DEVELOPING A METHOD TO DETECT *XYLELLA FASTIDIOSA* IN THE GLASSY-WINGED SHARPSHOOTER

Project Leaders:

Blake Bextine
Dept. of Entomology
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

Matthew J. Blua
Dept. of Entomology
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

Richard Redak
Dept. of Entomology
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

Reporting Period: The results reported here are from work conducted from September 2003 to September 2004.

ABSTRACT

A rapid and reproducible technique to detect *Xylella fastidiosa* (*Xf*) in the glassy-winged sharpshooter (GWSS) is important for epidemiological studies, and monitoring programs in support of Pierce's disease management. Such a technique must be amenable to large samples sizes, while remaining sensitive enough to detect pathogen DNA in low amounts. In this study we have improved the speed of tissue extraction by developing a simple vacuum step that replaces labor and time-intensive tissue maceration, and is compatible with manufactured DNA extraction kits and a SYBR Green® based real-time (QRT) PCR system. No statistical differences in the ability to detect *Xf* were found among samples that were extracted using traditional maceration vs. our vacuum extraction method. Further experiments using our vacuum extraction methods detected no significant differences among samples immediately extracted, or stored for 10 d at -4ºC, dry or in mineral oil. In another experiment we placed *Xf*-fed GWSS on yellow sticky cards in a sunny location for 0 to 6 d. We found that there was no significant reduction in our detection capabilities for insects left on the cards.

INTRODUCTION

Grapevines infected with *Xylella fastidiosa* (*Xf*), the bacterium that induces Pierce's disease of grapevine [12], usually die within three to five years after infection due to the occlusion of xylem vessels [17]. The glassy-winged sharpshooter (GWSS) has recently become an important vector of *Xf* in California, spreading *Xf* to grapevines that traditionally had little or no Pierce's disease [2, 17]. This vector can disperse widely [5], and has a large host range [18] resulting in alarming spread of *Xf* to new areas [11]. The presence of GWSS in new regions of California, greater incidences of *Xf*-induced diseases in several crops, including grapevine [15], almond [1], oleander [10], and the threat of citrus variegated chlorosis (not currently found in the US) has lead to great concern over the ecology of this pest/pathogen interaction.

Over the past several years control programs have focused on reducing pathogen spread by managing vector populations [18]. Improvements of these strategies can be achieved through studies examining patterns of disease epidemiology [15, 20], and GWSS population densities and dispersion [5, 11, 21]. Most epidemiological studies of this system have involved *Xf*'s interaction with host plants [3, 6, 15, 20] or the population and behavioral ecology of the pest insect [5, 11]. Investigations of the interactions between *Xf* and insect vectors have largely been limited to laboratory and greenhouse studies [2, 4, 10].

Molecular protocols, such as PCR, to detect *Xf* in plants have been developed and are currently being used in epidemiological studies in other disease systems [8, 9, 14, 16, 19, 20]. Unfortunately, methods adapted to detect *Xf* in insects are inefficient. Detection methods designed for epidemiological studies, from collection of insect specimen to analysis of samples for the presence of *Xf*, need to be rapid, reproducible, inexpensive, and amenable to large sample sizes. We recently developed a DNA extraction protocol using the DNeasy tissue extraction kit (Qiagen Inc.) in conjunction with a SYBR Green® based real-time (QRT) PCR system to detect *Xf* in infectious GWSS [4]. Using this protocol, we reliably detected 50-500 *Xf* cells with GWSS background. This method used labor-intensive maceration of tissue to extract *Xf* from insect tissue where the bacterium resides in infectious insects [7]. The speed and efficiency of this method could be improved by simplifying this extraction step.

OBJECTIVES

Our overall goal is to develop a method of detecting *Xf* in infectious GWSS that would allow us to conduct epidemiological studies and optimize plant protection. To this end, the objectives for this study are to develop an efficient method to remove *Xf* cells from the foregut and mouthparts of GWSS for PCR based detection.

