Wolbachia pipientis should not be split into multiple species: A response to Ramírez-Puebla *et al.*, “Species in *Wolbachia*? Proposal for the designation of ‘*Candidatus Wolbachia bourtzisii*’, ‘*Candidatus Wolbachia onchocercicola*’, ‘*Candidatus Wolbachia blaxteri*’, ‘*Candidatus Wolbachia brugii*’, ‘*Candidatus Wolbachia taylori*’, ‘*Candidatus Wolbachia collembolicola*’ and ‘*Candidatus Wolbachia multihospitum*’ for the different species within *Wolbachia* supergroups”

Amelia R. I. Lindsey^{a,e}, Seth R. Bordenstein^b, Irene L. G. Newton^c, Jason L. Rasgon^d

^aDepartment of Entomology, University of California Riverside, Riverside, California, USA;

^bDepartment of Biological Sciences, and Department of Pathology, Microbiology and

Immunology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA; ^cDepartment of Biology,

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA; ^dDepartment of Entomology, Center for

Infectious Disease Dynamics, and the Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State

University, University Park, Pennsylvania, USA

^eCorresponding author: alind005@ucr.edu

KEYWORDS

Wolbachia; taxonomy

In their recent paper, Ramírez-Puebla *et al.* [26] propose the designation of species for a selection of *Wolbachia* lineages. While this study considers the largest number of *Wolbachia* strains in genomic analyses to date, there are several shortcomings and oversights, which render the conclusions problematic. The authors state that *Wolbachia* taxonomy has been understudied, and they disregard the caution implemented in other phylogenetic and phylogenomic studies to not define species [5, 10, 13, 22]. As an obligate intracellular symbiont, *Wolbachia* is intimately connected to its host. For this reason, and because *Wolbachia* cannot be cultured axenically, host phenotypes and phylogenetic relationships of *Wolbachia* strains are the most well studied aspects of *Wolbachia* biology rather than *Wolbachia* themselves. The strain designations used across the *Wolbachia* literature provide information on the host animal (ex: strain *wMel* infects *Drosophila melanogaster*), allowing results to be interpreted in the appropriate biological context. Below we outline three major concerns with the framework proposed by Ramírez-Puebla *et al.*, and argue that applying species status to *Wolbachia* lineages is premature.

First, the datasets used by the authors are unsound. While the authors have gathered a large amount of the publically available *Wolbachia* genomes, sequence data known to be unreliable was used in their analyses. For example, the sequences available for the *wAna* strain (from *Drosophila ananassae*) represent a combination of host genomic inserts of *Wolbachia* from lateral gene transfer events and sequence from the *Wolbachia* infection [18]. Additionally, for genome strains *wDacA* and *wDacB* (from *Dactylopius coccus*), the authors do not provide primary sequence data, instead stating that their analysis will be published at a later time. Defining species status should be held to higher standards and publicly available datasets that the community can evaluate. Ramírez-Puebla *et al.* present low *in silico* DNA-DNA hybridization

(DDH) and average nucleotide identity (ANI) values comparing *wDacA* to other A supergroup strains. Because the authors sequenced *wDacA* co-infecting with *wDacB* (a B supergroup *Wolbachia* strain), the data produced may be a combination of both strains or potential lateral gene transfer events, as often happens with *Wolbachia* [6, 10, 18, 24]. The evidence for phage and chromosomal genetic exchange across supergroups between co-infecting strains further complicates species designations [2, 8, 23], though we appreciate that some *Wolbachia* supergroups evolve cohesively to a degree despite frequent ecological overlap in coinfecting hosts [10].

Second, and as previous studies recognized [5, 13], the stability of any systematic framework is fundamentally dependent on data completeness for each candidate taxonomic grouping. As is evident by several recent studies that have identified novel *Wolbachia* supergroups, the field is still discovering new *Wolbachia* diversity [1, 4, 14, 19]. Currently, there are 16 reported supergroups, denoted A – Q [1, 4, 14, 15, 21, 27]. Supergroup G was de-commissioned as it was based on a recombinant from supergroups A and B [3]. Ramírez-Puebla *et al.* acknowledge the large number of *Wolbachia* supergroups, but only examine genomic data from strains representing six of these supergroups (A-F). They suggest that the name “*Wolbachia pipientis*” applies only to supergroup B, and propose new species names for seven other clades. This system of nomenclature would leave a total of ten supergroups nameless (supergroups H – Q), and it is unclear how these groups would be incorporated into their framework in future. Importantly, for two supergroups (C and D), there is a severely limited quantity of genomic data; two of the proposed species (*Candidatus Wolbachia blaxteri* and *Candidatus Wolbachia taylora*) are each based on data from a single *Wolbachia* strain. This should deter biologists from splitting

