

# Mycorrhizae for a sustainable world

Article

Accepted Version

Pickles, B. J. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9809-6455, Truong, C., Watts-Williams, S. J. and Bueno, C. G. (2020) Mycorrhizae for a sustainable world. New Phytologist, 225 (3). pp. 1065-1069. ISSN 1469-8137 doi: 10.1111/nph.16307 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/87160/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See <u>Guidance on citing</u>.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nph.16307

Publisher: Wiley

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <u>End User Agreement</u>.

# www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

# CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

### 1 Mycorrhizae for a sustainable world

## 2 The 10<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Mycorrhiza (ICOM10), Mérida, Mexico, June 30 –

- 3 July 5 2019
- 4
- 5 Author list: Brian J. Pickles<sup>1</sup>, Camille Truong<sup>2</sup>, Stephanie Watts-Williams<sup>3</sup>, C. Guillermo
- 6 Bueno<sup>4</sup>
- 7
- 8 Author affiliations: <sup>1</sup>School of Biological Sciences, University of Reading, Harborne Building,
- 9 Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 8AS, UK. <sup>2</sup>Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma
- 10 de México, Circuito Zona Deportiva s.n., Ciudad Universitaria, Apartado Postal 70-367, C.P.
- 11 04510, Ciudad de México, Mexico. <sup>3</sup>School of Agriculture, Food and Wine, University of
- 12 Adelaide, Glen Osmond, SA, 5064, Australia. <sup>4</sup>Department of Botany, Institute of Ecology and
- 13 Earth Sciences, University of Tartu, 40 Lai Street, 51005 Tartu, Estonia.
- 14
- 15 ORCID: <sup>1</sup>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9809-6455. <sup>2</sup>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8510-1761.
- 16 <sup>3</sup><u>https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3467-0662</u>. <sup>4</sup>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7288-2271.
- 17
- 18 Author for correspondence:
- 19 Brian J Pickles
- 20 Email: <u>b.j.pickles@reading.ac.uk</u>
- 21 Tel: +44 (0) 118 378 7955
- 22
- 23 Word count Text: 1868, Acknowledgements: 120.
- 24 Figures: 2 [Colour figures: 2]
- 25
- 26 Key words: mycorrhiza, agricultural sustainability, ecosystem restoration, arbuscular
- 27 mycorrhiza, conservation
- 28
- 29 Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### 30 Meeting report

31 32

More than 80% of plant species exchange resources with mycorrhizal fungi and these 33 associations impact both partners at multiple scales, from individuals to ecosystems. 172 participants from 33 countries and 160 institutions met at the 10<sup>th</sup> International Conference on 34 Mycorrhiza in the city of Mérida in the Yucatan peninsula in Mexico – an area famous for its 35 36 Mayan archaeological sites, cenotes, and the Chicxulub impact crater that marks the end of the Cretaceous period. They discussed latest advances on mycorrhizal research across 125 talks 37 38 and 111 posters in 14 sessions focused on the biology, physiology, ecology, evolution and conservation of these interactions from molecules to biomes (Fig. 1). In particular, the 39 40 contribution of mycorrhizal research to sustainability in agriculture, conservation and 41 ecosystem restoration (Fig. 2) emerged as a promising topic to address today's challenges in 42 the realm of human population growth, globalization and climate change. 43 44 1. Sustainability in agriculture (managed ecosystems) 45 Several speakers discussed the increasing abundance of commercial arbuscular mycorrhizal 46 products for agriculture, from "biofertilisers" to advances in seed coating technology (i.e. 47 adding mycorrhizal fungal spores directly to seeds along with nutrients and plant-helper 48 49 bacteria), and the interest in these products from growers. 50 51 A noticeable recurring theme was that commercial biofertilisers make rather dramatic claims 52 about their effectiveness, without evidence of their application leading to direct improvements 53 in crop yield or nutrition. Jan Jansa (Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Rep.)'s keynote presentation made the point that biofertilisers do not *create* nutrients per se; however, 54 55 they may help plants to access existing nutrient sources, and may provide non-nutritional benefits. Examples of non-nutritional mycorrhizal benefits include increased soil glomalin 56 57 inputs, tolerance of microplastics inputs, and alteration of the soil microbiome (Svenningsen et al., 2018; de Souza Machado et al., 2019; Hestrin et al., 2019). Marcel van der Heijden 58 59 (Agroscope, Zurich, Switzerland) and Ashleigh Elliott (University of Leeds, Leeds, UK) 60 presented data on the application of commercial inoculants in field and glasshouse trials; crops 61 grown with a commercial arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) fungal inoculant exhibited higher root 62 colonisation but there were few benefits to growth. Notably, the quality (in terms of active AM fungal propagules) and effectiveness of different commercial products was highly variable. 63

