1 ORIGINAL PAPER

2 *Diplophrys mutabilis* sp. nov., a New Member of
3 Labyrinthulomycetes from Freshwater Habitats

4
5 Yuiki Takahashi, Masaki Yoshida¹, Isao Inouye, and Makoto M. Watanabe

6
7 Faculty of Life & Environmental Sciences, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1 Tennodai,
8 Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8572, Japan

9
10 Submitted August 23, 2013; Accepted October 19, 2013

11 Monitoring Editor: Michael Melkonian

12
13 **Running title:** *Diplophrys mutabilis*, a New Member of the Labyrinthulomycetes

14
15
16 ¹Corresponding author; e-mail yoshida.masaki.gb@u.tsukuba.ac.jp (M.
17 [Yoshida](#)).

Diplophrys is a ubiquitous protist genus belonging to the class Labyrinthulomycetes. Although most members of Labyrinthulomycetes prefer marine habitats, the genus *Diplophrys* exclusively consists of the freshwater species *Diplophrys archeri* and *Diplophrys parva*. To investigate the genus *Diplophrys*, several novel strains were isolated from Japanese freshwater environments, and cultures of the strains were established. Among the strains, an organism isolated from Lake Nojiri displayed some characteristic features different from that of both *D. archeri* and *D. parva*. Thus, we described this strain as a new species, *Diplophrys mutabilis*. *D. mutabilis* can be cultured using dried water flea as food. This species had an orbicular to fusiform shape, and it occasionally penetrated prey with prominent cytoplasm. From a molecular phylogenetic analysis based on 18S rRNA sequences, *D. mutabilis* evidently belongs to Amphitremitida, Labyrinthulomycetes. This study suggests that these species form a unique group in Labyrinthulomycetes.

Key words: Amphitremitida; *Diplophrys mutabilis*; lipid body; phylogeny; ultrastructure.

Introduction

Labyrinthulomycetes is a heterotrophic protist group belonging to the protistan supergroup stramenopiles (Dick 2001 (as “Straminipila”); Patterson 1989), and the class is characterized by the following features: biflagellate zoospores possessing an anterior flagellum with tripartite tubular mastigonemes (Kazama 1973), rhizoid-like ectoplasmic net elements produced by a unique organelle, bothrosome (sagenogen, sagenogenetosome) (Moss 1980; Perkins 1972; Porter 1972), and multilamellate cell walls composed of Golgi body-derived scales (Alderman et al. 1974; Darley et al. 1973). Honda et al. 1999 classified Labyrinthulomycetes into two families: Thraustochytriaceae, characterized by globose cells forming ectoplasmic nets that are derived from a single bothrosome, and Labyrinthulaceae, spindle-shaped cells with gliding motility using the channels of ectoplasmic nets extending from a number of bothrosomes (Honda et al. 1999). Thraustochytriaceae includes *Althornia*, *Aurantiochytrium*, *Botryochytrium*, *Japonochytrium*, *Oblongichytrium*, *Parietichytrium*, *Schizochytrium*, *Sicyoidochytrium*, *Thraustochytrium*, and *Ulkenia*, whereas Labyrinthulaceae includes only the genera *Aplanochytrium* and *Labyrinthula* (Anderson and Cavalier-Smith 2012; Yokoyama and Honda 2007; Yokoyama et al. 2007). Some genera such as *Diplophrys* and *Sorodiplophrys* are also included in Labyrinthulomycetes even though they are treated as incertae sedis (Dick 2001).

Labyrinthulomycetes species play ecological roles as decomposers or parasites. Naganuma et al. (1998) estimated the abundance of the Thraustochytriaceae in the Seto Inland Sea in Japan and demonstrated that their

biomass in coastal waters could reach 43% of the bacterial biomass. Some studies estimated the biomass of these organisms in the oceanic water column as being as high as 675×10^3 cells/L (Damare and Raghukumar 2008; Naganuma et al. 2006). Such high abundance and widespread occurrence indicate their ecological importance in coastal and oceanic environments. Conversely, the distribution of Labyrinthulomycetes species in freshwater water is poorly understood, and only a few freshwater genera have been described. Of these, the most common freshwater genus is *Diplophrys*.

Diplophrys was described with the type species *Diplophrys archeri* collected from a freshwater habitat in Great Britain (Barker 1868). This genus is characterized by the following features: nearly orbicular or broadly elliptical cells, a layer of scales covering the cell comprised of fine organic discs that can only be visualized by electron microscopy, a turf of filiform pseudopodia emanating from two opposite points, and an oil-like refractive orange-to-amber-colored globule immersed in the cytoplasm (Patterson 1996).

A new terrestrial species, *Diplophrys stercorea*, which possesses filopodia and a refractive granule, was added to the genus (Cienkowski 1876). Although *D. stercorea* has a similar shape as *D. archeri*, it was moved to a separate genus, *Sorodiplophrys* L. Olive & M Dykstra (Dykstra and Olive 1975), based on its terrestrial habitat and aggregative behavior.

