RESEARCH ARTICLE



Two new species of Xanthagaricus and some notes on Heinemannomyces from Asia

Md. Iqbal Hosen¹, Zong-ping Song^{1,2,3}, Genevieve Gates⁴, Samantha C. Karunarathna⁵, M. Salahuddin M. Chowdhury⁶, Tai-Hui Li¹

I State Key Laboratory of Applied Microbiology Southern China, Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Microbial Culture Collection and Application, Guangdong Institute of Microbiology, Guangzhou 510070, Guangdong, China 2 South China Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Applied Botany, Guangzhou 510650, Guangdong, China 3 University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, Beijing, China 4 School of Land and Food, University of Tasmania, Private Bag 54, Hobart, Tasmania 7001, Australia 5 Key Laboratory for Plant Diversity and Biogeography of East Asia, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650201, Yunnan, China 6 Department of Plant Pathology, Faculty of Agriculture, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh

Corresponding authors: Md. Iqbal Hosen (iqbalmyco@gmail.com); Tai-Hui Li (mycolab@263.net)

Academic editor: M. Neves | Received 16 Septrember 2017 | Accepted 20 November 2017 | Published 5 December 2017

Citation: Hosen MI, Song ZP, Gates G, Karunarathna SC, Chowdhury MSM, Li TH (2017) Two new species of *Xanthagaricus* and some notes on *Heinemannomyces* from Asia. MycoKeys 28: 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3897/mycokeys.28.21029

Abstract

Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus and X. necopinatus, two new species of Agaricaceae, are described and illustrated from Asia. Macroscopically, both species are closely related to each other, but there are obvious micromorphological and molecular differences between them. Morphological and phylogenetic data showed that the two new species are distinct from other known species of the genus Xanthagaricus. Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus from China is characterized by its small, yellow basidiomata, short clavate cheilocystidia, epithelial pileipellis, and verrucose basidiospores measuring $5-5.5 \times 3-3.5 \mu$ m. Xanthagaricus necopinatus from Bangladesh is characterized by having small, yellow basidiomata, a fugacious annulus, clavate to narrowly clavate cheilocystidia, epithelial pileipellis, and rugulose-rough basidiospores measuring $4-5 \times$ $2.7-3.2 \mu$ m. In addition to the new species, a Heinemannomyces collection from China is reported. Morphological data and molecular phylogenetic analyses fully support the Chinese collection being Heinemannomyces splendidissimus, a species of Agaricaceae, originally described from Southeast Asia. Detailed descriptions, color photos and illustrations of the three species are presented. A key to the genus Xanthagaricus occurring in Bangladesh and China is provided.

Copyright Md. Iqbal Hosen et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Keywords

Hymenagaricus, molecular phylogeny, monophyly, South Asia, taxonomy

Introduction

Xanthagaricus (Heinem.) Little Flower, Hosag. & T.K. Abraham is mainly characterized by small basidiomata with squamulose pileus, epithelial pileipellis, and more or less yellow-colored basidiospores (Little Flower et al. 1997; Hosen et al. 2017). This genus was originally placed in *Hymenagaricus* Heinem. subgenus *Xanthagaricus* Heinem. by Heinemann and Little Flower (1984) with the type species *X. flavidorufus* (Berk. & Broome) Heinem. & Little Flower. Heinemann (1981) erected *Hymenagaricus* as an independent genus in the family Agaricaceae with the type species *H. hymenopileus* (Heinem.) Heinem., and is characterized by a squamulose pileus, a hymeniform pileipellis, and brown basidiospores (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984, Ge et al. 2008, Hosen et a. 2017). The epithelial pileipellis and yellow basidiospores of the subgenus *Xanthagaricus* did not fit completely with the genus circumscription of *Hymenagaricus*. Subsequently, the subgenus *Xanthagaricus* was elevated to the genus level in Agaricaceae (Little Flower et al. 1997).

Species in the genus *Xanthagaricus* are saprotrophic, and mainly distributed in Asia and South Africa. For instance, 11 species from India (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984, Little Flower et al. 1997), four species from Sri Lanka (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984, Pegler 1986, Little Flower et al. 1997), two species from Africa (Reid and Eicker 1995, 1998), one species each from mainland China (Hosen et al. 2017), Pakistan (Hussain et al. 2017), and Taiwan, China (Ge et al. 2008) have so far been validly reported. However, Asia has more than the currently known species of *Xanthagaricus*, as sequences of several species of this genus are available in GenBank, especially from Thailand and Malaysia. Index Fungorum (http://www.indexfungorum.org/Names/ Names.asp) lists 12 taxa of *Xanthagaricus*. However, a recent study by Hussain et al. (2017) has transferred six species to *Xanthagaricus* from *Hymenagaricus*.

Watling (1998) circumscribed *Heinemannomyces* as an independent monotypic genus in the family Agaricaceae from specimens collected in Malaysia and Thailand. Since then, no additional species with detailed descriptions and geographical extensions of the genus *Heinemannomyces* have been reported so far. *Heinemannomyces* is distinguished by its medium-sized basidiomata, extremely woolly-arachnoid veils on the pileus surface composed of cylindrical cells, leaden gray to dark blue lamellae, and reddening context when injured (Watling 1998). Phylogenetically, *Heinemannomyces* is closely related to *Hymenagaricus*, but can be differentiated by its morphology.

In this study, three collections of *Xanthagaricus* and *Heinemannomyces* from China, and one collection of *Xanthagaricus* with several basidiomata from tropical Bangladesh were examined. Based on macromorphology, both East Asian and South Asian *Xanthagaricus* collections could be the same species. However, careful microscopic observations along with molecular data revealed that they are not conspecific, but represent undescribed species within *Xanthagaricus*. In addition, a brief description from the

Chinese collection of *Heinemannomyces* is provided along with molecular data. With the inclusion of the two new species of *Xanthagaricus* in this study and another two recently described new species, namely *X. caeruleus* Iqbal Hosen, T.H. Li & Z.P. Song (Hosen et al. 2017) and *X. pakistanicus* Hussain, Afshan & Ahmed (Hussain et al. 2017), the number of known species of this genus increases to 22.

Materials and methods

Morphological studies

Specimens of *Xanthagaricus* and *Heinemannomyces* were collected from south China and Bangladesh (*Xanthagaricus*). The examined specimens were deposited in the Fungal Herbarium of the Guangdong Institute of Microbiology (GDGM), Guangzhou, China, and in the private herbarium (PHI) of the first author. Macromorphological descriptions were based on the field notes and photographs. Color codes and names follow Kornerup and Wanscher (1978).

Micromorphological observations were made from the dried specimens. Line drawings were freehand. Water, 5% aqueous KOH (w/v), and Congo Red were used as mounting media; Melzer's solution was used to check any amyloid reaction of basidiospores and tissues. In the descriptions of basidiospore measurements, the notation [n/m/p] was used, which means *n* basidiospores from *m* basidiomata of *p* collections. Dimensions for basidiospores are given as (a–)b–c(–d), in which 'b–c' contains a minimum of 90% of the measured values and extreme values 'a' and 'd' are given in parentheses, whenever necessary. Q denotes the length/width ratio of a measured basidiospore, Q_m denotes the average of *n* basidiospores and SD is their standard deviation. Results are presented as $Q_m \pm$ SD. Basidiospores were also observed using a scanning electron microscope (SEM) following the protocol of Hosen et al. (2013).

Molecular studies

Protocols for genomic DNA extraction, PCR amplification, and sequencing followed Hosen et al. (2013). ITS1-F/ITS4 (White et al. 1990) and LROR/LR5 (Vilgalys and Hester 1990) primer pairs were used for the amplification of the nuclear ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region and partial sequence of nuclear ribosomal large subunit (28S) domains D1 and D2.

A total of 52 sequences (36 for ITS and 16 for 28S, Table 1) of Agaricaceae was retrieved from GenBank based on NCBI blast search results and recent publications (Ge et al. 2008, Vellinga et al. 2011, Ge and Yang 2017, Hosen et al. 2017, Hussain et al. 2017), and then combined with the newly generated ITS and 28S sequences of *Clarkeinda trachodes* (Berk.) Singer, *Xanthagaricus* and *Heinemannomyces*. Each individual dataset, either ITS or 28S, was aligned in MAFFT v.6.8 (Katoh et al. 2005)

 Table 1. List of fungal taxa of Agaricaceae and their GenBank accession numbers used in molecular phylogeny.

Name of the speciesVoucher/collection no.CountryITS288Agaricus aff. campestrisMurphy 6242USAHM488744-Agaricus bisporatusContul-AF432882-Agaricus bisporatusLAPAG562-KR006613KR006613Agaricus deserticolaS. SmithUSAHM488747-Agaricus deserticolaS. SmithUSAAF482831AF482877Agaricus diminutivusVellinga 2360USAAF482831AF482877Agaricus spectors oftalisecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB-5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum nachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandHM488750-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3500ThailandHM488750-Eriocybe chioneaecv3500ThailandHM488760HM488760Heinemannomyces splendidissimuscelv3833ChinaHM488760-Heinemanomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621039Heinemanomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621039Heinemanomyces splendidissimusBR6089BurundiKM98
Agaricus aff. campestrisMurphy 6242USAHM488744-Agaricus bisporatusContul-AF432882-Agaricus bisporatusContul-AF432882-Agaricus desenticolaS. SmithUSAHM488747-Agaricus desenticolaS. SmithUSAAF482831AF482877Agaricus megacystidiatusWFLU 12-0137ThailandNR_119953-Agaricus megacystidiatusMFLU 12-0137ThailandNR_119953-Agaricus spequestidiatusecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB-5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandHM488750HM488771Caniclepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488760HM488760Heinemannomyces splendidissimusact3043ThailandJF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858 </th
Agaricus bisporatusContul-AF432882-Agaricus bohusiiLAPAG562-KR006613KR006613Agaricus deserticolaS. SmithUSAHM488747-Agaricus diminutivusVellinga 2360USAAF482831AF482877Agaricus megacystidiatusMFLU 12-0137ThailandNR_119953-Agaricus rotalisecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB-5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488750HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621038Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621049Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858- </td
Agaricus bohusiiLAPAG562-KR006613KR006613Agaricus deserticolaS. SmithUSAHM488747-Agaricus diminutivusVellinga 2360USAAF482831AF482877Agaricus megacystidiatusMFLU 12-0137ThailandNR_119953-Agaricus rotalisecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB-5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF27858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Clarkeinda trachodesvellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandM488750HM488771Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488750HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621049Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorIAPAF9TogoJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858- </td
Agaricus deserticolaS. SmithUSAHM488747Agaricus diminutivusVellinga 2360USAAF482831AF482877Agaricus megacystidiatusMFLU 12–0137ThailandNR_119953-Agaricus rotalisecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB-5059IndiaKR15104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Carkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimusgGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus sp.CA833Thailan
Agaricus diminutivusVellinga 2360USAAF482831AF482877Agaricus megacystidiatusMFLU 12–0137ThailandNR_119953-Agaricus rotalisecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB–5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chrophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodeslqbal 806Bangladesh-MG462712Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488750HM488760Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimusgDGM 46633China-MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.cCA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.cCA833ThailandJF27858-Hymenagaricus sp.cCA833ThailandJF27858<
Agaricus megacystidiatusMFLU 12–0137ThailandNR_119953-Agaricus rotalisecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB–5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesIqbal 806Bangladesh-MG462712Coniclepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniclepiota spongodesHKAS 77574BangladeshKC625531KC625530Eriocybe chioneaecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488760Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727859 <t< td=""></t<>
Agaricus rotalisecv3768USAHM488746HM488792Agaricus sp.BAB-5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuscRJG4633China-MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA831ThailandKM982451KM982453 <td< td=""></td<>
Agaricus sp.BAB-5059IndiaKR155104Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandHM48875-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM488752-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.ZA801ThailandKM982451KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.ZA801ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'China </td
Agaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.cA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmui
Agaricus sp.C3182TogoKJ540956-Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM488752HM488773Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiGF2106'ChinaKY768927-
Agaricus sp.NTS113ThailandJF514531-Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesIqbal 806Bangladesh-MG462712Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKY904355-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355-
Chlorophyllum rachodesVellinga 2106NetherlandsAF482849-Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesIqbal 806Bangladesh-MG462712Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesHKAS 77574BangladeshKC625531KC625530Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.cA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandKM982451KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKY768927-Hymenagaricus sp.MELU100515ThailandKY768927-
Clarkeinda trachodesecv3838ThailandM488750HM488771Clarkeinda trachodesIqbal 806Bangladesh–MG462712Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875–Coniolepiota spongodesHKAS 77574BangladeshKC625531KC625530Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559–Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China–MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840–Hymenagaricus spl.CA833ThailandJF727858–Hymenagaricus spl.zrl3103ThailandJF727859–Hymenagaricus spl.CA801ThailandJF727859–Hymenagaricus spl.CA801ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927–Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355–
Clarkeinda trachodesIqbal 806Bangladesh–MG462712Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875–Coniolepiota spongodesHKAS 77574BangladeshKC625531KC625530Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559–Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China–MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840–Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160–Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858–Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727859–Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859–Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927–Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355–
Coniolepiota spongodesecv3898ThailandHM48875-Coniolepiota spongodesHKAS 77574BangladeshKC625531KC625530Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY90/4355-
Coniolepiota spongodesHKAS 77574BangladeshKC625531KC625530Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGc2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355-
Eriocybe chioneaecv3560ThailandHM488752HM488773Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGc2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355-
Heinemannomyces splendidissimusecv3586ThailandHM488760HM488769Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160-Hymenagaricus cf. kivuensisBR6089BurundiKM982454Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGc2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355-
Heinemannomyces splendidissimuszrl3043ThailandJF691559-Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China-MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840-Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160-Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM362154Hymenagaricus cf. kivuensisBR6089BurundiKM982454Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106'ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355-
Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633ChinaMF621038MF621039Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China–MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840–Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160–Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorBR6089BurundiKM982454Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858–Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859–Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106°ChinaKY768927–Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKY904355–
Heinemannomyces splendidissimusGDGM 46633China–MF621040Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840–Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160–Hymenagaricus cf. kivuensisBR6089BurundiKM982454Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858–Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859–Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859–Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandKM982451KM982453Byeudolepiota zangmuiGe2106°ChinaKY768927–Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKX904355–
Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorLAPAF9TogoJF727840Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160Hymenagaricus cf. kivuensisBR6089BurundiKM982454Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106°ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKX90/4355-
Hymenagaricus ardosiicolorisolateZ4TanzaniaKM360160Hymenagaricus cf. kivuensisBR6089BurundiKM982454Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106°ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKX90/4355-
Hymenagaricus cf. kivuensisBR6089BurundiKM982454Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858-Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106*ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKX904355-
Hymenagaricus sp.CA833ThailandJF727858Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106*ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKX90/355-
Hymenagaricus sp.zrl3103ThailandKM982450KM982452Hymenagaricus sp.CA801ThailandJF727859-Hymenagaricus sp.LD2012186ThailandKM982451KM982453Pseudolepiota zangmuiGe2106*ChinaKY768927-Pseudolepiota zangmuiMELU100515ThailandKX904355-
Hymenagaricus sp. CA801 Thailand JF727859 - Hymenagaricus sp. LD2012186 Thailand KM982451 KM982453 Pseudolepiota zangmui Ge2106* China KY768927 - Pseudolepiota zangmui MELU100515 Thailand KX904355 -
Hymenagaricus sp. LD2012186 Thailand KM982451 KM982453 Pseudolepiota zangmui Ge2106° China KY768927 - Pseudolepiota zangmui MELU100515 Thailand KX904355 -
Pseudolepiota zangmui Ge2106° China KY768927 – Pseudolepiota zangmui MELU100515 Thailand KY904355 –
Reudalehinta zanamui MELU100515 Thailand KX904355 -
131111010011 11111010011 1111101001001
Xanthagaricus caeruleus GDGM 50651* China MF039088 MF039086
Xanthagaricus caeruleus GDGM 50794 China MF039089 MF039087
Xanthagaricus epipastus zrl 3045 Thailand HM436649 HM436609
Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus GDGM 50913 China MF351627 –
Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus GDGM 50918* China MF351629 MF351631
Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus GDGM 50924 China MF351628 –
Xanthagaricus necopinatusIqbal-821 (GDGM 46632', PHI-12#)BangladeshMF351626MF351630
Xanthagaricus pakistanicus LAH SH 207 Pakistan KY621555 –
Xanthagaricus pakistanicus HUP SH 315 Pakistan KY621556 –
Xanthagaricus sp. TL6025 Malavsia AF482835 AF482879
Xanthagaricus sp. ecv3807 Thailand HM488761 HM488770
Xanthagaricus taiwanensis HKAS 42545 Taiwan, China DO490633 DO089016
Xanthagaricus taiwanensis C.M. Chen 3636* Taiwan, China DQ006271 DQ006270

Highlighted in bold are newly generated sequences in this study. *holotype, #isotype

separately with default settings, and manually edited in BioEdit v.7.0.9 (Hall 1999). ITS and 28S datasets was then concatenated using Phyutility (Smith and Dunn 2008) for further phylogenetic analyses, and treated here as a ITS-28S dataset. The combined dataset (ITS-28S) was used for the recognition of the new species in *Xanthagaricus* and to find out their relationships with allied genera in Agaricaceae. Maximum Likelihood (ML) was performed using RAxML v.7.2.6 (Stamatakis 2006). As RAxML only supports the GTR model of nucleotide substitution, the GTRGAMMAI model was

used for phylogenetic analyses, and statistical support values were obtained using nonparametric bootstrapping (BS) with 1000 replicates. *Chlorophyllum rachodes* (Vittad.) Vellinga was chosen as the outgroup.

Results

Molecular phylogenetic results

A total of 10 nuclear ribosomal RNA gene sequences (five each for ITS and 28S) was generated from the newly collected materials of *C. trachodes, Heinemannomyces* and *Xanthagaricus*, and deposited in GenBank (Table 1). In the aligned ITS-28S dataset, sequences of the 43 samples were included with 1663 nucleotide sites (784 for ITS and 879 for 28S, gaps included) for each sample, of which 1186 were constant characters, 384 were parsimony informative characters, and 93 were parsimony uninformative characters. The resulting aligned dataset has been deposited in TreeBASE (http://purl. org/phylo/treebase/phylows/study/TB2:S21521). In the combined ITS-28S ML tree (Fig. 1), the proposed two new species are distinct, the collection from Bangladesh is a close relative to *X. pakistanicus* with strong BS support value (97% ML BS), while the Chinese collection is not sister to any single species. Both clustered together with *X. epipastus* (Berk. & Broome) Hussain, *X. taiwanensis* (Zhu L. Yang, Z.W. Ge & C.M. Chen) Hussain, *X. caeruleus*, and two unnamed species of the same genus. The result of the phylogenetic analysis is presented in Fig. 1.

Taxonomy

Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus **T.H. Li, Iqbal Hosen & Z.P. Song, sp. nov.** MycoBank: MB822730 Figs 2a–b, 3, 5b

Diagnosis. Closely related to *X. epipastus* and *X. subepipastus* but differs in having larger basidiospores with verrucose surface, short but broadly clavate cheilocystidia, and found on the ground covered by fallen needles or debris of *Pinus* sp.

Typification. CHINA, Jiangxi Province, Jiulong Provincial Forest Park, 25 August 2015, Ming Zhang, Jun Ping Zhou & Hao Huang (GDGM 50918, holotype).



Figure 1. Phylogenetic relationships of *Xanthagaricus* species and its allied genera inferred from ITS-28S data using ML method. RAxML bootstrap support values (ML BS, \geq 50%) are indicated on the branches at nodes. The two new species of *Xanthagaricus* from Bangladesh and China, and *Heinemannomyces splen-didissimus* from China, are highlighted in bold on the tree. Herbarium or voucher specimen numbers and country names are provided after the species name. *Chlorophyllum rachodes* is rooted as the outgroup. Bar: indicates 0.1 expected change per site per branch.

Etymology. The species epithet "*flavosquamosus*" (Lat.) refers to the yellow squamules on the pileus surface.

Description. *Basidiomata* small-sized. *Pileus* 8–13 mm broad, at first hemispherical to convex, then plano-convex to nearly applanate with age, yellow (2A4–7) to vivid yellow (2A8), lemon yellow or mustard yellow (3B8, 3B6), more or less yellow-



Figure 2. Basidiomata of *Xanthagaricus* species. **a, b** Basidiomata of *X. flavosquamosus* (**a, b** GDGM 50918, holotype) **c, d** Basidiomata of *X. necopinatus* (GDGM 46632, holotype; PHI-12, isotype). Scale bars: 5 mm.

brown to grayish brown at centre, concentrically fibrillose-squamulose, sometimes woolly to matted squamulose on the surface, more densely and darker at centre; margin incurved with appendiculate, often lacerated velar remnants, concolorous with the squamules; context 0.8 mm thick at the pileus center, elsewhere thin, no color change when cut or injured. *Lamellae* free, depressed around the stipe, broadly ventricose, yellowish white (3A2) to light pinkish white (10A2), with crenulate margin; 3-4 tiers of lamellulae. *Stipe* 20–30 × 1.5–2 mm, equal, central, cylindrical, slightly curved, fistulose, pale yellow (3A3) to slightly grayish yellow (3B3), some scattered squamules or scales on surface, with white mycelial tufts at base. *Annulus* absent. *Odor and taste* unknown.