each supergroup into two species (*Candidatus Wolbachia onchocercicola* and *Candidatus Wolbachia blaxteri* for supergroup C, and *Candidatus Wolbachia brugii* and *Candidatus Wolbachia taylori* for supergroup D). It is not clear how remaining members of the C and D supergroups not analyzed by Ramírez-Puebla *et al.* are to be classified. This could be especially problematic for strains that are found to cluster closely with, for example, supergroup D, but are sister to the clade of *Candidatus Wolbachia brugii* + *Candidatus Wolbachia taylori*.

Third, the utility of new species designations is not evident to us and presumably other researchers in the *Wolbachia* community. A combination of both genetic distance and functional divergence should be taken into consideration when devising taxonomic frameworks. For example, there are many closely related *Wolbachia* strains in supergroup A (referred to as *Candidatus Wolbachia bourtzisii* in Ramírez-Puebla *et al.*) that infect *Drosophila* spp. and have vastly different consequences for their hosts [16]. Also, the proposed nomenclature could easily cause confusion. While a transitional process is expected when adopting new nomenclature, several of the suggested species names provide confusing descriptors for the clades. The name suggested for supergroup E is “*Candidatus Wolbachia collembolicola*” due to the fact that this clade is found infecting Collembolan hosts. However, there is evidence that this clade is not specific to Collembola, and can infect Dipteran species as well (J. Rasgon, unpublished data). The clade that would make up *Candidatus Wolbachia onchocercicola* (a subset of the C supergroup) includes *Wolbachia* strains that do not infect the genus *Onchocerca* [11]. However, all hosts of both the C and D supergroup strains are members of the Onchocercidae family.

The authors reference Pfarr *et al.* [25] as a source of support for splitting *Wolbachia* into species. Given the sequencing of additional genomes, discovery of many new supergroups, and discovery of novel phenotypes since then, the arguments made in Pfarr *et al.* are no longer as strong. Pfarr *et al.* argue that the nematode-infecting *Wolbachia* should be classified differently because they are obligate, infect a different taxon of hosts, and have genomes with different features. However, we now know of obligate *Wolbachia* strains infecting various arthropods [9, 17, 20, 28, 29], the F supergroup that infects both arthropods and nematodes [7], and that the *Wolbachia* infecting *Trichogramma* wasps share some similarities with the nematode-infecting strains, such as the absence of phages [12]. It is clear that *Wolbachia* do not “bin” nicely according to the criteria in Pfarr *et al.*

It is well understood that the *Wolbachia* clade is diverse and contains a number of distinct lineages identifiable to the community in the current supergroup classification system. Therefore, for these reasons and those above, we recommend to the community that they continue to use the previously designated strain names and supergroups for clarity in the field. Should there be further evidence and community support for species designations within this unique clade of bacteria, a comprehensive and voluntary *Wolbachia* consortium should work together to propose nomenclature, as has been previously done in the field (International *Wolbachia* Conference, Heron Island, Australia, August 2004).

110   **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

111   *Wolbachia* work in our labs is supported by grants NSF IOS 1456545 to ILGN, NSF IOS
112   1456778 to SRB, NIH NIAID R56AI116636 to JLR, NSF DEB DDIG 1501227 to ARIL, and a
113   Robert and Peggy van den Bosch Memorial Scholarship in Biological Control to ARIL.