In addition, a marine protist that displays a prominent refractive granule, ectoplasmic elements, and gliding motility was isolated from both the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of the United States and named *Diplophrys marina* (Dykstra and Porter 1984). As a result of molecular phylogenetic analysis based on 18S rDNA

sequences, *D. marina* was classified into Thraustochytriaceae rather than Labyrinthulaceae (Leander and Porter 2001). Although the phylogenetic position of *D. marina* appeared to be clarified, its gliding motility is characteristic of Labyrinthulaceae species. Recently, *D. marina* was transferred to the genus *Amphifila* upon the report of the novel species *Diplophrys parva* (Anderson and Cavalier-Smith 2012). In the paper, the authors proposed the reclassification of the entire class Labyrinthulomycetes, and the genus *Diplophrys* was classified into the order Thraustochytrida, family Diplophryidae. However, in the following year, Gomaa et al. described the new order Amphitremida, and *Diplophrys* members were transferred to this order together with testaceous amoeboid organisms with a bipolar symmetry (Gomaa et al. 2013). Based on these recent classifications, Labyrinthulomycetes should be composed of three orders: Thraustochytrida, Labyrinthulida, and Amphitremida including Diplophryidae. Though *Diplophrys* encountered unheralded testaceous neighbors, related uncultured organisms remain to be discovered, and the diversity of the genus itself is unclear.

In this study, we describe a new species in *Diplophrys* isolated from Lake Nojiri, Nagano, Japan using ultrastructural features. The phylogenetic position of the new species is also consolidated using 18S rRNA sequence comparisons.

Results

Taxonomic Treatments

Based on the morphological characteristics and the result of molecular phylogenetic analyses using SSU rDNA sequences, we describe a new species of the genus *Diplophrys*, *D. mutabilis* sp. nov.

Diplophrys mutabilis (ICBN)

Taxonomic Description

The cell shape of *D. mutabilis* was orbicular to fusiform, asymmetrical to the axis connecting the polar ends. The cells measured 3.1–8.3 × 3.4–10.3 µm in diameter, exhibiting an irregular gliding motility by means of fine filamentous, branching ectoplasmic elements extending up to 150 µm from both polar ends of the cell. The cells had hyaline cytoplasm containing one to several colorless, or yellow, orange, or amber-colored conspicuous refractive granules. The nucleus was located subcentrally with an evident nucleolus. One to several vacuoles were present, one of which was a contractile vacuole. Unidentified cytoplasmic membranes of various forms, including ring-like, single-helical, or double-helical structures, were present. The cell wall was composed of overlapping Golgi-derived circular scales (0.8–1.5 µm in diameter) displaying an incrassate rim. The cells divided by repeated binary fission. Sporangia, spores, and cysts were not observed. The species' SSU rDNA sequence places it in the *Diplophrys* clade, but it was separated from any known species.

Taxonomic summary: Chromalveolate, Stramenopiles, Labyrinthulomycetes (Labyrinthulea), Amphitremida, Diplophriidae.

Type material: Holotype: EM block (TNS-AL-57099).

Type strain: NIES-3361

Type habitat/locality: Nojiri Lake, Nagano Prefecture, Japan (36.830585N, 138.20848E).

Etymology: Specific epithet “mutabilis” means changeable cell shapes.

Gene sequence: AB856527

General Morphology

Diplophrys mutabilis was orbicular or broadly elliptic in shape, and it contained refractive granules, a single nucleus, a contractile vacuole, and ectoplasmic elements emanating from the poles of the cells (Fig. 1). Cells changed their shape from orbicular (Fig. 1A, C, D) to fusiform (Fig. 1B). Gliding motility was observed, notably in fusiform cells. As many as 10 refractive bodies were observed in each cell. Using a Nile Red stain, refractive bodies were stained yellow and thus identified as lipid bodies containing neutral lipids (Fig. 1C, D).

Ectoplasmic elements were branching but not anastomosing, and one of the branching ectoplasmic elements for each pole was eminently longer than the others (Fig. 2A). The ectoplasmic elements were up to 150 μ m in length. In the basal part of the ectoplasmic elements, ectoplasmic swelling was frequently observed (Fig. 2A, B). Distal ectoplasmic elements exhibited dichotomous branching (Fig. 2C).

The cell surface was covered with scales (Fig. 3A, B). The scales were round

in shape with an incrassate rim but without palpable marking. They measured 0.8–1.5 μm in diameter and were extremely thin. Thus, overlapping of multiple scales was recognizable (Fig. 3B). These scales were Golgi-derived (see below). In the culture examined, bacteria were attached to the scale surface and ectoplasmic elements (Fig. 3A, C). No debris surrounding the cell was observed.

Ultrastructural Observations

In thin-section observations using TEM, nucleus, mitochondria, lipid bodies, and Golgi bodies were observed (Fig. 4A). Ectoplasmic elements contained ribosome-free cytoplasm and tubular internal membrane system elements (Fig. 4B). Bothrosomes and bothrosome-like bodies were not observed. *D. mutabilis* possessed mitochondria containing distinctive cristae with short, stubby branches (Fig. 4C). Developed lipid bodies were observed in the cytoplasm. In these lipid bodies, mosaic patterns were occasionally observed (Fig. 4D). Many small vesicles were observed between the nucleus and Golgi body (Fig. 4A, E). Organic scales were formed in the dictyosomes near the cell surface (Fig. 4E, arrows).

In some cells, unidentified cytoplasmic membranes were observed (Fig. 5). These membranes displayed various forms, including concentric circles (Fig. 5A), a single helical form (Fig. 5B), and a double-helical form (Fig. 5C). These transverse and slant sections (Fig. 5D) suggested that these membrane systems are probably cylindrical in shape. Although the entire three-dimensional shape and the role of these membranes are unclear, some hypothetical functions are

suggested on the basis of their location and neighboring organelles (described in Discussion).

