: $P_{\text{presence}} = 0.02$). Data for *F. acetilerea* were somewhat contradictory; the number of galleries where it was present decreased (period 2 vs. 4: $P_{\text{presence}} = 0.03$), whereas its prevalence within galleries increased (period 2 vs. 4: $P_{\text{prevalence}} = 0.002$; Table S1).

Fungal composition in relation to location

Raffaelea sulfurea ($P_{\text{prevalence}} < 0.001$, $P_{\text{presence}} = 0.12$) and *F. acetilerea* ($P_{\text{prevalence}} = 0.002$, $P_{\text{presence}} = 0.08$) were more common in the brood chamber than in the entrance tunnel of the galleries, while the opposite result was determined for *P. variotii* ($P_{\text{prevalence}} < 0.001$, $P_{\text{presence}} = 0.01$; Table S1). *Paecilomyces variotii* was the dominant species growing in the dumps of the beetles (present in 7 of 8 galleries), followed by *F. acetilerea* (in 2 of 8 galleries), Unknown sp. B (in 1 of 8 galleries) and *P. decaturense* (in 1 of 8 galleries; Fig. 2).

Fungi on the body of adults

Lonesome foundresses were regularly found to be overgrown with a thin layer of fungi (Fig. 1). If they were not able to successfully produce offspring (who would have groomed off this layer), this likely led to the death of these females, because this layer becomes so thick that it constricts movements of beetles through the tunnels (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). *Paecilomyces variotii* (present on 4 of 4 of these beetles) was the main component forming this layer, but *F. acetilerea* (in 2 of 4 beetles; Fig. 2) was also found.

Discussion

The mutualistic associates of *X. saxesenii*

Raffaelea sulfurea and *F. acetilerea* were the only fungi isolated from the spore-carrying organs of dispersing

Table 2. The relationship between the most common fungal species and the number of *Xyleborinus saxesenii* offspring

Fungal species	Parameters	Coeff. \pm SE	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Foundress with eggs, brood chamber				
<i>Raffaelea sulfurea</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA)	-0.14 \pm 1.45	-0.01	0.92
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	-3.49 \pm 1.04	-3.37	< 0.001
	Number of eggs	0.9 \pm 0.53	1.72	<u>0.09</u>
<i>Fusicolla acetilerea</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA)	-22.9 \pm 9.99	0	<u>1</u>
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	Only present on MA		
	Number of eggs	-2.91 \pm 4.24	-0.69	0.49
<i>Paecilomyces variotii</i>	Not present			
Foundress with larvae, brood chamber				
<i>Raffaelea sulfurea</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA)	-0.15 \pm 0.51	-0.3	0.77
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	-2.49 \pm 0.61	-4.08	< 0.001
	Number of larvae	0.05 \pm 0.02	2.11	0.035
<i>Fusicolla acetilerea</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA)	-7.88 \pm 4.82	-1.63	0.1
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	13.6 \pm 5.04	2.69	0.007
	Number of larvae	0.02 \pm 0.21	0.1	0.92
<i>Paecilomyces variotii</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA)	-0.86 \pm 0.49	-1.76	<u>0.08</u>
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	-0.46 \pm 0.65	-0.71	0.48
	Number of larvae	-0.06 \pm 0.03	-1.86	<u>0.063</u>

Separate GLMMs were performed with an exchangeable correlation structure of the response variable within a cluster (gallery identity) to examine the potential influence of the prevalence of fungal species on offspring numbers, controlling for the influence of medium (CSMA, MA). The potential effects on egg and larval numbers during particular periods of gallery development are shown (for graphical illustration see Fig. 3). Model coefficients are reported as coeff. \pm SE (standard error of the estimate), with the group in brackets in the first row of the model as the reference category (coefficient set to zero). A positive coefficient denotes a positive relationship; a negative coefficient denotes a negative relationship. Significant relationships ($P \leq 0.05$) are set in bold type, and significant trends ($P \leq 0.01$) are underlined.




Fig. 3. Relationship of *Raffaelea sulfurea* and *Paecilomyces variotii* with numbers of *Xyleborinus saxesenii* larvae during the immature stage of colonies. During the stage when the gallery contained the foundress, eggs, larvae and pupae, the prevalence of *R. sulfurea* correlated positively with the numbers of larvae present (GLMM: $P = 0.035$; LR: $r^2 = 0.11$). In contrast, the prevalence of *P. variotii* tended to correlate negatively with the numbers of larvae present (GLMM: $P = 0.063$; LR: $r^2 = 0.22$). All other fungal species had no significant relationship with offspring numbers. $N = 10$ galleries; for statistical details see Table 2.

