

1 ***Saccharomyces cerevisiae* found in the crop of a Neotropical**  
2 ***Drosophila* species fly collected in a natural forest remnant –**  
3 **comments on Hoang, Kopp & Chandler (2015).**

4  
5 Marcos R. D. Batista<sup>1</sup>, Ana R. de Oliveira Santos<sup>2</sup>, Rafael D. Chaves<sup>3</sup>,  
6 Carlos A. Rosa<sup>2</sup>, Louis B. Klaczko<sup>1</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> Depto. Genética, Evolução e Bioagentes, Inst. Biologia, Universidade Estadual de Campinas –  
8 UNICAMP, SP, Brasil.

9 <sup>2</sup> Depto. Microbiologia, ICB, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais – UFMG, MG, Brasil.

10 <sup>3</sup> Depto. Ciência de Alimentos, Fac. Engenharia de Alimentos, Universidade Estadual de  
11 Campinas – UNICAMP, SP, Brasil.

12

13 \*Corresponding author:

14 Louis Bernard Klaczko, Departamento de Genética, Evolução e Bioagentes, Instituto de Biologia,  
15 Universidade Estadual de Campinas – UNICAMP, Cx. Postal 6109, Campinas, 13083-970 SP,  
16 Brasil.

17 Telephone: 55+19-3521-1150; FAX: 55+19-3521-6235.

18 E-mail: *lbk@unicamp.br*

19 **Abstract**

20 **Background.** Hoang, Kopp & Chandler (2015) questioned the use of commercial  
21 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* as a model for investigating *Drosophila* – yeast association, since this  
22 approach “may not be fully representative of host-microbe interactions as they operate in nature”.  
23 They also claimed: “*S. cerevisiae* is rarely found with natural populations of *D. melanogaster* or  
24 other *Drosophila* species”. Indeed, previous choice experiments found that *Sophophora* subgenus  
25 flies (including invasive species *D. melanogaster*) are more attracted to banana baits inoculated  
26 with apiculate yeasts such as *Hanseniaspora uvarum* over *S. cerevisiae* inoculated baits. Yet, the  
27 forest interior dwelling species (FIDS) *D. tripunctata* group flies choose preferentially *S.*  
28 *cerevisiae* inoculated baits over *H. uvarum* in a natural forest environment.

29 **Aim and Methods.** Our objective was to carry out a pilot experiment to examine yeast species  
30 associated with *Drosophila* in a natural Atlantic Rainforest fragment, especially examining, the  
31 yeast found with FIDS of the *D. tripunctata* group. We sampled *Drosophila* in a natural  
32 population from a Neotropical forest fragment. Males were dissected for isolating yeast colonies  
33 from their crops and to use their genitalia for species identification. Yeast species were identified  
34 by sequencing the D1/D2 domains of the 26S rRNA gene.

35 **Results and Conclusion.** We isolated five yeast species from crops of *Drosophila* species of  
36 *tripunctata* group, including one strain of *S. cerevisiae* (from *D. paraguayensis*), confirming a  
37 previous record of *S. cerevisiae* isolates from a few *tripunctata* group species. Thus, their  
38 contention that “the results from *D. melanogaster*–*S. cerevisiae* laboratory experiments may not  
39 be fully representative of host–microbe interactions in nature” is probably right, but because *D.*  
40 *melanogaster* is an invasive species that is preferentially attracted in forests to apiculate yeasts,  
41 yet *S. cerevisiae* may be associated with FIDS *Drosophila* such as *D. paraguayensis*.

## 42 Introduction

43 The symbiotic association between yeast and *Drosophila* in natural environments has  
44 long been assessed with experiments investigating *Drosophila* species attraction to baits  
45 inoculated with different yeast species as well as isolating yeasts from *Drosophila* crops  
46 (Dobzhansky & Da Cunha, 1955; Powell, 1997; Buser et al., 2014). A number of differential  
47 attractivity experiments have used baits inoculated with various yeast species isolated from  
48 *Drosophila* crops and also commercial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, as a control treatment (e.g.: Da  
49 Cunha, Dobzhansky & Sokoloff, 1951; Klaczko, Powell & Taylor, 1983; Becher et al., 2012).

50 Hoang, Kopp & Chandler (2015) criticized this approach, first, claiming that: “*S.*  
51 *cerevisiae* is rarely found with natural populations of *D. melanogaster* or other *Drosophila*  
52 species”. To explain the finding of *D. simulans* associated with *S. cerevisiae* in a single study  
53 from New Zealand, they argued that it could be due to the unnatural environment (vineyard)  
54 where the flies were collected. Furthermore, they carried out a feeding preference experiment in  
55 the laboratory with *D. melanogaster*, when they allowed flies to choose between *S. cerevisiae* and  
56 another species taken from five natural yeast species. In no case, did the flies prefer *S. cerevisiae*  
57 over the other species. Finally, they questioned the overuse of *S. cerevisiae* as a model for  
58 studying the fly-yeast relationship, since it “may not be fully representative of host-microbe  
59 interactions as they operate in nature.”

