Full Length Research Paper

# Phyllosphere bacterial communities associated with the degradation of acetamiprid in *Phaseolus vulgaris*

Yu Zhou<sup>1,3</sup>\*, Xiongwu Qiao<sup>2</sup>, Wenjun Li<sup>3</sup>, Junfeng Xu<sup>1</sup>, Wei Wang<sup>1</sup> and Xiaoyun Chen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Quality and Standard for Agricultural Products, Zhejiang Academy of Agricultural Sciences (ZAAS), Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310021, China.

<sup>2</sup>Shanxi Key Laboratory of Pesticide Science, Shanxi Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Taiyuan, Shanxi 030031, China.
<sup>3</sup>The Key Laboratory for Microbial Resources of the Ministry of Education, and Laboratory for Conservation and Utilization of Bio-resources, Yunnan Institute of Microbiology, Yunnan University, Kunming, Yunnan 650091, China.

Accepted 7 April, 2011

Much effort has been focused on microbes that inhabit soil and water and their degradation abilities to chemical pollutants. Few studies were performed on interactions between pollutants and phyllosphere microbes (phyllomicrobes) in plant leaves, although, plant leaves exert critical effects on the quality of agricultural product. In this study, acetamiprid degradation by phyllomicrobes and its ecological effects on phyllobacteria were investigated by in situ and ex situ methods. In situ degradation results showed that the half-lives of 10 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid on disinfected and natural leafage were 4.99 and 3.24 d, respectively, but the half-lives of 30 and 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid displayed no significant difference on the two kinds of leafage. Ex situ cultivable microbes from phyllosphere of Phaseolus vulgaris completely degraded 11 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid within 42 days in plant leaves medium (PLM), but not in chemical medium. However, only 30% acetamiprid was decreased within 56 days when acetamiprid concentration increased up to 30 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> in PLM. Bacterial population investigation and 16S rRNA gene PCR-DGGE (denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis) fingerprints analysis indicated that, low concentration of acetamiprid showed minor effects on phyllobacterial community or population, but phyllobacterial community structure was significantly changed by acetamiprid at the concentration higher than 30 µq·ml<sup>-1</sup>. In conclusion, phyllomicrobes of *P. vulgaris* were able to degrade acetamiprid at the proper concentration, however, phyllomicobes biodegradation capability was inhibited by high concentration of the pesticide and phyllomicrobes' community was also destroyed at the same conditions.

**Key words:** Microbial community structure, phyllosphere, acetamiprid degradation, 16S rDNA, polymerase chain reaction-denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (PCR-DGGE).

## INTRODUCTION

Foliage is always inhabited by a large number of microbes including epibiosis and endogenesis. Phyllosphere microflora is mainly composed of bacteria, filamentous fungi, yeasts and a small bit of algae, protozoa and nematodes. Bacteria are the most abundant inhabitants within phyllosphere and also the greatest contributors to phyllosphere ecosystem (Lindow and Brandl, 2003; Richard et al., 2003; Wilson et al., 1999). Phyllosphere environment is generally considered as a rather hostile habitat for microorganisms due to the tremendous physical fluctuation during day and light, direct UV radiation and oligotrophy. Interestingly, bacteria are often detected in population averaging from 10<sup>6</sup> to 10<sup>7</sup> cells every centimeter (up to  $10^8$  cells  $g^{-1}$ ) in the hostile habitat (Lindow and Brandl, 2003; Yang et al., 2001). It is reasonable to believe that, such organism possess special ecological relationships with the hosts. Inconsequential (transient epiphytic saprophytes) and (commensals, mutualistic substantial symbionts, endophytes or pathogens) could be sum-up between the relationships 3810 of plant-microbe and microbe-microbe in phyllosphere ecosystem (John and Harris, 2000).

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author. E-mail: microbes@yahoo.cn. Tel: +86-571-86404049. Fax: +86-571-86401834.

Leaf-associated microbes play important roles in their hosts, such as nitrogen fixation, pathogen prevention, growth stimulation and residual pesticide decomposition. Researches about microbial ecology and disease protection of phyllosphere microbes have been so abundant, but interactions between phyllomicrobes and pesticides were rarely investigated (Lindow and Brandl, 2003; Wilson et al., 1999).

