

**The utility of morphological,
ITS molecular and combined datasets
in estimating the phylogeny of the
cortinarioid sequestrate fungi**

by

Anthony Francis

This thesis is presented for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

of

Murdoch University

2006

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own account of my research and contains as its main content work which has not previously been submitted for a degree at any tertiary education institution.

Anthony Andrew Francis

(December, 2006)

Abstract

Molecular technology has shown the classical, morphologically defined groupings of sequestrate cortinarioid fungi to be artificial and in need of revision. However, these same molecular studies have highlighted morphological characters, such as spore shape and ornamentation, that have proved useful for distinguishing phylogenetically informative groups. This observation underpins the hypothesis of this study: that the numeric analysis of selected morphological characters can provide the same picture of the diversity of, and relationships among, sequestrate cortinarioid fungi as that recovered from phylogenetic analysis of rDNA sequence data.

Sequestrate fungi are those in which the spores mature inside an enclosed fruit body, remaining there until the fruit body decomposes or is eaten. For the purposes of this thesis the following genera are considered to contain cortinarioid sequestrate fungi: *Auritella*, *Cortinarius*, *Dermocybe*, *Descomyces*, *Hymenogaster*, *Hysterogaster*, *Inocybe*, *Protoglossum*, *Quadrispora*, *Setchelliogaster* and *Timgrovea*. This thesis focussed on Australian representatives of these fungi to address the hypothesis outlined above.

Four analysis methods were applied to each of three datasets (morphological, rDNA and combined data) in a comparative approach to test the stated hypothesis. The four analysis methods were two multivariate methods: cluster analysis and ordination (by principal coordinates analysis), and two phylogenetic methods: maximum parsimony and Bayesian analysis.

Low bootstrap support and Bayesian partition probabilities for phylogenetic analyses of the morphological data indicated this dataset had little to no phylogenetic signal

discernable by parsimony and Bayesian analyses. Different analyses of the morphological data differed in the way they grouped the collections. The type of clustering method used affected the pattern of relationships recovered. The coding of the data had a much more substantial effect on the patterns of relatedness suggested by the multivariate analyses. Despite the low level of phylogenetic information and agreement between analyses of the morphological data it was found that some collections were consistently grouped together. This included the separation of the *Cortinarius*-like collections from the *Descolea*-like collections and the relatively consistent grouping of some pairs of collections and some larger groups. Thus, despite the limited phylogenetic signal of the small morphological dataset and the artefacts of coding, some relatively consistent groups were recovered.

Separate analyses of the *Cortinarius*-, *Descolea*- and *Hebeloma*-like ITS sequences recovered similar patterns to published phylogenies. The inclusion of more sequestrate taxa and a greater sample of Australian collections than previous studies, indicated that both *Timgrovea* subgenera nest among the *Descolea*-like collections and that hitherto undiscovered lineages of *Descolea*-like fungi are represented among the collections in Australian herbaria. The *Cortinarius*-like fungi fall within clades recognised by published phylogenies. Similar topologies were supported by both Parsimony bootstrap and Bayesian partition probability values for analyses of the molecular data including the separation of *Cortinarius*-like collections from *Descolea*-like collections. However neither of these methods of analysis and evaluation yielded well-resolved deeper nodes for either of these two major clades. Comparable clades/clusters of *Cortinarius*-like and *Descolea*-like collections were found in all analyses of the molecular data. Thus phylogenetically distinct groups of cortinarioid sequestrate fungi could be consistently distinguished using ITS molecular data, but not confidently related to one another.

The ratio of molecular to morphological characters (741:16) meant the patterns observed for the combined analyses were more similar to those observed in analyses of the molecular data than those of the morphological data. This included the recovery of substantially similar clades/clusters to those recovered by analyses of the molecular data alone. The value of combining the morphological and molecular data as analysed is questioned despite the congruence of the datasets according to the Incongruence-Length Difference test. Differences between the molecular and combined datasets arose primarily where the molecular data grouped collections that were also grouped by the morphological data.

