# Novel host-bacterial symbioses revealed: characterization of *Wolbachia* in arthropods of western North America

JOANNE P. ODDEN<sup>1,\*</sup>, WYATT ENG<sup>1</sup>, KELSEY LEE<sup>1</sup>, HELEN DONELICK<sup>1,2</sup>, Mallory Hiefield<sup>1</sup>, Jamie Steach<sup>1</sup>, and Lauren Chan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Pacific University, Department of Biology, Forest Grove, OR 97116 <sup>2</sup>Present address: University of Utah, Department of Biochemistry, Salt Lake City, UT 84112

ABSTRACT.—Arthropod-bacterial symbioses are prevalent and play significant roles in ecosystems and the economy, and in some cases, habitat invasion. Wolbachia bacteria form symbiotic associations with a wide range of arthropod hosts and can affect both host reproduction and resistance to viral infections. The extent to which Wolbachia infects different arthropod species is fundamental not only to host biology, but also to the health of humans, ecosystems, and agriculture. Much of what we know about the effects of Wolbachia comes from a few key taxa, such as the model organism Drosophila melanogaster and the mosquito vector of human disease, Aedes aegypti. The majority of arthropods, even at higher taxonomic levels, have not been tested for infection, with a lack of surveys conducted in western North America. We screened and characterized Wolbachia diversity in arthropods in 2 types of collections in western North America: broad surveys and targeted collections of species known to be infected with Wolbachia. Our goals were to (1) find new Wolbachia strains and hosts, (2) characterize Wolbachia in commonly studied taxa to see whether there are different infection frequencies or strain types in this location, and (3) compare new Wolbachia strains in western North America to previously characterized strains. PCR screening of broadly sampled arthropods with Wolbachia-specific 16S rDNA (W16S) identified 5 novel host species. Three of these are invasive: a ground beetle, Nebria brevicollis (Coleoptera: Carabidae); a cereal crop agricultural pest, Oulema melanopus (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae); and a residential nuisance pest, Raglius alboacuminatus (Hemiptera: Rhyparochromidae). The crab spider Philodromus dispar (Araneae: Philodromidae) is nonnative, though not considered invasive, and the hyaline grass bug Liorhyssus hyalinus (Hemiptera: Rhopalidae) is of undetermined origin. To characterize 9 novel Wolbachia strains in our collections, we analyzed the 5-gene MultiLocus Sequence Type (MLST) and the Wolbachia surface protein gene (wsp). We identified 10 novel alleles among 5 MLST genes and 10 novel alleles of the highly variable regions (HVR) of wsp. This is the first report of Wolbachia hosts and strain identification from the Pacific Northwest and Rocky Mountain regions. These studies contribute to our understanding of the natural history of arthropod hosts, the biogeography of Wolbachia, and host-symbiont evolution. Moreover, strain identification is the first step in implementing Wolbachia-based biocontrol for conservation and pest mitigation, including control of the invasive N. brevicollis, O. melanopus, and R. alboacuminatus reported herein.

RESUMEN.—Las simbiosis artrópodo-bacteria prevalecen y juegan un papel importante en los ecosistemas y en la economía, y en algunos casos, en la invasión del hábitat. Las bacterias Wolbachia forman asociaciones simbióticas con una amplia gama de hospederos artrópodos, y pueden afectar la reproducción del hospedero, así como su resistencia a las infecciones virales. El grado en que Wolbachia infecta diferentes especies de artrópodos es fundamental no sólo para la biología del hospedero, sino también para la salud de los humanos, los ecosistemas y la agricultura. Gran parte de lo que sabemos sobre los efectos de Wolbachia proviene de pocos taxones claves, tales como el organismo modelo Drosophila melanogaster y el mosquito vector de la enfermedad humana, Aedes aegupti. La mayoría de los artrópodos, incluso en niveles taxonómicos más altos, no han sido sometidos a pruebas de infección, con mayor carencia de muestreos en el oeste de América del Norte. En este estudio, examinamos y caracterizamos la diversidad de Wolbachia en artrópodos, en dos tipos de colecciones del oeste de América del Norte. Estos estudios fueron llevados a cabo en especies objetivo que se sabe son infectadas con *Wolbachia*. Nuestros objetivos fueron: (1) encontrar nuevas cepas y huéspedes de Wolbachia, (2) caracterizar a Wolbachia en taxones comúnmente estudiados, para ver si hay diferentes frecuencias de infección o tipos de cepas en esta ubicación, y (3) comparar nuevas cepas de Wolbachia al oeste de América del Norte con cepas previamente caracterizadas. Mediante, la detección por Reacción en Cadena de la Polimerasa (PCR, por sus siglas en inglés) en artrópodos ampliamente muestreados con Wolbachia el ADNr específico 16S (W16S) identificó cinco nuevas especies de hospederos, tres de las cuales son invasivas, (1) el escarabajo de tierra Nebria brevicollis (Coleoptera: Carabidae), (2) una plaga de cultivo de cereales Oulema melanopus (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae), y (3) una plaga doméstica dañina Raglius alboacuminatus (Hemiptera: Rhyparochromidae). La araña cangrejo Philodromus dispar (Araneae: Philodromidae) no es nativa y no se considera invasiva, y la chinche Liorhyssus

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: joanne.odden@pacificu.edu

*hyalinus* (Hemiptera: Rhopalidae) es de origen la indeterminado. Para caracterizar nueve cepas nuevas de *Wolbachia* en nuestras colecciones, analizamos cinco genes por medio de tipificación multilocus de secuencias (MLST, por sus siglas en inglés) y el gen de la *proteína de superficie de Wolbachia (wsp.*, por sus siglas en inglés). Identificamos 10 alelos nuevos en cinco genes MLST y 10 alelos nuevos en regiones altamente variables (HVR, por sus siglas en inglés) de *wsp.* Este es el primer registro de hospederos y cepas de *Wolbachia* en el Pacífico Noroeste y en las Montañas Rocallosas (Rocky Mountains). Estos resultados contribuyen a nuestra comprensión de la historia natural de los artrópodos hospederos, la biogeografía de *Wolbachia* y la evolución parásito-hospedero. Además, la identificación de las cepas, es el primer paso para implementar un control biológico basado en *Wolbachia*, para la conservación y mitigación de plagas, incluyendo a los invasores *N. brevicollis, O. melanopus, y R. alboacuminatus* reportados en este trabajo.

Arthropod-bacterial symbioses are prevalent and affect host reproduction, resistance to viral infections, and in some cases, habitat invasion. Invasive species and their symbionts play significant roles in ecosystems by impacting the environment and economy (Holway et al. 1998, Goulson 2003, Snyder and Evans 2006, Lu et al. 2016). Bacterial symbioses abound within arthropods and include Wolbachia, Spiroplasma, and Cardinium (Goodacre et al. 2006, Duron et al. 2008, Zhang et al. 2016). These associations are established through horizontal transmission (via the environment) or vertical transmission (via germ cells) (Baldo et al. 2006, Hurst 2017). Symbiotic associations range from mutualism to parasitism (Correa and Ballard 2016), in which host and symbiont partners intimately affect each other, from gene expression and metabolism to behavior and evolution (Douglas 2014, Shropshire and Bordenstein 2016, Hurst 2017), sometimes resulting in co-evolution. For example, we see parallel evolution between lachnid aphids and their nutritional endosymbionts (Buchnera) (Wilson and Duncan 2015, Chen et al. 2017).

Wolbachia is arguably the world's most charismatic bacterial symbiont, infecting a wide range of arthropod hosts, including insects, spiders, and scorpions (Duron et al. 2008). This obligate intracellular symbiont is vertically transmitted through the host egg, with a high fidelity of transmission to 97% of Drosophila melanogaster offspring (Hoffmann et al. 1998). Wol*bachia* can also be transmitted horizontally, from parasitoids, wounding, or predator consumption of infected prey (Rowley et al. 2004). Wolbachia causes a range of reproductive effects, including feminization, parthenogenesis, and male killing, all of which select for *Wolbachia*infected female offspring. Additionally, Wolbachia causes cytoplasmic incompatibility, which dramatically decreases the number of viable offspring from matings between uninfected females and Wolbachia-infected males. Due to these effects, *Wolbachia*-based biocontrol has been developed to reduce vector-borne human disease (e.g., mosquitoes transmitting Dengue and Zika) (Frentiu et al. 2014, Hoffmann et al. 2015, Dutra et al. 2016) and to control agricultural pests (Zhou and Li 2016). Characterizing *Wolbachia* strains in novel hosts not only increases our understanding of the evolution of this widespread symbiosis, but also has implications for pest and disease management.