Basidiospores [60/3/3] 5–5.5(–6) × 3–3.5 μ m, [mean length = 5.38 μ m, mean width = 3.25 μ m, Q = (1.51–)1.61–1.68(–1.71), Q_m = 1.65 ± 0.052], ellipsoid to broadly ellipsoid, slightly thick-walled (0.5 μ m), smooth under light microscope but minutely vertucose or warty under SEM, pale yellow to yellowish brown in H₂O and 5% KOH, inamyloid. *Basidia* 10–12 × 5–6 μ m, clavate, pale yellow in H₂O, hyaline, thin-walled, 4-spored, with sterigmata up to 3 μ m long. *Lamellar trama* regular to subregular, composed of thin-walled cylindrical hyphae 4–8 μ m wide. *Cheilocystidia* 7–15 × 6–9 μ m, abundant, clavate to broadly clavate, some-



Figure 3. Microscopic features of *Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus* (GDGM 50918, holotype). **a** Basidia with basidioles **b** Basidiospores **c** Epithelial pileipellis with encrusted wall. **d** Cheilocystidia. Scale bars: 10 μ m.

times slightly fusoid to obovate, smooth, hyaline, thin-walled. *Pleurocystidia* absent. *Pileipellis* (squamules on pileus) epithelial, composed of agglutinated globose to subglobose, rarely clavate to ellipsoidal thin-walled cells, terminal cells $6-12 \times 6-10 \mu m$, slightly encrusted, with some vacuolar pigments when observed in KOH or H₂O. *Caulocystidia* not found. *Stipe trama* composed of parallel hyphae 3–8 μm wide, yellowish brown in mass but pale yellow or subhyaline individually. *Clamp connections* absent in all tissues.

Habit, habitat and distribution. Gregarious to scattered, ground covered with fallen needles or debris of *Pinus* sp., currently only known from Jiangxi Province of China.

Additional specimens examined. CHINA, Jiangxi Province, Jiulong Provincial Forest Park, 26 Aug 2015, Ming Zhang, Jun Ping Zhou & Hao Huang (GDGM 50924); same location, 26 Aug 2015, Ming Zhang, Jun Ping Zhou & Hao Huang (GDGM 50613b).

Xanthagaricus necopinatus Iqbal Hosen, T.H. Li, & G.M. Gates, sp. nov. MycoBank: MB822731

Figs 2c, d, 4, 5b

Diagnosis. Morphologically similar to *X. flavosquamosus* but differs in the presence of a fugacious annulus, smaller and denser squamules, comparatively smaller basidiospores with rugulose-rough surface, clavate to narrowly clavate cheilocystidia.

Typification. BANGLADESH, Dhaka Division, Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, Chondrima Uddan, 21 Aug 2014, Iqbal 821 (GDGM 46632, holotype; PHI-12, isotype).

Etymology. The species epithet "*necopinatus*" (Lat.) means unexpected, refers to the unexpected, surprising habitat of the collection, which was found on a concrete wall.

Description. *Basidiomata* small-sized. *Pileus* 10–15 mm broad, hemispherical, convex to plano-convex, yellow (2A4–7) to vivid yellow (2A8), maize yellow (4A6), light olive yellow (3D3–4) to pale brown (5D4) at disc, with yellow (3A4) to yellowish brown (5D8, 5E8) squamulose or finely fibrillose squamules on the surface, more concentrated and darker at center but scattered elsewhere; margin incurved with appendiculate velar remnants, concolorous with the pileus squamules; context 0.7 mm thick at pileus center, elsewhere thin, unchanged when cut or injured. *Lamellae* free, depressed around the stipe, yellowish white (3A2) to pinkish white (10A2), light brownish gray (6C3, 6D3), with crenulate edge, broadly ventricose; lamellulae commonly with 3–4 tiers. *Stipe* 18–28 × 1.5–2 mm, equal to slightly attenuated towards base, central, cylindrical, slightly curved, fistulose, yellowish brown (5D4) to dull brown (5C2), with some scattered squamules on surface; squamules more concentrated toward apex. *Annulus* very thin and tiny, superior, fugacious, often gone due to handling or with age. *Odor and taste* unknown.

Basidiospores [60/3/1] $4-5 \times 2.7-3.2 \mu m$, [mean length = 4.45 μm , mean width = 2.98 μm , Q = (1.31–)1.41–1.64(–1.72), Q_m = 1.49 ± 0.064], ellipsoid to ovoidellipsoid, slightly thick-walled (0.5 μm), inamyloid, smooth under light microscope but rugulose-rough surface under SEM, yellow to yellowish brown in H₂O and 5% KOH. *Basidia* 13–17 × 5–6 μm , clavate to narrowly clavate, pale yellow in H₂O, thin-walled, 4-spored, with sterigmata up to 2 μm long. *Lamellar trama* regular to subregular, composed of thin-walled cylindrical hyphae, 4–8 μm wide. *Cheilocystidia* 15–20 × 4–6 μm , abundant, clavate to narrowly clavate, sometimes narrowly fusoid, smooth, hyaline, thin-walled. *Pleurocystidia* absent. *Pileipellis* (squamules on pileus) epithelial, composed of agglutinated globose, subglobose to broadly ellipsoid, rarely clavate cells, terminal cells measuring 9–15 × 6–10 μm , slightly encrusted, with some vacuolar pigments when observed in KOH or H₂O. *Caulocystidia* sometimes present, cylindro-clavate to narrowly clavate measuring 18–25 × 5–7 μm , thin-walled, smooth, hyaline. *Stipe trama* composed of parallel hyphae 4–10 μm wide, yellowish brown in mass but pale yellow to subhyaline individually. *Clamp connections* absent in all tissues.

Habit, habitat and distribution. Scattered, clustered on a concrete wall, currently only known from Bangladesh.



Figure 4. Microscopic features of *Xanthagaricus necopinatus* (GDGM 46632, holotype; PHI-12, isotype). **a** Basidia with basidioles **b** Basidiospores **c** Epithelial pileipellis with encrusted wall **d** Cheilocystidia. Scale bars: 10 µm.

Heinemannomyces splendidissimus Watling, Belg. J. Bot. 131(2): 135 (1998) Figs 6, 7

Description. *Basidiomata* medium-sized to large. *Pileus* 35–65 mm broad, at first hemispherical, then convex to applanate with age, sometimes depressed at disc, pileus surface covered by snuff brown, chestnut brown, purple-brown or grayish red (9B4, 9C4, 10CD4), woolly-floccose or woolly arachnoid velar remnants, usually darker at center, outer zone showing dull white to whitish background when the velar remnants vanish; margin incurved with slightly appendiculate velar remnants, often slightly lacerated; context 3–4 mm thick at pileus centre, elsewhere thin, changes from white to slightly reddening when cut or injured. *Lamellae* free, depressed around the stipe, broadly ventricose, bluish gray to leaden gray (19B3, 18C3) when young, becoming dark blue (19E4–7) to bluish gray (19D3–5) when mature; 3–4 tiers of lamellulae. *Stipe* 50–60 × 5–6 mm, central, cylindrical, slightly tapering towards the base,



Figure 5. SEM of basidiospores of *Xanthagaricus* spp. **a** SEM basidiospores of *X. flavosquamosus* (GDGM 50918, holotype) **b** SEM of basidiospores of *X. necopinatus* (PHI-12, isotype). Scale bars: 5 µm.



Figure 6. Basidiomata of *Heinemannomyces splendidissimus*. **a** Basidiomata showing leaden-blue lamellae and floccose pileus surface (GDGM 46633) **b** Basidiomata showing dark blue lamellae and floccose pileus surface (GDGM 46633) **c** Basidiomata showing blue lamellae and slightly depressed pileus disc (GDGM 46634) **d** Basidiomata showing pileus surface and a reddening context when cut (GDGM 46635). Scale bars: 20 mm.

floccose-squamulose all over the stipe, often vanish from handling or rain, with lighter shade of the pileus color, fistulose; *stipe context* slightly reddening when cut or injured. *Annulus* delicate, fugacious. *Odor and taste* unknown.



Figure 7. Microscopic features of *Heinemannomyces splendidissimus* (GDGM 46633). **a** Basidiospores **b** Basidia **c** Elements from stipe surface **d** Pileipellis **e** Cheilocystidia. Scale bars: 10 μm.

Basidiospores [60/3/3] (5.5–)6–6.5(–7) × 3.5–4.5(–5) µm, [mean length = 6.25 µm, mean width = 4.15 µm, Q = 1.42–1.55(–1.63), $Q_m = 1.50 \pm 0.043$], ellipsoid to ovoid-ellipsoid, inamyloid, slightly thick-walled (0.5 µm), smooth, dark brown, gray-

ish brown to slightly leaden gray in H₂O and 5% KOH. *Basidia* 13–19 × 7–9 µm, clavate to broadly clavate, colorless or pale yellow in H₂O and KOH, 4-spored, rarely 2-spored, with sterigmata up to 2 µm long. *Lamellar trama* regular to subregular, composed of thin-walled cylindrical hyphae 4–8 µm wide. *Cheilocystidia* 15–22 × 6–10 µm, abundant and scattered colorless, clavate to cylindro-clavate, sometimes narrowly fusoid, smooth, hyaline, thin-walled. *Pleurocystidia* absent. *Pileus trama* hyaline or pale yellow, 4–10 wide hyphae; refractive hyphae very common, 5–8 µm wide. *Pileipellis* (woolly-floccose squamules on pileus) a complex of hyphal types, interwoven, loosely arranged, brick red in mass but hyaline to light red or pale red individually when observed in H₂O and KOH, sometimes slightly puffy or swollen in some portion of some hyphae, smooth, thin-walled, cylindrical hyphae 4–10 µm wide; terminal elements measuring 20–50 × 4–10 µm. *Stipitipellis* similar to pileipellis but with paler color and slightly narrower hyphae measuring 3–8 µm wide. *Stipe trama* composed of parallel hyphae 4–9 µm wide, hyaline; refractive hyphae sometimes present 3–5 µm wide. *Clamp connections* not found in any tissue.

Habit, habitat and distribution. Solitary, scattered on the ground; known from Malaysia, Thailand, and now China.

Specimens examined. CHINA, Guangdong Province, Shantou City, Nanao Island, 8 May 2015, Iqbal, Tai-Hui Li & Ting Li (GDGM 46633); same location, 9 May 2015, Iqbal, Tai-Hui Li & Ting Li (GDGM 46634, GDGM46635).

Discussion

Little Flower et al. (1997) defined Xanthagaricus to include taxa with "basidiomata small, pileus with characteristic woolly squamules and appendiculate margin; lamellae free, brown when mature; stipe cylindrical, slender, fistulose, slightly broader at the apex, veil absent; context thin, sometimes becoming vinaceous red on bruising; spore print brown, spores subglobose to ellipsoid, smooth, thick-walled, brown with yellowish tinge; lamellar edge heteromorphous; cheilocystidia present; hymenophoral trama regular to subregular; pileal surface a disrupted epicutis of radial hyphae with plenty of spherical or subspherical cells at the scales; clamp connections absent". In spite of that, some species of Xanthagaricus do not warrant the generic circumscription on account of lamellae color (ink-blue in X. caeruleus), presence of an annulus (tiny and fugacious annulus in X. necopinatus), basidiospore color (greenish gray to grayish brown in X. caeruleus) with either smooth (X. caeruleus) or ornamented basidiospores (X. flavosquamosus, X. necopinatus, X. epipastus, X. subepipastus, etc.), but share the common features like small basidiomata, squamulose pileus, epithelial pileipellis with globose to subglobose terminal elements, the presence of cheilocystidia, the absence of pleurocystidia, more or less yellow to brownish yellow basidiospores, and the absence of clamp connections. It should be noted that most species of the genus Xanthagaricus have ornamented basidiospores (Figs. 15c-h, 16 in Little Flower et al. 1997) but it was not mentioned in the genus circumscription by the authors (1997).

Macromorphologically, both new species are superficially close to each other, and could be confused in the field, although *X. flavosquamosus* has relatively larger squamules, no annulus and slightly lighter color that *X. necopinatus*. However, they can be separated microscopically. *Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus* has short and broadly clavate cheilocystidia, comparatively larger and wider basidiospores with a verrucose surface under SEM, while *X. necopinatus* has narrowly clavate cheilocystidia and shorter basidiospores with a rugulose-rough surface under SEM. Furthermore, these two species are in different clades in the phylogeny. *Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus* creates a new phyletic line with weak support, while *X. necopinatus* is a close relative to *X. pakistanicus* with strong BS support value (93% ML BS, Fig. 1). However, morphologically, *X. pakistanicus* has a light orange-yellow to moderate orange-yellow pileus, and globose to subglobose basidiospores measuring 7–7.5 × 6.5–7.0 µm (Hussain et al. 2017).

Some morphologically closely related species to be compared to X. necopinatus and X. flavosquamosus are X. epipastus, X. ochraceoluteus (D.A. Reid & Eicker) Hussain, X. subepipastus (Heinem. & Little Flower) Little Flower, Hosag. & T.K. Abraham, and X. viridulus (Heinem. & Little Flower) Little Flower, Hosag. & T.K. Abraham. The latter two species differ from X. necopinatus in having comparatively larger and wider basidiospores (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984, Daniëls et al. 2015). Xanthagaricus epipastus has an olive yellow to olivaceous squamulose pileus, and slightly wider basidiospores $(3.7-4.7 \times 2.8-3.4 \,\mu\text{m})$ with lower Q value (avg. 1.36) (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984). Xanthagaricus ochraceoluteus differs from X. necopinatus in having olivebuff lamellae, no annulus, and variable cystidia. Xanthagaricus flavosquamosus has comparatively larger and wider basidiospores (5-5.5× 3-3.5 µm) than those of X. epipastus (see above), X. subepipastus $(3.7-4.7 \times 2.8-3.4)$ and X. viridulus $(3.8-5.0 \times 2.9-3.6)$ μm) (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984, Heinemann and Rammeloo 1986, Daniëls et al. 2015). Furthermore, X. epipastus has a pileus covered by olive yellow to olivaceous squamules (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984). Moreover, X. subepipastus and X. vir*idulus*, originally described from the Kerala state of India, differ in having lageniform cheilocystidia (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984). Xanthagaricus viridulus also has an umbonate, brown, floccose-squamulose pileus, and lageniform to clavate cheilocystidia (Heinemann and Little Flower 1984). Xanthagaricus ochraceoluteus has olive-buff adnexed lamellae (Reid and Eicker 1998). Unfortunately, molecular data for the Indian collections and other comparable species are unavailable to include in this study.

Xanthagaricus taiwanensis (=Hymenagaricus taiwanensis Zhu L. Yang, Z.W. Ge & C.M. Chen), originally described from Taiwan, China is distinguished from X. flavosquamosus by having a yellow-brown pileus covered with fuscous brown-black squamules, a white membranous annulus, and comparatively wider basidiospores 5–5.5 × 3–4 μ m (Ge et al. 2008). Xanthagaricus caeruleus, a recently described species from China, can also be distinguished from X. flavosquamosus by its grayish lilac to grayish violet squamules on pileus, ink-blue lamellae, and comparatively larger and smooth basidiospores 5–6 × 3–3.5 μ m (Hosen et al. 2017). On the other hand, X. necopinatus is distinguished from all closely related species of this genus (see above), and the first contribution to the genus Xanthagaricus for Bangladesh. It is interesting to note that *Xanthagaricus* appears to be a monophyletic genus and close sister to *Pseudolepiota* Z.W. Ge, a monotypic genus, recently described from China, with strong BS support value (85% ML BS). The latter genus is distinguished in having white color of the lamellae, hyaline basidiospores, and a subcutis pileipellis made up of slightly interwoven cylindrical hyphae (Ge and Yang 2017). However, the synapomorphic features of the two genera are the squamulose pileus, the absence of pleurocystidia, and the absence of clamp connections. Though a recent molecular study by Hosen et al. (2017) recovered *Xanthagaricus* as a close sister genus to *Hymenagaricus*, lacked significant BS support value while using ITS data. With the inclusion of eight species of *Xanthagaricus* including two new species based on ITS-28S phylogeny, the monophyly of the genus is resolved with the close evolutionary relationship to *Pseudolepiota*, and distinct from *Hymenagaricus* (Fig. 1).

The collection of Heinemannomyces made from south China matches well with the salient features (woolly-arachnoid veil on pileus, leaden gray lamellae, and a reddening context) of *H. splendidissimus* reported in the protologue by Watling (1998). However, the Chinese material slightly deviates from the original description in having comparatively larger basidiomata (up to 65 mm broad), and the absence of clamp connections. The authors were unable to include the type material of Heinemannomyces in the present study, but several sequences of H. splendidissimus from the type locality and its adjacent areas (Thailand) are available in the public accessible database (GenBank) to compare with the Chinese material. Sequences of Heinemannomyces from Thailand fall in the same clade with those from China, and are closely related to Hymenagaricus (Fig. 1). However, morphologically, Heinemannomyces differs from Hymenagaricus by having woolly-arachnoid veil remnants on the pileus surface, becoming brown, a reddening context when cut or injured, leaden gray lamellae, and a pileipellis composed of cylindrical hyphae (Watling 1998). It should be noted that three species of Hymenagaricus (GenBank voucher numbers. C.M. Chen 3636, T. Laessoe 6025 and ecv3807) used in this study (Xanthagaricus clade, Fig. 1) were also grouped together with strong BS support value in the molecular study of Vellinga et al. (2011) based on either ITS or multigene phylogeny, and Heinemannomyces was separated from them, and formed an independent lineage (Figs. 2 and 3 in Vellinga et al. 2011). However, no additional species of Hymenagaricus from the Hymenagaricus-Heinemannomyces clade (Fig.1) was included in the study of Vellinga et al. (2011). In the present analysis, more species of Hymenagaricus including some other close relative taxa of Agaricaceae were included, and Heinemannomyces showed a close affinity to Hymenagaricus (Fig. 1). One possible classification would be to collapse Heinemannomyces into a single genus Hymenagaricus or separate it into a subgenus/section. However, there are some remarkable morphological characteristics for Heinemannomyces and Hymenagaricus, which supports separating them into different genera. Further exploration of Hymenagaricus/Heinemannomyces species diversity and historical biogeography from Asia/South Africa, which seems to be species rich in these genera, could help to confirm or refute the hypothesis of monophyly/paraphyly of Hymenagaricus.

Key to the taxa of Xanthagaricus known from Bangladesh and China

1	Basidiomata small (8–15 mm broad)2
_	Basidiomata small (15-35 mm broad), with yellow brown pileus, covered
	with fuscous black squamules, lamellae pink becoming grayish pink, basidi-
	ospores $5-5.5 \times 3-4 \mu m$, smooth, pileipellis epithelial with encrusted wall,
	found in Taiwan, China
2	Basidiomata small (10–15 mm broad), with dull lilac to grayish lilac or gray-
	ish violet squamules, lamellae white becoming light blue to blackish blue, ba-
	sidiospores 5–6 × 3–3.5 μ m, smooth surface under SEM, pileipellis epithelial
	without encrusted wall but pigmented, found in China
_	Basidiomata small (8–15 mm broad), with yellow to yellowish brown, lamel-
	lae yellowish white to light pinkish white, pileipellis epithelial with encrusted
	wall, basidiospores $4-5.5 \times 2.7-3.5 \mu m$, ornamented under SEM
3	Basidiomata 8-13 mm broad, basidiospores 5-5.5 × 3-3.5 µm, ornament-
	ed with verrucose surface under SEM, fugacious annulus absent, found in
	China
_	Basidiomata 10–15 mm broad, basidiospores $4-5 \times 2.7-3.2 \mu$ m, ornamented
	with rugulose-rough surface under SEM, fugacious annulus present, found in
	Bangladesh

Acknowledgments

The authors are very grateful to Dr. David Ratkowsky (University of Tasmania, Australia) for checking the English in the manuscript. The first author thanks Shah Hussain (University of Swat, Pakistan) for providing invaluable information on *Xanthagaricus pakistanicus* prior to formal publication. Dr. Zai-Wei Ge (Kunming Institute of Botany, China) is acknowledged for providing sequences data of *Pseudolepiota zangmui*. Dr. Ming Zhang, Mr. Jun Ping Zhou and Mr. Hao Huang (Guangdong Institute of Microbiology, China) are acknowledged for providing voucher specimens. This work was supported by the NSFC Research Fund for International Young Scientists (No. 31750110476) and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation Grant (No. 2017M610514, 61st Phase) to the first author. This study was also partially supported by the Science and Technology Program of Guangzhou, China (No. 201607020017), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 2013FY111200).