females ready to found new fungus gardens (Fig. 2, Table 3). Their elytral pouches (mycetangia) contained mostly spores of *F. acetilerea*, whereas *R. sulfurea*

dominated in gut samples, which led to the initial high prevalence of these two species in the fungal gardens and during the period of larval development. The primary food fungus, *R. sulfurea*, formed thin ambrosia layers that were fed upon by the adults (Fig. 4; Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). While fungus-farming ants and termites actively pick symbiont propagules to found new fungus gardens (Mueller *et al.*, 2005), ambrosia beetles passively take up spores into external mycetangia from the surrounding environment when moving within their natal nest before dispersal (Beaver, 1989). At that time (which is the period when only adult progeny is present), galleries were already heavily infested by four other nonmutualistic fungi, Unknown sp. A, Unknown sp. B, *P. decaturense* and *P. variotii*. The increased prevalence of *R. sulfurea* in the gut relative to mycetangia might indicate that this main mutualist is actively taken up earlier than at the time of dispersal. Selective substances produced in the gut lumen and by numerous glands lining the beetles' mycetangia (Schneider & Rudinsky, 1969; Schneider, 1991) on the other hand likely also assure the exclusive transmission of *R. sulfurea* and *F. acetilerea*. In summary, this confirms the presumed simultaneous existence of two spore-carrying modes in *X. saxesenii* (Francke-Grosman, 1975), and it suggests important roles for these two fungi in the life cycle of this beetle.

Table 3. Summary of observations of six fungal species isolated from galleries of *Xyleborinus saxesenii* reared in the laboratory

Order	Species	Medium	Location	Fungal species dynamics during colony stages	Correlation with progeny numbers	Consistency (> 50% of samples)	Proposed association
Ophiostomatales	<i>Raffaelea sulfurea</i>	CSMA > MA	BC > MT*	Foundress/eggs > adult progeny*	Positive (larvae)	In gut, during foundress/eggs	Mutualist
Hypocreales	<i>Fusicolla acetilerea</i>	CSMA < MA	BC > MT*	Foundress/eggs < foundress/larvae† Foundress/larvae < adult progeny*	ns	In mycetangium	Mutualist
Eurotiales	<i>Penicillium decaturense</i>	ns	ns	Foundress/eggs > adult progeny† Foundress/larvae < adult progeny†	ns	–	Commensal
Unknown	<i>Paecilomyces variotii</i>	ns	BC < MT†	Foundress/larvae < adult progeny†	ns	On adult bodies, in gallery dump	Parasite
Unknown	Unknown sp. A	Only on CSMA	ns	Not present during foundress/eggs	ns	–	Commensal
Unknown	Unknown sp. B	CSMA > MA	ns	Foundress/eggs > adult progeny*† ns Not present during foundress/eggs	ns	–	Commensal

Significant differences ($P < 0.05$) are given.

'...>...'/'...<...' denote the direction of the significant difference in the prevalence between the two media/locations/gallery classes.

ns, nonsignificance; BC, brood chamber, MT, entrance tunnel.

*Significant difference in the prevalence of the fungus ($P \leq 0.05$).


†Significant difference in the presence of the fungus ($P \leq 0.05$).

Several observations suggest a strong mutualistic role of *R. sulfurea* in this system. First, it prevailed in galleries shortly after their foundation and throughout brood development, where it formed characteristic ambrosial layers of densely packed conidia with large nutritional conidiospores on the gallery walls (Fig. 4). Ambrosia layers are predominately formed within the brood chambers, where adult daughters and larval offspring aggregate and crop off the nutritional conidia (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). Second, the number of eggs produced by the foundress and the number of larvae tended to correlate positively with the abundance of *R. sulfurea*. Third, the abundance of *R. sulfurea* was lowest in galleries with only adult progeny, suggesting that egg production ceased when productivity of this fungus dropped below a certain threshold (Table 3). Fourth, *R. sulfurea* has been isolated from mycetangia and galleries of *X. saxesenii* originating from locations across the US and Europe (Francke-Grosman, 1956, 1975; Batra, 1967; Roeper *et al.*, 1980; Roeper & French, 1981). *Raffaelea* (Ascomycota: Ophiostomatales) and *Ambrosiella* (Microascales) species are also the primary mutualists of many other temperate ambrosia beetles (Roeper & French, 1981; Farrell *et al.*, 2001; Harrington *et al.*, 2010).

Fusicolla acetilerea was part of the fungal biofilm that sometimes formed on adults and was also common within brood chambers during development of larvae. Related species (the genus *Fusarium sensu lato*) appear to be extremely common in ambrosia beetle gardens and play different roles for their hosts (e.g. Norris, 1979). While *Fusarium solani* associated with *Dendroctonus frontalis* is weakly pathogenic to its host (Moore, 1973), other strains of *F. solani* isolated from galleries of *Anisandrus dispar* and *X. ferrugineus* (Zimmermann, 1973; Norris, 1979) as well as *F. merismoides* isolated from *Platypus quercivorus* (Platypodinae; Qi *et al.*, 2011) apparently have nutritional functions for their hosts. Our observations suggest a secondary mutualistic role of *F. acetilerea* for *X. saxesenii*, but experimental studies are needed to determine whether this is actually the case.

