Broader prevalence of Wolbachia in insects including potential human disease vectors

C.D. de Oliveira¹⁺, D.S. Gonçalves¹⁺, L.A. Baton¹, P.H. F. Shimabukuro², F.D. Carvalho¹ and L.A. Moreira^{1*}

¹Mosquitos Vetores: Endossimbiontes e Interação Patógeno Vetor: ²Estudos em Leishmanioses, Centro de Pesquisas René Rachou (CPqRR), FIOCRUZ, Avenida Augusto de Lima, 1715, Barro Preto, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, CEP 30190-002, Brazil

Abstract

Wolbachia are intracellular, maternally transmitted bacteria considered the most abundant endosymbionts found in arthropods. They reproductively manipulate their host in order to increase their chances of being transmitted to the offspring, and currently are being used as a tool to control vector-borne diseases. Studies on distribution of Wolbachia among its arthropod hosts are important both for better understanding why this bacterium is so common, as well as for its potential use as a biological control agent. Here, we studied the incidence of Wolbachia in a broad range of insect species, collected from different regions of Brazil, using three genetic markers (16S rRNA, wsp and ftsZ), which varied in terms of their sensitivity to detect this bacterium. The overall incidence of Wolbachia among species belonging to 58 families and 14 orders was 61.9%. The most common positive insect orders were Coleoptera, Diptera, Hemiptera and Hymenoptera, with Diptera and Hemiptera having the highest numbers of Wolbachia-positive families. They included potential human disease vectors whose infection status has never been reported before. Our study further shows the importance of using quantitative polymerase chain reaction for high-throughput and sensitive Wolbachia screening.

Keywords: Brazil, insects, Wolbachia

(Accepted 21 January 2015)

Introduction

Wolbachia are gram-negative alphaproteobacteria of the order Rickettsiales and family Anaplasmataceae exhibiting symbiotic relationships with their hosts (O'Neill *et al.*, 1992; Dumler *et al.*, 2001; Werren *et al.*, 2008). They were first reported in the reproductive tissues of the mosquito *Culex pipiens* (Hertig & Wolbach, 1924) and, therefore, the species was named *Wolbachia pipientis* (Hertig, 1936). However, due to

*Author for correspondence Phone: +55 31 33497776 Fax: +55 31 32953115 E-mail: luciano@cpqrr.fiocruz.br

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

uncertainty about the actual taxonomic status of *W. pipientis*, researchers commonly refer to it simply as *Wolbachia* (Lo *et al.*, 2007). Currently, based on gene sequence information, at least 13 major clades of *Wolbachia* known as 'supergroups' (A–F and H–N) have been reported (reviewed in Augustinos *et al.*, 2011). All but three of these supergroups are found in arthropods, while the remaining three have so far only been found in nematodes (Casiraghi *et al.*, 2005; Lo *et al.*, 2007; Haegeman *et al.*, 2009; Augustinos *et al.*, 2011). However, the great majority of arthropod *Wolbachia* so far described come from only two supergroups (A and B).

Wolbachia strains are globally distributed (Werren & Windsor, 2000) and currently these bacteria are considered the most abundant endosymbionts found in invertebrates. *Wolbachia* are referred to as reproductive parasites, because they induce diverse reproductive phenotypes, mainly in arthropods (Werren, 1997; Werren *et al.*, 2008). Commonly, they are



associated with parthenogenesis (Weeks & Breeuwer, 2001), phenotypic feminization of genetic males (Rousset *et al.*, 1992), cytoplasmic incompatibility (O'Neill *et al.*, 1992) and male killing (Hurst & Jiggins, 2000). *Wolbachia* are also thought to play important roles in speciation and local adaptation (Brucker & Bordenstein, 2012). The importance of *Wolbachia* in reproductive processes depends ultimately on its prevalence, and how it is transmitted between species (Stouthamer *et al.*, 1999). In Arthropoda, *Wolbachia* are believed to be primarily maternally transmitted within species (Skinner, 1982), but horizontal transmission also frequently occurs between species over longer evolutionary time-scales (Werren *et al.*, 1995a; Schilthuizen & Stouthamer, 1997).