References

Daniëls PP, Hama O, Fernández AF, García-Pantaleón FI, Barage M, Ibrahim D, Alcántara MR (2015) First records of some Asian macromycetes in Africa. Mycotaxon 130: 337–359. https://doi.org/10.5248/130.337

- Ge ZW, Chen CM, Yang ZL (2008) A new species of the genus *Hymenagaricus* (Basidiomycota) from Taiwan and its phylogenetic position inferred from ITS and nLSU sequences. Cryptogamie, Mycologie 29: 259–265.
- Ge ZW, Yang ZL (2017) *Pseudolepiota zangmui* gen. et sp. nov. (Agaricaceae, Basidiomycota), a new white-spored mushroom from China. Phytotaxa 312: 247–255. https://doi. org/10.11646/phytotaxa.312.2.7
- Hall TA (1999) BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. Nucleic Acids Symposium Series 41: 95–98.
- Heinemann P (1981) *Hymenagaricus* Heinem. gen. nov. (Agaricaceae). Bulletin du Jardin Botanique National de Belgique 51: 465–466. https://doi.org/10.2307/3668081
- Heinemann P, Little Flower S (1984) Hymenagaricus (Agaricaceae) de Kerala (Inde) et de Sri Lanka. Bulletin du Jardin Botanique National de Belgique 54: 151–182. https://doi. org/10.2307/3667871
- Heinemann P, Rammeloo J (1986) Flore illustrée des champignons d'Afrique central: Agariceae (Agaricaceae), Paxillaceae (Boletineae). Vol. 12.
- Hosen MI, Feng B, Wu G, Zhu XT, Li YC, Yang ZL (2013) *Borofutus*, a new genus of Boletaceae from tropical Asia: phylogeny, morphology and taxonomy. Fungal Diversity 58: 215–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13225-012-0211-8
- Hosen MI, Song ZP, Gates G, Li TH (2017) *Xanthagaricus caeruleus*, a new species with ink-blue lamellae from southeast China. Mycoscience. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.myc.2007.10.003
- Hussain S, Afshan NS, Ahmed H, Sher H, Khalid AN (2017) Xanthagaricus pakistanicus sp. nov. (Agaricaceae), the first report of the genus from Pakistan. Turkish Journal of Botany. https://doi.org/10.3906/bot-1705-21
- Katoh K, Kuma K, Toh H, Miyata T (2005) MAFFT version 5: improvement in accuracy of multiple sequence alignment. Nucleic Acids Research 33: 511–518. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gki198
- Kornerup A, Wanscher JH (1978) Methuen Handbook of Colour (3rd edn). Eyre Methuen, London, 252 pp.
- Little Flower S, Hosagoudar VB, Abraham TK (1997) *Xanthagaricus*, a new generic name in the family Agaricaceae. New Botanist 24: 93–100.
- Pegler DN (1986) Agaric flora of Sri Lanka. Kew Bulletin Add Ser 12. HMSO, London.
- Reid DA, Eicker A (1995) The genus *Hymenagaricus* Heinem. in South Africa. South African Journal of Botany 61: 293–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0254-6299(15)30549-4
- Reid DA, Eicker A (1998) South African Fungi 8. Three new species of *Hymenagaricus* from South Africa, with a revised key to South African taxa. South African Journal of Botany 64: 356–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0254-6299(15)30924-8
- Smith SA, Dunn CW (2008) Phyutility: a phyloinformatics tool for trees, alignments and molecular data. Bioinformatics 24: 715–716. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/ btm619
- Stamatakis A (2006) RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihood-based phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. Bioinformatics 22: 2688–2690. https://doi. org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btl446
- Vellinga EC, Sysouphanthong P, Hyde KD (2011) The family Agaricaceae: phylogenies and two new white-spored genera. Mycologia 103: 494–509. https://doi.org/10.3852/10-204

- Vilgalys R, Hester M (1990) Rapid genetic identification and mapping of enzymatically amplified ribosomal DNA from several *Cryptococcus* species. Journal of Bacteriology 172: 4238–4246. https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.172.8.4238-4246.1990
- Watling R (1998) *Heinemannomyces*: a new lazuline-spored agaric genus from South East Asia. Belgian Journal of Botany 131: 133–138.
- White TJ, Bruns T, Lee S, Taylor J (1990) Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. In: Innis MA, Gelfand DH, Sninsky JJ, White TJ (Eds) PCR protocols: a guide to methods and applications. Academic Press, San Diego, 315–322. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-372180-8.50042-1

RESEARCH ARTICLE



Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with conifer-infesting beetles and their phoretic mites in Yunnan, China

Runlei Chang¹, Tuan A. Duong², Stephen J. Taerum², Michael J. Wingfield¹, Xudong Zhou³, Z. Wilhelm de Beer¹

I Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology, Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI), University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa 2 Department of Genetics, Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI), University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa 3 FuturaGene Biotechnology (Shanghai) Co., Ltd., Xuhui, Shanghai 200235, China

Corresponding author: Z. Wilhelm de Beer (wilhelm.debeer@fabi.up.ac.za)

Academic editor: C. Gueidan | Received 20 October 2017 | Accepted 4 December 2017 | Published 21 December 2017

Citation: Chang R, Duong TA, Taerum SJ, Wingfield MJ, Zhou X, de Beer ZW (2017) Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with conifer-infesting beetles and their phoretic mites in Yunnan, China. MycoKeys 28: 19–64. https://doi.org/10.3897/mycokeys.28.21758

Abstract

The Ophiostomatales is an Ascomycete order of fungi that accommodates several tree pathogens and many species that degrade wood. These fungi are commonly vectored by Scolytine bark and ambrosia beetles. In recent years it has also been shown that hyperphoretic mites on these beetles can vector some Ophiostomatales. Little is known regarding the Ophiostomatales in China and we have consequently explored the diversity of these fungi associated with conifer-infesting beetles and mites in Yunnan province. Galleries and beetles were collected for 17 beetle species, while 13 mite species were obtained from six of these beetle species. Collectively, 340 fungal isolates were obtained, 45 from beetles, 184 from mites, 56 from galleries and 55 isolates where the specific niche was not clear. DNA sequences for five gene regions (ITS, LSU, BT, EF, and CAL) were determined for fungal isolates representing different morphological groups. Phylogenetic analyses confirmed the presence of 19 fungal taxa, including five novel species described here as Ophiostoma acarorum sp. nov., Ophiostoma brevipilosi sp. nov., Graphilbum kesiyae sp. nov., Graphilbum puerense sp. nov., and Leptographium ningerense sp. nov. Ophiostoma ips was the most frequently isolated species, representing approximately 31% of all isolates. Six of 19 taxa were present on mites, beetles and in the galleries of the beetles, while three species were found on mites and galleries. Two species were found only on mites and one species only on a beetle. Although the numbers of beetles and mites were insufficient to provide statistical inferences, this study confirmed that mites are important vectors of the Ophiostomatales in China. We hypothesize that these mites are most likely responsible for horizontal transfer of fungal species between galleries of different beetle species. The fact that half of the fungal species found were new to science, suggests that the forests of east Asia include many undescribed Ophiostomatales yet to be discovered.

Copyright Runlei Chang et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Keywords

Symbiont, species diversity, fungal vector, Ophiostoma quercus

Introduction

The ophiostomatoid fungi represent a polyphyletic group of tree- or wood-infecting fungi, most often staining freshly exposed sapwood and thus lowering the value of timber (Seifert 1993). Some of the species are important tree pathogens that have dramatically impacted natural forests and caused major losses to forestry companies during the course of the last century (Harrington 1993, Wingfield et al. 2017). The sexual and often asexual spore-bearing structures of the ophiostomatoid fungi are specifically adapted for dispersal by arthropods, producing spores in sticky droplets that attach to the bodies of their vectors (Malloch and Blackwell 1993). However, these morphological and biological traits have evolved more than once in the Ascomycota and phylogenetic analyses have shown that these fungi reside in two different orders, the Ophiostomatales and Microascales (De Beer et al. 2013). The Ophiostomatales currently accommodates a single family, the Ophiostomataceae, that includes ten genera (Bateman et al. 2017, De Beer et al. 2016a, De Beer et al. 2016b, Van der Linde et al. 2016), while the Microascales comprises of five families, of which the Ceratocystidaceae, Gondwanamycetaceae and Graphiaceae include 14 genera of ophiostomatoid fungi (De Beer et al. 2014, 2017, Mayers et al. 2015, Nel et al. 2017).

Bark beetles (Coleoptera: Scolytinae) are well known vectors of ophiostomatoid fungi (Harrington 2005, Kirisits 2004, Six 2003). Other than a few bark beetle species that are considered to be primary pests causing significant economic losses, most species of bark beetles are secondary invaders, which colonize injured or stressed trees (Harrington 2005, Six and Wingfield 2011). Some bark beetle species have specialized structures known as mycangia that carry fungal conidia or ascospores, but most of these insects carry fungi on their exoskeletons (Six 2003). They construct their galleries, where the ophiostomatoid fungi grow, in the phloem and cambial layers under the bark of trees (Paine et al. 1997). The nature of the relationships between fungi and bark beetles is recognized as being very diverse. Some beetle-fungus symbioses appear to be obligate, while others may be facultative (Kirisits 2004). The role of the fungi can vary from their being nutritional symbionts of the symbiosis is not well understood (Six and Wingfield 2011).

Along with the fungi, mites are also common symbionts of bark beetles (Hofstetter and Moser 2014, Roets et al. 2009). Due to their small body size and low mobility, many mite species rely on beetles or other animals for dispersal (Mitchell 1970). The relationship between mites and their vectors is usually commensal, but in some cases these are antagonistic or even mutualistic (Pfammatter et al. 2013). The phoretic mites of only a limited number of bark beetles have been studied in detail, including mostly North American species of *Scolytus, Dendroctonus* and *Ips* (Hofstetter et al. 2013). As is the case with bark beetles, their mite associates can also vector ophiostomatoid fungi (Hofstetter and Moser 2014). Some mites such as *Tarsonemus* spp. possess sporothecae that are specialized structures of the integument that serve to carry fungal spores (Hofstetter et al. 2015). Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with mites include genera such as *Ceratocystis, Knoxdaviesia, Ceratocystiopsis, Ophiostoma, Leptographium, Grosmannia* and *Sporothrix* (Hofstetter et al. 2013). The interactions between mites and fungi are dynamic and vary with tree host condition and climate (Klepzig and Hofstetter 2011). It is for example known that mites can promote some fungal growth by increasing fungal transmission, reproduction, and survival, or by reducing the abundance of antagonistic fungi (Hofstetter and Moser 2014). Mites can also negatively affect some fungi because of exploitative/interference competition, predation, or encouragement of antagonistic fungi (Hofstetter et al. 2006).

Research on the interactions between ophiostomatoid fungi and bark beetles have been ongoing for more than a century in North America (Harrington 2005, Hedgcock 1906), Europe (Kirisits 2004, Münch 1907), and Japan (Masuya et al. 2013, Nisikado and Yamauti 1933). The associations of ophiostomatoid fungi with mites have been studied only in North America and Europe (Hofstetter and Moser 2014, Hofstetter et al. 2013), with a single report from Japan (Moser et al. 1997) and with ongoing studies on *Protea* spp. in Southern Africa (Roets et al. 2009, Roets et al. 2007). It is only more recently that the fungal associates of bark beetles have been recorded from that country (Yin et al. 1984).

The first new beetle associated ophiostomatoid species described from China for which the description was supported by DNA sequence data, was *Grosmannia yunnanensis* (Zhou et al. 2000, Yamaoka et al. 2008). Additional new species described during the past decade from a variety of conifer-infesting beetles in China, include one *Graphium* (Paciura et al. 2010a), 12 *Leptographium* (Liu et al. 2017, Lu et al. 2008, Paciura et al. 2010b, Yin et al. 2015), and five *Ophiostoma* (Yin et al. 2016) species. The most comprehensive study on the fungal associates of a specific beetle species in China has been on *Dendroctonus valens*, an economically important invasive bark beetle that was introduced to China from the USA and is attacking native pine species (Lu et al. 2008, 2009a, b, Taerum et al. 2013). Together with the fungal associates of *D. valens*, almost 40 ophiostomatoid species have been recorded and described from conifers in China (Liu et al. 2017, Paciura et al. 2010a, b, Yin et al. 2015, 2016, Zhou et al. 2013). Most of these are from bark beetles or their galleries. The fungal associates of mites have not been studied in this country (Hofstetter et al. 2013, Zhou et al. 2013).

Yunnan province forms part of in the southwestern forest zone, the second largest forest area in China (http://www.china.org.cn/english/shuzi-en/en-shuzi/gq/htm/zrzy-land-sl.htm). This province has a unique geography where three climatic regions meet: the eastern Asia monsoon region, the Tibetan plateau region, and the tropical monsoon region of southern Asia and Indo-China. As a result , species diversity in Yunnan province is high when compared to other parts of China. For example, more than 18000 plant species and 1836 vertebrate species are found here which represent 51.6% and 54.8% respectively of total species numbers in China (Yang et al. 2004). However,

only 13 ophiostomatoid species have been reported from Yunnan (Zhou et al. 2013). Based on the high diversity of trees and vertebrates, but the relatively low number of ophiostomatoid species reported from Yunnan to date, we hypothesize that there are many undiscovered species from this group of fungi associated with bark beetles and mites in this province. The aim of this study was thus to further explore the diversity of ophiostomatoid fungi associated with conifer-infesting beetles and mites in Yunnan.

Material and methods

Collection of bark beetles and mites

Three surveys were conducted in Yunnan during the flight period of bark beetles in July 2001, July 2002, and between June and September 2010 (Table 1, Suppl. material 2: Figure S1). Surveys were conducted both in sawmill log-yards and forest areas. During the 2001 and 2002 surveys, only galleries and beetles were considered from pine species in conifer and mixed forests in central and northwestern Yunnan (Table 1, Suppl. material 2: Figure S1). During the 2010 survey, some collections were conducted using *Pinus kesiya* log traps in the pine forests around Pu'er city in southwestern Yunnan. Both adult bark beetles and their galleries were carefully removed from these beetles and galleries in the laboratory and individually placed in Eppendorf tubes. After the isolation of fungi, beetles and mites were stored in 75% ethanol for later identification. Beetles and mites were identified based on the morphology by Dr R. Beaver (Chiang Mai University, Thailand) and Dr E.A. Ueckermann (Plant Protection Research Institute, Agricultural Research Council, South Africa) respectively.

Isolation of fungi

Fungi were isolated from the bark beetles and their galleries following the methods described by Linnakoski et al. (2008). At the time of collection, living mites collected from the galleries were placed on the surface of 2% MEA medium (20 g Difco agar, 20 g Difco BactoTM malt extract [Becton, Dickinson & Company], 1 L deionized water) and allowed to crawl over the plate for 24 hours. The mites were then removed and stored in Eppendorf tubes for identification. MEA plates were monitored daily for fungal growth and hyphal tips of emerging colonies were transferred to fresh MEA plates in order to purify the fungi. Pure cultures were grouped based on culture morphology, and representatives from each group were selected for DNA sequencing. All isolates used in this study were deposited in the Culture Collection (CMW) of the Forestry and Agricultural Biotechnology Institute (FABI), University of Pretoria, Pretoria, Republic of South Africa. Isolates representing types of new species were also deposited in the culture collection (CBS) of the Westerdijk Fungal Biodiversity Institute, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

A Decute species Famuy Nu A Coccotrypes cyperi Curculionidae So B Cyrtogenius luteus Curculionidae So C Hylurgeps major Curculionidae So D Ips acuminatus Curculionidae So E Lasconotus sp. Concolionidae So F Orthotomicus angulatus Curculionidae So I Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So I Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So J Presonaersis Curculionidae So M Tornoristic angulatus Curculionidae So J Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So M Tornoristic angulatus Curculionidae So M Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So M Tornoristic angulatus Curculionidae So M Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So M Tornicus minor Cur		Collection						Mit	e spe	scies					
A Coccotrypes cyperi Curculionidae Soc B Cyrrogenius luteus Curculionidae Soc C Hylurgops major Curculionidae Soc D Ips acuminatus Curculionidae Soc E Lasconotus sp. Curculionidae Soc G Psisodes sp. Curculionidae Soc H Polygraphus argulatus Curculionidae Soc J Psisodes sp. Curculionidae Soc J Psisodes sp. Curculionidae Soc J Psigraphus sp. Curculionidae Soc J Psigraphus sp. Curculionidae Soc M Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae Soc M Tornicus minor Curculionidae Soc M Tomicus minor Curculionidae Soc N T. pringend Curculionidae Soc O T. pringend Curculionidae Soc M Tomicus minor Curculionidae Soc N T. pringend Curculionidae Soc N T. pringend Curculionidae Soc O T. threvisiosus Curculionidae Soc	Iree host Urigin	dates	a	p	- -	-		60 2	4	•=		k	-	E	Total
B Cyrtogenius luteus Curculionidae So C Hylurgops major Curculionidae So D Ips acuminatus Curculionidae So E Lasconotus sp. Zopheridae So G Pissodes sp. Zopheridae So H Polygraphus argulatus Curculionidae So J Persodes sp. Curculionidae So J Pabygraphus aretrimus Curculionidae So J Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So J Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So J Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So M Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So M Tomicus minor Curculionidae So M Tomicus minor Curculionidae So N T. piniperda Curculionidae So O T. priniperda Curculionidae So Q Thenvipilosus Curculionidae So M Tomicus minor Curculionidae So O T. priniperda Curculionidae So O T. priniperda Curculionidae M Curcul	inus kesiya Ning`er	Sep. 2010	16	3) 6	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	37
C Hydurgops major Curculionidae Soc D <i>fps acuminatus</i> Curculionidae Soc E Lasconotus sp. Zopheridae Co F Orthotomicus angulatus Curculionidae Soc G Pissodes sp. Curculionidae Soc I Polygraphus aterrimus Curculionidae Soc I Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae Soc J Pelographus sp. Curculionidae Soc K Permorifrons Curculionidae Soc K Permorifrons Curculionidae Soc M Tomros angulatus Curculionidae Soc J Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae Soc K Permos fis Curculionidae Soc M Tomros minor Curculionidae Soc N Tomios minor Curculionidae Soc O Therupilosus Curculionidae Soc M Tomros minor Curculionidae Soc M Tomros minor Curculionidae Soc O Therupilosus Curculionidae Soc Soc Curculionidae Soc I O <	P. kesiya Ning'er	Sep. 2010	0	5	10 (0		0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	12
D <i>fps acuminatus</i> CurculionidaeSoELaxconotus sp.ZopheridaeCoFOrthotomicus angulatusCurculionidaeSoGPissodes sp.CurculionidaeSoHPolygraphus aterrimusCurculionidaeSoJPelygraphus sp.CurculionidaeSoJPolygraphus sp.CurculionidaeSoJPenanoensisCurculionidaeSoKP. vernucifronsCurculionidaeSoLStemaoensisCurculionidaeSoMTomicus minorCurculionidaeSoNT. piniperdaCurculionidaeSoOT. brewipilosusCurculionidaeSoOT. brewipilosusCurculionidaeSoQUnknown sp.1CurculionidaeSoQUnknown sp.2CurculionidaeSoAteritAteritCurculionidaeSoPDuhknown sp.1CurculionidaeSoOTotalAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeSoDUnknown sp.1CurculionidaeDAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurculionidaeAteritCurcu	s yunnanensis Zixishan	Jul. 2002	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E Lasconotus sp. Zopheridae Co F Orthotomicus angularus Curculionidae So: G Pissodes sp. Curculionidae So: H Polygraphus aterrimus Curculionidae So: I Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae So: J Pesonensis Curculionidae So: J Pesonensis Curculionidae So: J Presenatoensis Curculionidae So: L Stematoensis Curculionidae So: L Stematoensis Curculionidae So: M Tomicus minor Curculionidae So: N Tomicus minor Curculionidae N Tom	P. kesiya Ning'er, Puer	Jun. 2010	0	0	0	5		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8
F Orthotomicus angulatus Curculionidae Soc G Pissodes sp. Curculionidae M I Polygraphus aterrimus Curculionidae Soc I Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae Soc J P. szemaoensis Curculionidae Soc J P. szemaoensis Curculionidae Soc J P. szemaoensis Curculionidae Soc L Stenoscelis sp. Curculionidae Soc M Tomicus minor Curculionidae Soc N T. piniperda Curculionidae Soc O T. previpilosus Curculionidae Soc P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Soc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Soc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Soc	P. kesiya Ning'er	Jun. 2010	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G Pissodes sp. Curculionidae M H Polygraphus aterrimus Curculionidae Sc I Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae Sc J P. szemaoensis Curculionidae Sc K P. verrucifrons Curculionidae Sc K P. verrucifrons Curculionidae Sc L Stemoschis sp. Curculionidae Sc M Tomicus minor Curculionidae Sc N T. piniperda Curculionidae Sc O T. priniperda Curculionidae Sc P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Sc Q Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Sc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Sc	P. kesiya Ning'er	Sep. 2010	0	0	4 1	3		0	0		0	0	-	0	19
H Polygraphus atterrimus Curculionidae Soc I Polygraphus sp. Curculionidae Soc J P. szemaoensis Curculionidae Soc K P. verrucifrons Curculionidae Soc K P. verrucifrons Curculionidae Soc M Tomicus minor Curculionidae Soc N Tripinjerda Curculionidae Soc O T. piniperda Curculionidae Soc O T. piniperda Curculionidae Soc Q T. piniperda Curculionidae Soc Q Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Soc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Soc	<i>us armandii</i> Lijiang, Midu	Jul. 2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I Pabgraphus sp. Curculionidae So J P. szemaoensis Curculionidae So K P. vernacifrons Curculionidae So L Szemoscelis sp. Curculionidae So M Tomicus minor Curculionidae So N T. piniperda Curculionidae So O T. briniperda Curculionidae So O T. briniperda Curculionidae So O T. briniperda Curculionidae So Q Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae So Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Maculionidae Antal Curculionidae So	P. kesiya Ning'er	Jun. 2010	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J P. szemaoensis Curculionidae Soc K P. verrucifrons Curculionidae Soc L Stenoscelis sp. Curculionidae Soc M Tomicus minor Curculionidae Soc N Temicus minor Curculionidae Soc N T. piniperda Curculionidae Soc O T. briniperda Curculionidae Soc P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Soc Q Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Soc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Soc	P. kesiya Ning'er	Jun. 2010	0	0	0	2	7	í 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
K <i>P. vernucifrons</i> Curculionidae Soc L <i>Stenoscelis</i> sp. Curculionidae Co. M <i>Tomicus minor</i> Curculionidae Soc N <i>T. piniperda</i> Curculionidae Soc O <i>T. briniperda</i> Curculionidae Soc O <i>T. briniperda</i> Curculionidae Soc O <i>T. briniperda</i> Curculionidae Soc P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Soc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Soc Antal Antal Mine sp.3 Curculionidae Mine sp.3	P. kesiya Ning'er, Simao	Jun. 2010	0	0	0 1	4	_	0 (0	0	2	2	0	-	20
L Stenoscelis sp. Curculionidae Co. M Tomicus minor Curculionidae So. N T. piniperda Curculionidae So. O T. breuipilosus Curculionidae So. P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae So. Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae M Total Minterspecies: a = Dandadatas st.1 (Mesostienmata.)	wnnanensis Lufeng	Jul. 2002	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M Tomicus minor Curculionidae Sc N T. piniperda Curculionidae Sc O T. brevipilosus Curculionidae Sc P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Sc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Marculionidae	P. kesiya Ning'er	Jun. 2010	0	0) 0	0)	0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N T. piniperda Curculionidae So O T. brevipilosus Curculionidae So P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae So Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae Machine Anter species: a = Durdnalehors on 1 (Mesostienmata) Mesostienmata)	wnnanensis Zixishan	Jul. 2002	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
O T. breuipilosus Curculionidae Sc P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae Sc Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae M Total Mire species: a = Durdnidelans sp.1 (Mesostiumata)	numanensis Lufeng, Zixishan, Changhu	Jul. 2002	0	0) 0	0) (0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P Unknown sp.1 Curculionidae So Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae M Total Mire species: a = Dundndadas sp.1 Mesostiomata.	<i>P. kesiya</i> Ning'er	Jun. 2010	0	0) 0	0	0	0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Q Unknown sp.2 Curculionidae M Total	semaonensis Chuxiong	Jul. 2002	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Dendendadans sn. 1 (Mesostiemata	Tsuga sp. Dali	Jul. 2002	0	0) 0	0)	0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mite species: a = <i>Dendrolaelans</i> sp. 1 (Mesostiemata.			16	5	23 3	6		į 2	4	1	2	2	1	6	106
octomotidae): d = Issocial delate on 1 (Manatiamoto); b = <i>Dendrolaelaps</i> sp. 2 (Mesostig	mata, Digamas 20 Rherrisociid	sellida	e); c	= Hiv	stiost	ma .	of. saf	more	yzaru	s) m	arco A	ptifo	rmes	, Histi-