The cultivation of two or more mutualists may be common in ambrosia beetles (Norris, 1979; Haanstad & Norris, 1985; Harrington & Fraedrich, 2010; Endoh *et al.*, 2011), against the predictions of hypotheses regarding the formation and maintenance of mutualisms. Symbiont competition can generate selection for symbiont traits that enhance their competitive ability at the cost of harming the host (Frank, 1996; Mueller, 2002). Additionally, there should be strong selection for a 'best symbiont', over time leading to its fixation with a host. However, while some symbioses, including

Fig. 4. Morphology of the ambrosial layer produced by *Raffaelea sulfurea* within laboratory galleries of *Xyleborinus saxesenii*. Conidiophores (A) with conidia (B) are visible. The picture was taken using scanning electron microscopy (SEM) with 400× magnification.



fungus-farming ants and termites, involve only one main mutualistic partner (e.g. Mueller *et al.*, 2005), many others involve multiple symbionts, indicating mechanisms that allow their coexistence (Six, 2012). In the case of symbionts in ambrosia beetle gardens, niche differences in the various fungi may reduce competition. If the fungi exploit different resources in the tree, this may alleviate selection against any one partner and help to maintain a community of symbionts rather than a single fungal partner. In *X. saxesenii*, for instance, one fungus species might serve as food for the mycetophagous adults and the other one as food for the xylomycetophagous larvae (De Fine Licht & Biedermann, 2012). Cooperation between symbionts is also possible. Laboratory studies showed that *R. sulfurea* requires exogenous B vitamins to grow, which might be provided by other microorganisms (filamentous fungi, yeasts or bacteria; R.A. Roeper, pers. commun.). In *Dendroctonus* bark beetles (Scolytinae), the possession of several apparently redundant fungal symbionts with differing environmental tolerances may reduce the risk of the host being left aposymbiotic, when environmental conditions shift over a season and from year to year (Six & Bentz, 2007). Experimental studies are needed to clarify the roles and interactions of the various symbionts associated with bark and ambrosia beetles.

Other fungal associates

Species of the anamorphic genera *Paecilomyces* and *Penicillium*, as well as two unknown species, were also associated with *X. saxesenii*, without being transmitted by founder females in their spore-carrying organs (Fig. 2, Table 3). Instead, spores of such fungi have been found to be vectored in small quantities on females' body surfaces (Francke-Grosmann, 1967). Unknown sp. A was isolated at low frequencies from all gallery classes and also from larval bodies. The presence of this fungus did not affect adult beetles or larvae in this study. *Penicillium decaturense* and *P. variotii* predominated in old galleries, at the entrance tunnel and in gallery dumps. *Penicillium decaturense* has only been isolated previously from a

wood decay fungus (Peterson *et al.*, 2004) and is known to produce anti-insect compounds (Zhang *et al.*, 2003). *Penicillium* species often compete with insects for ephemeral resources and thus regularly produce compounds against insect feeding (Peterson *et al.*, 2004; Rohlf & Churchill, 2011). *Penicillium* species have been frequently reported from old galleries of *X. saxesenii* and have been regarded as weak antagonists (Fischer, 1954; Francke-Grosmann, 1975). However, we found no negative effects of *P. decaturense* on the host beetle. *P. variotii* appears to act as a weak pathogen for *X. saxesenii*: Its abundance tended to negatively correlate with larval numbers and it formed a fungal biofilm on the surface of adult beetles that can be deadly if not groomed off by group members (Fig. 1). In a previous study, we found this biofilm to have caused the death of at least 7 of 29 females, likely not because mycelium enters the body, but rather because it constricts female movements, which leads to females getting stuck within the narrow tunnels (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). The genus *Paecilomyces* includes many entomopathogenic species and also plant saprobes belonging to the earliest colonizers of recently dead plants (e.g. Kim *et al.*, 2001; Tang *et al.*, 2005).

Fungus dynamics in a laboratory setting vs. field galleries

Ambrosia beetles live in the wood of trees, where they can only be studied by destructive gallery dissection. Thus, a laboratory setting was required to study the fungus dynamics in relation to the dynamics of the beetles' life history within galleries. It is intrinsic to all laboratory studies; however, that results might be influenced by differences between laboratory and field conditions. Our artificial breeding medium, for example, is richer in nutrients and moisture than natural wood (Saunders & Knoke, 1967). Therefore, it is important to consider whether these differences could have influenced the conclusions of our study. Supporting our laboratory results is the observation that total numbers of offspring of *X. saxesenii* in field and laboratory galleries are almost identical

(Biedermann *et al.*, 2009). Also, while different substrate conditions might influence the prevalence of particular fungi relative to others, they should not affect within species dynamics (e.g. the time course of prevalence in dependence of gallery stage and composition). Thus, we believe that our conclusions are generally valid, but the results on relative prevalence of different species of fungi should be interpreted with caution.

Can beetles influence the community of their gardens?