Some unusual images were encountered in TEM observations (Fig. 6). In Figure 6A, it is likely that *D. mutabilis* changes its cell shape and breaks into the feed body. This deformation was recognized only by TEM observations, and it has not been observed by light microscopy. The cells multiplied by repeated binary fission (Fig. 6B). Some bacteria were present inside the scale layer of the parent cell. The scales of the parent cell were probably shed and discarded during cell division. It is unclear whether the scales of daughter cells are synthesized de novo or succeeded from the parent cell. Other types of multiplication, such as aplanosporogenesis or zoosporogenesis, were not observed.

Molecular Phylogenetic Analyses

Phylogenetic analyses based on the 18S rDNA gene sequence revealed that *D. mutabilis* was a new member of Labyrinthulomycetes (Fig. 7). The phylogenetic tree was similar to those reported previously (Anderson and Cavalier-Smith 2012; Leander and Porter 2001). Our analysis identified a close phylogenetic relationship between *D. mutabilis* and labyrinthuloid members, but it also revealed significant differences between them. It is known that Labyrinthulomycetes is divided into at least two phylogenetic groups, namely the labyrinthulid phylogenetic group (LPG) and thraustochytrid phylogenetic group (TPG) (Honda et al. 1999). ML algorithm and Bayesian analyses indicated that

Diplophrys was not classified into either LPG or TPG, but it was included in Amphitremida. The branching orders were different, but this result was consistent with Gomaa et al. 2013. From the phylogenetic tree, there was no doubt that *D. mutabilis* belonged to order Amphitremida, family Diplophryidae. This clade contains *Diplophrys*, *Amphitrema*, *Archerella*, and many unidentified environmental clones from anoxic deep-sea samples reported by Edgcomb et al. (2011). All identified members in this clade display a bipolar cell shape and are unicellular, solitary organisms that do not form developed ectoplasmic networks. They also share the characteristic of having solid cell coverings; however, *Amphitrema* and *Archerella* have a monolithic testa, whereas *Diplophrys* have layers of discrete scales.

Discussion

Concerning its appearance, *D. mutabilis* resembles *D. archeri*, *D. parva*, *Amphifila marina*, and the vegetative cells of *Sorodiplophrys stercorea* (Anderson and Cavalier-Smith 2012; Dykstra and Olive 1975; Dykstra and Porter 1984). These organisms are nearly orbicular or broadly elliptic in shape and contain refractive granules, a contractile vacuole, and ectoplasmic elements emanating from the poles of the cells. *D. mutabilis* can change its cell shape, not only from orbicular to fusiform (Fig. 1B) but also probably to a more plastic form such as that penetrating to the substratum as observed by TEM (Fig. 6A). This changeability of cell shape is one of the diagnostic characters of *D. mutabilis*.

A swelling in the basal part of the ectoplasmic elements was observed in *D. mutabilis* (Fig. 2A, B). Similar swellings have been observed in *Af. marina* and *S. stercorea*. However, their swellings occurred in the middle part of the ectoplasmic elements (Porter 1984), not in the basal part as observed in *D. mutabilis*. Although pseudopodial features are important morphological characteristics of amoeboid organisms in general, it is unclear whether this difference reflects phylogenetic relationships in this group.

An internal membrane system in ectoplasmic elements is widely observed in Labyrinthulomycetes species (Perkins 1972), and the system of *D. mutabilis* is apparently more developed than those in other organisms. The system has been observed in *S. stercorea* (Dykstra 1976a), but not in *Af. marina* and *D. parva*. The ectoplasmic element of *Af. marina* appears to consist of fine fibrous structures rather than a bundle of membranous tubes (Dykstra and Porter 1984). Labyrinthulomycetes species have mitochondria with tubular cristae, which are also observed in Stramenopiles, but *D. mutabilis* has mitochondria containing distinctive cristae with short, stubby branches (Fig. 4C). This characteristic has also been recognized in *S. stercorea* (Dykstra 1976a, 1976b), *D. parva* (Anderson and Cavalier-Smith 2012), and *Af. marina* (Porter 1984), but these mitochondrial features have not been observed in other members of Labyrinthulomycetes. This characteristic could be a synapomorphic or apomorphic characteristic of the genus *Diplophrys* and related lineages. Nevertheless, it remains a matter of debate because *Archerella flavum*, closely related to genus *Diplophrys*, has mitochondria with tubular cristae (Bonnet 1981).

In TEM observations, unidentified concentric and helical cytoplasmic membranes were observed (Fig. 5). Similar cytoplasmic membranes have been observed in *S. stercorea* (Dykstra et al. 1975) and *D. parva* (Anderson and Cavalier-Smith 2012), but they have not been reported in other Labyrinthulomycetes species including *Af. marina*. The function of these organelles is unclear, and no particular explanation has been uncovered. One possible insight is that these organelles appeared to be connected to lipid bodies and the outer membrane of mitochondria through the endoplasmic reticulum (Fig. 5B), so it is possible that this organelle plays some roles in development of lipid bodies. This would mean that this organelle could be an unusual type of smooth endoplasmic reticulum. Although further investigations are needed to answer the question, this organelle may be a key structure in the development of prominent lipid bodies in *Diplophrys*.