Surveys identifying Wolbachia infections across wild arthropod taxa have largely been conducted outside of the western hemisphere (e.g., Asia-Kittayapong et al. 2000; Australasia—Hariri et al. 1998, Wenseleers et al. 1998; Pacific islands-Bailly-Bechet et al. 2017, Bridgeman et al. 2018; Europe-Ricci et al. 2002, Duron et al. 2008). Only 2 broad arthropod surveys for Wolbachia infections have been performed in North America, specifically in the United States of America (USA), in the Midwest and the South (Jeyaprakash and Hoy 2000, Werren and Windsor 2000). Both surveys tested specimens from 13 arthropod orders and found infection rates of 19.3% and 76%, respectively. Targeted surveys of particular species have been performed within the USA in the Midwest, the Northeast, the South, and California. The most commonly studied hosts, mosquitoes (e.g., Culex pipiens) and the fruit fly D. melanogaster, have only been surveyed at a few locations (Rasgon and Scott 2004, Duron et al. 2005, Verspoor and Haddrill 2011), while other studies examined stalk-eyed flies and butterflies (Hariri et al. 1998, Nice et al. 2009). Although surveys have been useful, neither broad surveys of arthropods nor targeted surveys of D. melanogaster and C. pipiens have been done in the western USA.

A successful and widely used approach to define and classify different *Wolbachia* strains is MultiLocus Sequence Typing (MLST), a universal genotyping tool designed to characterize *Wolbachia* genetic diversity within and among arthropod species. The alleles at 5 housekeeping genes (coxA, ftsZ, fbpA, hcpA, and gatB) are used to determine the sequence type (ST) in the MLST database (Baldo et al. 2006). Sequences of the Wolbachia surface protein (wsp) gene and its 4 hypervariable regions (HVR 1–4) are also cataloged in this database (Baldo et al. 2005). Analysis of Wolbachia MLST data is used for several reasons: (1) to determine taxonomic classification of Wolbachia supergroup (Baldo et al. 2006), (2) to assign a specific strain name (ST), and (3) to make comparisons within the MLST database (https://pubmlst .org/wolbachia/), which catalogs hundreds of strains and thousands of isolates (Jolley and Maiden 2010). Based on phylogenetic analyses of MLST genotypes, Wolbachia is taxonomically subdivided into supergroups A-Q (Ma et al. 2017), with the arthropod-infecting Wol*bachia* typically assigned to supergroup A or B (Gerth et al. 2014).

Host-Wolbachia evolutionary history has been described by using targeted surveys within taxonomic groups and MLST genotyping. A study of funnel-web spiders found 3 distinct Wolbachia strains and inferred horizontal transmission across species, possibly through parasitoids (Baldo et al. 2008). In contrast to the horizontal transmission found for many other arthropod-Wolbachia associations tested thus far (Russell et al. 2009, Stahlhut et al. 2010, Gerth et al. 2013), the phylogeny for Wolbachia in aquatic beetles (Coleoptera: Hydraenidae) revealed genera-specific infections, supporting vertical transmission (Sontowski et al. 2015). Finally, a study of 120 species in 13 families of butterflies and moths delineated widespread MLST gene recombination (Ilinsky and Kosterin 2017). These studies contribute to our understanding of Wolbachia transmission across arthropod hosts and reconstruction of Wolbachia-host evolution.

Our study had 3 objectives to address the gap in host-*Wolbachia* associations within the western regions of the USA. First, we performed a broad survey by collecting and testing western North American arthropods for *Wolbachia* infection. Second, we performed targeted surveys of wild populations of the fruit fly and model organism (*D. melanogaster*), and 2 mosquito species (*Aedes vexans* and the West Nile Virus vector *C. pipiens*). *Wolbachia* infection rates of these widely known hosts were used for comparison to other studies. Third,

we used MLST and *wsp* analyses to characterize 9 infections identified through the broad survey. We report that broadly collected arthropods in data-poor regions yielded novel hosts and novel *Wolbachia* strains, each of which contributes to understanding host-symbiont evolution. Moreover, strain identification is the first step in implementing *Wolbachia*-based biocontrol for conservation or pest mitigation, including control of the invasive species reported herein.

### Methods

### **Broad Survey Field Collections**

Field collections consisted of a broad survey and specific targeted surveys. A broad group of 281 specimens from phylum Arthropoda was collected in the western USA from the campuses of Metropolitan State University of Denver, Colorado (MSUD), and Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon (PACU) (Table 1). Arthropods were collected by hand, without collection traps, from mostly terrestrial, but sometimes aquatic or subterranean environments, with the goal of collecting a variety of species from different microhabitats. The first specimens encountered were collected. MSUD collections occurred during October of 2011, 2012, and 2013, as well as March 2014. PACU collections occurred during September 2014, February 2015, and April 2016 and 2017. Specimens were immediately placed live into vials with 95% ethanol. They were transferred to individual tubes within 24 h and stored in 95% ethanol at -20 °C, typically for 2-5 d until they were photographed, identified to order, and prepared for DNA extraction.

### Targeted Surveys Field Collections

The following arthropod taxa were collected in our targeted surveys: (a) fruit flies, (b) mosquitoes, (c) the ground beetle *N. brevicollis*, and (d) the orb-weaving spider *Zygiella x-notata*. The first 2 groups were selected for in-depth targeted surveys of taxa commonly infected by *Wolbachia* (Kittayapong et al. 2000, Verspoor and Haddrill 2011). *Nebria brevicollis* and *Z. x-notata* were added because preliminary data from broad sampling indicated that they were novel *Wolbachia* hosts. *Nebria brevicollis* specimens were collected by hand from under concrete blocks or fallen tree trunks at 3 sites in Oregon between May 2017

	537

Site name	Site code	State	Latitude	Longitude	Study
Banner Lakes Wetlands	BANN	CO	40°04'35.62"	$-104^{\circ}33'46.77''$	Targeted <sup>M</sup>
Denver Residence	DENV	CO	39°44'7.16"	$-104^{\circ}55'44.05''$	Targeted <sup>M</sup>
Chatfield Reservoir Wetlands	CHAT	СО	39°31′32.56″	$-105^{\circ}04'54.50''$	Targeted <sup>M</sup>
Metropolitan State University of Denver	MSUD	СО	39°44′41.97″	$-105^{\circ}00'05.08''$	Broad
Wadsworth and Yale Green Belt	WYGB	СО	39°40′5.07″	$-105^{\circ}05'11.36''$	Targeted <sup>M</sup>
Purple Park	PUPA	CO	39°56'33.26"	-105°09'37.47"	Targeted <sup>M</sup>
Apolloni Vineyards	APOL	OR	45°37'23.74"	-123°13′2.14″	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
Cornelius Residence	CORN	OR	45°30'54.49"	-123°03′10.53″	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
David Hill Vineyards	DAHI	OR	45°32′51.33″	-123°09'26.10"	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
Forest Grove 1 Residence	FGO1	OR	45°30'40.73"	$-123^{\circ}05'58.74''$	Targeted <sup>FF, NB</sup>
Forest Grove 2 Residence	FGO2	OR	45°31'01.43"	$-123^{\circ}06'16.18''$	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
Forest Grove 3 Residence	FGO3	OR	45°31'03.06"	-123°06′10.40″	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
Forest Grove 4 Residence	FGO4	OR	45°31′48.69″	$-123^{\circ}06'34.59''$	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
Nehalem Residence	NEHA	OR	45°48'04.92"	-123°47′27.28″	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
Pacific University	PACU	OR	45°31′15.89″	-123°06'33.82"	Broad, Targeted <sup>NB, ZX</sup>
Plum Hill Vineyards	PLHI	OR	45°28'26.11"	-123°08'32.24"	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
Portland Residence	PORT	OR	45°29'21.74"	$-122^{\circ}42'24.45''$	Targeted <sup>FF</sup>
VanderZanden Farms	HBRO	OR	45°33′48″	-122°58′17″	Targeted <sup>NB</sup>

TABLE 1. Sampling sites in Colorado (CO) and Oregon (OR) for broad and targeted arthropod collections.

Mosquitoes

FFFruit flies

NBNebria brevicollis

<sup>ZX</sup>Zygiella x-notata

TABLE 2. Numbers of *Wolbachia*-infected and total collected (in parentheses) *Nebria brevicollis, Zygiella x-notata*, and *Drosophila melanogaster* during targeted sampling in Oregon from 2014 to 2019. Collection sites correspond to Table 1. A dash indicates that specimens were not collected. Sex was not determined for individuals of *N. brevicollis* or *Z. x-notata*.

			D. mela	nogaster
Collection site	N. brevicollis	Z. x-notata	Ŷ	5
APOL	_	_	8 (18)	3 (7)
CORN	—	—	9 (15)	1(1)
DAHI	—	—	18 (32)	6 (10)
FGO1	15 (15)	—	21 (28)	7(13)
FGO2	—	—	2 (2)	3(4)
FGO3	—	—	19 (35)	2(8)
FGO4	—	—	2 (3)	
HBRO	1(1)	—	_	
NEHA	_		5(10)	_
PACU	9 (10)	14 (33)	20 (30)	6 (7)
PLHI	—		13 (25)	8 (13)

and June 2018. Zygiella x-notata specimens were collected from buildings by hand at one site in Oregon in September 2018 and April 2019 (Table 2). All specimens were immediately placed live into 95% ethanol. They were transferred to individual tubes within 24 h and stored in 95% ethanol at -20 °C for up to 4 months before DNA extraction.