ostomatutacy; u = *insectatuteups* sp. 1 (Artesostigmata, Lugamaseuridae); e = Lastosetus sp. 1 (Artesostigmata, Indencharidae); g = Artesostigmata, Mencharidae); g = Artesostigmata, Mencharidae); g = Artesostigmata, Mencharidae); h = Schwiebea tatiwanensis (Sarcoptiformes, Acaridae); I = Unknown sp.1 (Mesostigmata); j = Unknown sp.2 (Oribatei); k = Unknown sp.3 (Mesostigmata, Uropodoidea); l = Unknown sp.4 (Mesostigmata); m = Unknown sp.5.

DNA sequencing and phylogenetic analyses

Isolates were grown on 2% MEA in Petri dishes. DNA was extracted using PrepMan Ultra Sample Preparation reagent (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) following the manufacturer's instructions. The primer pairs ITS1F (Gardes and Bruns 1993) and ITS4 (White et al. 1990) were used to amplify internal transcribed spacer regions (ITS), the primary barcode of fungi (Schoch et al. 2012). LR0R and LR5 (Vilgalys and Hester 1990) were used to amplify nuclear large subunit (LSU). For ITS2-LSU used in *Leptographium*, ITS and LSU sequences were combined. EF2F (Marincowitz et al. 2015) and EF2R (Jacobs et al. 2004) were used to amplify the elongation factor 1- α (EF) gene, the secondary barcode of fungi (Stielow et al. 2015). BT2A and BT2B (Glass and Donaldson 1995) were used to amplify part of the β -tubulin (BT) gene, and CL2F and CL2R (Duong et al. 2012) for the calmodulin (CAL) gene. PCR and sequencing were conducted using the methods described by Duong et al. (2012).

The sequences obtained using the forward and reverse primers were aligned in Geneious Pro v. 7.1.4 (Biomatters, Auckland, New Zealand). ITS sequences were submitted to BLAST searches in NCBI Genbank for preliminary identifications. Based on these results, the ITS data were separated into different data sets according to genus. ITS2-LSU data were used for analyses of taxa residing in *Leptographium s.l.*, while ITS was used for analyses of taxa belonging to the other genera. The BT, EF and CAL data were separated into smaller data sets based on the species complexes as defined by De Beer and Wingfield (2013). All sequences obtained in this study were submitted to GenBank (Table 2). Alignments were done online with MAFFT v. 7 (Katoh and Standley 2013). Maximum likelihood (ML), maximum parsimony (MP) and Bayesian Inference (BI) were conducted on the datasets as described in Duong et al. (2012). For haplotype analyses of *O. quercus* and *O. tsotsi*, the online server ElimDupes was used (http://www.hiv.lanl.gov/content/sequence/ELIMDUPES/elimdupes.html).

Growth studies

Growth studies were conducted on three isolates of each novel taxon. Mycelium-covered agar plugs were transferred from the actively growing margins of one-week-old cultures and placed at the centers of 90 mm Petri dishes containing 2% MEA. Cultures were incubated in the dark at temperatures ranging from 5–35 °C at 5 °C intervals. Three replicates were used for each isolate at each temperature. Colony diameters were measured every day until hyphae reached the edges of the Petri dishes. Optimum and maximum growth temperatures were calculated for each species.

Morphological studies

To facilitate morphological descriptions of new taxa, asexual and sexual structures (where present) were mounted in lactophenol on glass slides, covered with a coverslip

Yunnan.
2
-=
mites
and
eries
all
heir g
Ē,
setles
t,
lifferen
p
from
eq
btain
0
fungi
id
stomatoi
io
hqc
ofc
ates (
sol
Ť.
2
<u>e</u>
Tab

		Isolate n	umber ^{1,2}						GenBank	number ⁴	
Taxon	Species	CMW	CBS	Host	Location	Beetle	M ³ ²	ITS/ITS2- LSU ⁵	BT	EF	CAL
Ophios	tomatales										
1	Sporothrix sp. A	41787		Pinus kesiya	Ning'er	Coccotrypes cyperi	М	MG205645	MG205681	Ι	I
		11791		Pinus yunnanensis	Zixishan	Tomicus piniperda	×	MG205646	MG205682	I	I
		41762		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Х	MG205647	MG205683	I	
		41776		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	М	MG205648	MG205684	I	I
		41779		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Х	MG205649	=MG205684	I	1
7). nebudris	41782		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	М	MG205650	=MG205684	I	1
		41816		P. kesiya	Ning`er	Cyrtogenius luteus	М	MG205651	MG205685	I	I
		41819		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Orthotomicus angulatus	М	MG205652	=MG205685	I	I
		41835		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus sp.	М	MG205653	=MG205684	Ι	I
		41630		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Ips acuminatus	IJ	=MG205656	MG205686	I	1
		41641		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus szemaoensis	IJ	=MG205656	=MG205686	I	I
		41642		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	IJ	=MG205656	=MG205686	I	I
		41647		P. kesiya	Pu'er	I. acuminatus	М	=MG205656	=MG205686	I	1
		41789		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Cy. luteus	М	=MG205657	=MG205686	I	I
3	Ophiostoma acarorum	41791		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Cy. luteus	М	=MG205657	=MG205686	I	I
	sp. 110v.	41795		P. kesiya	Ning`er	Cy. luteus	М	=MG205657	=MG205686	Ι	I
		41798	139643	P. kesiya	Ning'er	Cy. luteus	М	=MG205657	=MG205686	Ι	I
		41812	139658	P. kesiya	Ning'er	Cy. luteus	Μ	MG205656	=MG205686	I	I
		41850^{H}	139748	P. kesiya	Ning'er	O. angulatus	М	MG205657	=MG205686	Ι	I
		41852		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	М	=MG205657	=MG205686	Ι	I
		41987		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	G	=MG205656	=MG205686	Ι	I
		41620		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	IJ	MG205658	MG205687	I	I
t. 	o. the	41644		P. kesiya	Pu'er	I. acuminatus	В	=MG205658	=MG205687	I	I

Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with conifer-infesting beetles...

		Isolate ni	umber ^{1,2}						GenBank	number ⁴	
Taxon	Species	CMW	CBS	Host	Location	Beetle	M ³	ITS/ITS2- LSU ⁵	BT	EF	CAL
		41653		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	G	=MG205658	MG205688	I	I
		41695		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	Μ	=MG205658	=MG205688	I	1
		41697		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	В	=MG205658	=MG205688	I	I
4	O. ips	41709		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	в	=MG205658	=MG205688	I	I
		41745		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus sp.	М	=MG205658	=MG205688	I	I
		41916		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	IJ	=MG205658	=MG205688	I	I
		41993		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	Μ	=MG205658	=MG205687	I	I
\$	Ophiostoma sp. B	12032		Pinus semaonensis	Chuxiong	Unknown sp.1	×	MG205659	MG205689	MG205731	I
		41624	139661	P. kesiya	Ning'er	Tomicus brevipilosus	В	=MG205660	MG205690	MG205732	I
		41662 ^H	139659	P. kesiya	Ning'er	T. brevipilosus	В	MG205660	=MG205690	=MG205732	I
		41760		P. kesiya	Ning'er	T. brevipilosus	В	=MG205660	=MG205690	=MG205732	I
0	O. previpuosi sp. nov.	41873	139660	P. kesiya	Ning'er	T. brevipilosus	В	=MG205660	=MG205690	=MG205732	I
		41932		P. kesiya	Ning'er	T. brevipilosus	В	=MG205660	=MG205690	=MG205732	I
		41995		P. kesiya	Ning'er	T. brevipilosus	В	=MG205660	=MG205690	=MG205732	I
		12152		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	MG205661	MG205691	MG205733	I
	O. setosum	12192		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	×	=MG205661	=MG205691	MG205734	I
		12337		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=MG205661	=MG205691	MG205735	I
		11747		P. yunnanensis	Lufeng	Polygraphus verrucifrons	×	=AF198238	=FJ455565	MG205736	I
		11748		P. yunnanensis	Lufeng	P. verrucifrons	×	=AF198238	=FJ455565	=MG205736	I
		11756		P. yunnanensis	Lufeng	P. verrucifrons	*	MG205662	MG205692	MG205737	I
	(11806		P. yunnanensis	Changhu	T. piniperda	×	=FJ434947	=FJ455565	MG205738	I
×	O. quercus	11807		P. yunnanensis	Changhu	T. piniperda	×	=FJ434947	=AY466647	=MG205738	I
		11981		Abies sp.	Chuxiong	Unknown sp.1	×	=FJ434947	=FJ455570	MG205739	I
		12015		P. semaonensis	Chuxiong	Unknown sp.1	*	=AY466624	MG205693	MG205740	I
		12037		Unknown	Chuxiong	Unknown sp.1	*	=AY466624	MG205694	MG205741	I
		12039		Unknown	Chuxiong	Unknown sp.1	*	=FJ434947	MG205695	MG205742	Ι

		Isolate m	umber ^{1,2}						GenBank	number ⁴	
Taxon	Species	CMW	CBS	Host	Location	Beetle	M ³	ITS/ITS2- LSU ⁵	BT	EF	CAL
		12122		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=FJ434947	MG205696	MG205743	I
		12146		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=FJ434947	=MG205696	=MG205743	I
		12185		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=FJ434947	MG205697	=MG205740	I
		12195		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=FJ434947	=MG205697	=MG205740	I
		12286		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=FJ434947	=FJ455570	MG205744	I
		12350		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=FJ434947	MG205698	MG205745	I
		12359		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=AF198238	=FJ455570	MG205746	I
c	C	12364		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	×	=AF198238	MG205699	MG214780	I
x	O. quercus	12370		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=AF198238	=MG205698	MG205747	I
		12382		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	=AF198238	=FJ455570	MG205748	I
		41659		P. kesiya	Pu'er	I. acuminatus	IJ	MG205664	MG205700	MG205749	
		41693		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	IJ	=MG205664	=MG205700	=MG205749	I
		41715		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	В	=MG205664	=MG205700	=MG205749	I
		41718		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	В	=MG205664	=MG205700	=MG205749	I
		41724		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	В	MG205665	MG205701	MG205750	I
		41732		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Cy. luteus	IJ	=MG205664	=MG205700	=MG205749	
		41730		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	IJ	=FJ441284	MG205704	MG205755	I
		41731		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	IJ	=FJ441284	MG205705	MG205756	I
		41733		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Cy. luteus	Ð	=FJ441284	=MG205704	=MG205755	I
c		41734		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Cy. luteus	IJ	=FJ441284	=MG205704	=MG205755	I
٧	U. 130131	41735		P. kesiya	Ning`er	Co. cyperi	Μ	=FJ441284	=MG205704	=MG205755	I
		41742		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Μ	=FJ441284	=MG205705	=MG205756	I
		41746		P. kesiya	Ning`er	Co. cyperi	М	=FJ441284	=MG205704	=MG205755	I
		41758		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Μ	=FJ441284	=MG205705	=MG205756	I
10	Ophiostoma sp. C	12150		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	MG205666	MG205709	MG205762	I
11	Graphilbum fragrans	11778		P. yunnanensis	Zixishan	Tomicus minor	*	MG205667	MG205710	I	I
۲ د	Card broken on were	41626		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	М	=MG205669	I	I	I
71	OTU. KENJUE SP. 110V.	41657	139639	P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus sp.	М	MG205668	=MG205714	I	I

Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with conifer-infesting beetles...

		Isolate n	umber ^{1,2}						GenBank	number ⁴	
Taxon	Species	CMW	CBS	Host	Location	Beetle	G/B/ M ³	ITS/ITS2- LSU ⁵	BT	EF	CAL
		41686	139641	P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	М	=MG205668	MG205711	I	I
		41691	139642	P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	М	=MG205669	=MG205713	I	I
		41703		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	IJ	I	MG205712	I	I
		41716	139657	P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	Μ	=MG205669	=MG205712	I	I
12	Gra. kesiyae sp. nov.	41729 ^H	139652	P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	IJ	MG205669	MG205713	I	I
		41774	139653	P. kesiya	Ning`er	Polygraphus aterrimus	В	MG205668	MG205714	I	I
		46468		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. aterrimus	IJ	MG205668	=MG205714	I	I
		46469		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. aterrimus	В	MG205668	=MG205714	I	I
		41619		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	В	=MG205670	MG205715	I	I
		41667	139651	P. kesiya	Pu'er	I. acuminatus	IJ	MG205670	MG205716	I	I
		41670		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	В	=MG205670	I	I	I
		41671		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	В	=MG205670	MG205717	I	I
13	Gra. puerense sp. nov.	41673	139640	P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	В	=MG205670	MG205718	I	I
		41942 ^H	139650	P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	G	MG205671	MG205719	I	Ι
		41971		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	М	=MG205671	MG205720	Ι	I
		41996		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	Μ	=MG205671	MG205721	I	I
		41998		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	G	=MG205670	=MG205715	Ι	I
		12305		Pinus armandii	Lijiang	Pissodes sp.	×	MG205672	MG205722	MG205763	MG205782
		12397		P. armandii	Midu	Pissodes sp.	×	=MG205672	=MG205722	=MG205763	=MG205782
1 4		12399		P. armandii	Midu	Pissodes sp.	*	=MG205672	=MG205722	=MG205763	=MG205782
14	Lepuographium gracine	12404		P. armandii	Midu	Pissodes sp.	×	=MG205672	=MG205722	=MG205763	=MG205782
		12407		P. armandii	Midu	Pissodes sp.	×	=MG205672	=MG205722	=MG205763	=MG205782
		12412		P. armandii	Midu	Pissodes sp.	×	=MG205672	=MG205722	=MG205763	=MG205782
15	Grosmannia radiaticola	12323		Tsuga sp.	Dali	Unknown sp.2	*	MG205673	MG205723	MG205764	I
		41773		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	М	I	=MG205724	MG205765	=MG205783
16	L. ningerense sp. nov.	41786^{H}	139663	P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	М	MG205674	MG205724	=MG205765	MG205783
		41831	139664	P. kesiya	Ning'er	O. angulatus	М	MG205675	=MG205724	=MG205765	=MG205783

		Isolate nu	umber ^{1,2}						GenBank	number ⁴	
Taxon	Species	CMW	CBS	Host	Location	Beetle	M ³	ITS/ITS2- LSU ⁵	ВТ	EF	CAL
		41622		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	В	MG205676	MG205725	MG205766	I
		41627		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis or I. acuminatus	М	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41633		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis or I. acuminatus	Μ	I	MG205726	I	I
		41635		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Lasconotus sp.	В	I	=MG205726	MG205767	I
		41636		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Lasconotus sp.	В	I	=MG205726	MG205768	I
		41666		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus sp.	Μ	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41687		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	Μ	I	=MG205725	MG205769	I
		41694		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	Μ	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41707		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	В	I	=MG205725	MG205770	I
		41720		P. kesiya	Simao	P. szemaoensis	IJ	I	=MG205725	MG205771	I
		41721		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	Μ	I	=MG205725	MG205772	I
17	G. yunnanensis	41726		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	Μ	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41728		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	Μ	I	=MG205726	MG205773	I
		41777		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Μ	I	MG205727	MG205774	I
		41778		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Μ	I	MG205728	=MG205774	I
		41781		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Μ	I	=MG205727	=MG205774	I
		41783		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Co. cyperi	Μ	I	=MG205725	MG205775	I
		41805		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus sp.	Μ	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41814		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus sp.	М	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41858		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	IJ	I	=MG205725	MG205776	I
		41863		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	G	MG205677	=MG205725	MG205777	I
		41945		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	Μ	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41963		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	Μ	I	=MG205725	I	I
		41990		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	G	I	=MG205725	=MG205776	I

Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with conifer-infesting beetles...

29

		Isolate nt	umber ^{1,2}						GenBank	number ⁴	
Taxon	Species	CMW	CBS	Host	Location	Beetle	M ³	ITS/ITS2- LSU ⁵	BT	EF	CAL
		41992		P. kesiya	Ning'er	I. acuminatus	IJ	I	=MG205725	MG205778	I
17	G. yunnanensis	41999		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	В	I	=MG205725	I	I
		42000		P. kesiya	Ning'er	P. szemaoensis	В	I	I	=MG205778	I
0	r	11782		P. yunnanensis	Zixishan	Hylurgops major	×	MG205678	MG205729	MG205779	I
10	т. сопјинстит	41761		P. kesiya	Ning'er	Polygraphus sp.	Μ	MG205679	MG205730	MG205780	I
Micros	iscales										
19	Graphium pseudormiticum	41665		P. kesiya	Pu'er	I. acuminatus	Μ	MG205680	I	MG205781	I
¹ The c Biotech	culture collection (CBS) 1000gy Institute (FABI)	of Wester , Universit	dijk Fun _i sy of Pret	gal Biodiversity oria, Pretoria, Sc	Institute, U	trecht, the Netherla	nds; CN	fW Culture C	ollection of th	le Forestry and	Agricultural

² H = ex-holotype isolate ³ G = Gallery; B = Beetle; M = Mite; * = Unknown

⁴ ITS = internal transcribed spacer regions 1 and 2 of the nuclear ribosomal DNA operon, including the 5.8S region; ITS2–LSU = the internal transcribed spacer 2 region and partial large subunit of the nrDNA operon; BT = beta-tubulin; EF = translation elongation factor 1-alpha; CAL = Calmodulin and examined with a Zeiss Axioskop2 Plus compound microscope or a Zeiss Discovery V12 dissection microscope with an Axiocam digital camera (Axiovision 3.1) (München-Hallbergmoos, Germany). Measurements were made for each taxonomically characteristic structure. The measurements are presented in the format (minimum–) mean minus standard deviation–mean plus standard deviation (–maximum). For reference to asexual states that resemble morphological features of well-known asexual genera, we followed the reference style (e.g. hyalorhinocladiella-like) suggested

by Hawksworth (2011). Descriptions of morphological features of *Leptographium* species were based on the style of Jacobs and Wingfield (2001).