At present, two kinds of bioremediation methods are applied. One is to isolate degradative microbes from environmental samples (or construct multifunctional degradative bacteria by genetic technologies). The other is to stimulate degradation ability of indigenous microbes by creating appropriate conditions for contaminated areas (Zwillich, 2000; Debarati et al., 2005). Although, efficient degradative microbial strains for acetamiprid were very hard to get, the pesticide has been reported as a degradable chemical for environmental microbes (Dai et al., 2010a, b). Thus, bioremediation technology of indigenous microbes is a useful method for acetamiprid remediation (Abramovitch et al., 2002). In order to explore more efficient bioremediation methods for acetamiprid. this study was designed to: (1) test phyllomicrobes' degradation ability to acetamiprid; (2) to detect acetamiprid ecological effects on phyllbacterial community; (3) to determine the relationships between acetamiprid degradation and phyllobacteria fluctuation.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

*Phaseolus vulgaris* (a kind of common bean), sown in culture dishes (10 cm in diameter and 10 cm height) at 30°C, 15000 Lx light intension (12 h) with black land soil for three weeks were chosen as plant materials. The black land soil was collected from Liaoning province, northeast of China with soil organic carbon (SOC) of about 18.3 g·kg<sup>-1</sup>, total nitrogen 1.9 g·kg<sup>-1</sup> and pH 6.5. Tryptone-yeast-beef extracts medium (TYB medium, contained 0.3% yeast extract, 0.2% beef extract, 0.6% tryptone and 0.3% NaCl) was selected as chemical medium for bacteria cultivation and population investigation. Acetamiprid was provided by Nippon Soda Co., Ltd. Japan.

### Acetamiprid degradation on phyllosphere of P. vulgaris (in situ)

Leaves surface was sterilized by UV irradiation and ethanol as described by Wilson et al. (1999). Acetamiprid solution was prepared by technical product (acetamiprid content ≥ 97%) with distilled water at different concentrations. Different concentrations (0. 10, 30 and 50 µg ml<sup>-1</sup>) of acetamiprid solution were sprayed onto the sterilized materials, respectively, with a misting bottle, until the applied solution was run off from leaves (50 ml acetamiprid solution was applied onto every tested culture dishes). Unsterilized natural materials were set as control. Samples were collected for acetamiprid residue analysis after being incubated at the same conditions as mentioned earlier for 2 h and 1, 3, 7, 14 and 21 days. respectively. Considering the residue of acetamiprid on plant leaves was declined quickly for the first two cultivation days and became relatively stable at the third day, the samples incubated for 3 davs were selected to analyze phyllobacterial community. The acetamiprid degradation dynamics on the two kinds of leaves were

represented using the regression equation  $C_{\vdash}C_{0'}e^{-Kt}$  and half-lives were calculated by  $T_{0.5}=1/k\cdot ln2$  (t, incubation time;  $C_t$ , acetamiprid residue;  $C_0$ , original deposition; K, degradation constant;  $T_{0.5}$ , half-life).

#### Preparation of plant leaves medium

120 g well-cut and well-mixed fresh leaves of *P. vulgaris* were homogenized for 15 min by a glass homogenizer after 1000 ml sterilized water was added, the homogenized solution was the prepared plant leaves medium (PLM). Another 1000 ml homogenized solution was sterilized thoroughly by  $C_{060}$  gamma radiation to construct sterilized PLM.

# Acetamiprid degradation and microbial community dynamics in PLM 'microcosms'

Different concentrations (0, 10, 30 and 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>) of aceamiprid was added into 250 ml PLM to construct four tested 'microcosms'. Sterilized PLM and distilled water that mixed with the same concentrations of aceamiprid were set as control. Appropriate samples were withdrawn from the constructed microcosms after incubated at 30°C (150 r/min) for 2 h and 7, 14, 28, 42 and 56 days to analyze the acetamiprid residue and cultivable bacterial population. At the time point of the 14<sup>th</sup> day, the bacterial communities were analyzed. The population dynamics of bacteria were determined using plating dilutions with TYB agar and the bacterial communities were analyzed by polymerase chain reaction-denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (PCR-DGGE).

#### Phyllomicrobial community structure in TYB microcosms

Different concentration (0, 10, 30 and 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>) of acetamiprid was added into 250 ml TYB broth and each broth was further mixed with 0.5 ml PLM to inoculate phyllomicrobes. The TYB microcosms were incubated at the same condition as PLM microcosms. Sample collection, acetamiprid residue determination and microbial community investigation were performed as described in PLM microcosms.

In order to make PCR-DGGE data more informative, the PLM homogenates prepared for PLM microcosms and TYB microcosms were obtained from the same homogenized solution. The same origin of homogenized solution insured the identical microbial community for these treatments at the time of zero (T = 0).