In targeted mosquito surveys, *C. pipiens* and *A. vexans* were collected by aspirating adults or by dip-netting larvae at urban, suburban, and rural sites in Colorado during September and October of 2009 and 2010 (Table 1).

Adult field-collected mosquitoes were transferred live into individual test tubes with 95% ethanol and stored in a cooler with ice for up to 12 h. Specimens were stored at -20 °C until DNA extraction. Collected larvae were reared to adults at room temperature. Within 24 h of eclosion, adult mosquitoes were aspirated and immediately transferred live into individual vials with 95% ethanol. Colorado Mosquito Control (Broomfield, CO) staff performed species identification based on morphology.

In targeted fruit fly surveys, *D. melanogaster* specimens were collected using polyethylene

plastic containers baited with overly ripe fruit, water, and yeast. Collections were made over the course of 5 d at private residences and 3 wineries in western Oregon during September 2014, July and October 2015, and July, September, and October 2016 (Table 1). Traps with lids askew were placed at the locations and set up indoors for all sites except FGO4. At FGO4, adults were aspirated directly from the field site. Following collection, live fruit flies were anaesthetized using carbon dioxide. A dissecting microscope was used to confirm fruit fly species. Visual examination of genitalia and presence of male-specific sex combs (D. melanogaster) were used for sex determination. Male and female specimens were placed live into 95% ethanol, with one fly per tube, and stored at -20 °C until DNA extraction, which was performed within 2 weeks. Voucher specimens from the same locality were saved for targeted surveys.

DNA Extraction, PCR Amplification, Sequence Analysis, and Strain Typing

DNA was extracted from individual specimens using Qiagen DNeasy Blood and Tissue (Valencia, CA) kits according to manufacturer specifications. For the broad survey collection, small specimens such as fruit flies or mosquitoes were used whole, whereas for larger specimens (such as wasps or beetles), an approximately 2-mm by 3-mm section of the upper abdomen was used. For targeted collections of N. brevicollis and Z. x-notata, DNA was extracted only from legs to avoid false positives of Wolbachia-infected prey. All DNA extractions were stored at -20 °C. Wolbachia infection status was determined via co-PCR of Wolbachia (16S rRNA; W16S, 438 bp) and arthropods (cytochrome oxidase subunit I, COI, 708 bp) by using previously described methods (Folmer et al. 1994, Werren and Windsor 2000). Each PCR reaction was carried out in a total reaction volume of 25 µL with one PCRready bead (GE Healthcare, Chicago, IL), forward and reverse primers at 0.4 µM each, and 2 µL of DNA template. Reaction programs followed a thermocycler profile of initial denaturation at 94 °C for 2 min, 30 cycles of 94 °C for 30 s, 55 °C for 45 s, and 72 °C for 1 min, and a final extension at 72 °C for 10 min. PCR products were visualized with 1.5% agarose gel electrophoresis to determine Wolbachia infection status. Controls used in parallel were a known Wolbachia-infected D. melanogaster and a water-only negative control. The arthropod COI amplicon was used as an internal positive control for DNA quality for each specimen. Specimens with amplification of W16S and a robust COI band were scored as Wolbachia infected, whereas specimens yielding only a robust COI band were scored as uninfected. Weak or absent COI bands indicated a poor PCR reaction and were omitted from the broad survey (10.68%). Wolbachia infection status was confirmed for most specimens by sequencing W16S (Eurofins; Louisville, KY).

In the *N. brevicollis*-targeted collections (n = 31 specimens), 16.13% had weak or no amplification of *COI* and were removed from the study. Similarly, in targeted collections of *D. melanogaster* (n = 261), *C. pipiens* (n = 126), *A. vexans* (n = 27), and *Z. x-notata* (n = 33), we omitted poor PCR reactions (2.98%, 5.26%, 10.00%, and 0%, respectively). These reactions were subjected to secondary screening by doubling the DNA and decreasing DNA by half, for which *D. melanogaster*, *C. pipiens*, and *A. vexans* were then scored (8.17%, 0.75%, and 0% of total screened, respectively).

PCR amplification and sequencing were used to characterize the *Wolbachia* strain within targeted collections of *N. brevicollis, D. melanogaster,* and *C. pipiens,* as well as from select host specimens from the broad survey. All 5 loci of the MLST system (Baldo et al. 2006) and *wsp* were amplified (Zhou et al. 1998).

MLST genes and *wsp* (including the HVR regions) were individually amplified using previously published, gene-specific forward and reverse primers (Baldo et al. 2006). Each 25-µL volume PCR reaction included 0.8 µM primers (or 0.4 µM for wsp), 1 PCR ready bead, and 2 µL of DNA template. Thermocycling included an initial denaturation of 94 °C for 2 min, 36 cycles of 94 °C for 30 s, annealing temperature (ftsZ, 54 °C; hcpA, 53 °C; gatB, 54 °C; coxA, 55 °C; fbpA, 59 °C; wsp, 59 °C) for 45 s, and 72 °C for 1.5 min and final extension of 70 °C for 10 min. Products were visualized on 1.5% agarose gels for expected length and then Sanger-sequenced using PCR primers by Eurofins (Louisville, KY). Forward and reverse sequences were checked and assembled for each gene across individuals using Geneious R9 (www.geneious.com; Kearse et al. 2012). COI was also sequenced for host confirmation using mitochondrial barcoding (Hebert et al. 2003).

MLST allele numbers for each locus were determined by sequence query of the MLST database (https://pubmlst.org/wolbachia/). Identical sequences of standardized length were assigned the same allele number. Sequences differing by one or more nucleotides from those in the database were submitted to the MLST database curator and assigned a unique allele number. Novel combinations of alleles for all 5 MLST genes were submitted and designated with a unique ST (sequence type) integer. Sequences shorter than the required MLST length were submitted to GenBank (https:// www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nucleotide/) (Table 3). Novel strains with unique MLST or *wsp* allele sequences or combinations of alleles were named using the standard naming scheme of a lowercase "w" followed by 3–4 letters referring to host taxonomy (e.g., genus and species).

### Phylogenetic Analyses

We estimated the phylogenetic relationships of novel Wolbachia strains (Table 3) with an MLST data set including 109 different strains (Supplementary Material 1) to (1) assign Wolbachia supergroup and (2) place novel Wolbachia strains relative to previously characterized STs. Representative sequences from supergroups A, B, D, F, and H were included, similar to previous study designs (Montagna et al. 2014, Ali et al. 2018a, 2018b). Furthermore, we included select STs from the same host order as our novel strains: Araneae, Coleoptera, Hemiptera, and Isopoda. STs identified as closest matches to each of our novel strains (i.e., results from the "search by combination of alleles" and "exact or nearest match" functions of the MLST database) were included. Published phylogenetic analyses were used to limit the number of STs to one Wolbachia strain per major clade for hosts from targeted studies of Araneae (Baldo et al. 2008, Yun et al. 2011) and Hemiptera (Watanabe et al. 2012, Guidolin and Cônsoli 2013, Bing et al. 2014). All 25 STs from coleopteran hosts in the MLST database (accessed 21 January 2019) and GenBank sequences corresponding to 14 aquatic coleopteran Wolbachia strains (Sontowski et al. 2015) were included. Because exploratory trees identified a lepidopteran ST as most closely related to the Wolbachia strain infecting N. brevicollis, the data set was expanded to include additional STs from lepidopteran hosts. One Wolbachia strain per clade was included from a previously published targeted lepidopteran study (Ilinsky and Kosterin 2017).

Locus-specific alignments of the 5 MLST genes, as well as concatenated alignment, were done using ClustalW (Larkin et al. 2007) within Geneious. We identified the open reading frames to verify alignments. Alignment of sequences for each gene was straightforward, with only 26 sequences in the *fbpA* gene containing a 6 nucleotide indel. The data matrix was partitioned by gene, with 2 partitions per gene (codon positions 1 + 2, and codon position 3). We estimated the best-fit nucleotide substitution model for each partition using MrModeltest v2 (Nylander et al. 2004) within PAUP\* version 4.0b (Swofford 2002) (Supplementary Material 2).

Bayesian estimates of the phylogeny for the partitioned, concatenated alignment, including all 5 MLST genes, were conducted in MrBayes version 3.2.7 (Ronquist and Huelsenbeck 2003, Ronquist et al. 2012). Identical haplotypes were collapsed to single representatives to reduce run time. The final 2 runs each consisted of 4 chains of 50 million generations sampled every 5000 generations. Mixing within runs and convergence between runs were checked in Tracer version 1.6 (Rambaut et al. 2018). The posterior distribution of trees was summarized on a consensus tree after the first 25% of our samples were discarded as burn-in.

