

Genetic determinants of suboptimal N₂ fixation and host range in the *Medicago-Sinorhizobium* symbiosis

Jason Terpolilli^{*1}, John Howieson², Philip Poole¹

¹Department of Molecular Microbiology, John Innes Centre, Norwich NR4-7UH, United Kingdom ² Centre for *Rhizobium* Studies, Murdoch University, , Murdoch 6150, Perth, Australia

*Author for correspondence: Jason.Terpolilli@bbsrc.ac.uk

Background

- \circ The *Medicago* genus is one of prime importance to sustainable agriculture due to the ability of its members to fix atmospheric N₂ in symbiosis with bacteria.
- Although two species of bacteria Sinorhizobium meliloti and S. medicae can form symbiotic interactions with Medicago spp., the host range exhibited by these microsymbionts varies (Figure 1):
 - S. meliloti is Nod⁻ on M. murex and Nod⁺Fix⁻ on M. polymorpha
 - S. medicae is Nod⁺Fix⁺ on both these hosts
- Recently the complete genome sequence of *S. medicae* WSM419 was reported¹, complementing that of the widely studied 'lab workhorse' *S. meliloti* 1021 (Sm1021), making these two strains key references for study.
- While both Sm1021 and WSM419 are able to nodulate and fix N₂ on the model legume *M. truncatula* A17, only WSM419 is able to do so effectively under Nlimited conditions² (Figure 1).
- The genetic determinants of these variations in N₂ fixation effectiveness and host range are not known.
- Therefore, we propose to investigate the basis of the effectiveness and host range differences of these strains using a cosmid library approach.





Screening for effectiveness and host range determinants

- Screen Sm1021 carrying the WSM419 cosmid library on *M. polymorpha*, *M. murex* and *M. truncatula*.
- Look for large pink nodules, indicative of an effective interaction.
- Should be straight-forward for *M. polymorpha* and *M. murex* interactions, as wild-type Sm1021 is Fix⁻ and Nod⁻ on these hosts, respectively.
- The situation is more complicated for *M. truncatula* A17; Sm1021 is Fix⁺ on this host, albeit only partially (Figure 1).
- But, nodulation of *M. truncatula* A17 by Sm1021 compared to WSM419 is very different - Sm1021 yields more numerous nodules which are paler, smaller in size and more widely distributed over the root system than those induced by WSM419 on this host (Figure 3).
- Therefore, it will be necessary to screen for a change in nodule morphology on *M. truncatula*.
- Successful putative clones will be isolated from nodules, the symbiotic phenotype will be authenticated and the clone(s) sequenced.

This research has been supported by a grant from the BBSRC



Figure 1 - Mean shoot dry weight of three *Medicago* hosts grown in sterile sand for 42 days with nutrients in N-free conditions and either uninoculated, or inoculated separately with Sm1021 or WSM419. Bars which share a letter for a given plant host are not significantly different (*P*<0.05).

Cosmid Library Construction

- The cosmid pLAFR3, containing the *cos* sites for packaging into λ -phage and transduction of *E. coli*, was selected as a starting point.
- Although pLAFR3 carries the *incC* plasmid stability region, work in our lab has suggested the cosmid is not reliably stable *in planta*.
- Therefore, the parDE region was PCR amplified from pJP2 and cloned into pLAFR3 as a HindIII-BamH1 fragment, creating pLMB377 (Figure 2).
- parDE encodes an antioxin-toxin protein pair, with demonstrated stability in planta on Pisum sativum³ and M. sativa⁴.
- The stability of pLMB377 *in planta* is currently being confirmed with Sm1021 (pLMB377) on *M. truncatula* A17.
- pLMB377 will then be used to construct a cosmid library of *S. medicae* WSM419 (partial *Eco*R1 digest of gDNA) and cloned into *Eco*R1-digested pLMB377.
- Based on the known genome size of WSM419 (6.8 Mbp), will require approximately 1,300 colonies for 99% genome coverage.
- Mobilise the WSM419 cosmid library into a Sm1021 background.



Figure 3 - Photographs of *M. truncatula* A17 roots inoculated with (a) Sm1021 and (b) WSM419 and harvested 42 days post-inoculation.

References

- 1. Reeve et al. (2010) Stand. Gen. Sci. 2: 77-86
- 2. Terpolilli et al. (2008) New Phytol. 179: 62-6
- Prell *et al.* (2009) *P.N.A.S.* 106: 12477-82
 Weinstein *et al.* (1992) *J. Bact.* 174: 7486-9