About 40% of arthropod species are estimated to be infected with *Wolbachia* (Zug & Hammerstein, 2012). They are common and widespread in insects (Werren *et al.*, 1995*b*), which represent the greatest diversity of all known animal groups on Earth (Rafael *et al.*, 2012), equivalent to around 60% of all currently described organisms (Grimaldi & Engel, 2005). They are important for maintenance of ecosystems, as agricultural pests and vectors of human diseases, and useful in medicine and scientific research, besides representing a commercial value food in some cultures (Triplehorn & Johnson, 2005).

Due to the importance of Wolbachia, some researchers have investigated the presence of these bacteria in insects from different locations (Duron et al., 2008; Russell, 2012; Russell et al., 2012). Hilgenboecker et al. (2008) estimated that over 65% of insect species carry Wolbachia. However, other studies reported that up to 76% (Jeyaprakash & Hoy, 2000) or as few as 20% of insect species are infected with Wolbachia (Werren et al., 1995b). In the first published survey of Wolbachia distribution, Werren et al. (1995b) found over 16% of sampled insect species from Panama were infected with Wolbachia, within several insect orders. In the UK, 22% of insects sampled were infected with Wolbachia, mainly in the Lepidoptera and Hymenoptera (West et al., 1998). In North America, insect species from 13 different orders were screened for Wolbachia, of which 19.3% were positive. The bacteria have been found in species within several major insect orders: Coleoptera, Diptera, Hymenoptera, Lepidoptera and Orthoptera (Werren & Windsor, 2000).

Wolbachia detection in Arthropoda has been traditionally performed through standard polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assays targeting the 16S rRNA gene, or protein-coding genes such as the Wolbachia surface protein (*wsp*) gene and the bacterial cell division gene *ftsZ* (reviewed in Simões *et al.* (2011). In contrast, real-time quantitative PCR (qPCR), which possesses high reproducibility, sensitivity and precision of results, has never been used as a tool for Wolbachia screening in Arthropoda.

In Brazil, there are some reports regarding the detection of *Wolbachia* in limited, specific arthropod groups, but no general surveys of *Wolbachia* distribution among arthropods have so far been conducted. For example, infection of *Wolbachia* has been detected in two species of *Balloniscus* (Crustacea, Oniscidea) (Almerão *et al.*, 2012) and in some species of Diptera in Culicidae (de Albuquerque *et al.*, 2011; de Almeida *et al.*, 2011; Morais *et al.*, 2012; Baton *et al.*, 2013) and in Hymenoptera (Formicidae) (Martins *et al.*, 2012). Here, we show the incidence of *Wolbachia* in different insect orders from the northern and southeastern regions of Brazil using three different markers (*16S rRNA, wsp* and *ftsZ*), and the observed incidence corroborates the previously reported

widespread nature of this bacterium. We also emphasize the importance of using qPCR for *Wolbachia* high-throughput screening.

Materials and methods

Insect collection sites

Insects were collected from various field sites spanning the northern and southeastern regions of Brazil, from 2009 to 2012. Samples were obtained from urban, non-urban, forest and forest fragments from Manaus, Careiro da Várzea, Coari and Lábrea in the state of Amazonas; from Belo Horizonte, Belo Vale, Campo Belo and São João da Missões in the state of Minas Gerais; and from Niterói and Rio de Janeiro city in the state of Rio de Janeiro (table 1).