Phylogenetic analyses demonstrated that the genus *Diplophrys*, including *D. mutabilis*, clearly belongs to Labyrinthulomycetes, Amphitremida, Diplophryidae. From our phylogenetic tree, *D. mutabilis* belongs to Amphitremida, and it exhibited a relationship with TPG rather than LPG (Fig. 7). This result is different from that of Gomaa et al. (2013), in which *Archerella*, *Amphitrema*, and *Diplophrys* formed a deep branching clade within all Labyrinthulomycetes. However, being in progress, phylogenetic relationships in Labyrinthulomycetes remain controversial because of low bootstrap supports. More molecular data should be obtained to clarify their relationships.

D. mutabilis resembles *D. archeri* in several ways. Based on the original

description of *D. archeri* (Barker 1868), Anderson and Cavalier-Smith defined the average cell size of the species as 12.7 μm (Anderson and Cavalier-Smith 2012). This is approximately twice the size of *D. mutabilis* and *D. parva*. Concerning motility, no locomotion was mentioned in the original description of *D. archeri* (Barker 1868). In contrast, *D. mutabilis* possessed an ability of active gliding motility (Table 1). In addition, *D. archeri* has a few lipid bodies of an orange or amber color, whereas *D. mutabilis* has 1–10 lipid bodies of a colorless or amber color. *D. archeri* was also reported to have a fixed shape because of its solid cell wall (Patterson 1996), whereas *D. mutabilis* can easily change its shape (Figs 1A, B, 6A). These differences distinctly separate *D. mutabilis* from *D. archeri*.

D. parva appears to be the closest relative of *D. mutabilis*. The phylogenetic tree indicated that these species are closely related (Fig. 7). Moreover, their cell sizes are extremely similar. However, regarding motility, these species are different (Table 1). *D. parva* exhibits only minimal cell motility, if any at all, whereas *D. mutabilis* locomotes by active gliding with moving filopodia. Moreover, the inner structure of the ectoplasmic elements and their root morphology are different between these species. In *D. parva*, ectoplasmic elements emerge from the cell surface as electron dense conical projections, possibly sagenogens, and become longer tubular extensions (Andersen and Cavalier-Smith 2012). However, in *D. mutabilis*, sagenogen-like bodies were not observed, and the ectoplasmic elements contained ribosome-free cytoplasm and branching internal membrane system elements (Fig. 4B). Based on these differences concerning ectoplasmic elements, it is apparent that they are

different species. In addition, whereas the scales of *D. parva* are slightly oval to elongated in shape, the scales of *D. mutabilis* are round. From this perspective, it is clear that they are separate species.

D. mutabilis has a different habitat from another morphologically similar species, *Af. marina*. Both species share a whole-cell morphology and thin, circular, simple scales. However, *Af. marina* lacks unidentified cytoplasmic membranes and an internal membrane system of ectoplasmic elements (Dykstra and Porter 1984); they are contrastingly well developed in *D. mutabilis* (Table 1). Furthermore, 18S rRNA analysis (Fig. 7) demonstrated that they are distantly related within Labyrinthulomycetes.

The vegetative cells of *S. stercorea* resemble *D. mutabilis* in light microscopic morphology, gliding motility, and organelle structure such as the unidentified cytoplasmic membranes (Dykstra and Olive 1975). However, the aggregative behavior, terrestrial habitat, and complex life cycle including a sorocarp would be sufficient to separate *Sorodiplophrys* from *Diplophrys* at the generic or perhaps higher level (Table 1). This should be confirmed when the DNA sequence of *Sorodiplophrys* becomes available. *Sorodiplophrys* may be related to Amphihilidae because the latter include environmental DNA sequences from soil habitats (Fig. 7).

Elaeorhanis cincta, a filopodial amoeba with debris on its cell surface, has been suggested to be closely related to *Diplophrys* species (Patterson 1996). They share filopodia, an oil-like refractive body of an orange or amber color, and some other features. Although *Diplophrys* and *Elaeorhanis* are easily

distinguished from one another by the presence or absence of the debris layer, it is still possible that they may be closely related species or simply different ecotypes of the same organism. No *Elaeorhanis* strain or its rRNA gene sequence are available at present even though the genus is common in freshwater habitats. A detailed comparison between these two organisms is required to settle this question.

From the phylogenetic tree, *D. mutabilis* clearly belonged to Labyrinthulomycetes, Amphitremida, Diplophryidae, being positioned near *At. wrightianum* and *Ar. flavum*. The two genera are very different from *Diplophrys* concerning cell size and the presence of a monolithic brown or hyaline testa and endosymbiotic algae. Endosymbionts, or preyed bacteria have never been reported in *Diplophrys* despite the presence of bacteria attached to the scale surface and ectoplasmic elements (Fig. 2A, C). Thus, according to our results, *Diplophrys* does not appear to display phagocytosis. On the contrary, the ultrastructure of their ectoplasmic elements and roots is similar to that of *D. mutabilis*, including the absence of bothrosomes and the presence of an internal membrane system (Table 1). *Diplophrys* is phylogenetically similar to these two genera, but it presumably diverged before its species could obtain endosymbiotic algae.