#### Determination of acetamiprid

Acetamiprid residue of plant leaves (or PLM) was determined as described by Obana et al. (2003). In detail, 5 ml liquid sample (or 5 g leaves' homogenate) was mixed with 25 ml methanol extracting for 30 min in airtight flask and was filtered under decompression conditions. Filtrate was extracted by 50 ml petroleum ether and 100 ml 5% NaCl for three times. Aqueous extracts were collected and followed by further extraction with 80 ml dichloromethane (CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>) for three times. The dried CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> extracts were dissolved with 10 ml petroleum ether/ethyl acetate (3:7 v/v) and then was loaded onto silica gel column which had been equilibrated by washing buffer (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 3:7 v/v). The extracted acetamiprid in silica gel column was firstly purified with 10 ml washing buffer, then was collected with 10 ml elution buffer (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 1:9 v/v). The elution was dried and re-dissolved with 1 ml CH<sub>3</sub>OH/H<sub>2</sub>O (3:2, v/v) for chromatogram analysis. Analysis was performed by high performance liquid chromatograph (HPLC; Agilent 1100) which was connected to a C<sub>18</sub> reverse phase column

Append concentration	Detected	Recovery efficiency	Regression equation
(#9 /		(/%)	oquation
10	10.52±0.57	105	
30	27.90±1.70	93	y=12.496x+0.0239
50	44.54±0.23	89	R <sup>2</sup> =0.999
60	54.71±2.21	91	

Table 1. Recovery efficiency and regression equation determined by different concentrations of acetamiprid for the analytical method evaluation.

Regression equation was determined by HPLC using different concentrations of standard acetamiprid; y, acetamiprid concentration; x, the peak area of HPLC;  $R^2$ , correlation coefficient of the regression equation.

(250 × 4.6 mm) and a UV detector with absorbance at 239 nm. The flow rate was 0.8 ml·min<sup>-1</sup> with CH<sub>3</sub>OH/H<sub>2</sub>O (3:2, v/v). Recovery efficiency of the stated method was evaluated at the concentrations of 10, 30, 50 and 60  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid that appended in clean plant leaves.

#### **Genomic DNA preparation**

Microbial cells collection from leaf samples was carried out following the method as described by Yang et al. (2001). Genomic DNAs which isolated from collected microbes or TYB medium were prepared using the method described by Marmur (1961). The microbial genomic DNA from PLM was extracted using the methods as described by Zhou et al. (1996) with moderate modification. In brief, 5 g pretreated sample was suspended in 5 volumes TENP buffer (50 mM Tris, 20 mM EDTA, 100 mM NaCl, 0.01 g·ml<sup>-1</sup> PVP, pH 8.0) and incubated at 37°C for 30 min. Pellets were collected by centrifuged at 13, 000 g for 2 min at 4°C and resuspended in 400 µl extraction buffer (100 mM Tris, 100 mM EDTA, 200 mM NaCl, 1% PVP, 2% CTAB, pH 8.0) by blazing vortexing for 5 min. Reversed tubes acutely for 5 min after 400 µl 2% SDS was added. The mixture was centrifuged at 13, 000 g for 10 min at 4°C. The supernatant was transferred to a fresh tube and was extracted with the same volume of chloroform-isoamyl alcohol (24:1, v/v). After extraction, the tube was centrifuged for 15 min at 13, 000 g at 4°C. The supernatant was transferred to another fresh tube and genomic DNA was precipitated with 0.6 volume of isopropanol at -20°C for 2 h.

#### PCR-DGGE

PCR primers and GC clamp used by Yang et al. (2001) were selected to amplify the 338-f to 518-rRNA region which contains one variable loop of the 16S rRNA gene. PCR amplification was performed in a volume of 50  $\mu$ l containing 25 pmol of each primer, 25 mM dNTPs, 1.5 mM Mg<sup>2+</sup>, 1×PCR buffer and 2.5 units of Taq polymerase (Takara, Dalian). The amplification procedure was as follows: 1 cycle of denature at 94°C for 5 min, followed by 30 cycles of 94°C for 30 s, 60°C for 30 s, 72°C for 30 s, and finally, was extended at 72°C for 10 min.

DGGE analysis of 16S rRNA gene was performed using the procedure of Muyzer et al. (1993). It was performed with Dcode universal mutation detection system (Bio-Rad, USA). 15  $\mu$ l of the PCR products were loaded onto an 8% (wt/v) polyacrylamide gel (acrylamide/bis acrylamide, 37.5:1) with a denaturing gradient ranging from 30 to 60%. The 100% denaturant contained 7 mol·L<sup>-1</sup> urea and 40% formamide (Blackwood et al., 2007; Sei et al., 2004). The electrophoresis was conducted at 55°C, first for 10 min at 20 V and subsequently. for 14 h at 100 V in 0.5 × TAE buffer

(Sambrook and Russell, 2002). After electrophoresis, the gels were

stained with silver nitrate according to the procedure as described by Sanguinetti et al. (1994).