60 We collected specimens of *Drosophila tripunctata* species group within an Atlantic  
61 Rainforest fragment. This group encompasses 80 species (Bächli, 2016) and is widely distributed  
62 over the Neotropical region (Val, Vilela & Marques, 1981; Hatadani et al., 2009). Several species  
63 that belong to *D. tripunctata* group are *forest interior dwelling species* (FIDS) of flies and use

64 naturally-occurring fruits for feeding and breeding (Mata, Valadão & Tidon, 2015; Machado,  
65 Gottschalk & Robe, 2016).

66 Our objective was to carry out a pilot experiment to examine yeast species associated  
67 with *Drosophila* species in a natural Atlantic Rainforest fragment, especially examining, the  
68 yeast found with FIDS of the *D. tripunctata* group.

69

## 70 **Materials & Methods**

71 We sampled yeast of *Drosophila* crops from an Atlantic Rainforest fragment located at  
72 Itatiba, SP, Brazil (23° 00.073' S, 46° 52.917' W; altitude = 740 m) on June 29, 2015. We  
73 collected drosophilids by sweeping entomological nets over baits of mashed banana inoculated  
74 with commercial *S. cerevisiae* and covered with sterile tulle cloth. Flies were brought to the  
75 laboratory and dissected within one hour as suggested by Phaff et al. (1956). Wild males were  
76 identified by their external morphology and genitalia (Breuer & Rocha, 1971; Vilela & Bächli,  
77 1990).

78 Before dissected in a drop of *Drosophila* Ringer's solution, flies were immersed in  
79 distilled water and in alcohol 70%, following the procedures described by Hamby et al. (2012).  
80 Next, crops were streaked in formulated YM medium (1.0% glucose, 0.5% peptone A, 0.3%  
81 yeast extract, 0.3% malt extract, 2.0% agar with Chloramphenicol 1.0%) and incubated at 30°C  
82 for 48 hours. Then, genomic DNA of the colonies was extracted as described by Rosa et al.  
83 (2009). Regions ITS-D1/D2 of the 26S rRNA gene sequences were amplified according to PCR  
84 conditions and protocol described in Rosa et al. (2009). Yeast species were identified submitting  
85 the sequences to GenBank database and comparing them to entries for yeast.

86

87 **Results**

88 Twenty males of different *Drosophila* species had their crop dissected, but only five  
 89 yeast strains were isolated from five fly specimens sampled of the Itatiba population (Table 1).  
 90 From two different *D. mediopunctata* males two *Candida* sp. strains were isolated (top BLAST  
 91 identity was 97% to *Candida sake* strain K2.6.1 and 96% to *Candida sake* strain NRRL Y-1622).  
 92 A not yet identified yeast species was isolated from *D. frotapessoai*; from *D. unipunctata* a  
 93 *Starmerella bacillaris* strain was identified with 100% identity to reference strain CBS 13663.  
 94 Finally, from *D. paraguayensis* crop, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* was isolated and identified with  
 95 100% identity to reference strain NRRL Y-12632.

96 **Table 1** – Yeast strains isolated from crops of *Drosophila* species belonging to the  
 97 *tripunctata* group, yeast species with top identity compared to sequences submitted in  
 98 BLAST, with identity and percentage identity to reference accession number.

Yeast strains	<i>Drosophila</i> species	Yeast species –BLAST top identity (identity – % identity to reference)
BTC-L1	<i>Drosophila frotapessoai</i>	Not identified
BTC-L2	<i>Drosophila paraguayensis</i>	<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> (499/499 – 100% to NG042623)
BTD-L1	<i>Drosophila mediopunctata</i>	<i>Candida</i> sp. (467/483 – 97% to KC485459)
BTD-L2	<i>Drosophila unipunctata</i>	<i>Starmerella bacillaris</i> (405/405 – 100% to KP346913)
BTD-L3	<i>Drosophila mediopunctata</i>	<i>Candida</i> sp. (460/478 – 96% to U45728)

99

100

## 101 Discussion & Conclusion

102 Several reports show the diversity of substrates where *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*,  
103 *Starmerella bacillaris* and *Candida sake* have already been found. Particularly, they were found  
104 in fruits, grains and in the soil of natural environments (ARS, 2016). Barbosa et al. (2016)  
105 reported the occurrence of natural populations of *S. cerevisiae* associated with bark trees in  
106 several Brazilian forest ecosystems, including Atlantic Rainforest. The results of this work show  
107 that yeast populations of this species are available to *Drosophila* in these ecosystems. Moreover,  
108 *Drosophila paraguayensis*, *D. mediopunctata* and its cryptic sibling species *D. unipunctata* have  
109 been collected repeatedly in the interior of forests, and adults have emerged from naturally  
110 collected fruits (Mata, Valadão & Tidon, 2015; Machado, Gottschalk & Robe, 2016). These are  
111 good evidences that they occur naturally within the forest environment.