Concerning morphologically-based aspects, Diplophryidae is more similar to Amphifilidae than to Amphitremidae, although Diplophryidae is closer to Amphitremidae than to Amphifilidae with respect to its molecular phylogeny. Interestingly, such discrepancies between morphology and molecular phylogeny

are frequently observed in Labyrinthulomycetes. For example, *Oblongichytrium* species have morphological similarities to Thraustochytrida species (Yokoyama and Honda 2007); however, it was included in LPG in the molecular phylogenetic analysis (Gomaa et al. 2013; Yokoyama and Honda 2007). In terms of molecular phylogeny, *Diplophrys* tends to be related to TPG rather than LPG. Conversely, the ectoplasmic elements of the genera *Labyrinthula* and *Aplanochytrium*, which belong to LPG, support gliding motility as observed in *D. mutabilis*, *Af. marina*, and *S. stercorea*. However, the ectoplasmic elements of *Labyrinthula* species, e.g., *L. zosterae* (Muehlstein and Porter 1991), and *Aplanochytrium* species, e.g., *Ap. saliens* (Leander and Porter 2000; Quick 1974), are both branching and anastomosing; therefore, they construct a highly developed ectoplasmic network. The ectoplasmic elements of *D. mutabilis* exhibited dichotomous branching (Fig. 2C), and an anastomosing network has never been observed. *D. mutabilis*, *Af. marina*, and *S. stercorea* lack bothrosomes, a shared characteristic of Labyrinthulomycetes species, but *D. parva* was reported to have bothrosome-like structures. More studies, both morphological and molecular phylogenetic are required to establish a robust phylogenetic relationship among Labyrinthulomycetes species.

Methods

Sample collection and cultivation: In November 2011, *D. mutabilis* was isolated from freshwater samples collected from Lake Nojiri, Nagano Pref., Japan. Surface water was collected in a sampling bottle.

Single-species cultures were established using the single-cell isolation technique with micropipettes. For feeding, autoclaved distilled water and commercially available dried water flea for aquarium fish were used. 5 – 10 of dried water fleas were added to 5 ml of distilled water and autoclaved at 120 °C for 20 min. The cultures were maintained in test tubes at room temperature in a shaded space. Another novel strain, Amphihilidae H-1, was isolated from freshwater samples collected from the surface layer water of Pond Hiuchi, Ibaraki Pref., Japan, in June 2011. The culture of strain H-1 was established and maintained using the same technique utilized for *D. mutabilis*. *Diplophrys* ATCC PRA-36 strain HAVA-2 was also obtained from the American Type Culture Collection for molecular phylogenetic analysis.

Morphological observations: For light microscopy, a Zeiss AX10 microscope (Carl Zeiss, Göttingen, Germany) and an Olympus IX71 microscope (Olympus, Tokyo, Japan) equipped with Nomarski differential interference contrast optics was used. IX71 was also used for fluorescent microscopy with Nile red-stained cells.

For scanning electron microscopy (SEM), cultured samples were mounted onto glass plates coated with poly L-lysine and fixed at 4 °C for 2h in 5% glutaraldehyde. After rinsing with 0.2 M sodium cacodylate buffer (pH 7.2) several times, the prefixed samples were fixed in 1% osmium tetroxide for 30 min. These samples were then dehydrated through a graded ethanol series (50, 75, 90, 95, and 100%), keeping them in each concentration for 15 min, followed by substitution with dehydrated *t*-butyl alcohol. The specimens were freeze-dried

using a VFD-21S freeze drier (SHINKU-DEVICE, Ibaraki, Japan) and mounted onto specimen stubs. These specimens were coated with platinum/palladium with an E102 ion-sputter (Hitachi, Tokyo, Japan) and observed using a JSM-6330F field emission scanning electron microscope (JEOL, Tokyo, Japan).

For whole-mount images, cells were exposed to 4% OsO_4 fumes for 5 min followed by washing in distilled water. Cells were stained for 3 min with 4% uranyl acetate. Cells were viewed with a Hitachi H-7650 (Hitachi) transmission electron microscope (TEM).

For thin sectioning, cells were fixed as follows. Vegetative cells were exposed to 1% OsO_4 fumes for 3 min. The cells were fixed in a solution containing 2.5% glutaraldehyde, 2% OsO_4 , 4.5% sucrose, and 0.1 M cacodylate buffer at pH 7.0 for 90 min under refrigeration (4 °C, in the dark) followed by washing in the same buffer three times for 10 min each. The cells were successively dehydrated in 30, 50, 70, 90, 95, and 100% acetone for 10 min each under refrigeration, followed incubation in both acetone-propylene oxide (PO) mixtures and pure PO twice for 10 min. The dehydrated pellet was embedded in Agar low viscosity resin (LV Resin, VH1 and VH2 Hardener, and LV Accelerator, Agar Scientific, Essex, Great Britain), and a 1:1 mixture of PO and the resin was prepared. The resin was polymerized for 12 h at 70 °C.

Thin sections were cut on an ultramicrotome (Leica EM UC7, Leica Camera AG, Solms, Germany) and stained for 5 min with 4% uranyl acetate, followed by Sato's lead citrate (Sato 1968) for 5 min. The sections were viewed with a

Hitachi H-7650 TEM.

Molecular phylogenetic analyses: To amplify the 18S rDNA, single cells were isolated, again using micropipettes as mentioned above, and transferred into PCR tubes with autoclaved distilled water. Tubes were first stored overnight at room temperature to digest the feeds and then placed at -20 °C in the freezer overnight to break membranes. The 18S rDNA was amplified by PCR with the primer pairs reported in Nakayama et al. (1998), namely SR1 and SR12. The first PCR products were amplified again using following primer pairs: SR1 and SR5, SR4 and SR9, and SR8 and SR12. Nonspecific PCR products were electrophoretically detected, and second PCR products were purified using the QIAquick® Gel Extraction Kit (Qiagen, Venlo, Netherlands). Purified products were sequenced with a BigDye Terminator V1.1 cycle sequencing kit (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) and an Applied Biosystems 3130 genetic analyzer. Two sequences of 18S rDNA gene, namely of *D. mutabilis* (AB856527) and Amphifilidae H-1 (AB856528) were obtained. Other sequences of 18S rDNA were obtained from GenBank (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Genbank/>) and automatically aligned using CLUSTAL X version 1.81 (Thompson et al. 1997, <ftp://ftp-igbmc.u-strasbg.fr/pub/ClustalX/>). For phylogenetic analyses, ambiguously aligned regions were manually arranged or deleted using the BioEdit Sequence Alignment Editor version 7.0.9.0 (<http://www.mbio.ncsu.edu/BioEdit/bioedit.html>), and finally, 1310 sites for 18S rDNA were used.