The gel images were transformed into digital data using quantity one from Bio-Rad system. The Shannon-weaver index of diversity (*H*') and Simpson index of dominance (*D*) were calculated from the results of DGGE profiles to quantify the diversity of microbial community (Shannon and weaver, 1963; Simpson, 1949); Dice's coefficient of similarity ( $S_D$ ) which represents band similarities between pairs of samples were calculated as described by Sei et al. (2004).

### RESULTS

# Evaluation of the analytical method for acetamiprid determination

The recovery efficiency of acetamiprid in plant leaves (or PLM medium) are arranging from 89 to 105%. The evaluation results displayed that the analytical method applied in this study well satisfied the requirement of the pesticide analysis standard (Table 1; satisfy scopes are from 80 to 120%). The LOD (limit detection of the apparatus) and LOQ (limit of quantification of the analysis method) of the method were  $1.0 \times 10^{-10}$  g and  $0.002 \,\mu g \cdot m l^{-1}$ , respectively.

# Processes of acetamiprid degradation on plant leaves (*in situ*)

The residue of acetamiprid decreased rapidly at all treatments in the early stage of incubation and the degradation speed came into slow phase (the second phase) about three days later. The dynamics of acetamiprid degradation represented by the regression equation  $C_t=C_0$ ·e<sup>-Kt</sup> and the half-lives calculated from the equation  $T_{0.5}=1/k$ ·ln2 were displayed in Table 2.

The half-lives of 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid on unsterilized and sterilized leafage are 3.24 d and 4.99 d, respectively, but 30 and 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid showed similar half-lives on the two kinds of leafage (3.1 to 3.5 d) (Table 2).

After 21 days incubation, the residue of unsterilized sample with  $10 \ \mu g \cdot ml^{-1}$  acetamiprid treatment was almost

Treatment _( μg⋅ml⁻¹)	Original deposition (C₀, µg⋅ml <sup>-1</sup> )	Regression equation ( <i>C<sub>t</sub></i> =C₀ e <sup>-kt</sup> )	Correlation coefficient (R <sup>2</sup> )	Half-life (T <sub>0.5</sub> =1/k⋅ln2, day)
Unsterilized leaves				
10	8.60±0.11	$C_t = 9.605 \cdot e^{-0.2225t}$	0.939	3.24±0.25*
30	11.37±0.76	$C_t = 9.731 \cdot e^{-0.1075t}$	0.982	3.08±0.29
50	18.73±0.31	$C_t = 16.010 \cdot e^{-0.093t}$	0.957	3.20±0.25
Sterilized leaves				
10	8.65±0.12	<i>C</i> <sub>t</sub> =6.9442⋅e <sup>-0.139t</sup>	0.957	4.99±0.50*
30	12.22±0.48	$C_t = 11.308 \cdot e^{-0.1001t}$	0.974	3.23±0.31
50	17.98±0.44	<i>Ct</i> =15.842⋅e <sup>-0.0809t</sup>	0.986	3.46±0.48

Table 2. Residual regression equations and half-lives of acetamiprid on two kinds of plant leaves at the in situ conditions.

Original deposition (C<sub>0</sub>), regression equation and half-life (T<sub>0.5</sub>) were calculated from the mean values of three subsamples, the standard deviations were given for T<sub>0.5</sub> and C<sub>0</sub>. C<sub>0</sub> is the value of actual original deposition determined in the present tests and C<sub>0</sub> is the original deposition calculated by regression equation. Because the correlation coefficient of every regression equation lower than 1 (R<sup>2</sup><1), the values of C<sub>0</sub> are not as the same as C<sub>0</sub>. \*Significant difference.



**Figure 1.** Processes of acetamiprid degradation in the culture mediums and sterilized water (*ex situ* degradation processes). Treatment of acetamiprid concentrations: A, 10 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>; B, 30 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>; C, 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>.

cleared up ( $C_{21}$ =0.051 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>), but there were still about 1.10 and 2.60 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> residues at high concentration of treatments (30 and 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>). The residual concentration of sterilized samples was 0.30 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> (10 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> treatment), 1.60 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> (30 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> treatment) and 2.91µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> (50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> treatment), respectively. *In situ* degradation results on sterilized and unsterilized leafage at different concentrations implied that, phyllomicrobes of *P. vulgaris* showed significant degradative abilities to the new kind of pesticide at the properly applied concentration.