Miranda Hart (University of British Columbia, Kelowna, Canada) made the case that the 64 65 variable responses of AM fungal inoculum in field trials are like those observed in the case of plant species invasions (Thomsen & Hart, 2018), and that current practices were too focused on 66 establishing the most vigorous AM fungi. Some important questions arose from the workshop 67 68 discussion on the topic: how can we, as a research community, contribute to ensuring that 69 mycorrhizal fungal inoculum products are a) appropriate, e.g. are we selecting the most 70 suitable fungi for a given system, rather than good invaders?; and b) successful, e.g. would a 71 "certificate of effectiveness" be required?

72

73 In terms of alternative approaches to agriculture, Rillig & Lehmann (2019) identified 74 approximately 285,000 combinations of agricultural practices. In his keynote, Jan Jansa 75 emphasised the need to rigorously quantify the AM symbiosis and its effects in the field, to 76 enable the production of equations and models that make useful predictions, so that we can 77 best make use of the AM symbiosis as a valuable biological resource. Jansa also highlighted 78 the potential to look further down the production chain not only to crop productivity but to the 79 quality of the food product (e.g. do mycorrhizas affect food nutritional content, taste, or spoilage), such as lowered pest impacts, postharvest disease reduction, and thus reduction of 80 81 food waste (e.g. AM fungi for food security).

82

#### 83 **2.** Sustainability in conservation and restoration (natural ecosystems)

84

85 Effective use of the mycorrhizal symbiosis for restoration and conservation requires a deeper 86 understanding of mycorrhizal functionality and related ecosystem processes, and how these 87 processes and functions are altered through interactions with other actors and changing conditions. For instance, several talks (e.g. Heike Bücking, South Dakota State University, 88 89 Brookings, USA; Ricardo Arraiano Castilho, Kew Gardens, London, UK) highlighted the importance of local soil factors and host nutrient demand in shaping mycorrhizal fungal 90 91 communities, and whether changes in local environmental conditions associated with climate 92 change (i.e. drought) or nutrient deposition (i.e. soil fertility) may disrupt the structure of these 93 communities. Many speakers discussed the contribution of mycorrhizas in low impact, 94 sustainable approaches to ecosystem restoration (e.g. Brian Pickles, University of Reading, 95 Reading, UK; Cameron Egan, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa, USA) and species conservation 96 (e.g. Nicole Hynson, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa, USA; Louise Egerton-Warburton, 97 Chicago Botanic Garden, Glenco, USA). Still, other mechanisms related to the activities of

mycorrhizal fungi, such as carbon sequestration (i.e. priming effect discussed by María Pozo,
EEZ-CSIC, Granada, Spain; and Johanna Pausch, University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany)
or the outcome of interactions among important actors, such as signaling pathways for kin
recognition (e.g. Monika Gorzelak, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Lethbridge, Canada),
need to be accounted for when considering mycorrhizal applications in conservation and

103 ecosystem restoration.

104

105 A key theme is that different ecosystems may well need different approaches (i.e. there is no 106 "silver bullet" for restoration or conservation). For example, Louise Egerton-Warburton found 107 that "cedar" (Widdringtonii wrighteii) seedlings grew well in nursery conditions but experienced drastic mortality following transfer to the field in Malawi. In turn, Nicole Hynson 108 109 and Cameron Egan's work showed that incomplete recovery of Hawaiian native fungal 110 communities following successful growth of planted native host trees may compromise forest 111 restoration. However, the presence of diverse mycorrhizal fungal communities is not the only 112 requirement for a successful restoration plan. For instance, when comparing the performance of AM fungal species on high- and low-quality (determined by associated fungal biomass) native 113 114 plant hosts in tallgrass prairie, Ylva Lekberg (MPG Ranch, Missoula, USA) found that AM fungal identity and abundance influenced plant performance, while AM fungal species 115 diversity was unimportant in this regard. Similar results were found in a successional plant-116 117 feedback study where only the appropriate late successional AM fungi with their corresponding 118 plant species grew faster and larger (Koziol & Bever, 2019). In the North American Southwest, 119 Catherine (Kitty) Gehring (Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, USA) found that 120 intraspecific drought tolerance of pinyon pine was strongly associated with root-colonising ECM fungal species composition. Here, drought-tolerant pinyons tended to associate with 121 122 Geospora spp., which increased water flow velocity in drought-tolerant seedling lineages and 123 reduced it in intolerant lineages. A related study revealed that after successive droughts, ECM 124 fungal species composition and abundance in roots of pinyon pines were responsive to tree 125 mortality, with Geospora increasing and Tuber spp. decreasing in response to pine death (Mueller et al., 2019). These studies indicate that the identity of mycorrhizal fungi and their 126 127 interaction with certain host traits are critical for achieving restoration aims. 128