RESULTS

In this study we tested a vacuum extraction protocol for removal of *Xf* cells from GWSS foreguts for detection by QRT PCR. GWSS adults, collected from orange trees at the University of California, Riverside, were placed in rearing cages and allowed to feed for a 6 d acquisition access period on cuttings of *Xf*-infected grapevines that showed Pierce's disease symptoms. GWSS heads were removed, and because they float, an insect pin was placed through the back of the insect head and forced through the frons, so that the tip of the pin protruded slightly. The pinned head was then placed in a microcentrifuge tube (one per tube) and 500µl phosphate buffered saline (PBS) was added to the tube so that the head was completely submerged. Tubes were loaded into a tube rack and placed in a glass vacuum desiccator. With the desiccator lid in place, vacuum was applied to 20 bars slowly, to keep buffer from being displaced from its tube, and held for 15 s. Then,

the slow release valve was opened and pressure was slowly returned to ambient. The vacuum application and release was repeated 3 times. In this way, the insect's forgut and mouthparts were flushed out with PBS. The pinned heads were removed and DNA was extracted from the fluid using the DNeasy Tissue kit (Qiagen Inc.). QRT PCR was conducted as described earlier.

To compare our vacuum extraction method to a more conventional maceration technique, heads from GWSS infected with *Xf*, as above, were either macerated in PBS buffer with a pellet pestle in a disposable 1.5mL microcentrifuge tube (Kontes Glass Company, Vineland, NJ) or vacuum extracted in PBS buffer. In further experiments insects were collected and immediately extracted (n=24) as previously described or stored at -4ºC for 10 d either submerged in mineral oil (n=24) or not (n=24). Finally, infectious GWSS were placed by hand on yellow sticky cards (Trécé Inc., Adair, OK). Yellow sticky cards were placed outside in a sunny location. GWSS were removed from the traps for DNA extraction at 0, 3, and 6 d after placement. DNA was extracted individually from GWSS heads using the vacuum technique and QRT-PCR was used for detection of *Xf*.

DNA Extraction

The vacuum extraction technique developed in this study improved the speed and efficiency of extraction. Extraction of DNA using traditional maceration with the Qiagen DNeasy tissue kit averaged 90 minutes for 24 samples. About 30-40 minutes of the extraction was preparing for and executing the maceration step of the procedure. Using the vacuum extraction technique we prepared 24 samples in an average of 15 min. The vacuum extraction technique neither improved nor compromised our ability to detect *Xf* in GWSS heads. No statistical differences were revealed between maceration-extracted and vacuum-extracted samples in any trial for either the number of positive samples or the relative amounts of *Xf* DNA measured (Table 1). However, in 5 of 6 trials mean positives and mean relative fluorescence levels were greater for macerated samples than vacuum-extracted samples (Table 1).

Table 1. Proportion of GWSS positive for *Xf,* and mean relative fluorescence using vacuum (VE) and maceration (MP) sample collection prior to DNA extraction (n=24).

Trial	Mean Positive[a]		Mean relative fluorescence[b]	
	VE	MP	VE	MP
1	0.458a	0.542a	1.137a	6.299a
2	0.464a	0.789a	1.728a	5.879a
3	1.000a	0.917a	0.112a	0.125a
4	0.917a	0.958a	0.001a	0.003a
5	0.750a	0.917a	0.009a	<0.001a
6	0.917a	0.792a	<0.001a	<0.001a

[a]Means in the same row followed by the same letter were not statistically different (χ^2>6.6, df=1 , $p > 0.359$).
[b]Relative fluorescence correlates to cell number. Means in the same row followed by the same letter were not statistically different (χ^2<3, df=1, p<0.01).

Comparison of Sample Storage Methods

On either collection date, there were no significant differences in mean number of GWSS testing positive for the presence of *Xf* that could be attributed to the method of storage following GWSS collection (trial 1 χ^2=1.626, df=2, p=0.443; trial 2 χ^2=2.4, df=2, p=0.3;) (Table 2).