# Processes of acetamiprid degradation in *ex situ* culture microcosms

At the treatment concentration of 11 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>, acetamiprid was completely degraded by phyllomicrobes within 42 days in PLM (Figure 1c), however, only 30% acetamiprid was decreased within 42 days when acetamiprid concentration in PLM increased up to 30 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> (even the incubation time extended to 56 days, the degradation ratio was still approximately 30%) (Figure 1b). If the applied concentration of acetamiprid in PLM was higher than 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>, the residual concentration displayed almost no significant changes within the whole culture time, that means phyllomicrobes did not displayed any degradative effects to the pesticide. According to the degradation results in PLM, phyllomicrobes' degradative capability was inhibited obviously by high concentration of acetamiprid (Figure 1). Different from unsterilized PLM microcosms, acetamiprid was not degraded in sterilized PLM microcosms or sterilized water at every tested concentration (Figure 1). These results suggested that the composition of kidney bean's leafage (include the enzymes of the plant leaves) did not displayed any degradation ability to the pesticide and the pesticide was quite stable in sterilized water at tested pH and temperature. TYB microcosms and TYB medium (not inoculated phyllomicrobes) also did not displayed obvious degradative abilities to acetamiprid at each applied concentration (data not shown). TYB microcosms' degradation results further proved that, the degradative microbes of phyllosphere could not be cultured by the chemical medium and the PLM was a kind of suitable culture medium for this group of microbial cultivation test. The PLM microcosm's degradation results were consistent with that of in situ conditions, phyllomicrobes



**Figure 2.** Bacterial population dynamics in PLM microcosms at different concentrations of acetamiprid.

showed significant capability to low concentration of acetamiprid than that of high-loading conditions.

# Population dynamics of phyllobacteria under acetamiprid stress

The population of phyllobacteria in PLM microcosms increased rapidly at all applied concentrations of acetamiprid within the first two weeks. Investigation result of population dynamics showed that, all treated concentrations of acetamiprid displayed limited effect on bacterial population that cultured in PLM. The bacterial population at the time point of 14<sup>th</sup> day was about 10<sup>5</sup> times larger than that of in situ conditions. After 14 days, phyllobacterial population in PLM microcosms decreased drastically at all concentrations treatment, the negative results may be caused by nutrition shortage, metabolized products accumulation or other negative factors (Figure 2). The incubation time of 14<sup>th</sup> day was the largest bacterial population time point in PLM microcosms for every concentration treatment. The bacterial population investigation result showed that, phyllobacteria of this time point was the most abundant period during the whole cultural time and the samples collected at this point were selected for phyllobacterial community analysis.

### Qualitative analysis of the microbial community

As displayed in Figure 3, the DGGE band patterns at conditions *in situ*, PLM microcosms and TYB microcosms

were all changed drastically at the high concentrations of acetamiprid. However, the band patterns remained quite stable at low concentration of acetamiprid treatment compared with their controls (Figure 3). The band pattern of sterilized leafage was completely distinct from those of the natural leaves or natural leaves treated with different concentrations of pesticide (Figure 3a).

For the *in situ* conditions (Figure 3a), bands S1 and S2 were the primary members for the sterilized leafage and the two groups of phyllobacteria should be the sterilize reagents resistant bacteria species. Natural leaves treated with 10 µg ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid showed highly similarity band pattern to the natural leaves, but the L1 and L2 were the new appeared bands that were not existed in natural leaves and these two bands also appeared in high concentrations treatment of acetamiprid. Interestingly, bands L1 and L2 are the groups of bacterial communities that can be significantly promoted by high concentrations of acetamiprid. Bands M1 and M2 are the particular communities for the treatments of 30 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid of in situ conditions and bacterial community of M2 were strongly promoted by this concentration level of acetamiprid. If the acetamiprid concentration increased to 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup>, M2 will be restrained and another new band H1 was appeared.

For the PLM microcosms (Figure 3b), bands P1 and P2 were the most sensitive bacterial communities to acetamiprid, the two bands disappear when PLM microcosms was treated with acetamiprid even under the concentration of  $10 \ \mu g \cdot m r^{-1}$ . Bands A1, A2 and A3 were the typical bacterial groups that can be stimulated by low concentration of acetamiprid and inhibited by high concentration.



**Figure 3.** 16S rRNA gene PCR-DGGE profiles for phyllobacterial community structure at different cultural conditions. A, *In situ* conditions: Lanes 1 to 2, sterilized leafage; lanes 3 to 4, unsterilized leafage; lanes 5 to 6, unsterilized leafage with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 8, unsterilized leafage with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 9 to 10, unsterilized leafage with 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 5 to 6, PLM with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 3 to 4, PLM with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 5 to 6, PLM with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 8, PLM with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 8, TYB without acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 8, PLM with 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; lanes 10 to 12, TYB with 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid.

concentrations of the pesticide, especially the group A2 and A3 which were the most abundant groups for the 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid treatment, but almost disappeared under the conditions of high concentration treatments. Many special bacterial groups could be promoted by 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid but inhibited by 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid in PLM microcosms, such as bands B1, B2, B3 and B4. Bands C1 and C2 were the new appeared bacterial groups under the conditions of 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid, the two bands were the acetamiprid resistant bacteria groups in PLM microcosms test.