Larvae and adult *X. saxesenii* constantly remove the growth of *F. acetilerea* and *P. variotii* from their body surface by grooming each other. They also constantly crop their gardens and hinder the spread of pathogens by dumping old sawdust, faeces, fungal material and dead individuals out of the gallery entrance (Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011). If larvae and adults are removed from a gallery, its fungus gardens are overrun by saprobic fungi (normally coexisting at low levels) within 1–2 days (Leach *et al.*, 1940; Batra, 1979; Norris, 1979; Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011), which demonstrates that beetles play an active role in maintaining the composition of their gardens. As mechanical removal is likely to be only partially effective against 'weed' fungi, beetle-associated antibiotics-producing bacteria may play a role in controlling weeds and pathogens, like in other fungus-culturing insects (Mueller *et al.*, 2005). In *Dendroctonus* bark beetles, several bacterial groups have been found to reduce the growth of antagonistic fungi (Scott *et al.*, 2008), and some of them are actively applied with oral secretions during specialized cleaning behaviours by the adults (Cardoza *et al.*, 2006). *Streptomyces griseus*, which is known to produce antibiotics, has been recently isolated from *X. saxesenii* galleries (Grubbs *et al.*, 2011). Whether and how bacteria influence the composition of ambrosia gardens remains to be investigated.

This is the first study reporting correlative evidence for fitness effects of a fungal consortium on an ambrosia beetle. A relatively high number of filamentous fungi are regularly associated with the ambrosia beetle *X. saxesenii*. Interestingly, most of the genera of secondary fungal flora found in this study have been isolated also from nests of fungus-growing ants (Rodrigues *et al.*, 2008, 2011): *Fusarium sensu lato*, *Paecilomyces* and *Penicillium* have been frequently isolated from different attine ant species. These genera are also often associated with plants, either as endophytes or as early saprobes. Thus, these fungi are likely present in the plant material the ants collect to provision their gardens (Rodrigues *et al.*, 2011). In the case of ambrosia beetles, the fungi must be vectored by the dispersing females or enter via the entrance hole after excavation, even if this possibility is

unlikely. The absence of a strong association between the secondary associates and the farming insects in both systems suggests that most of these filamentous fungi are transient components of the gardens. This does not mean, however, that secondary microorganisms do not influence insect–fungus symbioses (Silva *et al.*, 2006).

Our study revealed six fungal species within ambrosia beetle gardens (Table 3), which is at least 10 times less than the number of species isolated from fungus-growing ant gardens (between 66 and 106 fungal species, depending on the ant species; Rodrigues *et al.*, 2011) and also much less than the species numbers isolated from fungus-growing termite gardens in the field (Thomas, 1987; Guedegbe *et al.*, 2009). These apparent differences between beetles and ants/termites may, in part, reflect differences between laboratory and field settings; however, a more important reason may be that beetle galleries are a much more closed system than the ant and termite nests (U.G. Mueller, pers. commun.). Ants and termites build their nests in soil, which is heavily colonized by microorganisms. They also leave the nest regularly to forage and thus are exposed to many kinds of contaminants that they may bring back to their nest. Additionally, they use substrates that contain endophytic and epiphytic microorganisms to feed their gardens. Ambrosia beetles, in contrast, tunnel into dying or recently dead wood, a substrate that is much less contaminated by microorganisms than soil. They also do not leave and re-enter their nests or introduce material from outside the nest. Furthermore, beetle galleries are relatively short-lived, which reduces the time for additional fungi to enter the system. Thus, it seems that ambrosia beetles have a greater ability to protect their gardens from foreign fungi than do the fungus-farming ants and termites. Because of this, sophisticated techniques for weeding and disinfection like those observed in ant gardens (e.g. Currie *et al.*, 1999; Currie & Stuart, 2001; Boomsma & Aanen, 2009) might not be needed in beetle gardens. The biggest threats to ambrosia gardens are desiccation (cf. Fischer, 1954) and probably diminishing nutrients, so recycling of excretions may be important. Indeed, there is some evidence of nutrient cycling between beetles and fungi (Kok & Norris, 1972a, c; Biedermann & Taborsky, 2011).

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Stacy Blomqvist for her help with trapping *X. saxesenii* in the field and starting the first laboratory galleries. We also thank Eric Ott for subculturing the fungi and for his first trials to identify the species. This manuscript benefitted greatly from comments of Ulrich G. Mueller, Andre Rodrigues, Tabea Turrini and Gerrit Holighaus. The study was supported by a cooperative agreement between the Department of Behavioural

Ecology, University of Bern and the Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service. PHWB is a recipient of a DOC fellowship of the Austrian Academy of Sciences at the Department of Behavioural Ecology, University of Bern, and was partly funded by a fellowship of the Roche Research Foundation. The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