The numeric analysis of the selected morphological characters as carried out in this study did not recover the same pattern of groups and relationships among the cortinarioid sequestrate fungi as phylogenetic analyses of ITS data. The composition of groups recovered using the morphological data alone or as part of the combined dataset, and the relationships between those groups, differed from those recovered from the molecular data alone; although there were similarities between groups recovered from different datasets. The ability of this thesis to conclusively address its fundamental hypothesis was compromised by limitations of the study such as taxon sampling, character selection, character coding and the poor resolution of the ITS phylogeny. Acknowledging these limitations, and that some similar groups were recovered, the results of this thesis do not support its stated hypothesis that the numeric analysis of selected morphological characters can provide the same picture of the diversity of, and relationships among, sequestrate cortinarioid fungi as recovered from phylogenetic analysis of rDNA sequence data.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge those who have supervised and guided me to and through the completion of this thesis, Neale Bougher, Philip O'Brien, Morag Glen, and Inez Tommerup.

My unlimited thanks to my wife Heidi for help provided and understanding freely offered.

Deep thanks to those who have loaned specimens, taken me on their field trips, found space for me in their institutions, their offices and their homes and otherwise assisted enormously in the completion of this thesis: Jim Trappe, Teresa Lebel, Andrew Claridge, Tom May, Judith Curnow and Heino Lepp, David Ratkowsky, Genevieve Gates, Bruce Fuhrer, Don White, Gintas Kantivalis, Anna Hopkins, Niels Klazenga, Jenny Tonkin, Rod Jones and the staff and students at Ensis and CSIRO Floreat, the Royal Botanic Gardens Melbourne (MEL), Australian National Botanic Gardens (CANB) and the Western Australian Herbarium (PERTH).

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products (now Ensis), the Australian Biological Resources Study and Murdoch University.

I also wish to thank Denise Goodall, my Mother and Father (Kerry and Rod Francis), and my family, for meals cooked, roofs-over-our-heads and putting up with an increasingly absent and stressed son and brother.

Table of Contents

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF FIGURES	VII
LIST OF TABLES	IX
PUBLICATIONS ARISING FROM THE THESIS	XI
ABBREVIATIONS.....	XI
<i>CHAPTER 1</i> GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 AIM OF THIS THESIS	1
1.2 THE CORTINARIOID SEQUESTRATE FUNGI.....	1
1.2.1 <i>Characters used to classify sequestrate cortinarioid fungi</i>	11
1.3 COLLECTION AND STUDY OF CORTINARIOID SEQUESTRATE FUNGI.....	13
1.3.1 <i>Early Collection and Study of Australian Cortinarioid Sequestrate Fungi</i>	15
1.3.2 <i>The 20th Century to 1970</i>	16
1.3.3 <i>Collection and Study of Cortinarioid Sequestrate Fungi Since 1970</i>	17
1.4 CLASSIFICATION OF CORTINARIOID SEQUESTRATE FUNGI.....	22
1.4.1 <i>Early Developments</i>	22
1.4.2 <i>Bridging the gap between agaricoid and gasteroid fungi</i>	24
1.4.3 <i>The Molecular Age</i>	28
1.5 EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH	31
1.5.1 <i>Collections</i>	33
1.5.2 <i>Types of analysis employed</i>	35
<i>CHAPTER 2</i> MORPHOLOGICAL DATASET	37
2.1 INTRODUCTION	37
2.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	39
2.2.1 <i>Data collected</i>	39
2.2.1.1 Macroscopic characteristics of fresh specimens	39
2.2.1.2 Macroscopic characters of air-dried specimens	41
2.2.1.3 Microscopic characteristics of air-dried specimens	41