129 **3.** Advances in mycorrhizal research with sustainability applications

131 Understanding patterns of plant mycorrhizal type dominance, for instance in highly protected 132 and valuable ecosystems, is key to understanding many ecosystem processes and their dynamics, and hence predicting limiting factors and environmental risks. In his keynote 133 134 presentation, Richard Phillips (Indiana University, Bloomington, USA) presented a plethora of 135 works describing differences in functioning between forests dominated by AM and ECM trees 136 in similar climatic conditions (e.g. Zhang et al., 2018). It had long been hypothesised that 137 ECM-dominated forests accumulate more soil carbon, due in part to visibly greater production 138 of recalcitrant organic matter. Yet when soils from ECM- and AM-dominated forests in 139 proximity were compared to a depth of 1 m, greater accumulation of soil organic matter was 140 found in AM-dominated forests (Craig et al., 2018). Several talks presented at ICOM10 141 highlighted how processes such as C storage, soil enzymatic activities, nutrient cycling, and 142 ecosystem-level sensitivity to global changes may vary (in part) because of mycorrhizal 143 interactions (e.g. Haley Dunleavy Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, USA; Tom Thirkell, 144 University of Leeds, Leeds, UK; Melanie Jones, University of British Columbia, Kelowna, 145 Canada). These results clearly stress the need to consider how the dominance of different 146 mycorrhizal types may impact ecosystem function, and the consequences of host changes for 147 broader ecosystem dynamics, management, and restoration. Nonetheless, subdominant plant 148 species such as herbs and grasses in the forest understory can also play significant roles in 149 ecosystems. For example, Rebecca Bunn (Western Washington University, Bellingham, USA) 150 revisited the 'direct mineral cycling hypothesis' from the 1960's and showed that AM fungal 151 hyphae are active in forest leaf litter through cooperation with other microorganisms (e.g. Lin 152 Zhang, China Agricultural University, Beijing, China), even in ecosystems dominated by ECM 153 trees (Bunn et al. 2019). Despite these recent advances in using plant mycorrhizal type to 154 investigate ecosystem processes, distinguishing between the plant mycorrhizal types (such as 155 AM, ECM, or dual AM and ECM) is not always easily solved and different approaches coexist 156 (Brundrett & Tedersoo, 2019; Bueno et al. 2019). ICOM10 facilitated an interesting debate in this respect, discussing possibilities for merging functional, morphological, and experimental 157 158 approaches to tackle this important issue.

159

160 Studies of the functions of symbioses in the presence of their closest neighbours are also

161 warranted. Marco Cosme (Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium)

162 illustrated the role that mycorrhizal fungi can play in 'non-mycorrhizal' plant functional

163 responses, in which a presumed non-host species (Arabidopsis thaliana) in the presence of a

164 mycorrhizal plant (*Medicago truncatula* colonised by the AM fungus *Rhizophagus* sp.)

- 165 exhibited root cortex colonisation. No nutrient exchange (via arbuscules) was observed, but the
- 166 non-host plant exhibited activation of AM fungal-induced resistance to pathogens (Fernández
- 167 et al., 2019), indicating a functionally beneficial colonisation of the presumed non-host
- 168 species. All in all, examining the multifunctional effects of the entire root mycobiome,
- 169 including non-mycorrhizal and "fine root endophyte" fungi (Hoysted *et al.*, 2019) across
- 170 plants, may be crucial to predicting the effect of global changes in natural and managed
- 171 ecosystems.
- 172

#### 173 4. Challenges

During the conference, key challenges facing mycorrhizal research (and researchers) in thecoming decades were addressed:

176

177 *Global change* 

178 Mycorrhizal symbioses are already highly complex, so how do we decipher mycorrhizal effects 179 in systems subjected to multiple simultaneous pressures? Many speakers discussed 180 mycorrhizal responses to climate change impacts such as drought, fire, and insect outbreaks 181 (e.g. Philip Brailey, University of York, York, UK; Jean Carlos Rodríguez-Ramos, University 182 of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada; Yong Zheng, Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou, China). Restoration of ecosystems exposed to pollutants (e.g. microplastics) was another common 183 184 theme, as exemplified by Matthias Rillig (Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany)'s keynote 185 talk. Species introductions of exotic fungi and/or exotic hosts are another important topic that 186 potentially leads to fungal invasions. For example, global patterns in native vs introduced 187 island floras revealed a strong tendency towards introduced mycorrhizal plants compared to 188 non-mycorrhizal natives (Delavaux et al., 2019), with some notable exceptions to the general 189 pattern (e.g. Hawaii). Anne Pringle (University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, USA)'s 190 research on Amanita muscaria (fly agaric) invasions in North America revealed that the 191 population structure of this invasive fungus differed dramatically compared to its native range. 192 The interactive effects of global change processes on mycorrhizal fungi and their hosts will 193 undoubtedly provoke significant research effort from the mycorrhizal research community. 194

#### 195 Methodological issues and advances

196 Although this topic is not new, finding ecologically relevant control for, and measurement of,

197 the mycorrhizal status of plants is still controversial. Is "non-mycorrhizal" really an appropriate

198 control condition for plants, given the prevalence of mycorrhizal fungi in natural and

- anthropogenic ecosystems (i.e., plants without mycorrhizal symbionts are rare), or would
  severing/restricting common mycorrhizal networks be more relevant experimental control (e.g.
  David Johnson, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK)?
- 202

The advent of modern high-throughput plant phenotyping systems has allowed us to begin characterising mycorrhizal host plant (shoot) growth responses (positive through to negative) over time (Watts-Williams *et al.*, 2019), rather than just at the harvest time point. This technology will be especially useful when it extends to root phenotyping platforms that allow for high resolution screening, and analysis of the effects of mycorrhizal fungi on root growth and morphology over time.

209

210 Several issues remain unresolved among the continual technological advances used for 211 molecular work and interpretation of those data, as sequencing of mycorrhizal fungal 212 communities becomes more commonplace. As Annegret Kohler (INRA, Nancy, France)'s 213 keynote talk asked: What does gene copy number mean in terms of function? What does 214 sequence abundance really mean in terms of species abundances? Many researchers 215 uncritically present sequence abundances from NGS platforms as if they were equivalent to 216 species relative abundances, although the ecological relevance of sequence abundance data needs to be cautiously addressed within the mycorrhizal (Nguyen et al., 2015) and wider 217 218 microbiome (Gloor et al., 2017) research communities. Clearly, there needs to be more care 219 with the use of metagenomic data and this may prove to be a suitable topic for a discussion 220 session at a future ICOM.

221

#### 222 Acknowledgements

223 This report is dedicated to the memory of the late Professor Sally E. Smith (1941 - 2019;

https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/nph.15569). Sally's illustrious research

career spanned more than 50 years and contributed important findings, particularly on the

arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis. She inspired many young scientists to pursue careers in plant

and mycorrhiza research, and she will be greatly missed by the mycorrhiza research community.

228 Sally received the Eminent Mycorrhiza Researcher Award at ICOM10.

229

230 The authors thank the local organising committee, the international scientific committee, the

231 International Mycorrhiza Society, and all the delegates at ICOM10 for many stimulating talks,

posters, and discussions throughout the conference. CGB was funded by the Estonian Research