For the TYB microcosms (Figure 3c), low concentration treatment also showed similar band pattern as control (TYB microcosm without acetamiprid treated), except the faint band D1. TYB microcosms showed the same reactions as the *in situ* conditions and PLM microcosms, that many bacterial groups (bands N1 to N8) could be promoted by 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid but completely inhibited by the pesticide at the concentration of 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup>. Band E1 was significantly stimulated by high concentration of acetamiprid and the bacterial groups of E1 and N5 were the resistant communities in the TYB microcosms test.

In all tested conditions (*in situ*, PLM and TYB), the number of bands at  $30 \ \mu g \cdot ml^{-1}$  acetamiprid treatment were more abundant than that of other applied concentrations. The PLM microcosms (Figure 3b) showed similar band numbers to the *in situ* conditions (Figure 3a) and they were all much more abundant than that of chemical microcosms (Figure 3c).

Cluster analysis constructed from PCR-DGGE profiles

displayed that in chemical and PLM microcosms, the sample treated with high concentration of acetamiprid (30 and 50  $\mu$ g·m<sup>-1</sup>) formed the farther distant branch from its corresponding control than those treated with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid (Figure 4b, c). Under in situ conditions (Figure 4a), the microbial community of sterilized leaves represented a deep-separated lineage from the natural leaves and natural leaves treated with different concentrations of acetamiprid. The stated result indicated that, the community structure of phyllobacteria was destroyed heavily by UV and alcohol sterilization. Cluster analysis results of in situ and ex situ tests indicated that, low concentration of acetamiprid showed minor effects on phyllobacteria community, but the bacterial communities were significantly changed by the pesticide at the concentration higher than 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup>.

### Quantitative analysis of the microbial community

The Shannon-Weaver indexes of diversity (H) of the PLM microcosms and *in situ* conditions showed similar values, which were all higher than that of chemical microcosms (TYB). The Simpson indexes of dominance (D) were significantly lower in PLM microcosms and *in situ* conditions than that of chemical microcosms (Figure 5). High H' and low D values indicated high diversity in a microbial community (Shannon and weaver, 1963; Simpson 1949). The results indicated that, the diversities of PLM microcosms and *in situ* conditions were significantly higher than that of chemical microcosms.



**Figure 4.** Phyllobacterial dendrogram constructed from PCR-DGGE banding profiles by cluster analysis for community similarities at different cultural conditions. A, In situ conditions: #1 to 2, sterilized leafage sample; #3 to 4, unsterilized leafage with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #7 to 8, unsterilized leafage with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #7 to 8, unsterilized leafage with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #3 to 4, PLM without acetamiprid; #3 to 4, PLM with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #3 to 4, PLM with 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #7 to 8, PLM microcosms: #1 to 2, PLM without acetamiprid; #3 to 4, PLM with 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #5 to 6, PLM with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #7 to 8, PLM with 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #7 to 9, TYB with 30  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid; #10 to 12, TYB with 50  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid. Note: The numbers listed are corresponding to the lanes' number the figure.

Diversity results of PLM microcosms also suggested that, the composition of kidney bean's leafage was more suitable for phyllobacterial nutrition requirements than that of chemical mediums. The PLM is one of the best choices for phyllobacteria cultivation tests.

Diversities of PLM microcosms and *in situ* conditions remained relatively stable at different concentrations of acetamiprid treatments compare with chemical microcosms. In chemical microcosms, phyllobacterial diversity fluctuated drastically according to different concentrations of acetamiprid applied. The similar disciplinarian in all culture conditions is that, the phyllomicrobial diversity could be stimulated by acetamiprid at appropriate concentration, but inhibited at the high concentration.

In summary, the new kind of pesticide showed minor negative effects on phyllobacterial community of *P. vulgaris* at the properly applied concentration (not higher than 10  $\mu$ g·ml<sup>-1</sup> in this study) and the phyllomicrobes also displayed significant degradation abilities to acetamiprid. However, the phyllobacteria's community structure could be destroyed heavily by high concentration of the pesticide, and the phyllomicrobes' degradation capability was also inhibited at the same conditions.