The phylogenetic trees were constructed using both maximum likelihood (ML)

and Bayesian approaches based on a 1230-bp alignment using three sequences of Alveolata as the outgroup. We used Phylip ver. 3.69 (<http://evolution.genetics.washington.edu/phylip.html>) for ML and MrBayes 3.2.1 for Bayesian analysis. For Bayesian analysis, GTR+I+R model were selected using MrModeltest 2.3 (Nylander 2004, <http://www.abc.se/~nylander/>). The stability of relationships was assessed by performing bootstrap analyses based on 100 resamplings for ML. Bayesian analysis was run for 1,000,000 generations, with a sampling frequency of every 100th generation. All other settings were left at their default values.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. Higuchi (Nagano Environmental Conservation Research Institute) for providing samples from Lake Nojiri. This study was financially supported by the Core Research of Evolutional Science & Technology program (CREST) from the Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST) and the Special Funds for Next Generation Energy Development Project, MEXT, Japan.

452

453 **References**

454 Alderman DJ, Harrison JL, Bremer GB, Jones EBG (1974) Taxonomic revisions
455 in the marine biflagellate fungi: The ultrastructural evidence. Mar Biol
456 **25**:345–357

457

458 Anderson OR, Cavalier-Smith T (2012) Ultrastructure of *Diplophrys parva*, a new
459 small freshwater species, and a revised analysis of Labyrinthulea (Heterokonta).
460 Acta Protozool **51**:291-304

461

462 Barker J (1868) No title. Quart. J. Microscop. Sci. (N. S.) **8**: 123

463

464 Bonnet L (1981) Nouvelles donnees sur le thecamoebien filosa *Amphitrema*
465 *flavum* (Archer 1877) Penard 1902. Protistologica **17**:225-233

466

467 Cienkowski L (1876) Ueber einige Rhizopoden und verwandte Organismen.
468 Arch. Mikroskop Anat **12**:15-50

469

470 Damare V, Raghukumar S (2008) Abundance of thraustochytrids and bacteria in

471 the equatorial Indian Ocean, in relation to Transparent Exopolymeric Particles
472 (TEPs). FEMS Microbiol Ecol **65**:40-49

473

474 Darley WM, Porter D, Fuller MS (1973) Cell wall composition and synthesis via
475 Golgi-directed scale formation in the marine eukaryote, *Schizochytrium*
476 *aggregatum*, with a note on *Thraustochytrium* sp. Arch Microbiol **90**:89–106

477

478 Dick MW (2001) Straminipilous Fungi: Systematics of the Peronosporomycetes
479 Including Accounts of the Marine Straminipilous Protists, the Plasmodiophorids
480 and Similar Organisms. Springer-Verlag, Berlin

481

482 Dykstra MJ (1976a) Wall and membrane biogenesis in the unusual
483 Labyrinthulid-like organism *Sorodiplophrys stercorea*. Protoplasma **87**:329–346

484

485 Dykstra MJ (1976b). Nuclear and cell division in *Sorodiplophrys stercorea*, a
486 Labyrinthulid-like protist. Protoplasma **359**:347–359

487

488 Dykstra MJ, Olive LS (1975) *Sorodiplophrys*: an unusual sorocarp-producing
489 protist. Mycologia **67**:873–879

490

491

492 Dykstra MJ, Porter D (1984) *Diplophrys marina*, a new scale-forming marine
493 protist with labyrinthulid affinities. Mycologia **76**:626–632

494

495 Edgcomb V, Orsi W, Bunge J, Jeon S, Christen R, Leslin C, Holder M, Taylor GT,
496 Suarez P, Varela R, Epstein S (2011). Protistan microbial observatory in the
497 Cariaco Basin, Caribbean. I. Pyrosequencing vs Sanger insights into species
498 richness. ISME J **5**:1344–1356

499

500 Edmondson WT (1959) Fresh-water Biology 2nd ed, Wiley, New York

501

502 Goldstein S, Belsky M (1964) Axenic culture studies of a new marine
503 phycomycete possessing an unusual type of asexual reproduction. Am J Bot
504 **51**:72–78

505

506 Gomaa F, Mitchell EAD, Lara E (2013) Amphitremida (Poche, 1913) Is a new
507 major, ubiquitous Labyrinthulomycete clade. PLoS ONE **8**(1):e53046

508

509 Honda D, Yokochi T, Nakahara T, Raghukumar S, Nakagiri A, Schaumann K,
510 Higashihara T (1999) Molecular phylogeny of labyrinthulids and thraustochytrids