Frequency of isolation

Frequencies of isolation of the ophiostomatoid species in all samples were calculated as follows: $F = (NF/NT) \times 100$, where F represents the frequency of isolation (%), NT represents the total number of isolates collected, and NF represents the number of isolates of a particular fungal species.

Results

Bark beetles and mites

Collectively, 17 beetle species belonging to four sub-families were collected from conifer hosts at 10 sites (Table 1). Seven of the species were collected in 2001 and 2002 and ten species in 2010. In total, 106 mites were collected from galleries of six Scolytine bark beetle species during the 2010 survey. One hundred of these mites represented 12 mite species belonging to eight families (Table 1). The remaining six mites (Table 1, Column m) could not be identified. The abundance of each mite species collected varied considerably, with *Insectolaelaps* sp. 1, *Histiostoma* cf. *sapromyzarum* and *Dendrolaelaps* sp. 1 being the most abundant overall. The other species were present in very low numbers. Among the most abundant mites, *Insectolaelaps* sp. 1 was found on four beetle species, and *Histiostoma* cf. *sapromyzarum* was found on three beetle species, while *Dendrolaelaps* sp. 1 was associated with only one beetle species. *Coccotrypes cyperi* was the most common beetle vector as it was phoreticed with 34 mites representing eight species, including three unknown species. Nineteen mites representing five species (including one unknown) came from *Polygraphus szemaoensis*, and *Orthotomicus angulatus* vectored 19 mites representing four species.

Fungal isolation

A total of 340 fungal isolates were obtained, 54 from beetles in 2001 and 2002, and 286 isolated from beetles, galleries and mites in 2010 (Tables 3 and Suppl. material 1: Table S1).

) associates
7
5
or mite
0
rh
۲
alleries
their g
<u></u>
Ξ.
seetles (
d from
aine
Ę
pecies o
s per s
l isolaté
funga
ų,
Numbers o
m
Table

Vear of survev →													1°	010														2001			20	8			
Host tree species ¹ \rightarrow													"	I																		5	2	>	
		-	_	B			٩			ы			H	\vdash	1			-			1			Г	-	P		G	U	K	Σ	z	P	0	Total
beetle species \rightarrow	B	N C	[B	U	Μ	B	G	Σ	B	U	M	B	A ()	V F	0	Μ	B	U	Σ	B	C	Σ	B	5	И	0	M	*	*	*	×	*	*	*	
Taxon. Fungus species↓																																			
1. Sporothrix sp. A	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2. S. nebularis	0	4	0	0	\sim	0		0	0	0	0	0	0 1	8	0	0	0	0	Ś		3	7		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-		0	45
3. Ophiostoma acarorum sp. nov.	0	2	0	0	7	0	7		0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
4. O. ips	0	1	0	-	17	9	Ξ	14	0	0	0	0	0 1	3	1	0	0	0	5	6	15	Ś	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4	0	106
5. <i>Ophiostoma</i> sp. B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
6. O. brevipilosi sp. nov.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	~	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
7. O. setosum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0) () (0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5
8. O. quercus	0	0	0	1	\sim	0		0	0	0	0) 0) () (0	0	0	0	0	9	-	9	0	0	0	0 (0	0	0	3	0	2	4	11	43
9. O. tsotsi	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
10. Ophiostoma sp. C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
11. Graphilbum fragrans	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0) (0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
12. Gra. kesiyae sp. nov.) 0	0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0) 0) (7 C	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	0	0	0 0	0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
13. Gra. puerense sp. nov.	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
14. Leptographium gracile	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
15. G. radiaticola	0	0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0) () () (0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
16. L. ningerense sp. nov.	0	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0) ()	C (2 (0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0 0	0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
17. G. yunnanensis	0	0	0	0	9	0	7	0	8	0	0	0		_	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-		0	39
18. L. conjunctum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		_	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
19. Graphium pseudormiticum) 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0) () (0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0 (0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	0	5	0	4	56	10	19	18	8	•	0	-	3	1	0	•	•	0	12	21	8	36	-	•	0	•	•	10	1	9	-	8	12	17	340
¹ Tree host species: I = <i>Pinus ke</i>	esiya	Ξ	= P. 1	arm	and	' <i>ii</i> ; I	= 11	P	umn,	iane	nsis	SI:	r = 1	P. se	mac	лөн	15is;	\geq	: Tsi	nga :	sp.														

² Beetle species: A = Coccotrypes cyperi; B = Cyrtogenius luteus; C = Hylurgops major; D = Ips acuminatus; E = Lasconotus sp.; F = Orthotomicus angulatus; G = Pissodes sp.; H = Polygraphus aterrimus; I = Polygraphus sp.; J = P. szemaoensis; K = P. verrucifrons; L = Stenoscelis sp.; M = Tomicus minor; N = T. piniperda; O = T. brevipilosus; P = Unknown sp.1; Q = Unknown sp.2.

* = information about specific niche not available.

Bark beetle niches in this study include the beetles themselves, their galleries or the mites associated with a particular bark beetle or its galleries. The numbers of fungal isolates collected from the different bark beetle niches varied substantially. For example, 85 isolates were collected from the *P. szemaoensis* niche, 60 isolates from that of *C. cyperi*, but only two and four isolates from the niches of *Lasconotus* sp. and *P. aterrimus* respectively.

DNA sequencing and phylogenetic analyses

From the total of 340 isolates obtained in the study, DNA sequences were generated for 134 isolates (Table 2), representing all the morphological groups. Based on preliminary BLAST results, ITS data generated in the present study were separated into two data sets, the first including *Ophiostoma, Sporothrix* and *Graphilbum* in the Ophiostomatales, and the second including *Graphium* spp. in the Microascales. Because amplification of the ITS1 and 2 regions is often problematic for *Leptographium s.l.* species (De Beer and Wingfield 2013), a reference data set consisting of ITS2-LSU data was compiled to determine the species complexes in *Leptographium s.l.* to which the isolates from China belonged.

The 340 isolates were separated in 19 taxa (Taxa 1 to 19) based on DNA sequences (Table 2) and culture morphology. Taxa 1 and 2 (Fig. 1) represented species of *Sporothrix*, Taxa 3 to 10 resided in five species complexes in *Ophiostoma s.l.*, and Taxa 11 to 13 belonged to *Graphilbum*. Taxa 14 to 18 belonged to four species complexes in *Leptographium s.l.* (Fig. 2). One taxon (Taxon 19) resided in the genus *Graphium* (Suppl. material 2: Figure S1).

Two species of *Sporothrix* were collected (Suppl. material 2: Figure S3). Taxon 1 was represented by a single isolate and both ITS and BT data suggested that this was of an undescribed species. Taxon 2 included 45 isolates, eight for which sequence data were included in our analyses (Suppl. material 2: Figure S3). In the ITS tree, these isolates grouped in a monophyletic clade that included the ex-type isolates of *S. nebularis* and *S. nigrograna*. In the BT tree these isolates again grouped with *S. nebularis*.

Taxon 3 included 29 isolates (Table 3), 12 of which (Table 2) were included in the analyses. These isolates grouped with a number of *Ophiostoma* spp. peripheral to the well-defined complexes in *Ophiostoma s.str.*, and they were treated as Group A in *Ophiostoma s.l.* (Fig. 1). In both the ITS and BT trees (Fig. 3), the Yunnan isolates formed a well-supported lineage, closest to but clearly distinct from *O. pallidulum* and *O. saponiodorum*.

Taxon 4 formed part of the *O. ips* complex (Fig. 1). This included 106 isolates (Table 3), nine of which were included in the analyses (Table 2). ITS and BT data (Suppl. material 2: Figure S4) confirmed that these isolates all represented *O. ips*.

Taxon 5, including only one isolate, together with Taxon 6 that included eight isolates (Table 3), six for which sequences were produced, formed part of the *O. clava-tum* complex (Fig. 1). BT and EF data confirmed that both these taxa grouped distinct from all known species in the complex (Fig. 4).

Five isolates comprised Taxon 7 (Tables 2 and 3), which formed part of the *O. piceae* complex (Fig. 1). Both BT and EF analyses confirmed that these isolates grouped



Figure 1. ML tree of the ITS region of *Ophiostoma, Sporothrix, Graphilbum.* Novel sequences obtained in this study are printed in **bold** type. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95 . Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.



Figure 2. ML tree of the ITS2-LSU region of *Leptographium*. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95 . Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.



Figure 3. ML trees of Group A generated from DNA sequences of ITS and BT regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95 . Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.



Figure 4. ML trees of the *O. clavatum* complex generated from DNA sequences of BT and EF regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95 . Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.

with *O. setosum* isolates previously identified from Canada, Korea and China (Suppl. material 2: Figure S5).

There were 55 isolates (Table 3) belonging to the *O. ulmi* complex (Fig. 1). The sequences for these isolates were quite variable. Thus more detailed analyses, including all available related sequences from Genbank generated in previous studies dealing with the variable haplotypes of these taxa (Grobbelaar et al. 2009, Kamgan Nkuekam et al. 2010), were required. Taxon 8 represented *O. quercus* and Taxon 9 *O. tsotsi* based on ITS (Suppl. material 2: Figure S6), BT (Suppl. material 2: Figure S7), and EF (Suppl. material 2: Figure S8). Sequences of the 36 putative *O. quercus* isolates were very variable and respectively represented 13, 23 and 28 haplotypes for the ITS, BT and EF gene regions (Suppl. material 1: Table S2). When combined, 51 unique haplotypes were found (Suppl. material 1: Table S2). The 18 isolates representing Taxon 9 grouped with isolates of *O. tsotsi* (Suppl. material 2: Figures S6, S7, S8). The ITS data for *O. tsotsi* was less variable than those of *O. quercus* (Suppl. material 2: Figure S6), including only one haplotype. However, the BT (Suppl. material 2: Figure S7) and EF (Suppl. material 2: Figure S8) of *O. tsotsi* had 14 and 12 unique haplotypes (Suppl. material 1: Table S3). Based on BT (Suppl. material 2: Figure S7) and EF (Suppl. material 2: Figure S8) data, the isolate representing Taxon 10 grouped distinct from all other lineages and could represent an undescribed species.

For *Graphilbum*, results from the analyses of the ITS and BT sequences (Fig. 5) suggested that the Yunnan isolates resided in three taxa. These included one isolate of *Gra. fragrans* (Taxon 11) and two distinct, well-supported lineages (Taxa 12 and 13) each including 11 isolates (Table 3), representing undescribed species.

In *Leptographium s.l.* (Fig. 2), ten isolates (Taxon 14) grouped in the *L. procerum* complex (Table 3). Although both BT and EF sequences (Suppl. material 2: Figure S9) of this taxon differed in 1 bp from those of *L. gracile*, CAL sequences were identical to those of *L. gracile* and we conclude that Taxon 14 represents the latter species. However, species delineation in this complex requires reconsideration because sequences of several species in the complex are very similar.

A single isolate (Taxon 15) grouped in the *Grosmannia galeiformis* complex (Fig. 2, Table 2). Both the BT and EF sequences placed this isolate among those of *G. radiaticola* (Suppl. material 2: Figure S10).

Taxon 16 (Fig. 2) included 13 isolates (Table 3) that grouped closest to *L. pineti*, peripheral to the *G. olivacea* complex. BT, EF and CAL analyses (Fig. 6) showed that Taxon 16 was distinct from *L. pineti* and represented a novel species.

Forty one isolates (Tables 2 and 3) belonged to the *L. lundbergii* complex (Fig. 2). The analyses of BT and EF sequences (Suppl. material 2: Figure S11) showed that these isolates separated in two groups, respectively aligning with *G. yunnanensis* (Taxon 17) and *L. conjunctum* (Taxon 18).

A single isolate represented Taxon 19 (Table 2) in the genus of *Graphium*. Both the ITS and EF sequences of this isolate grouped with *Graphium pseudormiticum* isolates (Suppl. material 2: Figure S1).

Frequencies of isolation

The origin and sources of the 340 isolates representing 19 taxa are presented in Tables 2, 3 and Suppl. material 1: S1. The 54 isolates collected from beetles and their



Figure 5. ML trees of the *Graphilbum* generated from DNA sequences of ITS and BT regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95 . Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.



Figure 6. ML trees of the *L. pineti* generated from DNA sequences of BT, EF and CAL regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95 . Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.

galleries in 2001 and 2002 belonged to 11 taxa (Table 3). During the 2010 survey, 286 isolates belonging to 12 taxa were collected (Table 3). The 45 isolates collected directly from six bark beetle species belonged to seven taxa, the 184 isolates from mites to 11 taxa, and the 57 isolates from galleries represented nine taxa. Six taxa were present on beetles, galleries and mites, three taxa on galleries and mites, one taxon only on beetles,

and two taxa only on mites. No taxa were found only in galleries that were not also found on beetles and/or mites. Four taxa were collected from both the 2001–2002 survey and the 2010 survey.

Grosmannia yunnanensis, O. ips, O. quercus, S. nebularis and Taxon 3 were the most frequently isolated species, representing 12.5%, 31.2%, 12.6%, 13.2% and 8.5% of the isolated fungi respectively. The remaining species were isolated only occasionally. O. ips was isolated from the niches (beetles, galleries, mites) of ten different bark beetles species. However, most of the O. ips were found associated with niches of I. acuminatus, P. szemaoensis and C. cyperi representing approximately 9.7%, 8.5% and 5.3%, respectively. S. nebularis was also isolated from the niches of ten beetle species and the highest frequency of isolation was 5.5%, associated with the niche of O. angulatus.

The number of fungal species isolated from different beetle or weevil niches varied between different species. There were ten fungal species, representing about 27.9% of total fungal isolates associated with the niche of *P. szemaoensis*. Among them, *O. ips* and *L. yunnanense* were the most frequently isolated, representing about 8.5% and 7.1%, respectively. There were eight fungal species, representing about 15.3%, associated with *Co. cyperi* and of these, the most frequently isolated fungus was *O. ips* with the frequency of 5.3%.

Only 13.2% of the total number of isolates were obtained directly from beetles (Table 3). Of these, 6.2% was obtained from *P. szemaoensis*. Most of the isolates from beetles were identified as *O. ips* (2.6%) and *O. quercus* (1.8%), while 2.9% and 2.6% of isolates were collected from *I. acuminatus* and *T. brevipilosus* respectively. Among these Taxon 6, representing 2.4%, was isolated only from *T. brevipilosus*. The other beetles vectored very low numbers of fungi. *O. ips* was the fungus most frequently isolated from the beetles, representing 4.4%, followed by Taxon 6 represting 2.4% of the isolates.

Approximately 54% of all isolates were collected from mites (Table 3, Suppl. material 1: Table S1). The fungi associated with mites varied between the different mite species. Ten fungal species were isolated from *Insectolaelaps* sp. 1, representing 21.2% of the total. From some mite species, such as *Lasioseius* sp. 1, *Dendrolaelaps* sp. 2 and the unknown species in the families of Mesostigmata and Oribatei, only one fungal species was found, representing a frequency of isolation of 0.3%, 1.8%, 1.2% and 1.5%, respectively. *O. ips, S. nebularis* and *G. yunnanensis* were the three most frequently isolated species associated with mites, representing 15.3%, 10.6% and 7.9%, respectively.

Taxonomy

Eight of the 19 taxa obtained in the present study represented undescribed species. For three of these, only a single isolate was obtained and we have chosen not to formally describe these. The remaining five taxa including two *Ophiostoma*, two *Graphilbum*, and one *Leptographium* species, are described as follows:



Figure 7. Morphological characters of asexual structures of *Ophiostoma acarorum* sp. nov. **a** fourteen days old culture on OA **b–c** Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state **d** conidia. Scale bars: \mathbf{a} – \mathbf{d} = 10 µm.

Taxon 3

Ophiostoma acarorum R.Chang & Z.W.de Beer, sp. nov.

MycoBank MB 823693 Fig. 7

Etymology. The epithet *acarorum* refers to the subclass Acari in the Arachnida to which all mite species belong from which 25 of the 29 isolates of this species were isolated.

Description. Sexual state not observed. Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state: *co-nidiophores* (7–) 18–76.5 (–140) µm long; *conidiogenous cells* arising directly from the hyphae, (10.5–) 13.5–24.5 (–31) × (1–) 1.5–2 (–2) µm; *conidia* hyaline, smooth, oblong, (3–) 3.5-5 (–6.5) × (0.7–) 1–1.5 (–2.5) µm.

Culture characteristics. Colonies hyaline at the beginning, becoming white to dark brown with age. Mycelium superficial on the 3% OA. Colony margin smooth. Colonies on 2% MEA flat, reaching 69 mm diam in 13 d at 30 °C. No growth observed at 5 °C. Optimal temperature for growth 25 °C.

Type material. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Insectolaelaps* sp. 1 in *Orthotomicus angulatus* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 17 Sep. 2010, *S.J.Taerum*,

herbarium specimen of dried culture, PREM 61539 (holotype), CMW41850 = CBS139748 (ex-holotype culture).

Additional specimens examined. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Histiostoma* cf. *sapromyzarum* in *Cyrtogenius luteus* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 16 Sep. 2010, *S.J.Taerum*, PREM 61540, CMW41812 = CBS139658; from *Histiostoma* cf. *sapromyzarum* in *Cyrtogenius luteus* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 16 Sep. 2010, *S.J.Taerum*, CMW41798 = CBS139643.

Host. Pinus kesiya.

Beetle vectors. Ips acuminatus, Polygraphus szemaoensis.

Mite vectors. *Histiostoma* cf. *sapromyzarum* (phoretic on *Cyrtogenius luteus*), *Insectolaelaps* sp. 1 (phoretic on *Ips acuminatus* and *Orthotomicus angulatus*).

Distribution. At present known only from Yunnan, China.

Notes. The hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state of *O. acarorum* resembles that of *O. pallidulum* (Linnakoski et al. 2010), one of its two closest relatives based on phylogeny (Fig. 3). *Ophiostoma saponiodorum*, the other close relative has a similar hyalorhinocladiella-like state, but can be distinguished based on the presence of a second, synnematous asexual state (Linnakoski et al. 2010).

Taxon 6

Ophiostoma brevipilosi R.Chang & Z.W.de Beer, sp. nov. MycoBank MB 823694 Fig. 8

Etymology. The epithet *brevipilosi* refers to the bark beetle vector *Tomicus brevipilosus* from which all eight isolates of this taxon were obtained.

Description. Sexual state not observed. Pesotum-like macronematal asexual state predominant. *Synnemata* simple, dark brown at the base, (179.5–) 227–468 (–667) µm long including *conidiogenous apparatus*, (22–) 32.5–58 (–69) µm wide at base; *conidiogenous cells* (13–) 16–26 (–32.5) µm long, *conidia* hyaline, 1-celled, smooth, oblong, (3–) 3–4.5 (–5.5) × (1.5–) 1.5–2.5 (–3) µm. Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state: *conidiophores* (14.5–) 33–115 (–145) µm long; *conidiogenous cells* arising directly from the hyphae, (12–) 15–38 (–47) × (1.1–) 1.5–2 (–2.5) µm; *conidia* hyaline, smooth, obvoid, (2.5–) 3–5.5 (–8) × (1.5–) 2–2.5 (–3) µm.

Culture characteristics. Colonies hyaline at the beginning, then becoming white to dark. Mycelium superficial on the 3% OA. Colony margin smooth. Colonies on 2% MEA flat, reaching 67 mm diam in 11 d at 25 °C. No growth observed at 5 and above 30 °C. Optimal temperature for growth 20 and 25 °C.

Type material. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Tomicus brevipilosus* on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 27 Jun. 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, herbarium specimen of dried culture, PREM 61537 (holotype), CMW41873 = CBS139660 (ex-holotype culture).

Additional specimens examined. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Tomicus brevipilosus* on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 27 Jun. 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, PREM 61538,



Figure 8. Morphological characters of asexual structures of *Ophiostoma brevipilosi* sp. nov. **a** fourteen days old culture on OA **b–d** Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state and condia **e** Pesotum-like macronematal asexual state **f** conidiogenous cells of Pesotum-like macronematal asexual state **g** conidia. Scale bars: $\mathbf{a-g} = 10 \ \mu\text{m}.$

CMW41624 = CBS139661; CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Tomicus brevipilosus* on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 27 Jun. 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, CMW41662 = CBS139659.

Host. Pinus kesiya.

Beetle vector. Tomicus brevipilosus.

Distribution. At present known only from Yunnan, China.