### DISCUSSION

After pesticides come into environment and contact with water, soils, plants or other substance, they can be cleaned up gradually by processes such as volatilization, photolysis, absorption, eluviations and biotic or abiotic decomposition (Petit et al., 1995). On the other hand, residual pesticides played complicated effects on environmental organisms in turn (Julien and Reeledr, 1987). Interactions between acetamiprid degradation and phyllobacterial community dynamics were determined in this study. The fact that acetamiprid residue decreased rapidly at all concentration treatments in the early stage of *in situ* conditions was mainly attributed to the results of eluviations and volatilization (the melting point of acetamiprid is 98.9°C and the vapor pressure  $1 \times 10^{-8}$  mm Hg), in this stage, other factors such as biotic or abiotic degradation may only displayed limited contributions. Biotic and abiotic degradation ought to play more important role after residual chemicals were steadily absorbed to the plant or other substance.

Once plant leaves were sterilized by ultraviolet, ethanol or  $H_2O_2$ , phyllomicrobes were killed or restrained during the phyllomicrobes recover period, the biotic degradation abilities would be reduced or even lost (Wilson et al., 1999). In this study, phyllobacterial community structure was seriously destroyed by ultraviolet and ethanol disposal, in the mean while, the pesticide degradation results showed that, the half-life of 10 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> acetamiprid on sterilized leafage were significantly longer than that of unsterilized leafage (unsterilized leafage was 3.24 days compared with 4.99 days on sterilized leaves). By comparing acetamiprid half-lives on sterilized and unsterilized leafage at different concentrations, we concluded that, phyllomicrobes of kidney bean's leafage showed the degradative abilities to new kind of neonicoti-.



**Figure 5.** Biodiversity analysis of phyllobacteria at different cultural conditions (*in situ* and *ex situ* conditions).

showed the degradative abilities to new kind of neonicoti-. 3816 noids pesticide at proper applied concentration Degradation process combine with PCR-DGGE analysis further displayed that, phyllobacterial community structure was heavily destroyed by high concentration of acetamiprid and phyllomicrobes degradation ability was restrained at the same time. The previous acetamiprid biodegradation results showed that, the pesticide could be biotransformed by Stenotrophomonas maltophilia, Rhodotorula mucilaginosa, Rhizopus sp. and Penicillium sp., but the biotransformstion efficiency of these soil microbes were not very high ( Dai et al., 2010a, b). The half-life of acetamiprid in sucrose mineral salt medium with the R. mucilaginosa IM-2 were about 3.7 days and there was still 8.8% acetamiprid residue detected after 20 days incubation (Dai et al., 2010b). Soil microbes degradation researches described earlier displayed similar results as in the plant leaves investigation of *in situ* conditions, that is, the pesticide could be biotransformed by microbes from soil and plant leaves at the proper concentration, but the transformation ability were not good enough (this study was the first report for the acetamiprid degradation by microbes of phyllosphere).

In order to investigate the relationships between phyllomicrobial community dynamics and acetamiprid degradation further, two kinds of *ex situ* culture methods were adopted and compared. According to results of uncultured scientific reports, only a small bit of environmental microorganisms could be cultivated using single chemical mediums, the closer medium composition is similar to original environment, the larger proportion of the environmental microbes could be isolated (Ward et al., 1990; Ghezzi and Steck, 1999). In this study, PLM and TYB mediums were selected and compared for phyllomicrobial cultivation tests. Obviously, bacterial diversity values in PLM microcosms were notably higher than that of TYB chemical microcosms. PLM was proved to be one of a proximal medium for phyllobacterial nutrition requirements. Perhaps the results of this study were not exhaustive enough, the microbial cultures in PLM represented the phyllobacterial community and functions of phyllosphere better than other mediums do.

Degradation result of PLM microcosms further proved that, acetamiprid is a degradable chemical for phyllomicrobes of P. vulgaris at proper applied concentration. However, the degradation ability was inhibited gradually with increasing of acetamiprid concentration and the degradation ability was lost completely when the treated concentration is higher than 50 µg·ml<sup>-1</sup> (Figure 1a). Although, the culture-depended results displayed that all tested concentrations of acetamiprid showed no significant negative effects on phyllobacterial population, phyllobacterial dominant communities were changed obviously, when PLM microcosms is treated with high concentrations of acetamiprid. Our work confirmed that, the new kind of pesticide could be degraded by phyllosphere microbes at proper concentration and the results could provide useful instructions for the pesticide applications.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledged Prof. Yang, Ching-Hong of University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for helpful suggestions on the manuscript written; Prof. Zhao, Liping and Dr. Liu, Binbin of Shanghai Jiaotong University, for their kind assistance in phyllomicrobial genomic DNA extraction in PLM. This work was supported by grants from Zhejiang Natural Science Foundation (No. Y3080502, Y3090026) and Zhejiang Science and Technology Project (No. 2008C12074). Yu Zhou was also supported by China Postdoctoral Foundation (No. 20090461410).