511 based on the sequencing of 18S ribosomal RNA gene. J Eukaryot Microbiol
 512 **46**:637–647
 513
 514 Kazama FY (1973) Ultrastructure of *Thraustochytrium* sp. zoospores. IV.
 515 External morphology with notes on the zoospores of *Schizochytrium* sp.
 516 Mycologia **66**:272–280
 517
 518 Leander CA, Porter D (2000) Redefining the genus *Aplanochytrium* (phylum
 519 Labyrinthulomycota). Mycotaxon **76**:439–444
 520
 521 Leander CA, Porter D (2001) The Labyrinthulomycota is comprised of three
 522 distinct lineages. Mycologia **93**:459–464
 523
 524 Lee JJ, Leedale GF, Bradbury P (2000) An Illustrated Guide to the Protozoa 2nd
 525 ed, Soc Protozool, Lawrence, Kansasnd edition: 811
 526
 527 Morro I, Negrisola E, Callegaro A, Andreoli C (2003) *Aplanochytrium stocchinoi*:
 528 a new Labyrinthulomycota from the Southern Ocean (Ross Sea, Antarctica).
 529 Protist **154**:331–340
 530

531 Moss ST (1980) Ultrastructure of the
 532 endomembrane-sagenogenetosome-ectoplasmic net complex in *Ulkenia*
 533 *visurgensis* (Thraustochytriales). Bot Mar **23**:73–94
 534
 535 Muehlstein LK, Porter D (1991) *Labyrinthula zosterae* sp. nov., the causative
 536 agent of wasting disease of eelgrass, *Zostera*. Mycologia **83**:180–191
 537
 538 Naganuma T, Takasugi H, Kimura H (1998) Abundance of thraustochytrids in
 539 coastal plankton. Mar Ecol Prog Ser **162**:105–110
 540
 541 Naganuma T, Kimura H, Karimoto R, Pimenov NV (2006) Abundances of
 542 planktonic thraustochytrids and bacteria and of particulate ATP in the Greenland
 543 and Norwegian Seas. Polar Biosci **20**:37–45
 544
 545 Nakayama T, Marin B, Kranz HD, Surek B, Huss VAR, Inouye I, Melkonian M
 546 (1998) The basal position of scaly green flagellates among the green algae
 547 (Chlorophyta) is revealed by analyses of nuclear-encoded SSU rRNA sequences
 548 Protist **149**:367–380
 549
 550 Nylander JAA (2004) MrModeltest. Program distributed by the author.
 551 Evolutionary Biology Centre, Uppsala University

552

553 Patterson DJ (1989) Stramenopiles: Chromophytes from a Protistan Perspective.
554 In Green, JC, Leadbeater, BSC, Diver, WL (eds), The Chromophyte Algae,
555 Problems and Perspectives. Clarendon Press, Oxford. pp 357–379

556

557 Patterson DJ (1996) Free-living Freshwater Protozoa: A Color Guide. Wiley, New
558 Jersey

559

560 Perkins FO (1972) The ultrastructure of hold-fasts, “rhizoids” and “slime track” in
561 traustochytriaceous fungi and in *Labyrinthula* spp. Arch Microbiol **84**:95–118

562

563 Porter D (1972) Cell division in the marine slime mold, *Labyrinthula* sp. and the
564 role of the bothrosome in extracellular membrane production. Protoplasma
565 **74**:427–448

566

567 Porter D (1984) *Diplophrys marina*, a new scale-forming marine protist with
568 labyrinthulid affinities. Mycologia **76**:626–632

569

570 Quick JA (1974) A new marine *Labyrinthula* with unusual locomotion. Trans Am
571 Microsc Soc **93**:52–61

572

573 Sato T (1968) A modified method for lead staining of thin sections. J Electron
574 Microsc **17**:158–159

575

576 Thompson JD, Gibson TJ, Plewniak F, Jeanmougin F, Higgins DG (1997) The
577 CLUSTAL_X windows interface: flexible strategies for multiple sequence
578 alignment aided by quality analysis tools. Nucleic Acids Res **25**:4876–4882.

579

580 Watanabe M (2012) Handbook of Algae - Their Diversity and Utilization, pp
581 73–76

582

583 Yokoyama R, Honda D (2007) Taxonomic rearrangement of the genus
584 *Schizochytrium* sensu lato based on morphology, chemotaxonomic
585 characteristics, and 18S rRNA gene phylogeny (Thraustochytriaceae,
586 Labyrinthulomycetes): emendation for *Schizochytrium* and erection of
587 *Aurantiochytrium* and *Oblongichytrium* gen. nov. Mycoscience **48**:199–211

588

589 Yokoyama R, Salleh B, Honda D (2007) Taxonomic rearrangement of the genus
590 *Ulkenia* sensu lato based on morphology, chemotaxonomical characteristics,
591 and 18S rRNA gene phylogeny (Thraustochytriaceae, Labyrinthulomycetes):
592 emendation for *Ulkenia* and *Botryochytrium*, *Parietichytrium*, and

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Light micrographs of *Diplophrys mutabilis*. **A.** Colonial cells connected through ectoplasmic elements (white arrowheads). This culture is not axenic, and thus, bacterial contaminations are present (arrowheads). Arrows denote the contractile vacuoles in cells. **B.** Elongated fusiform (spindle-shaped) cell. Ectoplasmic elements (white arrowheads) and a contractile vacuole (arrow) are also recognizable. **C, D.** Spherical cell of *Diplophrys mutabilis* containing oil droplets. **C.** Differential interference contrast. **D.** Fluorescent micrograph of a Nile Red-stained cell. Neutral lipid emits yellow fluorescence. Red fluorescence is derived from polar lipids such as phospholipid.