References

- Abrahamson LP & Norris DM (1970) Symbiotic interrelationships between microbes and ambrosia beetles. 5. Amino acids as a source of nitrogen to fungi in beetle. *Ann Entomol Soc Am* **63**: 177–180.
- Adams AS, Six DL, Adams SM & Holben WE (2008) *In vitro* interactions between yeasts and bacteria and the fungal symbionts of the mountain pine beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*). *Microb Ecol* **56**: 460–466.
- Batra LR (1967) Ambrosia fungi - A taxonomic revision and nutritional studies of some species. *Mycologia* **59**: 976–1017.
- Batra LR (1979) Symbiosis, commensalism and aposymbiosis – conclusions. *Insect-Fungus Symbiosis. Nutrition, Mutualism, and Commensalism* (Batra LR, ed), pp. 259–265. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Beaver RA (1989) Insect-fungus relationships in the bark and ambrosia beetles. *Insect-Fungus Interactions* (Wilding N, Collins NM, Hammond PM & Webber JF, eds), pp. 121–143. Academic Press, London.
- Benjamin RK, Blackwell M, Chapela IH *et al.* (2004) Insect- and other Arthropod-associated fungi. *Biodiversity of Fungi*. Academic Press, Burlington, pp. 395–433.
- Berryman AA (1989) Adaptive pathways in scolytid-fungus associations. *Insect-Fungus Interactions* (Wilding N, Collins NM, Hammond PM & Webber JF, eds), pp. 145–159. Academic Press, London.
- Biedermann PHW (2007) Social behaviour in sib mating fungus farmers. Master Thesis, University of Berne, Switzerland.
- Biedermann PHW & Taborsky M (2011) Larval helpers and age polyethism in ambrosia beetles. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **108**: 17064–17069.
- Biedermann PHW, Klepzig KD & Taborsky M (2009) Fungus cultivation by ambrosia beetles: behavior and laboratory breeding success in three xyleborine species. *Environ Entomol* **38**: 1096–1105.
- Biedermann PHW, Peer K & Taborsky M (2012) Female dispersal and reproduction in the ambrosia beetle *Xyleborinus saxesenii* Ratzeburg (Coleoptera; Scolytinae). *Mitt Dtsch Ges Allg Angew Entomol* **18**: 231–235.
- Boomsma JJ & Aanen DK (2009) Rethinking crop-disease management in fungus-growing ants. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **106**: 17611–17612.
- Cardoza YJ, Klepzig KD & Raffa KF (2006) Bacteria in oral secretions of an endophytic insect inhibit antagonistic fungi. *Ecol Entomol* **31**: 636–645.
- Cassar S & Blackwell M (1996) Convergent origins of ambrosia fungi. *Mycologia* **88**: 596–601.
- Currie CR & Stuart AE (2001) Weeding and grooming of pathogens in agriculture by ants. *Proc Biol Sci* **268**: 1033–1039.
- Currie CR, Scott JA, Summerbell RC & Malloch D (1999) Fungus-growing ants use antibiotic-producing bacteria to control garden parasites. *Nature* **398**: 701–704.
- De Fine Licht HH & Biedermann PHW (2012) Patterns of functional enzyme activity suggest that larvae are the key to successful fungus farming by ambrosia beetles. *Front Zool* **9**: 13.
- Endoh R, Suzuki M, Okada G, Takeuchi Y & Futai K (2011) Fungus symbionts colonizing the galleries of the ambrosia beetle *Platypus quercivorus*. *Microb Ecol* **62**: 106–120.
- Farrell BD, Sequeira AS, O'Meara BC, Normark BB, Chung JH & Jordal BH (2001) The evolution of agriculture in beetles (Curculionidae: Scolytinae and Platypodinae). *Evolution* **55**: 2011–2027.
- Fischer M (1954) Untersuchungen über den kleinen Holzbohrer (*Xyleborus saxeseni*). *Pflanzenschutzberichte* **12**: 137–180.
- Francke-Grosmann H (1956) Hautdrüsen als Träger der Pilzsymbiose bei Ambrosiakäfern. *Z Morph Ökol Tiere* **45**: 275–308.
- Francke-Grosmann H (1967) Ectosymbiosis in wood-inhabiting beetles. *Symbiosis* (Henry SM, ed), pp. 141–205. Academic Press, New York.
- Francke-Grosmann H (1975) Zur epizoischen und endozoischen Übertragung der symbiotischen Pilze des Ambrosiakäfers *Xyleborus saxeseni* (Coleoptera: Scolytidae). *Entomol German* **1**: 279–292.
- Frank SA (1996) Host-symbiont conflict over the mixing of symbiotic lineages. *Proc Biol Sci* **263**: 339–344.
- French JRJ & Roeper RA (1972) Interactions of ambrosia beetle, *Xyleborus dispar* (Coleoptera, Scolytidae), with its symbiotic fungus *Ambrosiella hartigii* (Fungi imperfecti). *Can Entomol* **104**: 1635–1641.
- Glass NL & Donaldson GC (1995) Development of primer sets designed for use with the PCR to amplify conserved genes from filamentous ascomycetes. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **61**: 1323–1330.
- Grubbs KJ, Biedermann PHW, Suen G *et al.* (2011) The complete genome sequence of *Streptomyces cf. griseus* (Xy1bKG-1), an ambrosia beetle-associated actinomycete. *J Bacteriol* **193**: 2890–2891.
- Guedegbe HJ, Miambi E, Pando A, Roman J, Houngnandan P & Rouland-Lefevre C (2009) Occurrence of fungi in combs of fungus-growing termites (Isoptera: Termitidae, Macrotermitinae). *Mycol Res* **113**: 1039–1045.
- Haanstad JO & Norris DM (1985) Microbial symbiotes of the ambrosia beetle *Xyletorinus politus*. *Microb Ecol* **11**: 267–276.
- Harrington TC & Fraedrich SW (2010) Quantification of propagules of the laurel wilt fungus and other mycangial fungi from the Redbay ambrosia beetle, *Xyleborus glabratus*. *Phytopathology* **100**: 1118–1123.