- 233 Council (grant IUT 20-28), and the European Regional Development Fund (Centre of
- 234 Excellence EcolChange).
- 235
- 236 **References**
- 237 Brundrett M, Tedersoo L. 2019. Misdiagnosis of mycorrhizas and inappropriate recycling of
- data can lead to false conclusions. *New Phytologist* **221**: 18–24.
- 239 Bueno CG, Aldrich-Wolfe L, Chaudhary VB, Gerz M, Helgason T, Hoeksema JD,
- 240 Klironomos J, Lekberg Y, Leon D, Maherali H, et al. 2019. Misdiagnosis and uncritical use
- of plant mycorrhizal data are not the only elephants in the room. New Phytologist
- 242 doi:10.1111/nph.15976.
- 243 Bunn RA, Simpson DT, Bullington LS, Lekberg Y, Janos DP. 2019. Revisiting the 'direct
- 244 mineral cycling' hypothesis: arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi colonize leaf litter, but why? *The*
- 245 *ISME Journal* **13**: 1891–1898.
- 246 Craig ME, Turner BL, Liang C, Clay K, Johnson DJ, Phillips RP. 2018. Tree mycorrhizal
- type predicts within-site variability in the storage and distribution of soil organic matter.
- 248 *Global Change Biology* **24**: 3317–3330.
- 249 Delavaux CS, Weigelt P, Dawson W, Duchicela J, Essl F, van Kleunen M, König C, Pergl
- 250 J, Pyšek P, Stein A, et al. 2019. Mycorrhizal fungi influence global plant biogeography.
- 251 *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **3**: 424–429.
- 252 Fernández I, Cosme M, Stringlis IA, Yu K, Jonge R, van Wees SM, Pozo MJ, Pieterse
- 253 **CMJ, van der Heijden MGA**. **2019**. Molecular dialogue between arbuscular mycorrhizal
- 254 fungi and the nonhost plant Arabidopsis thaliana switches from initial detection to antagonism.
- 255 New Phytologist **223**: 867–881.
- 256 Gloor GB, Macklaim JM, Pawlowsky-Glahn V, Egozcue JJ. 2017. Microbiome Datasets
- 257 Are Compositional: And This Is Not Optional. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **8:** article 2224.
- 258 Hestrin R, Hammer EC, Mueller CW, Lehmann J. 2019. Synergies between mycorrhizal
- 259 fungi and soil microbial communities increase plant nitrogen acquisition. *Communications*
- 260 *Biology* **2**: 233.
- 261 Hoysted G, Jacob A, Kowal J, Giesemann P, Bidartondo M, Duckett J, Gebauer G,
- 262 Rimington W, Schornack S, Pressel S, et al. 2019. Mucoromycotina fine root endophyte
- fungi form nutritional mutualisms with vascular plants. *Plant Physiology*: pp.00729.2019.
- 264 Koziol L, Bever JD. 2019. Mycorrhizal feedbacks generate positive frequency dependence
- accelerating grassland succession (B Turner, Ed.). *Journal of Ecology* **107**: 622–632.
- 266 Mueller RC, Scudder CM, Whitham TG, Gehring CA. 2019. Legacy effects of tree

- 267 mortality mediated by ectomycorrhizal fungal communities. *New Phytologist* **224**: 155–165.
- 268 Nguyen NH, Smith D, Peay K, Kennedy P. 2015. Parsing ecological signal from noise in
- 269 next generation amplicon sequencing. *New Phytologist* **205**: 1389–1393.
- 270 Rillig MC, Lehmann A. 2019. Exploring the agricultural parameter space for crop yield and
- 271 sustainability. *New Phytologist* **223**: 517–519.
- 272 de Souza Machado AA, Lau CW, Kloas W, Bergmann J, Bachelier JB, Faltin E, Becker
- 273 R, Görlich AS, Rillig MC. 2019. Microplastics Can Change Soil Properties and Affect Plant
- 274 Performance. *Environmental Science & Technology* **53**: 6044–6052.
- 275 Svenningsen NB, Watts-Williams SJ, Joner EJ, Battini F, Efthymiou A, Cruz-Paredes C,
- 276 Nybroe O, Jakobsen I. 2018. Suppression of the activity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi by
- the soil microbiota. *The ISME Journal* **12**: 1296–1307.
- 278 Thomsen CN, Hart MM. 2018. Using invasion theory to predict the fate of arbuscular
- 279 mycorrhizal fungal inoculants. *Biological Invasions* **20**: 2695–2706.
- 280 Watts-Williams SJ, Jewell N, Brien C, Berger B, Garnett T, Cavagnaro TR. 2019. Using
- 281 High-Throughput Phenotyping to Explore Growth Responses to Mycorrhizal Fungi and Zinc in
- 282 Three Plant Species. *Plant Phenomics* **2019**: 1–12.
- 283 Zhang H-Y, Lü X-T, Hartmann H, Keller A, Han X-G, Trumbore S, Phillips RP. 2018.
- 284 Foliar nutrient resorption differs between arbuscular mycorrhizal and ectomycorrhizal trees at
- local and global scales. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **27**: 875–885.

#### 287 Figure legends

- **Figure 1.** ICOM10 covered a variety of recent basic and applied mycorrhizal research with a
- 289 focus on topics that inform the sustainability of managed and natural ecosystems. Interactions
- between global change processes, and the interpretation of data from rapidly advancing
- 291 sequencing technologies, emerged as common challenges for mycorrhizal researchers.
- 292 Figure 2. Planned and unplanned (in some cases unwanted) inputs into managed (e.g.,
- agricultural, silvicultural) and natural mycorrhizal systems, and potential or existing outputs,
- which can extend to ecosystem and socio-economic impacts.



#### **Figure 1.**