Figure 2. Whole-mounted cells of *Diplophrys mutabilis*. **A.** Cell projecting ectoplasmic elements. Swelling is observed in the basal part of ectoplasmic elements (arrows). Many bacteria (arrowheads) are also contained. **B.** Close-up image of the swelling with an inhomogeneous texture. **C.** Close-up image of the distal part of ectoplasmic elements exhibiting dichotomous branching.

Figure 3. SEM images of *Diplophrys mutabilis*. **A.** Lyophilized cell. Some bacteria (arrowheads) are attached to the surface of the cell. **B.** Close-up image

of a scale. The scale is round and displays an incrassate margin (arrows). Scales are very thin, and thus, overlapping of multiple scales is recognizable (arrowheads). **C.** Ectoplasmic elements projecting from cells (white arrowheads).

Figure 4. TEM images of *Diplophrys mutabilis*. **A.** Spherical cell. G: Golgi body, L: lipid body, M: mitochondria, N: nucleus, B: bacteria. **B.** Longitudinal section of the basal part of the ectoplasmic element. Internal membranous tubes are observed (arrowhead). **C.** Mitochondria with inflated finger-like tubular cristae. **D.** Lipid body. **E.** Golgi body. Two developing scales are inside (arrows). Some vesicles (arrowhead) are observed between the nucleus and cis-side of the Golgi body.

Figure 5. TEM images of unidentified cytoplasmic membranes revealing different topologies. **A.** Concentric ring form. **B.** Single helical form. L: lipid body, M; mitochondria. Arrowhead denotes the inner end of the helix. **C.** Double-helical form. Arrowheads denote two inner ends of helixes. **D.** Slanted transverse section.

Figure 6. TEM images of *Diplophrys mutabilis*. **A.** Plastic cell penetrating the substratum. S: Substratum. **B.** Dividing cell. Two daughter cells are recognizable. Some bacteria (arrowheads) are located inside the cell wall of the parent cell. The ectoplasmic element (white arrowheads) elongates via the cleft of the parent scale layer. D: daughter cell.

Figure 7. Phylogenetic tree based on the 18S rDNA sequences and constructed using the maximum likelihood method based on a 1230-bp alignment. Bayesian approach also estimated the same topology of the tree (not shown). Support values at each node are presented for ML/Bayes. Bootstrap values larger than 50 and posterior probabilities larger than 0.80 are shown. Smaller values are represented by “–.”

Table 1. A comparative table of *Diplophrys mutabilis* and related organisms

?: Question mark indicates that the corresponding organ-like microstructures are observed but less certain.

*: The character is unspecified but determined from the information of other species of the same genus.

* *: In this table, “aggregation” refers to active aggregation of free-moving individuals. Aggregation as a result of cell division of aplanatic or sluggish cells observed in some species is treated as incapable (“–”) in this table.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Table 1

Genus/species (sources)	Internl membrane system	unidentified cytoplasmic membranes	shape of mitochondrial cristae	Cell size (μm)	gliding motility	sagenogenetosome (= bothrosome, sagenogen)	habitat	aggregation (**)	endosymbioti c algae
<i>Diplophrys mutabilis</i> (This study)	++	++	short, stubby branches	3.1 - 8.3 × 3.4 - 10.3	+	—	freshwater	—	—
<i>Diplophrys archeri</i> Barker, 1868 (Anderson and Cavalier-smith 2012, Barker 1868, Patterson 1996)	No data	No data	No data	12.7	—	No data	freshwater	—	—
<i>Diplophrys parva</i> Anderson et Cavarier-smith, 2012 (Anderson and Cavarier-smith 2012)	—	++	short, stubby branches	6.5 ± 0.08 × 5.5 ± 0.06; mean ± SE	—	+	freshwater	—	—
<i>Amphifila marina</i> Dykstra et Porter, 1984 (Dykstra And Porter 1984)	—	—	short, stubby branches	3.7 - 5.9 × 5.1 - 8.5	+	—	marine	—	—
<i>Sorodiplophrys stercorea</i> (Cienkowski) Olive et Dykstra, 1975 (Dykstra And Olive 1975)	+	+	short, stubby branches	2.4 - 4.8 × 4.8 - 9.6	+	—	terrestrial	+	—
<i>Elaeorhanis cincta</i> Greeff, 1873 (Lee 2000, Patterson 1996)	No data	No data	No data	10 - 20 in diameter	No data	No data	freshwater	No data	—
<i>Amphitrema wrightianum</i> Archer, 1869 (Edmondson1959, Gomma 2013)	No data	No data	No data	61 - 95 in diameter	+	No data	freshwater	—	+
<i>Archerella flavum</i> Loeclich et Tappan, 1961 (Bonnet et al. 1981,	+	—	tubular cristae	45 - 77 in diameter	+	—	freshwater	—	+
<i>Labyrinthula zosterae</i> Muehlstein et Porter, 1991 (Muehlstein and Porter 1991)	++ (Perkins 1972)	—	tubular cristae	15.5 - 19.5 × 3.5 - 5.0	+	+	marine	+	—
<i>Aplanochytrium stocchinoi</i> Morro et al. 2003 (Morro et al. 2003)	No data	—	tubular cristae	4 - 8 in diameter	+	++ (Watanabe 2012)	marine	—	—
<i>Schizochytrium aggregatum</i> Goldstein et Belsky, 1964 (Goldstein and Belsky 1964)	++ (Perkins 1972)	—	tubular cristae	6 - 12 in diameter	—	+	marine	—	—