Table 2. Comparison of *Xf* detection in GWSS following storage by three methods (n=24)

	Storage method (n=24)[a]		
Trial	Directly off Plant	-4ºC (10 d)	-4ºC in mineral oil (10 d)
1	0.875a	0.792a	0.917a
2	0.833a	0.750a	0.917a

[a]Means in the same row followed by the same letter were not statistically different (trial 1 χ^2=1.626 , df=2, p=0.443; trial 2 χ^2=2.4, df=2, p=0.3).

Detection Capabilities Following Insect Trapping

Exposure to the elements after capture on sticky cards had little effect on the ability to detect *Xf* in GWSS samples (Table. 3). Chi-square test for goodness of fit revealed no statistical differences among means from trial 1 (data taken 0, 3, and 6 days following capture, χ^2=3.069, df=2, p=0.216), or trial 2 (data taken 0, 3, and 6 days following capture, χ^2= 2.845, df=2, p= 0.241).

Table 3. Proportion of GWSS positive for *Xf* after outdoor exposure on a yellow sticky card.

Trial	Mean proportion of GWSS positive for *Xf* [a]		
	Day 0	Day 3	Day 6
1(n=49)	0.388a	0.429a	0.265a
2(n=30)	0.533a	0.333a	0.367a

[a]Means in the same row followed by the same letter were not statistically different (trial 1 χ^2=3.069, df=2, p=0.216, trial 2 χ^2= 2.845, df=2, p= 0.241)

CONCLUSIONS

Our study was conducted to find a means of accelerating a series of steps required to conduct epidemiological studies involving GWSS spread of *Xf,* while maintaining a high degree of detection sensitivity. Epidemiological studies require the examination of a large numbers of samples; therefore, an efficient testing protocol is necessary. Through our investigation, we improved the efficiency of *Xf* detection by streamlining DNA extraction and implementing a QRT PCR-based detection system. The vacuum method was simple, requiring only that heads be removed, pinned into position, and covered with extraction buffer. While time efficiency is the most obvious advantage to using the vacuum extraction method, other advantages also exist which did not impact the studies reported here but may affect detection in field samples. First, no insect tissue is homogenized; it is likely that fewer PCR inhibitors are released to interfere with the PCR reaction and less non-template DNA would be extracted. These factors often hinder detection of pathogen DNA in low concentrations. Second, by flushing the content of the insect's foregut the search for the presence of *Xf* is being concentrated in the area of the insect that will most likely contain the organism of interest. QRT-PCR is a sensitive detection technique that allows low concentrations of bacteria to be detected in environmental samples [13]. Our QRT-PCR detection system improved detect an order of magnitude, from 500 *Xf* cells (with traditional PCR[4]) to 50 *Xf* cells per insect sample. The implementation of such a system is well suited for the detection of pathogen DNA in an insect vector.

A disadvantage of using a molecular technique like PCR for the detection of a pathogen in a host is that detection is based on the presence of pathogen DNA. Unfortunately this does not necessarily mean that the pathogen was alive at the time of collection; the presence of DNA confirms the presence of the pathogen in the host. While other techniques, such as culturing [2], determine the presence of live cells, the sensitivity of such a technique is lower than molecular techniques. The 5-10 d growth period required to see *Xf* colonies on a nutrient agar plate allows time for contaminants to overgrow the plate. Although specialized media are often used for growth, confirmation of bacterial identity is still needed. While morphological and colony growth characteristics are often used, genetically based identification is more reliable and discriminatory.