112 Experiments of differential attractiveness in the field are important for characterizing the  
113 feeding habit differentiation of *Drosophila* species. For example, Klaczko, Powell & Taylor  
114 (1983) collected *Drosophila* over baits inoculated with *S. cerevisiae*, *Kloeckera apiculata*  
115 (= *Hanseniaspora uvarum*) and other yeasts in James Reserve, San Jacinto Mountains, USA.  
116 They collected fewer specimens of *D. obscura* group and *D. melanogaster* group over baits  
117 inoculated with *S. cerevisiae* than *K. apiculata* over baits (796 to 1243 respectively). Yet, flies  
118 from subgenus *Drosophila*, such as *D. occidentalis*, were more collected over *S. cerevisiae* baits  
119 (295 over 194).

120 We found a similar pattern in the Itatiba population (Batista et al., 2015). More flies  
121 from subgenus *Sophophora* (including invasive species such as *D. melanogaster* and *D. sukukii*,  
122 among others) were collected over baits inoculated with *H. uvarum* (68 in a total of 81 = 84%)  
123 than over *S. cerevisiae* (13 in 81 = 16%); while flies of the *tripunctata* group (subgenus

124 *Drosophila*) were more attracted to baits inoculated with *S. cerevisiae* (93 in 121 = 77%) than to  
125 *H. uvarum* (23%).

126 Da Cunha, Shehata & De Oliveira (1957) sampled yeasts from crops of *Drosophila*  
127 collected in *Serra da Mantiqueira*, Brazil. They found 58.9% out of 17 *S. cerevisiae* isolates were  
128 obtained from *tripunctata* species crops, while only 9% out of 24 *H. uvarum* isolates were  
129 isolated from flies of the same group. However, the opposite pattern is observed for *willistoni*  
130 group (subgenus *Sophophora*), with 58% out of 24 *H. uvarum* isolates obtained and 11.8% of 17  
131 *S. cerevisiae* isolates. Altogether, there are evidences in support of the natural association  
132 between *S. cerevisiae* and FIDS of the *D. tripunctata* group; while species of subgenus  
133 *Sophophora* such as *D. melanogaster*, may be naturally associated with apiculate yeasts. Thus,  
134 Hoang, Kopp & Chandler contention that “the results from *D. melanogaster*–*S. cerevisiae*  
135 laboratory experiments may not be fully representative of host–microbe interactions in nature” is  
136 probably right, but because *D. melanogaster* is an invasive species that is preferentially attracted  
137 in forests to apiculate yeasts, yet *S. cerevisiae* may be associated in natural environments with  
138 FIDS *Drosophila* such as *D. paraguayensis*.

139

## 140 **Acknowledgements**

141 The authors would like to thank: Vinicius Camargo Penteado for the field work authorization;  
142 Prof. Dr. Anderson S. Sant’Ana for allowing us to use his laboratory facilities; Claudete Couto  
143 and Klélia Carvalho for technical assistance. Financial support agencies: CAPES, CNPq,  
144 FAEPEX-UNICAMP, FAPESP, FAPEMIG.