#### RESULTS

# Wolbachia Infection in Broadly Collected Arthropods

Of the arthropods collected from the campuses of MSUD and PACU, 251 total individuals were from 5 taxonomic classes and 11 orders (Table 4). Wolbachia infections were detected in 5 orders, of which 10 infected taxa were identified to genus or species. Sample sizes were small for many specimens identified to species (n < 6). Based on preliminary findings (Table 1), N. brevicollis and Z. x-notata were selected for targeted survevs. Targeted collections of N. brevicollis beetles from 3 sites in Oregon resulted in a 96.15% Wolbachia infection rate (n = 26). From one site in Oregon, 42.42% of Z. x-notata spiders were Wolbachia infected (n = 33), Table 2).

÷
õ
ĩĩ
õ
р
an
ю
ac
ē
2
2
-=
ns
ti.
G
E.
ŭ
eq
et
50 E
$\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{a}}$
рı
ar
gq
Õ
q
E
£
S
en
E.
. <u>S</u>
ď
ts
OS
Ч
Ξ.
es
Э
5
ц Ц
Б
Ē
q
an
SC :
dn
ľ0
50
be
Ins
a
hi
ac
dl.
$W_{c}$
-
ve
Ξ.
de
Ē
Š
Į
ŝ
ĨĽ.
AE
Τ

			Study:	Suner-	.TS					Alle	esf				
Host species	Strain <sup>a</sup>	$n^{\mathrm{p}}$	site(s) <sup>c</sup>	group <sup>d</sup>	IDe.	gatB	coxA	hcpA	ftsZ	fbpA	dsm	HVRI	HVR2	HVR3	HVR4
Zygiella x-notata	wZxno	ŝ	Broad: PACU	Υ	<b>485:</b> 1849 1850	277	268	299	236	442	MH759011	257	290	286	
Philodromus dispar	wPdis	1	Broad: PACU	ы 	${1878}$				I		MK449428	256	289	285	I
Porcellio spp.	wPorc	01	Broad: PACU	в	${1862}$	MK449432	13	MK456487	237	401					
Armadillidium vulgare	<i>w</i> Vul3	4	Broad: PACU	в	${1863}$	13	13		6	13	MK449429		12	21	245
Nebria brevicollis	wNBre	44	Targeted: PACU FGO1	V	<b>502:</b> 1864	84	270	196	54	64	MK449431	255	175	204	165
Oulema melanopus	wOMel	1	Broad: PACU	V	$\frac{-}{1860}$		269	MH759010	238	36					
Culex pipiens	wPip	$\neg$ $\neg$ $\neg$	Targeted: WYGB DENV PUPA	В	6	4	က	ი	22	4	10	10	ø	10	×
Drosophila melanogaster	wMel		Targeted: FGO1 NEHA CORN	V	1	1	Т	1	1	П	31	Г	12	21	24
Drosophila melanogaster	wMel	ကက	Targeted: APOL DAHI	I		l			I		31	1	12	21	24
Liorhyssus hyalinus	wLHya	Г	Broad: MSUD	В	$\frac{-}{1865}$	278	14	MH759009	22	6	MK449427	69	17	288	
Raglius alboacuminatus	wRAlb	1	Broad: PACU	в	${1859}$	188			20	25	MK449430	125	291	287	
Polistes dominula	w Pdom2	Г	Broad: MSUD	в	1861	6	6	MK456485	MK456486	10	63	19	17	24	33
<sup>a</sup> Novel hosts, strains, and allelee <sup>b</sup> Number of specimens ( <i>n</i> ) sequ <sup>c</sup> Study sites correspond to Table <i>Targeted</i> indicates that taxa v	are in bold. enced. • 1. <i>Broad</i> in vere specific	dicate: ally ta	s broadly collect rgeted for colle	ted sample ction.	·Se	dSupergr eST (Sequ fNumbers allele	oup was d ience Typ s in <i>gatB</i> , e numbers;	etermined by phy e) and ID (isolate coxA, hcpA, ftsZ, j MH or MK prec	vlogenetic analy ) are MLST data fbpA, wsp and F eding numbers	ses (Fig. 1 abase ider IVR colur indicates	). tifiers. ms are MLST data GenBank Accessio!	abase n numbers.	gIn	idicates not	dentified.

540

Class Order Classification MSUD   Arachnida Araneae Zygiella x-notata Philodromus dispar —	PACU 3 (5) 1 (1) 0 (1) 0 (7)
Arachnida Araneae Zygiella x-notata — Philodromus dispar —	$\begin{array}{c} 3 \ (5) \\ 1 \ (1) \\ 0 \ (1) \\ 0 \ (7) \end{array}$
Philodromus dispar —	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \ (1) \\ 0 \ (1) \\ 0 \ (7) \end{array}$
2 milouromuo utopui	$egin{array}{c} 0 \ (1) \ 0 \ (7) \end{array}$
Tenuiphantes tenuis —	0 (7)
Unidentified 0 (14)	
Chilopoda Unidentified Unidentified 0 (3)	2(3)
Crustacea Isopoda Armadillidium vulgare —	4(5)
Porcellio spp. —	2(2)
Unidentified 2 (3)	8 (12)
Diplopoda Julida <i>Cylindroiulus</i> spp. —	0(1)
Unidentified Unidentified 0 (1)	0 (6)
Insecta Coleoptera Nebria brevicollis —	5(5)
Oulema melanopus —	1(1)
Coccinella septempunctata —	0(2)
Unidentified 0 (13)	0(14)
Dermaptera Unidentified 0 (1)	
Diptera Brilla spp. —	0(1)
Family Chironomidae —	0(1)
Unidentified 0 (8)	0 (3)
Hemiptera Liorhyssus hyalinus 1 (1)	
Raglius alboacuminatus —	1(1)
Boisea rubrolineata —	0(4)
Unidentified 1 (8)	0 (31)
Hymenoptera Polistes dominula 1 (1)	
Formica spp. —	1(1)
Prenolepis imparis —	0 (3)
Tetramorium spp. —	0(2)
Unidentified 0 (16)	0(54)
Lepidoptera Noctua pronuba —	0(1)
Platyedra subcinerea —	0(1)
Unidentified 0 (2)	—
Orthoptera Unidentified 0 (8)	
Trichoptera Unidentified 0 (2)	—
Unidentified Unidentified 0 (2)	—

TABLE 4. Numbers of *Wolbachia*-infected arthropods and total collected arthropods (in parentheses) broadly sampled from the campuses of Metropolitan State University of Denver, Colorado (MSUD 2011–2014), and Pacific University, Oregon (PACU 2014–2017). A dash indicates that specimens were not collected.

TABLE 5. Numbers of *Wolbachia*-infected mosquitoes and total collected mosquitoes (in parentheses) collected in Colorado from 2009 to 2010. Collection sites correspond to Table 1. A dash indicates that specimens were not collected.

Collection	Culex p	oipiens	Aedes	vexans
site	Ŷ	3	Ŷ	δ
BANN	1 (1)	_	0 (22)	_
CHAT PUPA	NC 22 (22)	11 (11)	0 (5)	_
DENV	29 (29)	23 (23)	_	_
WYGB	23 (23)	17(17)		_

# *Wolbachia* Infection Rates in the Targeted Fruit Flies and Mosquitoes

In *D. melanogaster*, the total *Wolbachia* infection rate compiled from individuals collected from a variety of sites in western Oregon was 58.62% (153 of 261 individuals). Total

infection rates of males and females per site among the 7 sites for which our sample size was >10 ranged from 44.00% to 70.27%. Among 3 sampled sites with fewer than 10 sampled individuals, infection rates were similar (50.00% to 83.33%).

A total of 126 *C. pipiens* and 27 *A. vexans* were collected from the greater metropolitan Denver, Colorado, area (Table 5). In *C. pipiens*, all individuals were infected at all collection sites. *Wolbachia* infection was not detected in *A. vexans*.

# Strain Typing of *Wolbachia* from Broad and Targeted Surveys

We selected specimens from both broad and targeted collections for strain typing. From the broad collections, we amplified and sequenced MLST and *wsp* genes from 14 *Wolbachia*-infected individuals from 8 different host species (Table 3). These individuals were randomly selected from the 35 *Wolbachia*infected specimens in the broad collections (Table 4). From specimens in targeted surveys, we added 3 more species: *N. brevicollis*, *D. melanogaster*, and *C. pipiens*. We identified 5 novel *Wolbachia* hosts, 10 novel *Wolbachia* alleles among the 5 MLST loci, and 10 novel hypervariable region (HVR) alleles of *wsp*. Nine novel strains were characterized (*w*Zxno–ST485, *w*Porc, *w*NBre–ST502, *w*OMel, *w*LHya, *w*RAlb, *w*Pdis, *w*Vul3, *w*Pdom2) (Table 3).