- Harrington TC, Aghayeva DN & Fraedrich SW (2010) New combinations in *Raffaella*, *Ambrosiella*, and *Hyalorhinocladiella*, and four new species from the redbay ambrosia beetle, *Xyleborus glabratus*. *Mycotaxon* **111**: 337–361.
- Hulcr J, Mann R & Stelinski LL (2011) The scent of a partner: ambrosia beetles are attracted to volatiles from their fungal symbionts. *J Chem Ecol* **37**: 1374–1377.
- Kajimura H & Hiji N (1992) Dynamics of the fungal symbionts in the gallery system and the mycangia of the ambrosia beetle, *Xylosandrus mutilatus* (BLANDFORD) (Coleoptera, Scolytidae). *Ecol Res* **7**: 107–117.
- Kim JJ, Ra JB, Son DS & Kim GH (2001) Fungi colonizing sapwood of Japanese red pine logs in storage. *Mycobiology* **29**: 205–209.
- Kingsolver JG & Norris DM (1977) The interaction of *Xyleborus ferrugineus* (Fabr.) (Coleoptera: Scolytidae) behavior and initial reproduction in relation to its symbiotic fungi. *Ann Entomol Soc Am* **70**: 1–4.
- Kirkendall LR, Kent DS & Raffa KF (1997) Interactions among males, females and offspring in bark and ambrosia beetles: the significance of living in tunnels for the evolution of social behavior. *The Evolution of Social Behavior in Insects and Arachnids* (Choe JC & Crespi BJ, eds), pp. 181–215. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kok LT & Norris DM (1972a) Comparative phospholipid compositions of adult female *Xyleborus ferrugineus* and its mutualistic fungal ectosymbionts. *Comp Biochem Physiol* **42**: 245–254.
- Kok LT & Norris DM (1972b) Phospholipid composition of fungi mutualistic with *Xyleborus ferrugineus*. *Phytochemistry* **11**: 1449–1453.
- Kok LT & Norris DM (1972c) Symbiotic interrelationships between microbes and ambrosia beetles 6. Amino acid composition of ectosymbiotic fungi of *Xyleborus ferrugineus* (Coleoptera, Scolytidae). *Ann Entomol Soc Am* **65**: 598–602.
- Kok LT & Norris DM (1973) Comparative sterol compositions of adult female *Xyleborus ferrugineus* and its mutualistic fungal ectosymbionts. *Comp Biochem Physiol* **44**: 499–505.
- Korb J (2008) The ecology of social evolution in termites. *Ecology of Social Evolution* (Korb J & Heinze J, eds), pp. 151–174. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Leach JG, Hodson AC, Chilton SJP & Christensen CM (1940) Observations on two ambrosia beetles and their associated fungi. *Phytopathology* **30**: 227–236.
- Martin MM (1987) *Invertebrate-Microbial Interactions*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Moore GE (1973) Pathogenicity of three entomogenous fungi to the Southern Pine Beetle at various temperatures and humidities. *Environ Entomol* **2**: 54–57.
- Mueller UG (2002) Ant versus fungus versus mutualism: ant-cultivar conflict and the deconstruction of the attine ant-fungus symbiosis. *Am Nat* **160**: S67–S98.
- Mueller UG, Schultz TR, Currie CR, Adams RMM & Malloch D (2001) The origin of the attine ant-fungus mutualism. *Q Rev Biol* **76**: 169–197.
- Mueller UG, Gerardo NM, Aanen DK, Six DL & Schultz TR (2005) The evolution of agriculture in insects. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* **36**: 563–595.
- Norris DM (1979) The mutualistic fungi of *Xyleborini* beetles. *Nutrition, Mutualism, and Commensalism* (Batra LR, ed), pp. 53–63. Allanheld, Osmun & Company, Montclair.
- O'Donnell K & Cigelnik E (1997) Two divergent intragenomic rDNA ITS2 types within a monophyletic lineage of the fungus *Fusarium* are nonorthologous. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* **7**: 103–116.
- Peer K & Taborsky M (2004) Female ambrosia beetles adjust their offspring sex ratio according to outbreeding opportunities for their sons. *J Evol Biol* **17**: 257–264.
- Peer K & Taborsky M (2005) Outbreeding depression, but no inbreeding depression in haplodiploid ambrosia beetles with regular sibling mating. *Evolution* **59**: 317–323.
- Peer K & Taborsky M (2007) Delayed dispersal as a potential route to cooperative breeding in ambrosia beetles. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **61**: 729–739.
- Peterson SW, Bayer EM & Wicklow DT (2004) *Penicillium thiersii*, *Penicillium angulare* and *Penicillium decaturense*, new species isolated from wood-decay fungi in North America and their phylogenetic placement from multilocus DNA sequence analysis. *Mycologia* **96**: 1280–1293.
- Qi HY, Wang JG, Endoh R, Takeuchi Y, Tarno H & Futai K (2011) Pathogenicity of microorganisms isolated from the oak platypodid, *Platypus quercivorus* (Murayama) (Coleoptera: Platypodidae). *Appl Entomol Zool* **46**: 201–210.
- R Development Core Team (2008) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Rodrigues A, Bacci M, Mueller UG, Ortiz A & Pagnocca FC (2008) Microfungal “weeds” in the leafcutter ant symbiosis. *Microb Ecol* **56**: 604–614.
- Rodrigues A, Mueller UG, Ishak HD, Bacci Mc Jr & Pagnocca FC (2011) Ecology of microfungi communities in gardens of fungus-growing ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae): a year-long survey of three species of attine ants in Central Texas. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **78**: 244–255.
- Roeper RA (1995) Patterns of mycetophagy in Michigan ambrosia beetles. *Mich Acad* **27**: 153–161.
- Roeper RA & French JRJ (1981) Ambrosia fungi of the Western United States and Canada – beetle associations (Coleoptera: Scolytidae), tree hosts, and distribution. *Northwest Sci* **55**: 305–309.
- Roeper RA, Hazen CR, Helsel DK & Bunce MA (1980) Studies on Michigan ambrosia fungi. *Mich Bot* **19**: 69–73.
- Rohlf M & Churchill ACL (2011) Fungal secondary metabolites as modulators of interactions with insects and other arthropods. *Fungal Genet Biol* **48**: 23–34.
- Saunders JL & Knoke JK (1967) Diets for rearing the ambrosia beetle *Xyleborus ferrugineus* (Fabricius) *in vitro*. *Science* **15**: 463.
- Schneider IA (1991) Some ecological aspects of the ambrosia-symbiosis. *Anz. Schädl.kd. Pflanzenschutz Umweltschutz* **64**: 41–45.