The mean number of GWSS testing positive varied between trials and between experiments. This was most likely due to natural variation in the ability of GWSS to harbor *Xf* which may be a function of both the insect's age and its exposure to other biotic and abiotic factor that influence the ability of the bacterium to colonize the foregut of GWSS. This does not compromise our objective which was to develop a detection protocol that could be used regardless of field conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Almeida RPP, Purcell AH (2003) Biological traits of *Xylella fastidiosa* strains from grapes and almonds. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 69:7447-7452
2. Almeida RPP, Purcell AH (2003) Transmission of *Xylella fastidiosa* to grapevines by *Homalodisca coagulata* (Hemiptera : Cicadellidae). J. Econ. Entomol. 96:264-271
3. Bextine B, Miller TA (2004) Comparison of whole-tissue and xylem fluid collection techniques to detect *Xylella fastidiosa* in grapevine and oleander. Plant Dis. *In press*
4. Bextine B, Tuan SJ, Shaikh H, Blua MJ, Miller TA (2004) Evaluation of methods for extracting *Xylella fastidiosa* DNA from the glassy-winged sharpshooter. J. Econ. Entomol.*:In Press*
5. Blua MJ, Morgan DJW (2003) Dispersion of *Homalodisca coagulata* (Cicadellidae: Homoptera), a vector of *Xylella fastidiosa*, into vineyards in southern California. J. Econ. Entomol. *In press*
6. Brlansky RH, Davis CL, Timmer LW (1991) Xylem-limited bacteria in citrus from Argentina with symptoms of citrus variegated chlorosis. Phytopath. 81:1210
7. Brlansky RH, Timmer LW, French WJ, McCoy RE (1983) Colonization of the sharpshooter vectors, *Oncometopia nigricans* and *Homalodisca coagulata* by xylem-limited bacteria. Phytopath. 73:530
8. Chen J, Banks D, Jarret RL, Newman M, Chang CJ, Smith BJ (1999) Using 16S rDNA sequences to identify *Xylella fastidiosa*. Phytopath. 89:S15
9. Chen J, Jarret RL, Qin X, Hartung JS, Banks D, Chang CJ, Hopkins L (2000) 16S rDNA sequence analysis of *Xylella fastidiosa* strains. Syst. Appl. Microbiol. 23:349-354
10. Costa HS, Blua MS, Bethke JA, Redak RA (2000) Transmission of *Xylella fastidiosa* to oleander by the glassywinged sharpshooter, *Homalodisca coagulata*. Hortsci. 35:1265-1267
11. Hoddle MS, Triapitsyn SV, Morgan DJW (2003) Distribution and plant association records for *Homalodisca coagulata* (Hemiptera: Cicadellidae) in Florida. Flo. Entomol. 86:89-91

12. Hopkins DL (1977) Diseases caused by leafhopper-borne, rickettsia-like bacteria. Annua. Rev. Phytopathol. 17:277-294
13. Lockey C, Ott E, Long Z (1998) Real-time fluorescence detection of a single DNA molecule. Biotechnol. 24:744-746
14. Minsavage GV, Hopkins DL, Leite RMVBC, Stall RE (1993) Comparison of PCR amplification of DNA and ELISA for the detection of *Xylella fastidiosa* in plant extracts. Phytopathol. 83:1399
15. Perring TP, Farrar CA, Blua MJ (2001) Proximity to citrus influences Pierce's disease in Temecula Valley vineyards. Calif. Agric. 55:13-18
16. Pooler MR, Hartung JS (1995) Specific PCR detection and identification of *Xylella fastidiosa* strains causing citrus variegated chlorosis. Curr. Microbiol. 31:377-381
17. Purcell AH (1997) *Xylella fastidiosa*, a regional problem or global threat? J. Plant Pathol. 79:99-105
18. Redak RA, Prucell AH, Lopes JRS, Blua MJ, Mizell III RF, Andersen PC (2003) The biology of xylem sap-feeding insect vectors of *Xylella fastidiosa* and their relation to disease epidemiology. Annua. Rev. Entomol. *In press*
19. Sherald JL, Lei JD (1991) Evaluation of rapid ELISA test kit for detection of *Xylella fastidiosa* in landscape trees. Plant Dis. 75:200-203
20. Smart CD, Hendson M, Guilhabert MR, Saunders S, Friebertshauser G, Purcell AH, Kirkpatrick BC (1998) Seasonal detection of *Xylella fastidiosa* in grapevines with culture, ELISA and PCR. Phytopath. 88:S83
21. Sorensen JT, Gill RJ (1996) A range extension of *Homalodisca coagulata* (Say) (Hemiptera: Clypeorrhyncha: Cicadellidae) to southern California. Pan-Pacific Entomol. 72:160-161

FUNDING AGENCIES
Funding for this project was provided by the University of California Pierce's Disease Grant Program and the USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.