Analysis of 3 *C. pipiens* individuals confirmed previous *Wolbachia* strain analyses of ST9, *wsp* allele 10. Three *D. melanogaster* individuals analyzed confirmed previous *Wolbachia* strain analyses of ST1, *wsp* allele 31 (Kittayapong et al. 2000, Baldo et al. 2006, Verspoor and Haddrill 2011). An additional 8 *D. melanogaster* specimens analyzed across 2 wineries in Oregon confirmed *wsp* allele 31 and *ftsZ* allele 1 (Table 3).

# Phylogenetic Analyses: Supergroup Determination

The concatenated alignment for the 5 MLST genes was 2079 bp in length. The numbers of variable sites and parsimony informative sites for each gene were as follows: *gatB*-142 variable sites and 101 parsimony informative sites; coxA-127 variable sites and 102 parsimony informative sites; hcpA-214 variable sites and 141 parsimony informative sites; ftsZ-138 variable sites and 109 parsimony informative sites; and fbpA-165 variable sites and 128 parsimony informative sites. Monophyly of supergroup A and supergroup B were unambiguously supported in Bayesian phylogenetic analysis of the concatenated MLST data set (posterior probabilities, PP = 1). We assigned 8 of our 9 novel Wol*bachia* strains to either supergroup A or B (Fig. 1, Table 3). The ninth novel strain, wPdis, was not included in the analysis because high-quality sequence was only obtained for *wsp*. This locus by itself is unreliable in assigning supergroup (Baldo and Werren 2007). On the concatenated tree, wNBre shows strong support to form a clade with lepidopteran strain ST351 (Fig. 1).

# Sequence Analyses: Shared *Wolbachia* Alleles Across Coleopteran and Lepidopteran Lineages

Query of the MLST database with Gen-Bank *Wolbachia* sequences from aquatic beetle



Fig. 1. Phylogeny of *Wolbachia* strains based on Bayesian phylogenetic analysis of MLST 5-gene alignment. **Top left panel (p. 542):** Reduced phylogeny indicating supergroups A, B, D, F and H. **Lower left panel (p. 542):** Supergroup A clade.



Fig 1. Continued. **Upper right panel (p. 543)**: Supergroup B clade. All groups have a posterior probability value of 1, unless otherwise noted. Six novel *Wolbachia* strains are outlined with colored boxes. *Wolbachia* strains are indicated by "ST" followed by a numerical value or "w" followed by 3–4 letters. Host taxa and strain sequence source are included in Supplementary Material 1. The scale bar within each panel indicates the distance in substitutions per site. **Lower right panel (p. 543)**: Symbol legend indicating host taxomomic order(s) or unreleased host identity (accessed 21 January 2019).

on		
nati		
forr		
e in		
llel		
or a		
ain		
str		
: the		
that		
ttes		
dica		
(i		
$\bigcup$		
lash		
Аġ		
era.		
opt		
ole		
D D		
a ar		
oter		
idoj		
Lep		
rs, ]		
orde		
od c		
ropo		
<b>vrth</b>		
vo A		
n tv		
ies i		
peci		
st sj		
t ho		
lec		
ss se		
cros		
es a		
llele		
ST a		
ML5		
via N		
ach		
Noll		
ed V		
har	le.	
6. S	ilab	
3LE	ava	
$T_{A1}$	not	
	is.	

						Alleles <sup>b</sup>		
Host classification	Taxonomic order	Strain/supergroup	Database identifier <sup>a</sup>	gatB	coxA	hcpA	ftsZ	fbpA
Nebria brevicollis	Coleoptera	ST502/A	$ID 1864^*$	84	270	196	54	64
Aphantopus hyperanthus	Lepidoptera	ST351/A	ID 477*	84	57	196	153	240
Ochthebius tivelumus	Coleoptera	wOTi/A	Ś	84	57	Short (Near 245)	153	240
Hydraena riberai	Coleoptera	wHRi/A	År.	Unique	Unique	Unique	Unique	Unique
Hydraena truncata	Coleoptera	$w\mathrm{HTr/A}$	ŵ	Unique (Near 84)	Unique (Near 62)	Unique) (Near 196)	Unique (Near 54)	Unique (Near 36)
Limnebius truncatellus	Coleoptera	wLTr	\$	(0)	62	65	54	64
Rove beetle Family Staphylinidae	Coleoptera	ST094/A	ID 77*	60	62	65	54	64
Agabus bipustulatus	Coleoptera	—/A	$\mathrm{KT199169^{\&}}$				54	
Lycaeides melissa	Lepidoptera	ST162/B	$ID 73^*$	108	73	40	80	6
Ochthebius minimus	Coleoptera	wOMi/B	Å	Unique (Near 9)	73	Short (Near 143)	7	Unique (Near 208)
Ochthebius lividipennis	Coleoptera	wOLi/B	Ś	Unique (Near 186)	73	Short (Near 143)	7	Unique (Near 208)
Ochthebius meridionalis	Coleoptera	wOMe/B	Ś	Unique (Near 186)	73	Short (Near 196)	7	64
Anthaxia anatolica	Coleoptera	—/B	$\mathrm{KT199201}^{\&}$		I		80	1
aAsterisks (*) indicate isolates (i	(D) in the Wolbachia MI ST d	latahase Amnercands (&) indicat	e nrevioucly remorted (Sontoweld ef	al 2015) micleotide	to a section of the s	are denosited in Gen	Bank (Sumhement	urv Material 1)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Numbers in *gatB, coxA, hepA, fbX,* and *fbpA* columns correspond to allele numbers derived from MLST analyses. Each allele number is a unique nucleotide sequence. Identical full-length alleles have matching colors. Purple: alleles matching *N irreicollis*. Green: alleles matching ST094 (rove beede, not identified to species) and unique from *N. brevicollis*. Orange: alleles matching A *hyperanthus* and unique from *N. brevicollis*.

Blue: alleles matching *L. melissa.* Pink and yellow<sup>\*</sup> each designate matching alleles. Unique (Near): no identical match in the database on 21 January 2019 with nearest matching allele number—typically 1–3 nucleotides but up to 6 nucleotides differing from the closest match. Short (Near): sequences shorter than the standard MLST with the nearest matching allele number, as determined by an MLST database query.

544

coleopteran species (Sontowski et al. 2015) identified shared *Wolbachia* alleles across coleopteran and lepidopteran hosts (Table 6). For example, within supergroup A, *Wolbachia* from *N. brevicollis* (Carabidae), the rove beetle (Staphylinidae), the minute moss beetle *wLTr* (Hydraenidae), and the diving beetle *Agabus bipustulatus* (Dytiscidae) all share the same *ftsZ* allele. Within supergroup B, shared *Wolbachia* alleles were identified between lepidopteran *Lycaeides melissa* (Lycaenidae) and a variety of different aquatic beetle alleles within our data set (Table 6).

#### DISCUSSION

In general, we find that species previously unscreened for Wolbachia have unique strains, indicating that more surveys of nonmodel taxa are warranted to better characterize arthropod-Wolbachia symbiosis. Furthermore, our results have 3 main implications for our understanding and further study of the evolutionary and natural history of this symbiosis in the Pacific Northwest and Rocky Mountains. Our study implies (1) that frequent horizontal transfer of coleopteran *Wolbachia* alleles happens within and between taxonomic orders, (2) that Wolbachia may be acquired during habitat invasion as hosts encounter new opportunities for horizontal transmission, and (3) that increased sample size and more sensitive screening methodology would yield higher Wolbachia infection rates in the western USA.

# Wolbachia Alleles Shared Within and Between Taxonomic Orders

Our study identifies intraorder Wolbachia allele sharing for coleopteran hosts, as well as interorder allele sharing between Lepidoptera and Coleoptera. This extends previous work on lepidopteran hosts which observed intraorder and interorder Wolbachia allele sharing, including with dipteran or hymenopteran hosts (Ahmed et al. 2016). Our broad survey and inclusion of strains in phylogenetic analyses from taxonomically diverse arthropod hosts suggest more complicated host-symbiont infection dynamics than previously described within Coleoptera host taxa and between Coleoptera and Lepidoptera host taxa. The N. brevicollis (Coleoptera: Carabidae) strain is particularly interesting because it shares alleles at 2 loci with a strain from a lepidopteran host (ST351,

Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae) and with alleles at 2 other loci with 1 strain (ST94) found in both a rove beetle (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae) and the aquatic beetle *Limnebius truncatellus* (Coleoptera: Hydraenidae). Thus, strain ST94 exhibits intraorder allele sharing of all 5 MLST alleles across 2 families, and 2 of these alleles (ftsZ 54 and fbpA 64) are shared with Carabidae. This combination of shared alleles may result from mutation and evolutionary convergence, though convergence at multiple loci is improbable. Alternatively, because N. brevi*collis* is a predator, its *Wolbachia* strain could have been initially acquired through consumption of Wolbachia-infected prey (Le Clec'h et al. 2013) and subsequent recombination between co-infecting strains (Correa and Ballard 2016, Ilinsky and Kosterin 2017).