#### REFERENCES

- Abramovitch A (2002). United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (7501C). p. 1-14.
- Blackwood CB, Waldrop MP, Zak1 DR, Sinsabaugh RL (2007). Molecular analysis of fungal communities and laccase genes in decomposing litter reveals differences among forest types but no impact of nitrogen deposition. Environ. Microbiol. 9: 1306-1316.
- Debarati P, Gunjan P, Pandey J, Rakesh KJ (2005). Accessing microbial diversity for bioremediation and environmental restoration. Trends Biotech. 23: 125-142.
- Dai Y, Zhao Y, Zhang W, Yu C, Ji W, Xu W, Ni J, Yuan S (2010A). Biotransformation of thianicotinyl neonicotinoid insecticides: diverse molecular substituents response to metabolism by bacterium

Stenotrophomonas maltophilia CGMCC 1.1788. Bioresourse Technol. 101: 3838-3843.

- Dai Y, Ji W, Chen T, Zhang W, Liu Z, Ge F, Yuan S (2010B). Metabolism of the Neonicotinoid insecticides acetamiprid and thiacloprid by the yeast *Rhodotorula mucilaginosa* strain IM-2. J. Agric. Food Chem. 58: 2419-2425.
- Ghezzi JI, Steck TR (1999). Induction of the viable but non-culturable condition in *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. Campestris in liquid microcosms and sterile soil. FEMS Microbiol. Eco. 30: 203–208.
- John HA, Harris RF (2000). The ecology and biogeography of microorganisms on plant surfaces. Annu. Rev. Phytopathol. 38: 145-180.
- Julien M, Reeledr, RD (1987). Effects of the pesticides maneb and carbaryl on the phylloplane microflora of lettuce. Can. J. Microbiol. 33: 212-216.
- Lindow SE, Brandl MT (2003). Microbiology of the Phyllosphere. Appl. Enviorn. Microbiol. 69: 1875-1883.
- Marmur J (1961). A procedure for the isolation of deoxyribonucleic acid from microorganisms. J. Mol. Biol. 3: 208–218.
- Muyzer G, Waal EC, Uitterlinden AG (1993). Profiling of complex microbial populations by denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis analysis of polymerase chain reaction-amplified genes encoding for 16S rRNA. Appl. Enviorn. Microbiol. 59: 695-700.
- Obana H, Okihashi M, Akutsu K, Kitagawa Y, Hori S (2003). Determination of Neonicotinoid Pesticide Residues in Vegetables and Fruits with Solid Phase Extraction and Liquid Chromatography Mass Spectrometry. J. Agric. Food Chem. 51: 2501-2505.
- Petit V, Cabridenc R, Swannell RPJ, Sokhi RS (1995). Review of strategies for modelling the environmental fate of pesticides discharged into riverine systems. Environ. Intern. 21: 167-176.
- Richard JE, Philip M, Andrew JW, John CF (2003). Cultivation-Dependent and -Independent Approaches for Determining Bacterial Diversity in Heavy-Metal-Contaminated Soil. Appl. Enviorn. Microbiol. 69: 3223-3230.
- Sambrook J, Russell DW (2002). Molecular Cloning: a Laboratory Manual, 3rd edition. (Cold Spring Harbor Press, Cold Spring Harbor, NY), pp. 1595–1596.
- Sanguinetti CJ, Dias, ND, Simpson AJG (1994). Rapid silver staining and recovery of PCR products separated on polyacrylamide gels. BioTechniques 17: 915-919.
- Sei K, Inoue D, Wada K, Mori K, Ike M, Kohno T, Fujita M (2004). Monitoring behavior of catabolic genes and change of microbial community structures in seawater microcosms during aromatic compound degradation. Water Research, 38: 4405-4414.
- Shannon CE, Weaver W (1963). The mathematical theory of communication. The 5th edition, University of Illinois Press, Urbana. p. 1-54.
- Simpson EH (1949). Measurement of diversity. Nature 163: 688.
- Ward DM, Weller R, Bateson MM (1990). 16S rRNA sequences reveal uncultured microorganisms in a natural community. Nature 345: 63-65.
- Wilson M, Hirano SS, Lindow SE (1999). Location and survival of leaf-associated bacteria in relation to pathogenicity and potential for growth within the leaf. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 65: 1435–1443.
- Yang CH, Crowley DE, Borneman J, Keen NT (2001). Microbial phyllosphere populations are more complex than previously realized. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 98: 3889–3894.
- Zwillich D (2000). A tentative comeback for bioremediation. Science, 289: 2266-2267.
- Zhou, JZ, Bruns MA, Tiedje JM (1996). DNA recovery from soils of diverse composition. Appl. Enviorn. Microbiol. 62: 316–322.