- Schneider IA & Rudinsky JA (1969) Mycetangial glands and their seasonal changes in *Gnathotrichus retusus* and *G. sulcatus*. *Ann Entomol Soc Am* **62**: 39–43.
- Scott JJ, Oh DC, Yuceer MC, Klepzig KD, Clardy J & Currie CR (2008) Bacterial protection of beetle-fungus mutualism. *Science* **322**: 63.
- Silva A, Rodrigues A, Bacci M, Pagnocca FC & Bueno OC (2006) Susceptibility of the ant-cultivated fungus *Leucoagaricus gongylophorus* (Agaricales: Basidiomycota) towards microfungi. *Mycopathologia* **162**: 115–119.
- Six DL (2003) Bark beetle-fungus symbioses. *Insect Symbiosis* (Bourtzis K & Miller TA, eds), pp. 97–114. CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- Six DL (2012) Ecological and evolutionary determinants of bark beetle–fungus symbioses. *Insects* **3**: 339–366.
- Six DL & Bentz BJ (2007) Temperature determines symbiont abundance in a multipartite bark beetle-fungus ectosymbiosis. *Microb Ecol* **54**: 112–118.
- Six D, Doug Stone W, de Beer Z & Woolfolk S (2009) *Ambrosiella beaveri* sp. nov., associated with an exotic ambrosia beetle, *Xylosandrus mutilatus* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae, Scolytinae), in Mississippi, USA. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* **96**: 17–29.
- Tamura K, Dudley J, Nei M & Kumar S (2007) MEGA4: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis (MEGA) software version 4.0. *Mol Biol Evol* **24**: 1596–1599.
- Tang AMC, Jeewon R & Hyde KD (2005) Succession of microfungal communities on decaying leaves of *Castanopsis fissa*. *Can J Microbiol* **51**: 967–974.
- Thomas RJ (1987) Distribution of *Termitomyces* and other fungi in the nests and major workers of several Nigerian Macrotermitinae. *Soil Biol Biochem* **19**: 335–341.
- Vilgalys R & Hester M (1990) Rapid genetic identification and mapping of enzymatically amplified ribosomal DNA from several *Cryptococcus* species. *J Bacteriol* **172**: 4238–4246.
- Wheeler Q & Blackwell M (1984) *Fungus-Insect Relationships*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- White TJ, Bruns T, Lee S & Taylor J (1990) Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. *PCR Protocols: A Guide to Methods and Application* (Innis MA, Gelfand DH, Sninsky JJ & White TJ, eds), pp. 315–322. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Wilding N, Collins NM, Hammond PM & Webber JF (1989) *Insect-Fungus Interactions*. Academic Press, London.
- Zhang YC, Li C, Swenson DC, Gloer JB, Wicklow DT & Dowd PF (2003) Novel antiinsectan oxalicine alkaloids from two undescribed fungicolous *Penicillium* spp. *Org Lett* **5**: 773–776.
- Zimmermann G (1973) Die Pilzflora einiger im Holz lebender Borkenkäfer. *Mater. Organismen* **8**: 121–131.

Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

Table S1. Factors influencing the abundance of fungi isolated from *X. saxesenii*.