Interorder and intraorder horizontal transmission of Wolbachia may occur among divergent hosts, with subsequent vertical transmission and horizontal transmission within host clades (Ahmed et al. 2016, Ilinsky and Kosterin 2017). How often horizontal transmission occurs between divergent taxa is an open question, though the mapping of hosts on the evolutionary relationships among strains (Fig. 1) suggests it may happen frequently. For example, the strain in *N. brevicollis* may reflect a long-standing symbiosis, as is typical for Wolbachia infections. A study of over 1000 host species estimated that a given species cvcles through Wolbachia-infected and uninfected phases approximately every 7 million and 9 million years (Bailly-Bechet et al. 2017). In contrast, infection dynamics can change rapidly. Wolbachia swept through wild populations of Drosophila simulans across 700 km in just over 10 years (Weeks et al. 2007). These results call for greater surveys of Wol*bachia* in arthropods. By combining strain data for diverse host taxa, we see that there are not simply order-specific Wolbachia strains. To understand the transmission and evolution of Wolbachia, we must consider multiple hosts. Future studies investigating transmission dynamics should include deeper withintaxon sampling (e.g., multiple species within a host order, tribe, family, etc.) alongside taxonomically broad host sampling. Our broad survey and phylogenetic analyses of evolutionarily diverse host taxa allow us to identify potential instances of horizontal gene transfer worthy of further investigation.

# Implications of *Wolbachia* in Invasive and Nonnative Hosts

A large number of the infected host species detected among the 281 host specimens screened are nonnative and invasive, suggesting a causative relationship between Wolbachia infections and establishment of nonnative species in the western USA. Our sample sizes are low for many arthropods  $(n \leq 4)$ , and thus we cannot confidently classify any host species as uninfected (Hilgenboecker et al. 2008). We focus instead on Wolbachiainfected hosts that are nonnative or invasive. These hosts are taxonomically diverse and originate from some shared but often different regions. The European gazelle beetle, N. *brevicollis* (Coleoptera: Carabidae), and the tuxedo bug, R. alboacuminatus (Hemiptera: Rhyparochromidae), are recent invaders to the western USA, respectively originating from Europe or Palearctic regions (Henry 2004, Kavanaugh and Labonte 2008). The cereal leaf beetle, O. melanopus (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae), is native to Europe and Asia (Morrill 1995). The hyaline grass bug, *Liorhyssus hyal*inus (Hemiptera: Rhopalidae), is of unknown origin and hypothesized to have been introduced from Palearctic regions (Hradil et al. 2007, Wheeler 2016). Finally, the philodromid crab spider P. dispar (Araneae: Philodromidae) is not invasive, but is native to Europe (Dondale and Redner 1969) (Table 4).

Wolbachia's effects are both host specific and dynamic (Weeks et al. 2007); thus, the relationship between *Wolbachia* infection and host habitat invasion may be specific to the biology and ecology of each host. Wolbachia can result in both direct and indirect host benefits, including host resistance to RNA viral infections (Hedges et al. 2008, Teixeira et al. 2008, Brownlie and Johnson 2009, Frentiu et al. 2014), and an established Wolbachia host infection may confer host benefits that facilitate habitat invasion. Alternatively, because Wolbachia can have parasitic effects (Correa and Ballard 2016), habitat invasion might instead result from the loss of symbiotic Wolbachia. For example, when *Wolbachia* was absent in a major pest of maize (the western corn rootworm, Diabrotica virgifera virgifera [Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae]), plant defense-related genes were indirectly upregulated (Barr et al. 2010). One way to test the contribution of Wolbachia in hosts would be to compare the fitness of infected versus uninfected subsets of a host species.

Habitat invasion by an uninfected host could result in Wolbachia acquisition. This may occur as hosts invade a new ecosystem, encounter new prey or parasitoids, and establish Wolbachia symbiosis through mechanisms of horizontal transmission (Rowlev et al. 2004). As an example, the invasive N. brevicollis may have acquired Wolbachia after it invaded the Pacific Northwest, or this symbiosis may have been previously established. Wolbachia surveys within targeted collections of N. brevicollis in Europe, its native prey, and prey across its path of invasion would address whether this strain of Wolbachia was recently acquired. To test the causative relationship between invasion and Wolbachia infection, this approach should be extended to the other invasive and nonnative Wolbachia hosts reported in this study.

# Wolbachia Survey Methodology and Implications

Our 13.15% infection rate of individuals in the broad survey is at the low end of previous broad surveys reporting infection rates from 16.9% to 76% (Werren et al. 1995, Jeyaprakash and Hoy 2000). This result has several implications regarding methodology and how prevalence is reported. First, limitations to our collection methodology resulted in small sample sizes for many host taxa (e.g., n = 1-5). We also have lower confidence in the results of the infection status for species with smaller sample size, especially those that were uninfected with <10 individuals (e.g., *Boisea rubrolineata*).

Our infection rate is similar to studies using comparable methods and calculating infection based on individuals rather than on species (Werren et al. 1995, Werren and Windsor 2000, Duron et al. 2008). The wide range of infection rates in previous studies is attributed primarily to screening methodology (Werren et al. 1995, Jeyaprakash and Hoy 2000). Our PCR method utilized well-established loci (W16S and COI) to estimate infection rates among arthropods screened in the broad survey (Folmer et al. 1994, Werren et al. 1995). The W16S amplification we used clearly identifies Wolbachia, with few false positives, but is also likely to include false negatives when used in broad surveys.

Overall, we expect that increased sample sizes and more sensitive screening methodology would yield higher Wolbachia infection rates, reported either as individuals or species infected. For example, one broad survey found that 17.8% of individuals and 22.8% of species were infected. However, statistical models correcting for very small and large sample sizes of individuals tested per species estimated that 40% of these species were infected (Duron et al. 2008, Zug and Hammerstein 2012). These analyses are based on a prevalence model in which either a high or a low proportion of individuals are infected within a species (Hilgenboecker et al. 2008). Thus, our small sample sizes bias our estimate of the number of infected individuals downward. In our broad study, only a subset of our specimens were identified to species (n = 33) and Wolbachia-infected specimens were prioritized. Because of this, while our methodology to identify novel Wolbachia hosts and strains was effective, our species infection rate is not comparable to previous studies. However, Wolbachia infection rates of individuals from our study can be taken as a conservative estimate of the potential hidden diversity of Wolbachia hosts and strains. The identification of novel Wolbachia hosts and strains provides foundational data for Wolbachia infections in western North American arthropods. Because Wolbachia can have substantial consequences for host population biology as well as conservation and biocontrol, understanding the extent and prevalence of Wol*bachia* has broad significance. Furthermore, the genetic characterization of novel Wolbachia strains offers insight into *Wolbachia* diversity, with implications for future studies investigating their acquisition, transmission, and evolution. Such studies will shed light on processes underlying host-symbiont evolution, a fundamental part of the biology of arthropod species worldwide.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Two online-only supplementary files accompany this article (https://scholarsarchive.byu .edu/wnan/vol79/iss4/7). SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 2. Nucleotide substitution models. Phylogenetic analyses were partitioned by codon position, applying the best-fit nucleotide substitution models from MrModeltest v2 (Nylander et al. 2004). We parameterized with 2 partitions for each gene—one including positions 1 + 2 and the other including only third positions.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by Pacific University College of Arts and Sciences, the Pacific Research Institute for Science and Mathematics, a Start-Up Research Package for New Position in Biology #2013167 from the M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust, and Metropolitan State University of Denver Mini-grants. We thank B. Hancock, M. Weissmann, S. Saindon, M. Hendricks, A. Partridge, R. Ferrell, R. Albertson, J. Rasgon, A. Schwindt, and H. Liu for technical assistance. The development and maintenance of the Wolbachia MLST site has been funded by the Wellcome Trust. Development and curation of this site has been supported by funds from the U.S. National Science Foundation to Jack Werren as part of community outreach activities.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- AHMED, M.Z., J.W. BREINHOLT, AND A.Y. KAWAHARA. 2016. Evidence for common horizontal transmission of *Wollbachia* among butterflies and moths. BMC Evolutionary Biology 16(118):1–16.
- ALI, H., A. MUHAMMAD, AND Y. HOU. 2018a. Infection density dynamics and phylogeny of Wolbachia associated with coconut hispine beetle, *Brontispa longissima* (Gestro) (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae), by multilocus sequence type (MLST) genotyping. Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology 28:796–808.
- ALI, H., A. MUHAMMAD, S.U. ISLAM, W. ISLAM, AND Y. HOU. 2018b. A novel bacterial symbiont association in the hispid beetle, *Octodonta nipae* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae), their dynamics and phylogeny. Microbial Pathogenesis 118:378–386.
- BAILLY-BECHET, M., P. MARTINS-SIMÕES, G.J. SZÖLLOSI, G. MIALDEA, M.F. SAGOT, AND S. CHARLAT. 2017. How long does *Wolbachia* remain on board? Molecular Biology and Evolution 34:1183–1193.
- BALDO, L., N.A. AYOUB, C.Y. HAYASHI, J.A. RUSSELL, J.K. STAHLHUT, AND J.H. WERREN. 2008. Insight into the routes of Wolbachia invasion: high levels of horizontal transfer in the spider genus Agelenopsis revealed by Wolbachia strain and mitochondrial DNA diversity. Molecular Ecology 17:557–569.
- BALDO, L., J.C. DUNNING HOTOPP, K.A. JOLLEY, S.R. BOR-DENSTEIN, S.A. BIBER, R.R. CHOUDHURY, C. HAYASHI, M.C.J. MAIDEN, H. TETTELIN, AND J.H. WERREN. 2006. Multilocus sequence typing system for the endosymbiont *Wolbachia pipientis*. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 72:7098–7110.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1. Accession numbers and allele numbers for all sequences employed for *Wolbachia* MLST phylogeny. MLST database: https://pubmlst.org/ wolbachia