Notes. The synnematous asexual state of *O. brevipilosi* corresponds with similar structures of *O. brunneo-ciliatum* as described by Linnakoski et al. (2016). The hyalorhinocladiella state resembles those of *O. brunneolum*, *O. macroclavatum*, *O. pseudo-catenulatum* (Linnakoski et al. 2016) and *O. poligraphi* (Yin et al. 2016). However, the morphology of these structures is not sufficient to distinguish between the species in the complex, and DNA sequences of the BT and EF gene regions are recommended for accurate species identification.



Figure 9. Morphological characters of asexual structures of *Graphilbum kesiyae* sp. nov. **a** fourteen days old culture on OA **b–e** Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state and conidia **f** Pesotum-like macronematal asexual state **g** conidiogenous cells of Pesotum-like macronematal asexual state **h** conidia. Scale bars: $\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{h} = 10 \ \mu\text{m}.$

Taxon 12

Graphilbum kesiyae R.Chang & Z.W.de Beer, sp. nov.

MycoBank MB 823695 Fig. 9

Etymology. The epithet *kesiyae* refers to the tree host of all beetles and mites from which the 12 isolates of this species were collected.

Description. Sexual state not observed. Pesotum-like macronematal asexual states predominant. *Synnemata* simple, dark brown at the base, (85.5–) 112.5–173 (–203) μ m long including *conidiogenous apparatus*, (9–) 14–45.5 (–65.5) μ m wide at base; *conidiogenous cells* (8.5–) 10–18.5 (–25.5) μ m long; *conidia* hyaline, 1-celled, smooth, oblong, (3.5–) 4–5 (–5.5) × (1.5–) 1.5–2 (–2.5) μ m. Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual

state: *conidiophores* (22–) 38–101.5 (–166) µm long; *conidiogenous cells* arising directly from the hyphae, (10–) $12-27(-40) \times (1.2-) 1.5-2$ (–2.5) µm; *conidia* hyaline, smooth, obovoid, (3.5–) 4–5.5 (–8.5) × (1–) 1.5–2 (–3) µm.

Culture characteristics. Colonies hyaline. Mycelium superficial on the 3% OA. Colony margin smooth. Colonies on 2% MEA flat, reaching 85 mm diam in 10 d at 25 °C. No growth observed at 5 and 35 °C. Optimal temperature for growth 25 °C.

Type material. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Polygraphus szemaoensis* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 12 Aug. 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, herbarium specimen of dried culture, PREM 61541 (holotype), CMW41729 = CBS139652 (ex-holotype culture).

Additional specimens examined. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Insectolaelaps* sp. 1 in *Polygraphus szemaoensis* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 10 Aug. 2010, *S.J.Taerum*, CMW41691 = CBS 139642; CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Proctolaelaps nr. hystrix* in *Polygraphus szemaoensis* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 11 Aug. 2010, *S.J.Taerum*, PREM 61542, CMW41716 = CBS139657.

Host. Pinus kesiya.

Beetle vectors. Polygraphus aterrimus, Polygraphus szemaoensis.

Mite vectors. Proctolaelaps nr. hystrix (phoretic on Polygraphus szemaoensis), Insectolaelaps sp. 1 (phoretic on Polygraphus szemaoensis).

Distribution. At present known only from Yunnan, China.

Notes. Graphilbum kesiyae and Gra. puerense can be distinguished from Gra. crescericum by the presence of both synnematous and hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual states in culture. Gra. crescericum produces only the hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state. The optimal temperature for growth of Gra. puerense is 30 °C while that for Gra. kesiyae is 25 °C, and synnemata of Gra. puerense reach double the length of those of Gra. kesiyae.

Taxon 13

Graphilbum puerense **R.Chang & Z.W.de Beer, sp. nov.** MycoBank MB 823696 Fig. 10

Etymology. The epithet *puerense* refers to the city from which this species was collected.

Description. Sexual state not observed. Pesotum-like macronematal asexual states predominant. *Synnemata* simple, dark brown at the base, (187.5-) 206-357(-437.5) µm long including *conidiogenous apparatus*, (12-) 15.5-45 (-61) µm wide at base; *conidiogenous* cells (15.5-) 18.5-30.5 (-34) µm long, *conidia* hyaline, 1-celled, smooth, oblong, (4-) 4-5 (-5.5) × (1-) 1.5-2 (-2.5) µm. Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state: *conidiophores* (17-) 3-140 (-232.5) µm long; *conidiogenous cells* arising directly from the hyphae, (6.5-) 10-25.5 (-42.5) × (1-) 1-2 (-3) µm; *conidia* hyaline, smooth, obovoid to oblong, (3.5-) 4-8 (-12) × (1-) 1.5-2.5 (-3) µm.



Figure 10. Morphological characters of asexual structures of *Graphilbum puerense* sp. nov. **a** fourteen days old culture on OA **b–d** Hyalorhinocladiella-like asexual state **e** conidia **f** Pesotum-like macronematal asexual state **g–h** conidiogenous cells of Pesotum-like macronematal asexual state and conidia. *Scale bars*: $\mathbf{a-h} = 10 \ \mu\text{m}$.

Culture characteristics. Colonies hyaline. Mycelium superficial on the 3% OA. Colony margin smooth. Colonies on 2% MEA flat, reaching 76 mm diam in 5 d at 30 °C. No growth observed at 5 °C. Optimal temperature for growth 30 °C.

Type material. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Polygraphus szem-aoensis* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 29 Jun. 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, herbarium specimen of dried culture, PREM 61543 (holotype), CMW41673 = CBS139640 (ex-holotype culture).

Additional specimens examined. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Ips acuminatus* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 4 Jul. 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, PREM 61544, CMW41667 = CBS139651; CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Ips acuminatus* gallery on *Pinus kesiya* bark, Jul 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, CMW41942 = CBS139650.

Host. Pinus kesiya.

Beetle vectors. Ips acuminatus, Polygraphus szemaoensis.

Mite vectors. Proctolaelaps nr. hystrix (phoretic on Ips acuminatus), Insectolaelaps sp. 1 (phoretic on Ips acuminatus), and Uropodoidea sp. 2 (phoretic on Polygraphus szemaoensis).

Distribution. At present known only from Yunnan, China.

Notes. See comparison between *Gra. kesiyae* and *Gra. puerense* above under notes of *Gra. kesiyae*.

Taxon 16

Leptographium ningerense R.Chang & Z.W.de Beer, sp. nov. MycoBank MB 823697 Fig. 11

Etymology. The epithet *ningerense* refers to the Ning'er county where all isolates of this taxon were collected.

Description. Sexual state not observed. Asexual state, *conidiophores* occurring singly or in groups of up to 3, macronematous, mononematous, erect, arising directly from the mycelium, (93.5–) 141.5–195.5 (–210.5) µm long. Rhizoids present. *Stipes* dark olivaceous, 4–6 septa, not constricted at septa, (66–) 119.5–142 (–159) µm long. *Apical* cells not swollen at apex, (3–) 5–6.5 (–7) µm wide. *Basal cells* occasionally swollen at apex, (5.5–) 7–10 (–11.5) µm wide. *Conidiogenous apparatus* (28–) 35–58 (–70) µm long, excluding the conidial mass, with multiple series of cylindrical branches. *Primary branches* olivaceous, smooth, cylindrical, not swollen at apex, aseptate, arrangement of primary branches was Type B—two or more branches, (12.5–) 14.5–18 (–19.5) × (3.5–) 4–5.5(–6.5) µm. *Secondary branches* light olivaceous, frequently swollen at apex, aseptate, (6.5–) 9–13(–15) × (3.5–) 4–5 (–5.5) µm. *Tertiary branches* light olivaceous, aseptate, (7–) 8–10 (–12) × (3–) 3.5–4.5 (–5) µm. *Conidiogenous cells* discrete, hyaline, 2–3 per branch, aseptate, cylindrical, tapering slightly at the apex, (10.5–) 12–17.5 (–20.5) × (2–) 2–2.5 (–3) µm. *Conidia* hyaline, aseptate, elliptical, (3–) 3.5–5.5 (–6.5) × (1.5–) 2–3 (–4) µm.

Culture characteristics. Colonies on 3% OA flat, hyaline at the beginning, then becoming light olivaceous to dark olivaceous. Colonies hyaline at the beginning, then becoming dark olivaceous. Mycelium superficial on the 3% OA with olivaceous aerial mycelium. Colony margin smooth. Conidiophores forms abundantly in clusters on OA. Colonies on 2% MEA flat, reaching 76 mm diam in 10 d at 25 °C. No growth observed at 5 and 35 °C. Optimal temperature for growth 25 °C, reaching 30.5 mm in diam. in 7 days.

Type material. CHINA, Yunnan Province, Puer City, from *Schwiebea (Jacoti-etta) taiwanensis* hyperphoretic on *Coccotrypes cyperi* on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 16 Sep. 2010, *S.J. Taerum*, herbarium specimen of dried culture, PREM 61545 (holotype), CMW41786 = CBS139663 (ex-holotype culture).

Additional specimens examined. CHINA, Yunnan province, Puer City, from *Insectolaelaps* sp. 1 in *Orthotomicus angulatus* on *Pinus kesiya* bark, 17 Sep. 2010, *S.J.Taerum*, PREM 61546, CMW41831 = CBS139664.



Figure 11. Morphological characters of asexual structures of *Leptographium ningerense* sp. nov. **a** fourteen days old culture on OA **b** mononematous asexual morph on wood tissue on WA **c** conidiophore **d** conidia **e** conidiogenous apparatus. Scale bars: $\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{e} = 10 \ \mu m$.

Host. Pinus kesiya.

Beetle vectors. Polygraphus szemaoensis.

Mite vectors. Dendrolaelaps sp. 1 (phoretic on Coccotrypes cyperi), Dendrolaelaps sp. 2 (phoretic on Coccotrypes cyperi and Cyrtogenius luteus), Schwiebea (Jacotietta) taiwanensis (phoretic on Coccotrypes cyperi), Insectolaelaps sp. 1 (Orthotomicus angulatus).

Distribution. At present known only from Yunnan, China.

Notes. *L. ningerense* is morphologically similar to *L. pineti*, but grows much more rapidly, reaching 30 mm in 7 d on 2% MEA at 25 °C while *L. pineti* reaches a diameter of only 15 mm in 6 d. However, the two species are best distinguished with BT, EF and CAL sequences.

Discussion

This study resulted in a total of 340 fungal isolates of ophiostomatoid fungi obtained from the beetles and weevils, their galleries and phoretic mites in a province of China where these fungi are poorly known. The fungi resided in the two phylogenetically unrelated Microascales and Ophiostomatales and included a species of *Graphium* (Microascales) as well as species of *Sporothrix, Graphilbum, Leptographium* and *Ophiostoma* (Ophiostomatales). Analysis showed that these isolates belonged to 19 distinct taxa, eight of which represented undescribed species of which five were provided with names. Of the remaining 11 species, 10 had previously been reported from China, with only *S. nebularis* representing a new report for this country. This study also includes the first records of fungi associated with the Scolytine beetle species *Coccotrypes cyperi, Cyrtogenius luteus*, and *Tomicus brevilopus* and it is the first time that fungal associates are reported from beetle-associated mites in China.

Surveys in this study aimed to explore fungal diversity in conifer-infesting beetle ecosystems in Yunnan. This is in contrast to determining the specificity of these interactions where a much more focused and systematic sampling would have been required. The exact nature of the interactions between the beetles and mites, mites and fungi, beetles and fungi, and all of these with their host trees, thus remains largely unknown. The discussion below therefore focuses on the fungi collected in these surveys, with limited notes on the hosts, beetles and mites and some general observations.

The two *Sporothrix* species collected in this study were primarily from mites. *Sporothrix nebularis* was the second most abundant species and 36 of the 45 isolates came from five different mite species phoretic on five different beetle species. The fungus was first described from *Hylastes attenuatus* infesting *Pinus radiata* in Spain (Romón et al. 2014b) and was later also found on *Hylastes ater* and *Hylurgops palliatus* from the same host and country (Romón et al. 2014a). Our results suggest that *S. nebularis* has a much wider Eurasian distribution and host range than previously realized. It is also possible that in Europe, many of the previous reports of *S. stenoceras* from nine bark beetle species (Kirisits 2004), actually represent *S. nebularis*. This is particularly because the two taxa are morphologically almost indistinguishable, and *S. nebularis* might have been misidentified as *S. stenoceras* where only morphology was considered (Romón et al. 2014b). The single isolate of *Sporothrix* sp. A was from a mite on *Cyrtogenius luteus*. Overall, the results support the suggestion by De Beer et al. (2016a) that the majority of *Sporothrix* species are mite associates.

Ophiostoma acarorum grouped peripheral to the well-known species complexes in Ophiostoma s.str., and closest to, but distinct from O. pallidulum and O. saponiodorum. O. pallidulum is known from ten different bark beetle and one weevil species infesting Pinus sylvestris in Finland (Linnakoski et al. 2010), Poland (Jankowiak and Bilański 2013a, b, c), and the Ukraine (Davydenko et al. 2017). Interestingly, O. pallidulum was also isolated from dead P. sylvestris roots in Poland in the absence of beetle attack (Jankowiak et al. 2012). O. saponiodorum is known from two spruce-infesting beetles in Finland and Russia (Linnakoski et al. 2010), pine-infesting *Hylastes* and *Pissodes* spp. in Poland and Spain (Jankowiak and Bilański 2013a, c, Romón et al. 2014a), and Orthotomicus erosus caught in traps in Italy (Malacrinò et al. 2017). Similar to O. pallidulum and O. saponiodorum, O. acarorum does not appear to be beetle-specific as it was isolated from three mite species phoretic on four beetle species, and from the galleries of two beetle species. However, the fact that 25 of 29 isolates in the present study were from mites, suggests that O. acarorum is a symbiont of mites on conifer-infesting beetles, rather than the beetles themselves. The wide range of beetle species from which O. pallidulum and O. saponiodorum have been isolated in Europe, always in relatively low abundance, also suggests that these two species are mite rather than beetle symbionts.

Ophiostoma ips was the species most frequently isolated in the study, constituting 31% of the 340 isolates. It was also the fungus found in association with the largest

number of beetle species i.e. 10 of 17, and with three of the five host trees in central and southern Yunnan. This is consistent with current knowledge of the fungus that is known to have a global distribution (Zhou et al. 2007) and is associated with a wide range of conifer-infesting bark beetles in various genera (Kirisits 2004, Rumbold 1931, Upadhyay 1981). Shortly after the description of *O. ips* (Rumbold 1931), Leach et al. (1934) had already shown that ascospores of the fungus were vectored by mites associated with two *Ips* spp. Furthermore, Stone and Simpson (1990) observed that mycetophagous mites associated with *Ips grandicollis* fed directly on *O. ips* in the galleries of the beetle. About half of the 106 *O. ips* isolates from Yunnan came from mites associated with six of the bark beetle species. The results thus provide additional weight to the hypothesis that *O. ips* is primarily a mite associate, rather than a bark beetle associate.

Two taxa from Yunnan formed part of the *O. clavatum* complex as recently defined by Linnakoski et al. (2016). These authors showed that most of the species in the complex appear to be specific to one or two closely related *Ips* spp. on either a pine or spruce host from Europe. The only exception is *O. macroclavatum*, that is known from on three *Ips* spp. and *Pityogenes chalcographus* on both pine and spruce. Yin et al. (2016) subsequently described two additional species in the complex from *Polygraphus poligraphus* and *Ips shangrila* respectively, on spruce in Qinghai Province. Both fungi were also isolated from *Dendroctonus micans* in the same area. One of the species that we collected, *O. brevipilosi*, was from *Tomicus brevipilosus* beetles infesting *P. kesiya*. It is thus the first species in the complex associated with a *Tomicus* species. The other species from Yunnan, *Ophiostoma* sp. B (Taxon 5) was represented by only one isolate from the gallery of an unknown beetle on *P. semaonensis*.

Only a single species of the *O. piceae* complex, *O. setosum*, was obtained during the surveys. Five isolates of this species were from *Pissodes* galleries on *Tsuga dumosa*, confirming a previous report from the same host in China (Paciura et al. 2010b). The fungus was originally described from *Tsuga heterophylla* in Canada (Uzunovic et al. 2000). It was also reported from *Tsuga* and *Pseudotsuga* in the USA (Harrington et al. 2001), from *Hylastes ater* on pine in New Zealand (Reay et al. 2005) and pine logs imported from New Zealand to Korea (Kim et al. 2005a). In Bhutan, this species is associated with *Ips schmutzenhoferi* on *Picea spinulosa* and *Pinus wallichiana* (Kirisits et al. 2012). It thus seems as if *O. setosum* is a generalist associate of beetles infesting conifers in native Northern Hemisphere forests, and was most likely introduced into New Zealand.

The third most abundant species collected in this study was *O. quercus* that forms part of the *O. ulmi* species complex (De Beer and Wingfield 2013). This fungus is generally considered as hardwood-infecting with many reports from wounds and stained wood of well-known tree genera such as *Quercus, Betula, Populus, Eucalyptus, Acacia,* and *Nothofagus* from North and South America, Europe, Africa, Australasia, and Central and East Asia (De Beer et al. 2003, De Errasti et al. 2016, Grobbelaar et al. 2009, Harrington et al. 2001, Paciura et al. 2010b). Little is known regarding the insect vectors of *O. quercus* apart from reports that the fungus is vectored by nitidulid beetles on

oak (Juzwik et al. 1998) and eucalypts (Kamgan Nkuekam et al. 2012). Unlike most other species in the *O. ulmi* complex, there is a growing body of evidence suggesting that *O. quercus* is also a successful colonist of conifer wood. It has been reported from stained pine wood in the USA, Sweden, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa (De Beer et al. 2003, Harrington et al. 2001), but also in association with pine bark beetles such as *Tomicus yunnanensis* in China (Paciura et al. 2010b), *Hylastes plumbeus* in Japan (Masuya et al. 2009), as well as *Ips sexdentatus* and *Hylobius abietus* in Poland (Jankowiak 2012, Jankowiak and Bilański 2013b). Furthermore, it has been found with *Pissodes* weevils on *Tsuga* in China (Paciura et al. 2010b) and pine in Poland (Jankowiak and Bilański 2013c).

The 43 *O. quercus* isolates obtained in this study came from four of the host trees distributed in eight of the ten study sites in both central and southern Yunnan. The *O. quercus* isolates were found in association with eight beetle species, with 13 of the isolates coming from three mite species. To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first records of this fungus from mites. However, spores of the closely related and morphologically similar *O. novo-ulmi* have been observed in the guts and sporothecae of mites phoretic on *Scolytus* beetle vectors of the Dutch Elm Disease fungi (Brasier 1978, Moser et al. 2010). The difference between the latter group of fungi and *O. quercus* is that they are specific to elm trees and elm-infesting beetles. In contrast, *O. quercus* is probably of all ophiostomatoid species the one with the widest array of hosts and the plasticity to utilize as a vector, any arthropod passing a wound or gallery in which it is growing. It is thus not surprizing that *O. quercus* is also one of the most genetically diverse ophiostomatoid species (Grobbelaar et al. 2009, Kamgan Nkuekam et al. 2010), which is supported by the large variety of haplotypes revealed in analyses of the BT and EF gene regions in this study.

Ophiostoma tsotsi was the second species in the *O. ulmi* complex obtained in this study. This species, which is morphologically indistinguishable from *O. quercus*, is known from wounds on planted *Eucalyptus* and *Acacia mearnsii* trees in Africa (Grobbelaar et al. 2010), Australia (Kamgan Nkuekam et al. 2011) and China (Grobbelaar et al. 2011), as well as native mangroves in South Africa (Osorio et al. 2016). The only insects from which the fungus has previously been reported are nitidulid beetles (Kamgan Nkuekam et al. 2012). We isolated *O. tsotsi* from galleries of two pine bark beetles, as well as from two mite species associated with one of these beetles. This was an unexpected result because, much like *O. quercus*, the assumption has been that *O. tsotsi* is an exclusively hardwood-infesting member of the *O. ulmi* complex. This complex was initially referred to as the 'hardwood lineage' of the *O. piceae* complex (De Beer et al. 2003, Harrington et al. 2001) before De Beer and Wingfield (2013) distinguished between the *O. piceae* and *O. ulmi* complexes. Although *O. tsotsi* is known from fewer hosts and locations than *O. quercus*, it also displays a relatively high level of genetic diversity as was evident from our BT and EF sequence analyses.

A single isolate referred to as *Ophiostoma* sp. C (Taxon 10) came from an unknown beetle gallery on *Tsuga*. This isolate was clearly distinct from all other species in the *O*. *ulmi* complex. Although we have chosen not to describe it as new, together with *O*.

quercus and *O. tsotsi*, this is only the third of the 18 species currently recognized in the complex to be reported from conifer hosts.