REFERENCES

- [1] Augustinos, A.A., Santos-Garcia, D., Dionyssopoulou, E., Moreira, M., Papapanagiotou, A., Scarvelakis, M., Doudoumis, V., Ramos, S., Aguiar, A.F., Borges, P.A.V., Khadem, M., Latorre, A., Tsiamis, G., Bourtzis, K. (2011) Detection and characterization of *Wolbachia* infections in natural populations of aphids: Is the hidden diversity fully unraveled? PLoS One 6, e28695.
- [2] Baldo, L., Bordenstein, S., Wernegreen, J.J., Werren, J.H. (2006) Widespread recombination throughout *Wolbachia* genomes. Mol. Biol. Evol. 23, 437-449.
- [3] Baldo, L., Werren, J.H. (2007) Revisiting *Wolbachia* supergroup typing based on WSP: spurious lineages and discordance with MLST. Curr. Microbiol. 55, 81-87.
- [4] Bing, X.L., Xia, W.Q., Gui, J.D., Yan, G.H., Wang, X.W., Liu, S.S. (2014) Diversity and evolution of the *Wolbachia* endosymbionts of *Bemisia* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) whiteflies. Ecol. Evol. 4, 2714-2737.
- [5] Bordenstein, S.R., Paraskevopoulos, C., Dunning Hotopp, J.C., Sapountzis, P., Lo, N., Bandi, C., Tettelin, H., Werren, J.H., Bourtzis, K. (2009) Parasitism and mutualism in *Wolbachia*: what the phylogenomic trees can and cannot say. Mol. Biol. Evol. 26, 231-241.
- [6] Brelsfoard, C., Tsiamis, G., Falchetto, M., Gomulski, L.M., Telleria, E., Alam, U., Doudoumis, V., Scolari, F., Benoit, J.B., Swain, M., Takac, P., Malacrida, A.R., Bourtzis, K., Aksoy, S. (2014) Presence of extensive *Wolbachia* symbiont insertions discovered in the genome of its host *Glossina morsitans morsitans*. PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis. 8, e2728.
- [7] Casiraghi, M., Bordenstein, S.R., Baldo, L., Lo, N., Beninati, T., Wernegreen, J.J., Werren, J.H., Bandi, C. (2005) Phylogeny of *Wolbachia pipientis* based on *gltA*, *groEL* and *ftsZ* gene

136 sequences: clustering of arthropod and nematode symbionts in the F supergroup, and evidence
137 for further diversity in the *Wolbachia* tree. *Microbiology* 151, 4015-4022.

138 [8] Chafee, M.E., Funk, D.J., Harrison, R.G., Bordenstein, S.R. (2010) Lateral phage transfer in
139 obligate intracellular bacteria (*Wolbachia*): verification from natural populations. *Mol. Biol.*
140 *Evol.* 27, 501-505.

141 [9] Dedeine, F., Vavre, F., Fleury, F., Loppin, B., Hochberg, M.E., Bouletreau, M. (2001)
142 Removing symbiotic *Wolbachia* bacteria specifically inhibits oogenesis in a parasitic wasp. *Proc.*
143 *Natl. Acad. Sci.* 98, 6247-6252.

144 [10] Ellegaard, K.M., Klasson, L., Naslund, K., Bourtzis, K., Andersson, S.G.E. (2013)
145 Comparative genomics of *Wolbachia* and the bacterial species concept. *PLoS Genet.* 9,
146 e1003381.

147 [11] Ferri, E., Bain, O., Barbuto, M., Martin, C., Lo, N., Uni, S., Landmann, F., Baccei, S.G.,
148 Guerrero, R., de Souza Lima, S., Bandi, C., Wanji, S., Diagne, M., Casiraghi, M. (2011) New
149 insights into the evolution of *Wolbachia* infections in filarial nematodes inferred from a large
150 range of screened species. *PLoS One* 6, e20843.

151 [12] Gavotte, L., Henri, H., Stouthamer, R., Charif, D., Charlat, S., Bouletreau, M., Vavre, F.
152 (2007) A survey of the bacteriophage WO in the endosymbiotic bacteria *Wolbachia*. *Mol. Biol.*
153 *Evol.* 24, 427-435.

154 [13] Gerth, M., Gansauge, M.T., Weigert, A., Bleidorn, C. (2014) Phylogenomic analyses
155 uncover origin and spread of the *Wolbachia* pandemic. *Nat. Commun.* 5, 5117.

156 [14] Glowska, E., Dragun-Damian, A., Dabert, M., Gerth, M. (2015) New *Wolbachia*
157 supergroups detected in quill mites (Acari: Syringophilidae). *Infect. Genet. Evol.* 30, 140-146.

158 [15] Haegeman, A., Vanholme, B., Jacob, J., Vandekerckhove, T.T.M., Claeys, M., Borgonie,
159 G., Gheysen, G. (2009) An endosymbiotic bacterium in a plant-parasitic nematode: Member of a
160 new *Wolbachia* supergroup. *Int. J. Parasitol.* 39, 1045-1054.

161 [16] Hoffmann, A.A., Ross, P.A., Rasic, G. (2015) *Wolbachia* strains for disease control:
162 ecological and evolutionary considerations. *Ecol. Evol.* 8, 751-768.