- BALDO, L., N. LO, AND J.H. WERREN. 2005. Mosaic nature of the Wolbachia surface protein. Journal of Bacteriology 187:5406–5418.
- BALDO, L., AND J.H. WERREN. 2007. Revisiting Wolbachia supergroup typing based on WSP: spurious lineages and discordance with MLST. Current Microbiology 55:81–87.
- BARR, K.L., L.B. HEARNE, S. BRIESACHER, T.L. CLARK, AND G.E. DAVIS. 2010. Microbial symbionts in insects influence down-regulation of defense genes in maize. PLOS ONE 5(6):e11339.
- BING, X.L., W.Q. XIA, J.D. GUI, G.H. YAN, X.W. WANG, AND S.S. LIU. 2014. Diversity and evolution of the Wolbachia endosymbionts of *Bemisia* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) whiteflies. Ecology and Evolution 4: 2714–2737.
- BRIDGEMAN, B., M. MORGAN-RICHARDS, D. WHEELER, AND S.A. TREWICK. 2018. First detection of Wolbachia in the New Zealand biota. PLOS ONE 13(4): e0195517.
- BROWNLIE, J.C., AND K.N. JOHNSON. 2009. Symbiontmediated protection in insect hosts. Trends in Microbiology 17:348–354.
- CHEN, R., Z. WANG, J. CHEN, L.Y. JIANG, AND G.X. QIAO. 2017. Insect-bacteria parallel evolution in multipleco-obligate-aphid association: a case in Lachninae (Hemiptera: Aphididae). Scientific Reports 7(10204): 1–9.
- CORREA, C.C., AND J.W.O. BALLARD. 2016. Wolbachia associations with insects: winning or losing against a master manipulator. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution 3(153):1–18.
- DONDALE, C.D., AND J.H. REDNER. 1969. The *infuscatus* and *dispar* groups of the spider genus *Philodromus* in North and Central America and the West Indies (Araneida: Thomisidae). Canadian Entomologist 101: 921–954.
- DOUGLAS, A.E. 2014. The molecular basis of bacterialinsect symbiosis. Journal of Molecular Biology 426: 3830–3837.
- DURON, O., D. BOUCHON, S. BOUTIN, L. BELLAMY, L. ZHOU, J. ENGELSTADTER, AND G.D. HURST. 2008. The diversity of reproductive parasites among arthropods: *Wolbachia* do not walk alone. BMC Biology 6(27): 1–12.
- DURON, O., J. LAGNEL, M. RAYMOND, K. BOURTZIS, P. FORT, AND M. WEILL. 2005. Transposable element polymorphism of *Wolbachia* in the mosquito *Culex pipiens:* evidence of genetic diversity, superinfection and recombination. Molecular Ecology 14: 1561–1573.
- DUTRA, H.L.C., M.N. ROCHA, F.B.S. DIAS, S.B. MANSUR, E.P. CARAGATA, AND L.A. MOREIRA. 2016. Wolbachia blocks currently circulating Zika virus isolates in Brazilian Aedes aegypti mosquitoes. Cell Host & Microbe 19:771–774.
- FOLMER, O., M. BLACK, W. HOEH, R. LUTZ, AND R. VRI-JENHOEK. 1994. DNA primers for amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates. Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology 3:294–299.
- FRENTIU, F.D., T. ZAKIR, T. WALKER, J. POPOVICI, A.T. PYKE, A. VAN DEN HURK, E.A. MCGRAW, AND S.L. O'NEILL. 2014. Limited Dengue virus replication in field-collected Aedes aegypti mosquitoes infected with Wolbachia. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases 8(2):e2688.

- GERTH, M., M.T. GANSAUGE, A. WEIGERT, AND C. BLEI-DORN. 2014. Phylogenomic analyses uncover origin and spread of the *Wolbachia* pandemic. Nature Communications 5(5117):1–7.
- GERTH, M., J. RÖTHE, AND C. BLEIDORN. 2013. Tracing horizontal Wolbachia movements among bees (Anthophila): a combined approach using multilocus sequence typing data and host phylogeny. Molecular Ecology 22:6149–6162.
- GOODACRE, S.L., O.Y. MARTIN, C.EG. THOMAS, AND G.M. HEWITT. 2006. Wolbachia and other endosymbiont infections in spiders. Molecular Ecology 15:517–527.
- GOULSON, D. 2003. Effects of introduced bees on native ecosystems. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 34:1–26.
- GUIDOLIN, A.S., AND FL. CÔNSOLI. 2013. Molecular characterization of Wolbachia strains associated with the invasive Asian citrus psyllid Diaphorina citri in Brazil. Microbial Ecology 65:475–486.
- HARIRI, A.R., J.H. WERREN, AND G.S. WILKINSON. 1998. Distribution and reproductive effects of Wolbachia in stalk-eyed flies (Diptera: Diopsidae). Heredity 81: 254–260.
- HEBERT, P.D.N., A. CYWINSKA, S.L. BALL, AND J.R. DEWAARD. 2003. Biological identifications through DNA barcodes. Proceedings of the Royal Society 270: 313–321.
- HEDGES, L.M., J.C. BROWNLIE, S.L. O'NEILL, AND K.N. JOHNSON. 2008. Wolbachia and virus protection in insects. Science 322:702.
- HENRY, T.J. 2004. Raglius alboacuminatus (Goeze) and Rhyparochromus vulgaris (Schilling) (Lygaeoidea: Rhyparochromidae): 2 palearctic bugs newly discovered in North America. Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington 106:513–522.
- HILGENBOECKER, K., P. HAMMERSTEIN, P. SCHLATTMANN, A. TELSCHOW, AND J.H. WERREN. 2008. How many species are infected with *Wolbachia*? A statistical analysis of current data. FEMS Microbiology Letters 281:215–220.
- HOFFMANN, A.A., M. HERCUS, AND H. DAGHER. 1998. Population dynamics of the Wolbachia infection causing cytoplasmic incompatibility in Drosophila melanogaster. Genetics 148:221–231.
- HOFFMANN, A.A., P.A. Ross, AND G. RAŠIĆ. 2015. Wolbachia strains for disease control: ecological and evolutionary considerations. Evolutionary Applications 8:751–768.
- HOLWAY, D.A., A.V. SUAREZ, AND T.J. CASE. 1998. Loss of intraspecific aggression in the success of a widespread invasive social insect. Science 282:949–952.
- HRADIL, K., P. KMENT, AND M. ROHÁ COVÁ. 2007. New records of *Liorhyssus hyalinus* (Heteroptera: Rhopalidae) in the Czech Republic, with a review of its worldwide distribution and biology. Acta Musei Moraviae, Scientiae biologicae (Brno) 92: 53–107.
- HURST, G.D.D. 2017. Extended genomes: symbiosis and evolution. Interface Focus 7:20170001.
- ILINSKY, Y., AND O.E. KOSTERIN. 2017. Molecular diversity of Wolbachia in Lepidoptera: prevalent allelic content and high recombination of MLST genes. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 109:164–179.
- JEYAPRAKASH, A., AND M.A. HOY. 2000. Long PCR improves Wolbachia DNA amplification: wsp sequences found in 76% of sixty-three arthropod species. Insect Molecular Biology 9:393–405.