Table of contents

2.2.2	<i>Preparation of dataset</i>	45
2.2.3	<i>Analyses</i>	46
2.2.3.1	Cluster analysis and Ordination	46
2.2.3.2	Parsimony analysis	47
2.2.3.3	Bayesian analysis	48
2.3	RESULTS	48
2.3.1	<i>Cluster analysis</i>	48
2.3.2	<i>Ordination</i>	59
2.3.3	<i>Parsimony analysis</i>	71
2.3.4	<i>Bayesian analysis</i>	73
2.4	DISCUSSION	76
CHAPTER 3 RDNA SEQUENCE DATASET		87
3.1	INTRODUCTION	87
3.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS	88
3.2.1	<i>Specimens and sampling</i>	89
3.2.2	<i>Extraction</i>	89
3.2.2.1	Protocol 1: Glass-‘milk’ extraction	90
3.2.2.2	Protocol 2: Qiagen DNEasy Plant Mini Kit	91
3.2.3	<i>Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)</i>	91
3.2.4	<i>Nested PCR</i>	93
3.2.4.1	Second round PCR	93
3.2.4.2	Third round PCR	93
3.2.5	<i>100µl PCRs</i>	93
3.2.6	<i>PCR clean up</i>	94
3.2.7	<i>DNA Sequencing</i>	94
3.2.8	<i>Sequence editing</i>	95
3.2.9	<i>Sequence alignment</i>	95
3.2.10	<i>Cluster analysis</i>	96
3.2.11	<i>Ordination</i>	96
3.2.12	<i>Parsimony analysis</i>	96
3.2.13	<i>Model testing</i>	97

3.2.14	<i>Bayesian analysis</i>	97
3.3	RESULTS	99
3.3.1	<i>Cluster analysis</i>	99
3.3.2	<i>Ordination</i>	101
3.3.3	<i>Parsimony analysis</i>	102
3.3.4	<i>Bayesian analysis</i>	107
3.3.5	<i>Expanded rDNA sequence dataset</i>	109
3.3.5.1	Hebeloma clade	109
3.3.5.2	Descomyces clade	111
3.4	DISCUSSION	117
CHAPTER 4 COMBINED DATASET		121
4.1	INTRODUCTION	121
4.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS	123
4.2.1	<i>Cluster analysis</i>	125
4.2.2	<i>Ordination</i>	125
4.2.3	<i>Parsimony analysis</i>	126
4.2.4	<i>Bayesian analysis</i>	126
4.3	RESULTS	127
4.3.1	<i>Cluster analysis</i>	127
4.3.2	<i>Ordination</i>	130
4.3.3	<i>Parsimony analysis</i>	134
4.3.4	<i>Bayesian analysis</i>	135
4.4	DISCUSSION	139
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS		145
5.1	INTRODUCTION	145
5.2	DISAGREEMENT ON CLUSTER/CLADE COMPOSITION BETWEEN ANALYSES	146
5.2.1	<i>Analogous characters</i>	146
5.2.2	<i>Inadvertent character weighting</i>	149
5.3	BETWEEN-CLUSTER/CLADE TOPOLOGY AND ESTIMATION OF THE PHYLOGENY	151
5.3.1	<i>Between cluster/clade topology</i>	151

Table of contents

5.3.2	<i>Phylogenetic resolution</i>	155
5.4	AGREEMENT BETWEEN MOLECULAR AND MORPHOLOGICAL GROUP COMPOSITION	159
5.5	IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SYSTEMATIC POSITION OF THE GENERA OF CORTINARIOID SEQUESTRATE FUNGI	162
5.6	HAS THE HYPOTHESIS BEEN CONCLUSIVELY DISPROVED... AND IF NOT HOW MIGHT RETESTING BE IMPROVED?	167
5.6.1	<i>Limitations of the analyses</i>	170
5.6.2	<i>Limitations of the data</i>	170
5.6.2.1	Taxon sampling	170
5.6.2.2	Character selection	171
5.6.2.3	Character coding.....	175
5.6.3	<i>Potential for future work</i>	177
	REFERENCES	179
	APPENDIX 1 COLLECTIONS	I
	APPENDIX 2 'FBE' GROUPS RESULTING FROM THE PRELIMINARY MORPHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION.....	XXVII
	APPENDIX 3 MORPHOLOGICAL TAXON BY CHARACTER MATRIX.....	XXXV
	APPENDIX 4 MULTIPLE SEQUENCE ALIGNMENT	XXXIX
	APPENDIX 5 CLUSTAL W ALIGNMENT OF <i>CORTINARIUS</i> -LIKE ITS SEQUENCES	XLVII
5.1	SUBGENERIC CLADES ASSOCIATED WITH <i>CORTINARIUS</i> -LIKE FUNGI SEQUENCED FOR THE CURRENT STUDY	XLVII
5.2	ACCESSIONED SEQUENCES INCLUDED IN THE CLUSTAL W ALIGNMENT BUT NOT USED TO DEFINE SUBGENERIC CLADE ASSOCIATIONS	LIII
	APPENDIX 6 EXAMPLES OF GRAPHS USED FOR MORPHOLOGICAL DATA EXPLORATION AND CODING	LIX
	APPENDIX 7 PREPARATION OF REAGENTS	LXIII
7.1	PREPARATION OF GLASS- 'MILK'	LXIII
7.2	PREPARATION OF EXTRACTION BUFFER	LXIII
7.3	PREPARATION OF SODIUM IODIDE (NAI) SOLUTION	LXIV