Supplementary material

Table S1. Factors influencing the abundance of fungi isolated from *X. saxesenii*. Separate (1) GLMMs with an exchangeable correlation structure of the response variable within a cluster (gallery-identity), for examining differences between the prevalence, and (2) GLMs for examining differences between the presence (yes/no) of the isolated fungal species, influenced by culture medium (CSMA – cycloheximide-streptomycin-malt agar, MA – malt extract agar), location within the gallery (brood chamber or entrance tunnel), and stage of gallery development. Model coefficients are reported as coeff. \pm se (standard error of the estimate), with the group in brackets in the first row of the model as the reference category (coefficient set to zero). The influences of main factors on the fungal prevalence are displayed as contrasts between classes. A positive contrast denotes that the mean of the second class is higher than the mean of the first class; a negative contrast denotes the reverse. Significant relationships ($p \leq 0.05$) are set in bold type and significant trends ($p \leq 0.01$) are underlined.

Fungal species	Parameters	coeff. \pm se	t	p	
<i>Raffaelea sulfurea</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA, brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	1.65 \pm 0.85	1.95	0.05	
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	-2.6 \pm 0.37	-7.03	<0.001	
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-2.02 \pm 0.36	-5.62	<0.001	
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	-1.28 \pm 1.05	-1.22	0.22	
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	-2.41 \pm 1.09	-2.2	0.028	
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	-1.13 \pm 0.82	-1.37	0.17	
	Intercept of presence (brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	1.34 \pm 0.69	1.94	0.058	
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-1 \pm 0.64	-1.57	0.12	
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	-0.16 \pm 0.78	-0.2	0.84	
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	-0.63 \pm 0.79	-0.8	0.43	
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	-0.48 \pm 0.76	-0.63	0.53	
	<i>Fusicolla acetilerea</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA, brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-8.04 \pm 2.63	-3.05	<0.002
		Contrast CSMA vs. MA	9.32 \pm 1.88	4.96	<0.001
		Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-1.67 \pm 0.51	-3.24	0.001
Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae		-0.19 \pm 2.43	-0.08	0.94	
Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult		4.05 \pm 2.52	1.61	0.11	

	progeny			
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	4.17 ± 1.33	3.13	0.002
	Intercept of presence (brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	0.39 ± 0.67	0.58	0.56
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-1.34 ± 0.75	-1.8	<u>0.08</u>
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	2.46 ± 1.03	2.38	0.02
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	0.19 ± 0.82	0.23	0.82
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	-2.27 ± 1.03	-2.2	0.03
<i>Penicillium decaturense</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA, brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-10.6 ± 12.1	0.88	0.38
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	-11.9 ± 8.66	-1.38	0.17
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-0.06 ± 0.66	-0.09	0.93
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	0.71 ± 13.8	0.05	0.96
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	2.76 ± 13.2	0.21	0.83
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	2.05 ± 7.05	0.29	0.77
	Intercept of presence (brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-2.37 ± 1.17	-2.02	0.05
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-0.83 ± 0.89	-0.93	0.36
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	0.59 ± 1.4	0.42	0.68
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	2.99 ± 1.27	2.35	0.02
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	2.4 ± 1.01	2.37	0.02
<i>Paecilomyces variotii</i>	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA, brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-21.8 ± 999	-0.01	1
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	-0.08 ± 0.37	-0.23	0.82
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	2.39 ± 0.39	6.22	<0.001
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	Only present during <i>foundress with larvae</i>		
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	Only present during <i>only adult progeny</i>		
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	-2.02 ± 0.62	-3.25	0.001
	Intercept of presence (brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-20.87 ± 999	-0.01	1
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	2.01 ± 0.78	2.56	0.01
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	Only present during <i>foundress with larvae</i>		
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	Only present during <i>only adult</i>		

	progeny		<i>progeny</i>	
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	-2.53 ± 0.77	-3.3	0.002
<hr/>				
Unknown sp. A	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA, brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-11.7 ± 23.3	-0.5	0.61
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA		Only present on CSMA	
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-5.66 ± 4.88	-1.16	0.25
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	-3.8 ± 32.9	-0.12	0.91
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	-1.3 ± 32.8	-0.04	0.97
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	-2.45 ± 1.69	-1.45	0.15
<hr/>				
	Intercept of presence (brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-2.45 ± 1.18	-2.08	0.04
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-0.57 ± 1.31	-0.44	0.67
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae	-0.16 ± 1.52	-0.1	0.92
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny	-0.03 ± 1.52	-0.02	0.98
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	0.12 ± 1.51	0.08	0.94
<hr/>				
Unknown sp. B	Intercept of prevalence (CSMA, brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	-31.9 ± 999	-0.00	1
	Contrast CSMA vs. MA	-4.83 ± 1.6	-3.02	0.003
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	8.35 ± 4.91	1.7	<u>0.09</u>
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae		Only present during <i>foundress with larvae</i>	
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny		Only present during <i>only adult progeny</i>	
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	-2.26 ± 1.74	-1.3	0.19
<hr/>				
	Intercept of presence (brood chamber, foundress with eggs)	0.45 ± 0.69	0.65	0.52
	Contrast brood chamber vs. entrance tunnel	-1.47 ± 0.79	-1.86	<u>0.07</u>
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. foundress with larvae		Only present during <i>foundress with larvae</i>	
	Contrast foundress with eggs vs. only adult progeny		Only present during <i>only adult progeny</i>	
	Contrast foundress with larvae vs. only adult progeny	1.37 ± 1.21	1.13	0.26