- JOLLEY, K.A., AND M.C.J. MAIDEN. 2010. BIGSdb : Scalable analysis of bacterial genome variation at the population level. BMC Bioinformatics 11(595):1–11.
- KAVANAUGH, D.H., AND J.R. LABONTE. 2008. Discovery of Nebria brevicollis (Fabricius) (Coleoptera: Carabidae: Nebriini), a European ground beetle, established in the Willamette Valley, Oregon. Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences, Series 4 59:481–488.
- KEARSE, M., R. MOIR, A. WILSON, S. STONES-HAVAS, M. CHEUNC, S. STURROCK, S. BUXTON, A. COOPER, S. MARKOWITZ, C. DURAN, ET AL. 2012. Geneious Basic: an integrated and extendable desktop software platform for the organization and analysis of sequence data. Bioinformatics 28:1647–1649.
- KITTAYAPONG, P., K.J. BAISLEY, V. BAIMAI, AND S.L. O'NEILL. 2000. Distribution and diversity of Wolbachia infections in Southeast Asian mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae). Journal of Medical Entomology 37:340–345.
- LARKIN, M.A., G. BLACKSHIELDS, N.P. BROWN, R. CHENNA, P.A. MCGETTIGAN, H. MCWILLIAM, F. VALENTIN, I.M. WALLACE, A. WILM, R. LOPEZ, ET AL. 2007. Clustal W and Clustal X version 2.0. Bioinformatics 23: 2947–2948.
- LE CLEC'H, W., F.D. CHEVALIER, L. GENTY, J. BERTAUX, D. BOUCHON, AND M. SICARD. 2013. Cannibalism and predation as paths for horizontal passage of *Wolbachia* between terrestrial isopods. PLOS ONE 8(4): e60232.
- LU, M., J. HULCR, AND J. SUN. 2016. The role of symbiotic microbes in insect invasions. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 47:487–505.
- MA, Y., W.J. CHEN, Z.H. LI, F. ZHANG, Y. GAO, AND Y.X. LUAN. 2017. Revisiting the phylogeny of *Wolbachia* in Collembola. Ecology and Evolution 7:2009–2017.
- MONTAGNA, M., B. CHOUAIA, L. SACCHI, D. PORRETTA, E. MARTIN, A. GIORGI, G.C. LOZZIA, AND S. EPIS. 2014. A new strain of *Wolbachia* in an alpine population of the viviparous *Oreina cacaliae* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). Environmental Entomology 43:913–922.
- MORRILL, W.L. 1995. Insect pests of small grains. APS Press, St. Paul, MN. 140 pp.
- NICE, C.C., Z. GOMPERT, M.L. FORISTER, AND J.A. FORDYCE. 2009. An unseen foe in arthropod conservation efforts: the case of *Wolbachia* infections in the Karner blue butterfly. Biological Conservation 142: 3137–3146.
- NYLANDER, J.A.A., F. RONQUIST, J.P. HUELSENBECK, AND J. NIEVES-ALDREY. 2004. Bayesian phylogenetic analysis of combined data. Systematic Biology 53:47–67.
- RAMBAUT, A., A.J. DRUMMOND, D. XIE, G. BAELE, AND M.A. SUCHARD. 2018. Posterior summarization in Bayesian phylogenetics using Tracer 1.7. Systematic Biology 67:901–904.
- RASCON, J.L., AND T.W. SCOTT. 2004. An initial survey for Wolbachia (Rickettsiales: Rickettsiaceae) infections in selected California mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae). Journal of Medical Entomology 41:255–257.
- RICCI, I., G. CANCRINI, S. GABRIELLI, S. D'AMELIO, AND G. FAVIA. 2002. Searching for Wolbachia (Rickettsiales: Rickettsiaceae) in mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae): large polymerase chain reaction survey and new identifications. Journal of Medical Entomology 39:562–567.
- RONQUIST, F., AND J.P. HUELSENBECK. 2003. MrBayes 3: Bayesian phylogenetic inference under mixed models. Bioinformatics 19:1572–1574.

- RONQUIST, F., M. TESLENKO, P. VAN DER MARK, D.L. AYRES, A. DARLING, S. HÖHNA, B. LARGET, L. LIU, M.A. SUCHARD, AND J.P. HUELSENBECK. 2012. MrBayes 3.2: efficient Bayesian phylogenetic inference and model choice across a large model space. Systematic Biology 61:539–542.
- ROWLEY, S.M., R.J. RAVEN, AND E.A. MCGRAW. 2004. Wolbachia pipientis in Australian spiders. Current Microbiology 49:208–214.
- RUSSELL, J.A., B. GOLDMAN-HUERTAS, C.S. MOREAU, L. BALDO, J.K. STAHLHUT, J.H. WERREN, AND N.E. PIERCE. 2009. Specialization and geographic isolation among *Wolbachia* symbionts from ants and lycaenid butterflies. Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution 63:624–640.
- SHROPSHIRE, J.D., AND S.R. BORDENSTEIN. 2016. Speciation by symbiosis: the microbiome and behavior. mBio 7(2):e0785-15. 11 pp.
- SNYDER, W.E., AND E.W. EVANS. 2006. Ecological effects of invasive arthropod generalist predators. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 37: 95–122.
- SONTOWSKI, R., D. BERNHARD, C. BLEIDORN, M. SCHLEGEL, AND M. GERTH. 2015. Wolbachia distribution in selected beetle taxa characterized by PCR screens and MLST data. Ecology and Evolution 5:4345–4353.
- STAHLHUT, J.K., C.A. DESJARDINS, M.E. CLARK, L. BALDO, J.A. RUSSELL, J.H. WERREN, AND J. JAENIKE. 2010. The mushroom habitat as an ecological arena for global exchange of *Wolbachia*. Molecular Ecology 19:1940–1952.
- SWOFFORD, D.L. 2002. PAUP\*: Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (and other methods). Nature Biotechnology 18:233–234.
- TEIXEIRA, L., Á. FERREIRA, AND M. ASHBURNER. 2008. The bacterial symbiont Wolbachia induces resistance to RNA viral infections in Drosophila melanogaster. PLOS Biology 6(12):e1000002.
- VERSPOOR, R.L., AND P.R. HADDRILL. 2011. Genetic diversity, population structure and Wolbachia infection status in a worldwide sample of Drosophila melanogaster and D. simulans populations. PLOS ONE 6(10):e26318.
- WATANABE, M., Y. TAGAMI, K. MIURA, D. KAGEYAMA, AND R. STOUTHAMER. 2012. Distribution patterns of Wolbachia endosymbionts in the closely related flower bugs of the genus Orius: implications for coevolution and horizontal transfer. Microbial Ecology 64: 537–545.
- WEEKS, A.R., M. TURELLI, W.R. HARCOMBE, K.T. REYN-OLDS, AND A.A. HOFFMANN. 2007. From parasite to mutualist: rapid evolution of *Wolbachia* in natural populations of *Drosophila*. PLOS Biology 5(5):e114.
- WENSELEERS, T., F. ITO, S. VAN BORM, R. HUVBRECHTS, F. VOLCKAERT, AND J. BILLEN. 1998. Widespread occurrence of the microorganism *Wolbachia* in ants. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 265:1447–1452.
- WERREN, J.H., AND D.M. WINDSOR. 2000. Wolbachia infection frequencies in insects: evidence of a global equilibrium? Proceedings of the Royal Society B 267:1277–1285.
- WERREN, J.H., D.M. WINDSOR, AND L.R. GUO. 1995. Distribution of Wolbachia among neotropical arthropods. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 262: 197–204.
- WHEELER, A.G., JR. 2016. *Liorhyssus hyalinus* (E) (Hemiptera: Rhopalidae) in the western United States:

new host records, host-plant range, and comments on use of the term "host plant." Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington 118:115–128.

- WILSON, A.C.C., AND R.P. DUNCAN. 2015. Signatures of host/symbiont genome coevolution in insect nutritional endosymbioses. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 112:10255–10261.
- YUN, Y., C. LEI, Y. PENG, F. LIU, J. CHEN, AND L. CHEN. 2011. Wolbachia strains typing in different geographic population spider, *Hylyphantes graminicola* (Linyphiidae). Current Microbiology 62:139–145.
- ZHANG, Y.K., Y.T. CHEN, K. YANG, AND X.Y. HONG. 2016. A review of prevalence and phylogeny of the bacterial symbiont *Cardinium* in mites (subclass: Acari). Systematic and Applied Acarology 21:978–990.
- ZHOU, W., F. ROUSSET, AND S. O'NEILL. 1998. Phylogeny and PCR-based classification of *Wolbachia* strains

using *wsp* gene sequences. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 265:509–515.

- ZHOU, X.F., AND Z.X. LI. 2016. Establishment of the cytoplasmic incompatibility-inducing Wolbachia strain wMel in an important agricultural pest insect. Scientific Reports 6(39200):1–9.
- ZUG, R., AND P. HAMMERSTEIN. 2012. Still a host of hosts for Wolbachia: analysis of recent data suggests that 40% of terrestrial arthropod species are infected. PLOS ONE 7(6):e38544.

Received 8 February 2019 Revised 2 June 2019 Accepted 18 June 2019 Published online 13 December 2019