7.4	PREPARATION OF WASH BUFFER	LXIV
	<i>APPENDIX 8 REPRINTS</i>	LXV

Table of contents

Table of Figures

Page

FIGURE 1: DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION OF THE POSTULATED TAXONOMIC POSITION OF SEQUESTRATE AND SELECTED AGARICOID CORTINARIOID FUNGI AMONGST THE CORTINARIACEAE AND HOMOBASIDIOMYCETE TAXA AS PUBLISHED IN FRANCIS & BOUGHER (2003).....	15
FIGURE 2: DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION OF THE POSTULATED TAXONOMIC POSITION OF SEQUESTRATE AND SELECTED AGARICOID CORTINARIOID FUNGI AMONGST THE HOMOBASIDIOMYCETES AS AT 2006 INCLUDING CHANGES PROPOSED IN THIS THESIS.	21
FIGURE 3: DIAGRAMMATIC REPRESENTATION OF MEASUREMENTS MADE OF MICROSCOPIC CHARACTERS OF BASIDIOSPORES.....	40
FIGURE 4: CLUSTER ANALYSIS DENDROGRAM FOR WARD’S CLUSTERING OF THE EUCLIDIAN PAIR-WISE DISTANCES OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA “STANDARDISED” AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE MAXIMUM VALUE	50
FIGURE 5: CLUSTER ANALYSIS DENDROGRAM FOR UN-WEIGHTED PAIR-GROUP METHOD USING ARITHMETIC AVERAGING (UPGMA) CLUSTERING OF THE EUCLIDIAN PAIR-WISE DISTANCES OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA “STANDARDISED” AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE MAXIMUM VALUE.....	53
FIGURE 6: CLUSTER ANALYSIS DENDROGRAM FOR UPGMA CLUSTERING OF THE MEAN PAIR-WISE DISTANCES OF THE ‘10 BIN’ MULTI-STATE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA	58
FIGURE 7: PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS (PCA) OF THE EUCLIDIAN PAIR-WISE DISTANCES OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA “STANDARDISED” AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE MAXIMUM VALUE	61
FIGURE 8: PRINCIPAL COORDINATES ANALYSIS (PCO) OF THE EUCLIDIAN PAIR-WISE DISTANCES OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA “STANDARDISED” AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE MAXIMUM VALUE	65
FIGURE 9: PRINCIPAL COORDINATES ANALYSIS (PCO) OF THE MEAN PAIR-WISE DISTANCES OF THE RECODED ‘10 BIN’ MULTI-STATE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA	67
FIGURE 10: 50% MAJORITY RULE CONSENSUS TREE OF THE TREES FOUND BY A HEURISTIC PARSIMONY SEARCH OF THE ‘10 BIN’ MULTI-STATE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA	70
FIGURE 11: 50% MAJORITY RULE CONSENSUS TREE OF 6750 OF THE TREES PRODUCED BY BAYESIAN ANALYSIS OF THE ‘10 BIN’ MULTI-STATE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA	75
FIGURE 12: CLUSTER ANALYSIS DENDROGRAM FOR UPGMA CLUSTERING OF THE PAIR-WISE ‘MEAN’ DISTANCES OF THE MOLECULAR DATA.....	99