Three of the taxa collected in the surveys resided in the genus *Graphilbum* that includes 10 known species and several undescribed taxa (De Beer and Wingfield 2013, Lu et al. 2009a, Reid and Hausner 2015, Romón et al. 2014b). All the known species are from conifers (*Abies, Picea, Pinus, Tsuga*) and mostly from bark beetles or their galleries, and in some cases stained wood. Only two undescribed species are from hardwoods (Geldenhuis et al. 2004, Kamgan Nkuekam et al. 2008). *Graphilbum fragrans* is by far the most common species with one report from bark beetles on spruce and fir in Canada (Jacobs et al. 2003). The remainder of the species have been collected from a variety of pine bark beetles and weevils from Europe (Mathiesen-Käärik 1953, Romón et al. 2007), the USA, New Zealand and Australia (Harrington et al. 2001), South Africa (Zhou et al. 2006), Japan (Masuya et al. 2009) and Korea (Kim et al. 2007).

Graphilbum fragrans found in this study had previously been reported from *T. yunnanensis* on *Pinus yunnanensis*, and *Pissodes* spp. on *Tsuga dumosa* and *P. armandii* in China (Paciura et al. 2010b, Zhou et al. 2013). In the present study, the fungus was isolated from galleries of *Tomicus minor* on *P. kesiya*. We collected 11 isolates each for *Gra. kesiyae* (Taxon 12) and *Gra. puerense* (Taxon 13). *Gra. kesiyae* was found in association with three beetle species with seven isolates from mites. *Gra. puerense* was from two beetle species with three isolates from mites. These are the first reports of any *Graphilbum* species isolated from mites.

Five species of fungi residing in *Leptographium sensu lato* were collected in this study, including one novel species. Ten isolates representing Taxon 14 were from *Pissodes* sp. on *P. armandii* and were shown to represent *L. gracile*. This species was described from the same insects and tree host as the isolates in the present study, as well as from *Ips typographus* on *Picea koraiensis* (Paciura et al. 2010a). Four other species grouped very closely to *L. gracile* in the *L. procerum* complex. *Leptographium sino-procerum* and *L. sinese* were both described from China where they were associated with the introduced bark beetle *Dendroctonus valens* that infests and kills native *P. tabuliformis* (Lu et al. 2008), and native *Hylobitelus xiaoi* on non-native *P. elliottii* (Yin et al. 2015). *Leptographium longiconidiophorum* was originally isolated from *P. densiflora* in Japan (Yin et al. 2015) and *L. bhutanense* from *Hylobitelus chenkupdorjii* on *Pinus wallichiana* in Bhutan (Zhou et al. 2008).

A single isolate from the gallery of an unknown bark beetle on *Tsuga* grouped with *Grosmannia radiaticola*. This species was originally described from stained *Pinus radiata* wood imported from New Zealand to Korea (Kim et al. 2005b). However, it has been reported from a variety of pine root-infesting bark beetles from South Africa, Chile, Sweden (Linnakoski et al. 2012), California (Kim et al. 2011) and Poland (Jankowiak and Bilański 2013a, b). In China, it has been reported from a gallery of the invasive *D. valens* on *P. tabuliformis* in Shanxi, which might have resulted in the in the impression that the fungus was introduced with the beetle into China (Lu et al. 2009b). However, the present report from another conifer host in a distant province suggests that the fungus could be native across Eurasia.

Of the 13 isolates of *L. ningerense* collected in this study one isolate was from the gallery of *Polygraphus szemaoensis* on *Pinus kesiya*, while the remaining 12 isolates were from four mite species associated with *Coccotrypes cyperi*, *Cyrtogenius luteus* and *Orthotomicus angulatus*. This species grouped closest to *L. pineti*, which was described from the gallery of an *Ips* sp. under the bark of *Pinus merkusii* growing on the island of Sumatra, Indonesia (Jacobs et al. 2000). The fact that no isolates were obtained from beetles might indicate that this species is a preferential symbiont of mites.

The fourth most prevalent species collected in this study was *G. yunnanensis* including 39 isolates, 27 of which were vectored by seven mite species. *G. yunnanensis* was originally described from *Tomicus yunnanensis* on *P. yunnanensis* in China (Zhou et al. 2000), and was subsequently reported from *Polygraphus major* on *Pinus kesiya* in Thailand (Yamaoka et al. 2007), and four other pine bark beetle species on *P. densiflora* in Japan (Masuya et al. 2009). Results of the present study have added an additional three beetle species to this list including *Cryphales luteus, Polygraphus szemaoensis* and an unidentified *Polygraphus* sp. This seemingly promiscuous relationship of *G. yunnanensis* with nine different beetle species in East Asia, together with the fact that more than two thirds of the isolates in our study were from mites, suggests an association of this fungus with mites, rather than beetles.

Two isolates of *L. conjunctum*, including one from a mite, were collected in the present study. *L. conjunctum* has not previously been reported from any location other than in the case of the original study in which it was described from *Hylurgops major* on *Pinus yunnanensis* in China (Paciura et al. 2010a). Our one isolate was from *H. major*, while the mite from which the second isolate came, was collected from the unknown *Polygraphus* sp.

The single *Graphium* isolate arising from this study was from a mite on *Ips acuminatus*, and had identical sequences to *Gr. pseudormiticum*. This fungus was first described from South Africa in association with *Orthotomicus erosus* on pine bait logs (Mouton et al. 1994). It was subsequently found in Sweden associated with *Ips typographus* on an unknown host tree, in Austria with *Tomicus minor* on *Pinus sylvestris* (Lackner and de Hoog 2011), and in China associated with *Pissodes* sp. on *Tsuga dumosa* (Paciura et al. 2010b). This is the first report of a *Graphium* species associated with a mite. The low frequency with which it was encountered could result from the fact that *Graphium* species are unable to grow on media including the antibiotic cycloheximide, which is commonly used as in a selective medium for the Ophiostomatales in surveys of bark beetle fungi.

Conclusions

Three surveys of pine-infesting bark beetles in Yunnan revealed several new fungal species and new beetle-fungus associations. This supports the view that the diversity of fungi associated with bark beetles in China is high and that it deserves further exploration. The results of the 2010 survey that included isolations from mites, revealed

that many of the ophiostomatoid species often considered as beetle associates can also be isolated frequently from mites. It has been suggested that mycetophagous mites are often generalists with the ability to feed on and vector several fungal species (Hofstetter et al. 2013). It is also known that phoretic mites are promiscuous in terms of their beetle vectors, and that they will infest virtually any beetle species in order to reach their tree hosts (Hofstetter et al. 2013). Our results underscore these views although structured surveys supported by statistical analyses should be undertaken to better understand these relationships.

One of the most surprising and intriguing outcomes of the study was that fungal species such as *O. quercus* and *O. tsotsi*, which were considered to be primarily hard-wood-infecting species, are prevalent on several of the pine-specific beetles and their associated mites. Bark beetles commonly have broad host ranges on either the hardwoods or conifers, but not across these groups. The question thus arises how these hardwood-infecting fungi can move between these host groups. One possibility is that they simply move with mites from one tree in a forest to another, crossing the forest floor and carrying the fungi with them. However, it is also known that most bark beetle-associated mites are not monospecific and may be common on other non-bark beetle hosts as well (e.g. Tenebrionidae, Cleridae, Histeridae, Elateridae) (Hofstetter et al. 2013). Some of these often predatory beetles, could thus vector the mites and their fungi across the otherwise hardwood-conifer barrier. The determining factor would then be whether the fungus has the ability to survive in the new environment. The results of this study suggest that *O. quercus* and *O. tsotsi* are the rare exceptions among the ophiostomatoid fungi that are equally fit in both the angiosperm and gymnosperm environments.

None of the known fungal species collected in the present study are considered pathogens based on current published knowledge, and we have not found any evidence that any of the novel taxa are pathogens. However, the study underscores the possibility that many ophiostomatoid fungi that have been considered beetle associates in the past, might actually have a closer association with mites, or that mites at least have the ability to vector them. Generally, bark beetles and their fungal associates are considered serious threats with invasive potential when they are introduced into new environments through the movement of wood and wood products (Wingfield et al. 2017). However, most pest risk analyses consider only the beetles and the fungi. Our results suggest that even in cases where beetles do not successfully establish and reproduce in a new environment, mites could vector potential fungal pathogens and introduce them into established beetle ecosystems. The role of mites in mixing fungal assemblages of different beetle species on a single tree or log, especially in the case of invasive versus native beetle species, deservers futher exploration.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge members of Tree Protection and Cooperation Programme (TPCP), Center of Excellence in Tree Health Biotechnology (CTHB), the National Research Foundation (NRF), the Department of Science and Technology (DST)/NRF and the University of Pretoria, South Africa. We are deeply grateful to Prof. Zhao of the Yunnan Academy of Forestry for his support during the collection surveys. We also thank Prof. Yihe Zhao, Dr Mingliang Yin and Miss Dongxia Xu for assistance with the field-work, Mr Deer Konkarn for assistance with sequencing, and Drs Roger Beaver and Eddie Ueckermann for beetle and mite identifications.

References

- Bateman C, Huang YT, Simmons DR, Kasson MT, Stanley EL, Hulcr J (2017) Ambrosia beetle *Premnobius cavipennis* (Scolytinae: Ipini) carries highly divergent ascomycotan ambrosia fungus, *Afroraffaelea ambrosiae* gen. nov. et sp. nov. (Ophiostomatales). Fungal Ecology 25: 41–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2016.10.008
- Brasier CM (1978) Mites and reproduction in *Ceratocystis ulmi* and other fungi. Transactions of the British Mycological Society 70: 81–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536(78)80175-2
- Davydenko K, Vasaitis R, Menkis A (2017) Fungi associated with *Ips acuminatus* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) in Ukraine with a special emphasis on pathogenicity of ophiostomatoid species. European Journal of Entomology 114: 77–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.14411/ eje.2017.011
- De Beer ZW, Duong TA, Barnes I, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ (2014) Redefining *Cerato-cystis* and allied genera. Studies in Mycology 79: 187–219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.si-myco.2014.10.001
- De Beer ZW, Duong TA, Wingfield MJ (2016a) The divorce of *Sporothrix* and *Ophiostoma*: solution to a problematic relationship. Studies in Mycology 83: 165–191. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.simyco.2016.07.001
- De Beer ZW, Marincowitz S, Duong TA, Kim JJ, Rodrigues A, Wingfield MJ (2016b) *Hawks-worthiomyces* gen. nov. (Ophiostomatales), illustrates the urgency for a decision on how to name novel taxa known only from environmental nucleic acid sequences (ENAS). Fungal Biology 120: 1323–1340. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.funbio.2016.07.004
- De Beer ZW, Marincowitz S, Duong TA, Wingfield MJ (2017) Bretziella, a new genus to accommodate the oak wilt fungus, Ceratocystis fagacearum. MycoKeys 27: 1–19. https://doi. org/10.3897/mycokeys.27.20657
- De Beer ZW, Seifert KA, Wingfield MJ (2013) The ophiostomatoid fungi: their dual position in the Sordariomycetes. In: Seifert KA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (Eds) The Ophiostomatoid Fungi: Expanding Frontiers. CBS, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 1–19.
- De Beer ZW, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ (2003) The Ophiostoma piceae complex in the Southern Hemisphere: a phylogenetic study. Mycological Research 107: 469–476. https:// doi.org/10.1017/S0953756203007445
- De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (2013) Emerging lineages in the Ophiostomatales. In: Seifert KA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (Eds) The Ophiostomatoid Fungi: Expanding Frontiers. CBS, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 21–46.

- De Errasti A, De Beer ZW, Coetzee MPA, Roux J, Rajchenberg M, Wingfield MJ (2016) Three new species of Ophiostomatales from *Nothofagus* in Patagonia. Mycological Progress 15: 17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11557-016-1158-z
- Duong TA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ (2012) Phylogeny and taxonomy of species in the *Grosmannia serpens* complex. Mycologia 104: 715–732. http://dx.doi.org/10.3852/11-109
- Gardes M, Bruns TD (1993) ITS primers with enhanced specificity for basidiomycetes-application to the identification of mycorrhizae and rusts. Molecular Ecology 2: 113–118. https:// doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.1993.tb00005.x
- Geldenhuis MM, Roux J, Montenegro F, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ, Wingfield BD (2004) Identification and pathogenicity of *Graphium* and *Pesotum* species from machete wounds on *Schizolobium parahybum* in Ecuador. Fungal Diversity 15: 137–151. https://goo.gl/4MVXew
- Glass NL, Donaldson GC (1995) Development of primer sets designed for use with the PCR to amplify conserved genes from filamentous Ascomycetes. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 61: 1323–1330. http://aem.asm.org/content/61/4/1323.abstract
- Grobbelaar JW, Aghayeva DN, de Beer ZW, Bloomer P, Wingfield MJ, Wingfield BD (2009) Delimitation of *Ophiostoma quercus* and its synonyms using multiple gene phylogenies. Mycological Progress 8: 221–236. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11557-009-0594-4
- Grobbelaar JW, De Beer ZW, Bloomer P, Wingfield MJ, Wingfield BD (2010) Ophiostoma tsotsi sp. nov., a wound-infesting fungus of hardwood trees in Africa. Mycopathologia 169: 413–423. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11046-009-9267-8
- Grobbelaar JW, De Beer ZW, Bloomer P, Wingfield MJ, Zhou XD, Wingfield BD (2011) Discovery of *Ophiostoma tsotsi* on *Eucalyptus* wood chips in China. Mycoscience 52: 111–118. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10267-010-0081-4
- Harrington TC (1993) Diseases of conifers caused by species of *Ophiostoma* and *Leptographium*. In: Wingfield MJ, Seifert KA, Webber JF (Eds) *Ceratocystis* and *Ophiostoma*: Taxonomy, Ecology and Pathogenicity. APS, St. Paul, Minnesota, 161–172.
- Harrington TC (2005) Ecology and evolution of mycophagous bark beetles and their fungal partners. In: Vega FE, Blackwell M (Eds) Insect-Fungal Associations: Ecology and Evolution. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 257–291.
- Harrington TC, McNew D, Steimel J, Hofstra D, Farrell R (2001) Phylogeny and taxonomy of the *Ophiostoma piceae* complex and the Dutch elm disease fungi. Mycologia 93: 111–136. https://doi.org/10.2307/3761610
- Hawksworth DL (2011) A new dawn for the naming of fungi: impacts of decisions made in Melbourne in July 2011 on the future publication and regulation of fungal names. MycoKeys 1: 7–20 https://doi.org/10.3897/mycokeys.1.2062
- Hedgcock GG (1906) Studies upon some chromogenic fungi which discolor wood. Missouri Botanical Garden Annual Report 1906: 59–114. https://doi.org/10.2307/2400089
- Hofstetter RW, Cronin JT, Klepzig KD, Moser JC, Ayres MP (2006) Antagonisms, mutualisms and commensalisms affect outbreak dynamics of the southern pine beetle. Oecologia 147: 679–691. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-005-0312-0
- Hofstetter RW, Dinkins-Bookwalter J, Davis TS, Klepzig KD (2015) Symbiotic associations of bark beetles. In: Vega FE, Hofstetter RW (Eds) Bark Beetles: Biology and Ecology of Native

and Invasive Species. Academic Press, San Diego, 209–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-417156-5.00006-X

- Hofstetter RW, Moser JC (2014) The role of mites in insect-fungus associations. Annual Review of Entomology 59: 537–557. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-011613-162039
- Hofstetter RW, Moser JC, Blomquist S (2013) Mites associated with bark beetles and their hyperphoretic ophiostomatoid fungi. In: Seifert KA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (Eds) The Ophiostomatoid Fungi: Expanding Frontiers. CBS Biodiversity Series, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 165–176.
- Jacobs K, Bergdahl DR, Wingfield MJ, Halik S, Seifert KA, Bright DE, Wingfield BD (2004) Leptographium wingfieldii introduced into North America and found associated with exotic Tomicus piniperda and native bark beetles. Mycological Research 108: 411–418. https:// doi.org/10.1017/S0953756204009748
- Jacobs K, Seifert KA, Harrison KJ, Kirisits T (2003) Identity and phylogenetic relationships of ophiostomatoid fungi associated with invasive and native *Tetropium* species (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae) in Atlantic Canada. Canadian Journal of Botany 81: 316–329. https://doi. org/10.1139/b03-025
- Jacobs K, Wingfield MJ (2001) *Leptographium* species: Tree Pathogens, Insect Associates, and Agents of Blue-stain. APS, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- Jacobs K, Wingfield MJ, Bergdahl DR (2000) New *Leptographium* species from Indonesia and Eastern North America. Mycoscience 41: 595–606. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02460926
- Jankowiak R (2012) Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with *Ips sexdentatus* on *Pinus sylvestris* in Poland. Dendrobiology 68: 43–54.
- Jankowiak R, Bilański P (2013a) Association of the pine-infesting *Pissodes* species with ophiostomatoid fungi in Poland. European Journal of Forest Research 132: 523–534. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10342-013-0693-2
- Jankowiak R, Bilański P (2013b) Diversity of ophiostomatoid fungi associated with the large pine weevil, *Hylobius abietis*, and infested Scots pine seedlings in Poland. Annals of Forest Science 70: 391–402. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13595-013-0266-z
- Jankowiak R, Bilański P (2013c) Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with root-feeding bark beetles on Scots pine in Poland. Forest Pathology 43: 422–428. https://doi.org/10.1111/efp.12049
- Jankowiak R, Bilański P, Kolařík M, Wasiuta D (2012) Root-colonizing ophiostomatoid fungi associated with dying and dead young Scots pine in Poland. Forest Pathology 42: 492–500. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0329.2012.00783.x
- Juzwik J, Cease KR, Meyer JM (1998) Acquisition of *Ophiostoma quercus* and *Ceratocystis fagacearum* by nitidulids from *O. quercus*-colonized oak wilt mats. Plant Disease 82: 239–243. http://dx.doi.org/10.1094/PDIS.1998.82.2.239
- Kamgan Nkuekam G, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ, Mohammed C, Carnegie AJ, Pegg GS, Roux J (2011) *Ophiostoma* species (Ophiostomatales, Ascomycota), including two new taxa on eucalypts in Australia. Australian Journal of Botany 59: 283–297. http://hdl.handle.net/2263/16958
- Kamgan Nkuekam G, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ, Roux J (2012) A diverse assemblage of Ophiostoma species, including two new taxa on eucalypt trees in South Africa. Mycological Progress 11: 515–533. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11557-011-0767-9

- Kamgan Nkuekam G, Jacobs K, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ, Roux J (2008) Ceratocystis and Ophiostoma species including three new taxa, associated with wounds on native South African trees. Fungal Diversity 29: 37–59. https://goo.gl/FJF2KE
- Kamgan Nkuekam G, Solheim H, De Beer ZW, Grobbelaar JW, Jacobs K, Wingfield MJ, Roux J (2010) *Ophiostoma* species, including *Ophiostoma borealis* sp. nov., infecting wounds of native broad-leaved trees in Norway. Cryptogamie, Mycologie 31: 285–303. http://hdl. handle.net/2263/16486
- Katoh K, Standley DM (2013) MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7: improvements in performance and usability. Molecular Biology and Evolution 30: 772–780. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst010
- Kim GH, Kim JJ, Breuil C (2007) Sap-staining fungi from logs and boards of two commercially important pines in Korea. Holzforschung 61: 333–336. https://doi.org/10.1515/HF.2007.042
- Kim GH, Kim JJ, Lim YW, Breuil C (2005a) Ophiostomatoid fungi isolated from *Pinus radia-ta* logs imported from New Zealand to Korea. Canadian Journal of Botany 83: 272–278. https://doi.org/10.1139/b04-170
- Kim JJ, Lim YW, Seifert KA, Kim SH, Breuil C, Kim GH (2005b) Taxonomy of *Ophiostoma radiaticola* sp. nov. (Ophiostomatales, Ascomycetes), the teleomorph of *Pesotum pini*, isolated from logs of *Pinus radiata*. Mycotaxon 91: 481–496.
- Kim SJ, Harrington TC, Lee JC, Seybold SJ (2011) Leptographium tereforme sp. nov. and other Ophiostomatales isolated from the root-feeding bark beetle Hylurgus ligniperda in California. Mycologia 103: 152–163. 10.3852/10-096
- Kirisits T (2004) Fungal associates of european bark beetles with special emphasis on the ophiostomatoid fungi. In: Lieutier F, Day K, Battisti A, Grégoire JC, Evans H (Eds) Bark and Wood Boring Insects in Living Trees in Europe, a Synthesis. Springer, Netherlands, 181–236. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-2241-8_10
- Kirisits T, Konrad H, Wingfield MJ, Chhetri DB (2012) Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with the Eastern Himalayan spruce bark beetle (*Ips schmutzenhoferi*) in Bhutan: Species assemblage and phytopathogenicity. Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development 4: 266–268. https://doi.org/10.5897/JAERD12.075
- Klepzig KD, Hofstetter RW (2011) From attack to emergence: Interactions between southern pine beetle, mites, microbes, and trees. In: Coulson RN, Klepzig KD (Eds) Southern Pine Beetle II. USDA Forest Service, 141–152.
- Lackner M, de Hoog GS (2011) *Parascedosporium* and its relatives: phylogeny and ecological trends. IMA Fungus 2: 39–48. https://doi.org/10.5598/imafungus.2011.02.01.07
- Leach JG, Orr LW, Christensen C (1934) The interrelationship of bark beetles and blue staining fungi in felled Norway pine timber. Journal of Agricultural Research 49: 315–341.
- Linnakoski R, De Beer ZW, Ahtiainen J, Sidorov E, Niemela P, Pappinen A, Wingfield MJ (2010) Ophiostoma spp. associated with pine- and spruce-infesting bark beetles in Finland and Russia. Persoonia 25: 72–93. https://doi.org/10.3767/003158510X550845
- Linnakoski R, De Beer ZW, Duong TA, Niemela P, Pappinen A, Wingfield MJ (2012) Grosmannia and Leptographium spp. associated with conifer-infesting bark beetles in Finland and Russia, including Leptographium taigense sp. nov. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 102: 375–399. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-012-9747-6