145

146 **References**

- 147 ARS - Agricultural Research Service. 2016. ARS Culture Collection (NRRL) Database Server.  
148 Available at <http://nrml.ncaur.usda.gov/cgi-bin/usda/process.html> (accessed 11 May 2016).
- 149 Bächli G. 2016. Taxodros v1.04, database 2016/04. Available at <https://www.taxodros.uzh.ch/>  
150 (accessed 5 May 2016).
- 151 Barbosa R, Almeida P, Safar SV, Santos RO, Morais PB, Nielly-Thibault L, Leducq JB, Landry  
152 CR, Gonçalves P, Rosa CA, Sampaio JP. 2016. Evidence of Natural Hybridization in Brazilian  
153 Wild Lineages of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 18: 317-29.  
154 DOI: 10.1093/gbe/evv263.
- 155 Batista MRD, Chaves RD, Uno FS, Tidon R, Rosa CA, Klaczko LB. 2015. Preliminary data on  
156 drosophilid - yeast interaction from a Neotropical forest fragment. In: 56th Annual *Drosophila*  
157 Research Conference - Full abstracts, 2015. Chicago: The Genetics Society of America, 294.
- 158 Becher PG, Flick G, Rozpędowska E, Schmidt A, Hagman A, Lebreton S, Larsson MC, Hansson  
159 BS, Piškur J, Witzgall P, Bengtsson M. 2012. Yeast, not fruit volatiles mediate *Drosophila*  
160 *melanogaster* attraction, oviposition and development. *Functional Ecology* 26: 822–828.  
161 DOI:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2012.02006.x
- 162 Breuer ME, Rocha RF. 1971. Genitália masculina de algumas espécies de *Drosophila* dos grupos  
163 *repleta* e *tripunctata* (Diptera, Drosophilidae). *Papéis Avulsos de Zoologia* 25: 121-137.
- 164 Buser CC, Newcomb RD, Gaskett AC, Goddard MR. 2014. Niche construction initiates the  
165 evolution of mutualistic interactions. *Ecology Letters* 17: 1257–1264.  
166 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2435.2012.02006.x



- 167 Da Cunha AB, Dobzhansky Th, Sokoloff A. 1951. On food preferences of sympatric species of  
168 *Drosophila*. *Evolution* 5: 91–101.
- 169 Da Cunha AB, Shehata AE, De Oliveira W. 1957. A study of the diets and nutritional preferences  
170 of tropical species of *Drosophila*. *Ecology* 38: 98–106.
- 171 Dobzhansky Th, Da Cunha AB. 1955. Differentiation of nutritional preferences in Brazilian  
172 *Drosophila*. *Ecology* 36: 34–39.
- 173 Hamby KA, Hernández A, Boundy-Mills K, Zalom FG. 2012. Associations of Yeasts with  
174 Spotted-Wing *Drosophila* (*Drosophila suzukii*; Diptera: Drosophilidae) in Cherries and  
175 Raspberries. *Applied Environmental Microbiology* 78: 4869–4873.  
176 DOI: 10.1128/AEM.00841-12
- 177 Hatadani LM, McInerney JO, de Medeiros HF, Junqueira ACM, de Azeredo-Espin AM, Klaczko  
178 LB. 2009. Molecular phylogeny of the *Drosophila tripunctata* and closely related species  
179 groups (Diptera: Drosophilidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 51: 595–600.  
180 DOI:10.1016/j.ympev.2009.02.022
- 181 Hoang D, Kopp A, Chandler JA. 2015. Interactions between *Drosophila* and its natural yeast  
182 symbionts – Is *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* a good model for studying the fly-yeast  
183 relationship? *PeerJ* 3:e1116. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.1116
- 184 Klaczko LB, Powell JR, Taylor CE. 1983. *Drosophila* baits and yeasts: species attracted.  
185 *Oecologia* 59: 411–413.
- 186 Machado S, Gottschalk MS, Robe LJ. 2016. Historical patterns of niche dynamics in Neotropical  
187 species of the *Drosophila* subgenus (Drosophilidae, Diptera). *Evolutionary Ecology* 30: 47-67.  
188 DOI: 10.1007/s10682-015-9805-4

- 189 Mata RA, Valadão H, Tidon R. 2015. Spatial and temporal dynamics of drosophilid larval  
190 assemblages associated to fruits. *Revista Brasileira de Entomologia* 59: 50-57.  
191 DOI:10.1016/j.rbe.2015.02.006
- 192 Phaff HJ, Miller MW, Recca JA, Shifrine M, Mrak EM. 1956. Yeasts Found in the Alimentary  
193 Canal of *Drosophila*. *Ecology* 37: 533–538.
- 194 Powell JR. 1997. Ecology: Yeast and Other Microbes. In: Powell JR, ed. Progress and Prospects  
195 in Evolutionary Biology: The *Drosophila* Model. New York: Oxford University Press, 156–  
196 160.
- 197 Rosa LH, Vaz BM, Caligorne RB, Campolina S, Rosa CA. 2009. Endophytic fungi associated  
198 with the Antarctic grass *Deschampsia antarctica* Desv. (Poaceae). *Polar Biology* 32: 161-167.  
199 DOI: 10.1007/s00300-008-0515-z
- 200 Val FC, Vilela CR, Marques MD. 1981. Drosophilidae of the Neotropical region. In Ashburner,  
201 M, Carson HL, Thompson JN eds., *The Genetics and Biology of Drosophila*. London:  
202 Academic Press, 123–168.
- 203 Vilela CR, Bächli G. 1990. Taxonomic studies on Neotropical species of seven genera of  
204 Drosophilidae (Diptera). *Journal of the Swiss Entomological Society (Supplement)* 63: 1-332.