Table of figures

FIGURE 13: PRINCIPAL COORDINATES ANALYSIS (PCO) OF THE PAIR-WISE MEAN DISTANCES OF THE MOLECULAR DATA SET105

FIGURE 14: 50% MAJORITY RULE CONSENSUS TREE OF THE 378 TREES FOUND BY A HEURISTIC PARSIMONY SEARCH OF THE MOLECULAR DATA107

FIGURE 15: 50% MAJORITY RULE CONSENSUS TREE OF THE 1502 SAMPLED TREES PRODUCED BY BAYESIAN ANALYSIS OF THE MOLECULAR DATA109

FIGURE 16: PHYLOGRAM PRODUCED BY THE MAXIMUM PARSIMONY ANALYSIS OF THE /HEBELOMA CLADE MOLECULAR DATASET.....111

FIGURE 17: PHYLOGRAM PRODUCED BY THE MAXIMUM PARSIMONY ANALYSIS OF THE /DESCOMYCES CLADE MOLECULAR DATA AND OUTGROUPS.114

FIGURE 18: CLUSTER ANALYSIS DENDROGRAM FOR UPGMA CLUSTERING OF THE PAIR-WISE ‘MEAN’ DISTANCES OF THE UNWEIGHTED COMBINED DATA128

FIGURE 19: PRINCIPAL COORDINATES ANALYSIS (PCO) OF THE PAIR-WISE MEAN DISTANCES OF THE UNWEIGHTED COMBINED DATA133

FIGURE 20: 50% MAJORITY RULE CONSENSUS TREE OF THE 378 TREES FOUND BY A HEURISTIC PARSIMONY SEARCH OF THE UNWEIGHTED COMBINED DATA136

FIGURE 21: 50% MAJORITY RULE CONSENSUS TREE OF THE 1502 SAMPLED TREES PRODUCED BY BAYESIAN ANALYSIS OF THE UNWEIGHTED COMBINED DATA.....139

FIGURE 22: HISTOGRAMS OF SPORE LENGTH (SL) DATA FOR: A. 74 BINS COLOURED BY ‘WORKING GENUS’ (BIN SIZE BASED ON THE SMALLEST INTERVAL BETWEEN ANY TWO LENGTH MEASUREMENTS), AND B. 10 BINS..... LIX

FIGURE 23: HISTOGRAMS OF SPORE WIDTH (SW) DATA FOR: A. 66 BINS COLOURED BY WORKING GENUS (BIN SIZE BASED ON THE SMALLEST INTERVAL BETWEEN ANY TWO WIDTH MEASUREMENTS), AND B. 10 BINS LX

FIGURE 24: SCATTER PLOT OF THE RATIO OF SPORE LENGTH TO WIDTH (QS) AGAINST SPORE LENGTH (SL) FOR THE COLLECTIONS EXAMINED IN THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL DATA. LXI