163 [17] Hosokawa, T., Koga, R., Kikuchi, Y., Meng, X.Y., Fukatsu, T. (2010) *Wolbachia* as a
164 bacteriocyte-associated nutritional mutualist. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107, 769-774.

165 [18] Hotopp, J.C.D., Clark, M.E., Oliveira, D., Foster, J.M., Fischer, P., Torres, M.C., Giebel,
166 J.D., Kumar, N., Ishmael, N., Wang, S.L., Ingram, J., Nene, R.V., Shepard, J., Tomkins, J.,
167 Richards, S., Spiro, D.J., Ghedin, E., Slatko, B.E., Tettelin, H., Werren, J.H. (2007) Widespread
168 lateral gene transfer from intracellular bacteria to multicellular eukaryotes. *Science* 317, 1753-
169 1756.

170 [19] Konecka, E., Olszanowski, Z. (2015) A screen of maternally inherited microbial
171 endosymbionts in oribatid mites (Acari: Oribatida). *Microbiology* 161, 1561-1571.

172 [20] Kremer, N., Charif, D., Henri, H., Bataille, M., Prevost, G., Kraaijeveld, K., Vavre, F.
173 (2009) A new case of *Wolbachia* dependence in the genus *Asobara*: Evidence for
174 parthenogenesis induction in *Asobara japonica*. *Heredity* 103, 248-256.

175 [21] Lo, N., Casiraghi, M., Salati, E., Bazzocchi, C., Bandi, C. (2002) How many *Wolbachia*
176 supergroups exist? *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 19, 341-346.

177 [22] Lo, N., Paraskevopoulos, C., Bourtzis, K., O'Neill, S.L., Werren, J.H., Bordenstein, S.R.,
178 Bandi, C. (2007) Taxonomic status of the intracellular bacterium *Wolbachia pipientis*. *Int. J.*
179 *Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 57, 654-657.

180 [23] Metcalf, J.A., Bordenstein, S.R. (2012) The complexity of virus systems: the case of
 181 endosymbionts. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* 15, 546-552.

182 [24] Nikoh, N., Tanaka, K., Shibata, F., Kondo, N., Hizume, M., Shimada, M., Fukatsu, T.
 183 (2008) *Wolbachia* genome integrated in an insect chromosome: evolution and fate of laterally
 184 transferred endosymbiont genes. *Genome Res.* 18, 272-280.

185 [25] Pfarr, K., Foster, J., Slatko, B., Hoerauf, A., Eisen, J.A. (2007) On the taxonomic status of
 186 the intracellular bacterium *Wolbachia pipientis*: should this species name include the
 187 intracellular bacteria of filarial nematodes? *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 57, 1677-1678.

188 [26] Ramirez-Puebla, S.T., Servin-Garciduenas, L.E., Ormeno-Orrillo, E., Vera-Ponce de Leon,
 189 A., Rosenblueth, M., Delaye, L., Martinez, J., Martinez-Romero, E. (2015) Species in
 190 *Wolbachia*? Proposal for the designation of '*Candidatus Wolbachia bourtzisii*', '*Candidatus*
 191 *Wolbachia onchocercicola*', '*Candidatus Wolbachia blaxteri*', '*Candidatus Wolbachia brugii*',
 192 '*Candidatus Wolbachia taylori*', '*Candidatus Wolbachia collembolicola*' and '*Candidatus*
 193 *Wolbachia multihospitum*' for the different species within *Wolbachia* supergroups. *Syst. Appl.*
 194 *Microbiol.* 38, 390-399.

195 [27] Ros, V.I.D., Fleming, V.M., Feil, E.J., Breeuwer, J.A.J. (2009) How diverse is the genus
 196 *Wolbachia*? Multiple-gene sequencing reveals a putatively new *Wolbachia* supergroup recovered
 197 from spider mites (Acari: Tetranychidae). *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 75, 1036-1043.

198 [28] Russell, J.E., Stouthamer, R. (2011) The genetics and evolution of obligate reproductive
 199 parasitism in *Trichogramma pretiosum* infected with parthenogenesis-inducing *Wolbachia*.
 200 *Heredity* 106, 58-67.

201 [29] Stouthamer, R., Russell, J.E., Vavre, F., Nunney, L. (2010) Intra-genomic conflict in
202 populations infected by Parthenogenesis Inducing *Wolbachia* ends with irreversible loss of
203 sexual reproduction. BMC Evol. Biol. 10, 12.

204

205