- Linnakoski R, De Beer ZW, Rousi M, Niemela P, Pappinen A, Wingfield MJ (2008) Fungi, including Ophiostoma karelicum sp. nov., associated with Scolytus ratzeburgi infesting birch in Finland and Russia. Mycological Research 112: 1475–1488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mycres.2008.06.007
- Linnakoski R, Jankowiak R, Villari C, Kirisits T, Solheim H, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (2016) The Ophiostoma clavatum species complex: a newly defined group in the Ophiostomatales including three novel taxa. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 109: 987–1018. https:// doi.org/10.1007/s10482-016-0700-y
- Liu XW, Wang HM, Lu Q, Decock C, Li YX, Zhang XY (2017) Taxonomy and pathogenicity of *Leptographium* species associated with *Ips subelongatus* infestations of *Larix* spp. in northern China, including two new species. Mycological Progress 16: 1–13. https://doi. org/10.1007/s11557-016-1245-1
- Lu M, Zhou XD, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ, Sun JH (2009a) Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with the invasive pine-infesting bark beetle, *Dendroctonus valens*, in China. Fungal Diversity 38: 133–145. http://hdl.handle.net/2263/13580
- Lu Q, Decock C, Zhang XY, Maraite H (2008) Leptographium sinoprocerum sp. nov., an undescribed species associated with Pinus tabuliformis-Dendroctonus valens in northern China. Mycologia 100: 275–290. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15572536.2008.11832482
- Lu Q, Decock C, Zhang XY, Maraite H (2009b) Ophiostomatoid fungi (Ascomycota) associated with *Pinus tabuliformis* infested by *Dendroctonus valens* (Coleoptera) in northern China and an assessment of their pathogenicity on mature trees. Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek 96: 275–293. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-009-9343-6
- Malacrinò A, Rassati D, Schena L, Mehzabin R, Battisti A, Palmeri V (2017) Fungal communities associated with bark and ambrosia beetles trapped at international harbours. Fungal Ecology 28: 44–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2017.04.007
- Malloch D, Blackwell M (1993) Dispersal biology of the ophiostomatoid fungi. In: Wingfield MJ, Seifert KA, Webber JF (Eds) *Ceratocystis* and *Ophiostoma*: Taxonomy, Ecology and Pathology. APS Press, St. Paul, 195–206.
- Marincowitz S, Duong TA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (2015) Cornuvesica: A little known mycophilic genus with a unique biology and unexpected new species. Fungal Biology 119: 615–630. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.funbio.2015.03.007
- Masuya H, Yamaoka Y, Kaneko S, Yamaura Y (2009) Ophiostomatoid fungi isolated from Japanese red pine and their relationships with bark beetles. Mycoscience 50: 212–223. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10267-008-0474-9
- Masuya H, Yamaoka Y, Wingfield MJ (2013) Ophiostomatoid fungi and their associations with bark beetles in Japan. In: Seifert KA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (Eds) Ophiostomatoid Fungi: Expanding Frontiers. CBS, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 77–89.
- Mathiesen-Käärik A (1953) Eine Übersicht über die gewöhnlichsten mit Borkenkäfern assoziierten Bläuepilze in Schweden und einige für Schweden neue Bläuepilze. Meddelanden från Statens Skogsforskningsinstitut 43: 1–74. https://goo.gl/NQTYoq
- Mayers CG, McNew DL, Harrington TC, Roeper RA, Fraedrich SW, Biedermann PHW, Castrillo LA, Reed SE (2015) Three genera in the Ceratocystidaceae are the respective symbionts of three independent lineages of ambrosia beetles with large, complex mycangia. Fungal Biology 119: 1075–1092. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funbio.2015.08.002

- Mitchell R (1970) An analysis of dispersal in mites. American Naturalist 104: 425–431. https:// doi.org/10.1086/282677
- Moser JC, Konrad H, Blomquist SR, Kirisits T (2010) Do mites phoretic on elm bark beetles contribute to the transmission of Dutch elm disease? Naturwissenschaften 97: 219–227. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-009-0630-x
- Moser JC, Perry TJ, Furuta K (1997) Phoretic mites and their hyperphoretic fungi associated with flying *Ips typographus japonicus* Niijima (Col., Scolytidae) in Japan. Journal of Applied Entomology 121: 425–428. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0418.1997.tb01429.x
- Mouton M, Wingfield MJ, Van Wyk PS, Van Wyk PWJ (1994) Graphium pseudormiticum sp. nov.: a new hyphomycete with unusual conidiogenesis. Mycological Research 98: 1272–1276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0953-7562(09)80298-0
- Münch E (1907) Die Blaufäule des Nadelholzes. I–II. Naturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Forst- und Landwirtschaft 5: 531–573.
- Nel WJ, Duong TA, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ, De Beer ZW (2017) A new genus and species for the globally important, multi-host root pathogen *Thielaviopsis basicola*. Plant Pathology. https://doi.org/10.1111/ppa.12803
- Nisikado Y, Yamauti K (1933) Contributions to the knowledge of the sap stains of wood in Japan. I. Studies on *Ceratostomella ips* Rumbold, the cause of blue stain of pine trees in Western Japan. Berichte des Ohara Instituts für Landwirtschaftliche Forschungen 5: 501–538.
- Osorio JA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ, Roux J (2016) Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with mangroves in South Africa, including *Ophiostoma palustre* sp. nov. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 109: 1555–1571. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-016-0757-7
- Paciura D, De Beer ZW, Jacobs K, Zhou XD, Ye H, Wingfield MJ (2010a) Eight new Leptographium species associated with tree-infesting bark beetles in China. Persoonia 25: 94–108. https:// doi.org/10.3767/003158510X551097
- Paciura D, Zhou XD, De Beer ZW, Jacobs K, Ye H, Wingfield MJ (2010b) Characterisation of synnematous bark beetle-associated fungi from China, including *Graphium carbonarium* sp. nov. Fungal Diversity 40: 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13225-009-0004-x
- Paine TD, Raffa KF, Harrington TC (1997) Interactions among scolytid bark beetles, their associated fungi, and live host conifers. Annual Review of Entomology 42: 179–206. https:// doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.42.1.179
- Pfammatter JA, Moser JC, Raffa KF (2013) Mites phoretic on *Ips pini* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae: Scolytinae) in Wisconsin red pine stands. Annals of the Entomological Society of America 106: 204–213. https://doi.org/10.1603/an12122
- Reay S, Thwaites J, Farrell R (2005) A survey of *Ophiostoma* species vectored by *Hylastes ater* to pine seedlings in New Zealand. Forest Pathology 35: 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0329.2004.00393.x
- Reid J, Hausner G (2015) A new Graphilbum species from western hemlock (Tsuga heterophylla) in Canada. Mycotaxon 130: 399–419. https://doi.org/10.5248/130.399
- Roets F, Crous PW, Wingfield MJ, Dreyer LL (2009) Mite-mediated hyperphoretic dispersal of *Ophiostoma* spp. from the infructescences of South African *Protea* spp. Environmental Entomology 38: 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1603/022.038.0118

- Roets F, Wingfield MJ, Crous PW, Dreyer LL (2007) Discovery of fungus-mite mutualism in a unique niche. Environmental Entomology 36: 1226–1237. https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/36.5.1226
- Romón P, De Beer ZW, Fernández M, Diez J, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ (2014a) Ophiostomatoid fungi including two new fungal species associated with pine root-feeding beetles in northern Spain. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 106: 1167–1184. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10482-014-0286-1
- Romón P, De Beer ZW, Zhou XD, Duong TA, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ (2014b) Multigene phylogenies of Ophiostomataceae associated with Monterey pine bark beetles in Spain reveal three new fungal species. Mycologia 106: 119–132. https://doi.org/10.3852/13-073
- Romón P, Zhou XD, Iturrondobeitia JC, Wingfield MJ, Goldarazena A (2007) Ophiostoma species (Ascomycetes: Ophiostomatales) associated with bark beetles (Coleoptera: Scolytinae) colonizing Pinus radiata in northern Spain. Canadian Journal of Microbiology 53: 756–767. https://doi.org/10.1139/w07-001
- Rumbold CT (1931) Two blue-staining fungi associated with bark-beetle infestation of pines. Journal of Agricultural Research 43: 847–873. http://books.google.co.za/ books?id=HjzMJAAACAAJ
- Schoch CL, Seifert KA, Huhndorf S, Robert V, Spouge JL, Levesque CA, Chen W, Bolchacova E, Voigt K, Crous PW, Miller AN, Wingfield MJ, Aime MC, An KD, Bai FY, Barreto RW, Begerow D, Bergeron MJ, Blackwell M, Boekhout T, Bogale M, Boonyuen N, Burgaz AR, Buyck B, Cai L, Cai Q, Cardinali G, Chaverri P, Coppins BJ, Crespo A, Cubas P, Cummings C, Damm U, De Beer ZW, De Hoog GS, Del-Prado R, B D, Dieguez-Uribeondo J, Divakar PK, Douglas B, Duenas M, Duong TA, Eberhardt U, Edwards JE, Elshahed MS, Fliegerova K, Furtado M, Garcia MA, Ge ZW, Griffith GW, Griffiths K, Groenewald JZ, Groenewald M, Grube M, Gryzenhout M, Guo LD, Hagen F, Hambleton S, Hamelin RC, Hansen K, Harrold P, Heller G, Herrera G, Hirayama K, Hirooka Y, Ho HM, Hoffmann K, Hofstetter V, Hognabba F, Hollingsworth PM, Hong SB, Hosaka K, Houbraken J, Hughes K, Huhtinen S, Hyde KD, James T, Johnson EM, Johnson JE, Johnston PR, Jones EB, Kelly LJ, Kirk PM, Knapp DG, Koljalg U, GM K, Kurtzman CP, Landvik S, Leavitt SD, Liggenstoffer AS, Liimatainen K, Lombard L, Luangsa-Ard JJ, Lumbsch HT, Maganti H, Maharachchikumbura SS, Martin MP, May TW, McTaggart AR, Methven AS, Meyer W, Moncalvo JM, Mongkolsamrit S, Nagy LG, Nilsson RH, Niskanen T, Nyilasi I, Okada G, Okane I, Olariaga I, Otte J, Papp T, Park D, Petkovits T, Pino-Bodas R, Quaedvlieg W, Raja HA, Redecker D, T R, Ruibal C, Sarmiento-Ramirez JM, Schmitt I, Schussler A, Shearer C, Sotome K, Stefani FO, Stenroos S, Stielow B, Stockinger H, Suetrong S, Suh SO, Sung GH, Suzuki M, Tanaka K, Tedersoo L, Telleria MT, Tretter E, Untereiner WA, Urbina H, Vagvolgyi C, Vialle A, Vu TD, Walther G, Wang QM, Wang Y, Weir BS, Weiss M, White MM, Xu J, Yahr R, Yang ZL, Yurkov A, Zamora JC, Zhang N, Zhuang WY, Schindel D, Consortium FB (2012) Nuclear ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region as a universal DNA barcode marker for Fungi. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 109: 6241-6246. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1117018109 Seifert KA (1993) Sapstain of commercial lumber by species of Ophiostoma and Ceratocystis. In: Wingfield MJ, Seifert KA, Webber JF (Eds) Ceratocystis and Ophiostoma: Taxonomy, Ecology, and Pathogenicity. American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA, 141–151.

- Six DL (2003) Bark beetle-fungus symbioses. In: Bourtzis K, Miller T (Eds) Insect Symbiosis. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, USA, 77–114. https://doi.org/10.1201/9780203009918.ch7
- Six DL, Wingfield MJ (2011) The role of phytopathogenicity in bark beetle-fungus symbioses: a challenge to the classic paradigm. Annual Review of Entomology 56: 255–272. https:// doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-120709-144839
- Stielow JB, Lévesque CA, Seifert KA, Meyer W, Irinyi L, Smits D, Renfurm R, Verkley GJM, Groenewald M, Chaduli D, Lomascolo A, Welti S, Lesage-Meessen L, Favel A, Al-Hatmi AMS, Damm U, Yilmaz N, Houbraken J, Lombard L, Quaedvlieg W, Binder M, Vaas LAI, Vu D, Yurkov A, Begerow D, Roehl O, Guerreiro M, Fonseca A, Samerpitak K, van Diepeningen AD, Dolatabadi S, Moreno LF, Casaregola S, Mallet S, Jacques N, Roscini L, Egidi E, Bizet C, Garcia-Hermoso D, Martín MP, Deng S, Groenewald JZ, Boekhout T, De Beer ZW, Barnes I, Duong TA, Wingfield MJ, De Hoog GS, Crous PW, Lewis CT, Hambleton S, Moussa TAA, Al-Zahrani HS, Almaghrabi OA, Louis-Seize G, Assabgui R, McCormick W, Omer G, Dukik K, Cardinali G, Eberhardt U, De Vries M, Robert V (2015) One fungus, which genes? Development and assessment of universal primers for potential secondary fungal DNA barcodes. Persoonia 35: 242–263. https://doi.org/10.3767/003158515X689135
- Stone C, Simpson JA (1990) Species associations in *Ips grandicollis* galleries in *Pinus taeda*. New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science 20: 75–96.
- Taerum SJ, Duong TA, De Beer ZW, Gillette N, Sun JH, Owen DR, Wingfield MJ (2013) Large shift in symbiont assemblage in the invasive red turpentine beetle. PLoS ONE 8: e78126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078126
- Upadhyay HP (1981) Monograph of *Ceratocystis* and *Ceratocystiopsis*. University of Georgia Press, Athens, Georgia, USA.
- Uzunovic A, Seifert KA, Kim SH, Breuil C (2000) Ophiostoma setosum, a common sapwood staining fungus from western North America, a new species of the Ophiostoma piceae complex. Mycological Research 104: 486–494. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0953756299001446
- Van der Linde JA, Six DL, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ, Roux J (2016) Novel ophiostomatalean fungi from galleries of *Cyrtogenius africus* (Scolytinae) infesting dying *Euphorbia ingens*. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 109: 589–601. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-016-0661-1
- Vilgalys R, Hester M (1990) Rapid genetic identification and mapping of enzymatically amplified ribosomal DNA from several *Cryptococcus* species. Journal of Bacteriology 172: 4238–4246. https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.172.8.4238–4246.1990
- White TJ, Bruns T, Lee S, Taylor JW (1990) Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal ribosomal RNA genes for phylogenetics. In: Innis MA, Gelfand DH, Sninsky JJ, White TJ (Eds) PCR protocols: a guide to methods and applications. Academic Press, San Diego (California), 315–322.
- Wingfield MJ, Barnes I, De Beer ZW, Roux J, Wingfield BD, Taerum SJ (2017) Novel associations between ophiostomatoid fungi, insects and tree hosts: current status future prospects. Biological Invasions: 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1468-3
- Yamaoka Y, Masuya H, Chung WH, Goto H, To-Anun C, Tokumasu S (2007) Two species of *Leptographium* isolated from blue-stained sapwood of *Pinus khasya* and bark beetles in Thailand. Mycoscience 48: 100–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10267-006-0337-1

- Yamaoka Y, Masuya H, Chung WH, Goto H, To-Anun C, Tokumasu S, Zhou X, Wingfield MJ (2008) The teleomorph of *Leptographium yunnanense*, discovered in crosses among isolates from Thailand, China, and Japan. Mycoscience 49: 233–240. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10267-008-0412-x
- Yang YM, Tian K, Hao JM, Pei SJ, Yang YX (2004) Biodiversity and biodiversity conservation in Yunnan, China. Biodiversity & Conservation 13: 813–826. https://doi.org/10.1023/ B:BIOC.0000011728.46362.3c
- Yin HF, Huang F, Li Z (1984) Economic Insect Fauna of China. Science Press, Beijing, China.
- Yin ML, Duong TA, Wingfield MJ, Zhou XD, De Beer ZW (2015) Taxonomy and phylogeny of the *Leptographium procerum* complex, including *Leptographium sinense* sp. nov. and *Leptographium longiconidiophorum* sp. nov. Antonie van Leeuwenhoek 107: 1–17. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10482-014-0351-9
- Yin ML, Wingfield MJ, Zhou XD, De Beer ZW (2016) Multigene phylogenies and morphological characterization of five new *Ophiostoma* spp. associated with spruce-infesting bark beetles in China. Fungal Biology 120: 454–470. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.funbio.2015.12.004
- Zhou XD, Burgess TI, De Beer ZW, Lieutier F, Yart A, Klepzig K, Carnegie A, Portales JM, Wingfield BD, Wingfield MJ (2007) High intercontinental migration rates and population admixture in the sapstain fungus *Ophiostoma ips*. Molecular Ecology 16: 89–99. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2006.03127.x
- Zhou XD, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (2006) DNA sequence comparisons of *Ophiostoma* spp., including *Ophiostoma aurorae* sp. nov., associated with pine bark beetles in South Africa. Studies in Mycology 55: 269–277. http://dx.doi.org/10.3114/sim.55.1.269
- Zhou XD, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (2013) Ophiostomatoid fungi associated with coniferinfecting bark beetles in China. In: Seifert KA, De Beer ZW, Wingfield MJ (Eds) Ophiostomatoid fungi: Expanding frontiers. CBS, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 91–98.
- Zhou XD, Jacobs K, Kirisits T, Chhetri D, Wingfield MJ (2008) *Leptographium bhutanense* sp. nov., associated with the root collar weevil *Hylobitelus chenkupdorjii* on *Pinus wallichiana* in Bhutan. Persoonia 21: 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3767/003158508X332435
- Zhou XD, Jacobs K, Morelet M, Ye H, Lieutier F, Wingfield MJ (2000) A new *Leptographium* species associated with *Tomicus piniperda* in south-western China. Mycoscience 41: 573–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02460923

Supplementary material I

Table S1–S3

Authors: Runlei Chang, Tuan A. Duong, Stephen J. Taerum, Michael J. Wingfield, Xudong Zhou, Z. Wilhelm de Beer

Data type: species data

Explanation note:

Table S1. Numbers of ophiostomatoid fungal isolates obtained from different mite species in this study.

Table S2. Haplotypes of Ophiostoma quercus.

Table S3. Haplotypes of Ophiostoma tsotsi.

Copyright notice: This dataset is made available under the Open Database License (http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0/). The Open Database License (ODbL) is a license agreement intended to allow users to freely share, modify, and use this Dataset while maintaining this same freedom for others, provided that the original source and author(s) are credited.

Link: https://doi.org/10.3897/mycokeys.28.21758.suppl1

Supplementary material I

Figure S1–S11

Authors: Runlei Chang, Tuan A. Duong, Stephen J. Taerum, Michael J. Wingfield, Xudong Zhou, Z. Wilhelm de Beer

Data type: occurence

Explanation note:

- Figure S1. Map of Yunnan Province in China showing the sites and tree hosts from which samples were collected during the three surveys in 2001, 2002 and 2010.
- Figure S2. ML trees of the genus *Graphium* generated from DNA sequences of the ITS and BT regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S3. ML trees of the genus *Sporothrix* generated from DNA sequences of ITS and BT regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S4. ML trees of the *O. ips* complex generated from DNA sequences of ITS and BT regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S5. ML trees of the *O. piceae* complex generated from DNA sequences of BT and EF regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Boot-strap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S6. ML tree of the *O. quercus* complex generated from DNA sequences of ITS region. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.

- Figure S7. ML tree of the *O. quercus* complex generated from DNA sequences of BT region. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S8. ML tree of the *O. quercus* complex generated from DNA sequences of EF region. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95 . Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S9. ML trees of the *L. procerum* complex generated from DNA sequences of BT, EF and CAL regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S10. ML trees of the *G. galeiformis* complex generated from DNA sequences of BT and EF regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Figure S11. ML trees of the *L. lundbergii* complex generated from DNA sequences of BT and EF regions. *Bold* branches indicate posterior probabilities values ≥ 0.95. Bootstrap values ≥ 70 % are recorded at nodes as ML/MP. T = ex-type isolates.
- Copyright notice: This dataset is made available under the Open Database License (http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0/). The Open Database License (ODbL) is a license agreement intended to allow users to freely share, modify, and use this Dataset while maintaining this same freedom for others, provided that the original source and author(s) are credited.
- Link: https://doi.org/10.3897/mycokeys.28.21758.suppl2