List of Tables

Page

TABLE 1: SOME BROAD GROUPINGS OF MORPHOLOGICAL FORMS FOUND AMONG THE CORTINARIOID SEQUESTRATE FUNGI	3
TABLE 2: WORLD AND AUSTRALIAN NUMBERS OF PUBLISHED SPECIES CONSIDERED TO BE CORTINARIOID SEQUESTRATE FUNGI FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS THESIS.....	5
TABLE 3: PUBLISHED CORTINARIOID SEQUESTRATE FUNGI OF AUSTRALIA	32
TABLE 4: DETAILS OF MEASUREMENTS MADE OF MICROSCOPIC CHARACTERS.....	42
TABLE 5: MAGNIFICATIONS WITH A 10X OCULAR LENS ON AN OLYMPUS BHS MICROSCOPE WITH AN OLYMPUS BH2–DA DRAWING ATTACHMENT SET AT POSITION “A” AND WITH THE MAGNIFIER SET AT 1.5.....	44
TABLE 6: COLLECTIONS GROUPING TOGETHER IN THE VARIOUS ANALYSES OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL DATASET.....	85
TABLE 7: CONCENTRATIONS OF THE VARIOUS REAGENTS FOR THE TWO PCR PROTOCOLS (1X REACTIONS)	92
TABLE 8: CYCLE PROFILES FOR PCR PROTOCOLS 1 AND 2, NESTED PCR AND SEQUENCING REACTIONS.	92
TABLE 9: WEIGHTS APPLIED TO THE MOLECULAR AND MORPHOLOGICAL DATASETS UNDER THREE DIFFERENT WEIGHTING SCHEMES.....	125
TABLE 10: LISTING OF THE CLUSTERS/CLADES FOUND IN ANALYSES OF THE MOLECULAR AND COMBINED DATASETS AND THE TWO SINGLE TAXON CLADES CONSISTENTLY NOT INCLUDED IN THE DETAILED CLADES.....	128
TABLE 11: SIMPLIFIED BETWEEN CLADE/CLUSTER TOPOLOGIES OF THE DENDROGRAMS FOR SELECTED ANALYSES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE FORMAT	153
TABLE 12: GROUPINGS FROM CLUSTER ANALYSIS, ORDINATION (PCA/PCO), PARSIMONY AND BAYESIAN ANALYSES FOR MORPHOLOGICAL, MOLECULAR (ITS) AND COMBINED DATASETS	168
TABLE 13: COLLECTIONS EXAMINED FOR THIS STUDY	I
TABLE 14: FBE (‘FINAL BY-EYE’) GROUPS RESULTING FROM THE PRELIMINARY MORPHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION	XXVII
TABLE 15: MATRIX OF TAXA EXAMINED IN DETAIL AGAINST MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERS.....	XXXV

Table of tables

TABLE 16: PUBLISHED SUBGENERIC CLADES OF *CORTINARIUS* AND THE GENBANK ACCESSIONS FROM THESE
CLADES WITH WHICH CORTINARIUS-LIKE SEQUESTRATE FUNGI SEQUENCED FOR THIS STUDY WERE
ALIGNED BY CLUSTAL W XLVII

Publications arising from the thesis

Reprints of both of these articles are included in Appendix 8.

Francis, A.A. and Bougher, N.L. (2003). Historical and current perspectives in the systematics of Australian cortinarioid sequestrate (truffle-like) fungi. *Australasian Mycologist* **21**: 81-92.

Francis, A.A. and Bougher, N.L. (2004). Cortinarioid sequestrate (truffle-like) fungi of Western Australia. *Australasian Mycologist* **23**: 1-26.

Abbreviations

Abbreviation *Definition*

ABRS	Australian Biological Resources Study.
CANB	Australian National Herbarium, Canberra
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (Australia)
DAR	New South Wales Plant Pathology Herbarium, Orange Agricultural Institute, Orange, New South Wales, Australia
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
ITS	Internal Transcribed Spacer. Non coding region between ribosomal DNA genes. May refer to spacer 1, spacer 2 or both of these along with the 5.8S rDNA gene <i>i.e.</i> ITS region.
K	Herbarium Royal Botanic Gardens Kew
MEL	Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Melbourne
nLSU	Nuclear large-subunit rRNA (28S) gene.
nSSU	Nuclear small-subunit rRNA gene, the 18S rRNA gene.
OSC	Herbarium, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA.
OTU	Operational taxonomic unit
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction

Abbreviations

PERTH	Western Australian Herbarium, Perth
rDNA	Genes coding for rRNA (also used in reference to the regions containing these genes)
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
RPB1 and RPB2	Largest and second largest subunits of RNA polymerase II respectively.
rRNA	Ribosomal RNA
s.s.	<i>Sensu stricto</i> . Latin for 'in the strict/restricted sense'
subg.	Subgenus