Insect collection and identification

Insects were manually collected using forceps, nets or traps: HP trap with light attraction (HP Biomédica, Sabará, Minas Gerais, Brazil; Pugedo et al., 2005), CDC trap+CO₂ (John W. Hock Company, Gainesville, Florida, USA) and BG-Sentinel traps (Biogents AG, Regensburg, Germany). Whole insects were individually preserved (to prevent potential cross-contamination) in 96% ethanol and stored at 4°C until identification and DNA extraction. Specimens were identified based on morphology to family level according to Rafael et al. (2012) and Triplehorn & Johnson (2005). Sand flies were identified to species level through genital morphology according to Galati (2003) and mosquitoes to species according to Consoli & de Oliveira (1994), Faran & Linthicum (1981) and Linthicum (1988). Photos were taken for voucher samples with a stereomicroscope (Zeiss Stemi DV4) and digital camera (Canon SX30 IS). Insects that had bristles and spots on the wings, which were important for identification, were not preserved in ethanol but kept in silica.

DNA extraction

Small insects had their bodies homogenized, whereas larger insects were dissected in 1X PBS, to remove ovaries, fat body, thorax and/or abdomen. In the latter case, individual organs were used for DNA extraction.

Crude DNA samples were prepared from individual insects by homogenization in $80 \,\mu$ l 'squash buffer' (0.4 mM EDTA, 4 mM Tris, 20 mM NaCl) using a Mini-Beadbeater-16 (BioSpec Products, Inc., Bartlesville, Oklahoma, USA) (modified from Fu *et al.*, 2010). All samples were measured using a NanoDrop (Thermo Scientific Waltham, MA, USA) and diluted to a final concentration of 20 to 50 ng genomic DNA μ l⁻¹.

Template and PCR reaction

Insects were screened for the presence of *Wolbachia* using PCR. Standard PCR was used for the ribosomal *16S rRNA* gene with the primers 16S-2 (originally called Wspec; Werren & Windsor, 2000; Simões *et al.*, 2011). Real-time qPCR was performed for the *wsp* and *ftsZ* genes using the *wsp* primers (Moreira *et al.*, 2009) and newly designed primers to the *ftsZ* gene, as follows; *ftsZ*qPCR Forward: 5'-GCATTGCAGAGCTTGGACTT-3' and *ftsZ*qPCR Reverse: 5'-TCTTCTCCTTCTGCCTCTCC-3'. The *ftsZ*qPCR primers were designed using Primer3 (Rozen & Skaletsky, 2000;

| City | Site | State | Environment | GPS coordinates | Collection date |
|------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Manaus | Centro | Amazonas | Urban | S3°6.4315′, W60°1.5676′ | September/2011 |
| Manaus | Petrópolis | Amazonas | Urban forest fragments | S3°09.5018′, W59°98.8075′ | - |
| Careiro da Várzea | Br319 – Km 106 | Amazonas | Forest | S3°17.6238' e W59°51.8484' | August/2009 and October/2010 |
| Coari | Gasoduto | Amazonas | Forest | S4°10.1303' e W63°14.0305' | May/2010 |
| Lábrea | Terra Indígena Caititu, Aldeia Castanheira | Amazonas | Forest | S07°27′28.7′, W64°43′42.2¢¢ | May/2012 |
| Niteroi | Jurujuba | Rio de Janeiro | Urban | S22°93.3332′, W43°11.6669′ | October and |
| Rio de Janeiro | Tubiacanga | Rio de Janeiro | Urban | S22°78.5780', W43°22.6513' | November/2012 |
| Rio de Janeiro | Vila Valqueire | Rio de Janeiro | Urban | S22°88.3333, W43°36.6665′ | |
| Rio de Janeiro | Urca | Rio de Janeiro | Urban | S22°95.4769′, W43°16.6557′ | |
| Belo Horizonte | Barro Preto | Minas Gerais | Urban | S19°55.1703', W43°57.973' | |
| Belo Horizonte | Sion | Minas Gerais | Urban | S19°57.3132', W43°56.2222' | |
| Belo Horizonte | Luxemburgo | Minas Gerais | Urban | S19°94.8444′, W43°95.6791′ | April/2011 and |
| Belo Horizonte | São Pedro | Minas Gerais | Urban | S19°94.2450′, W43°93.6733′ | September/2012 |
| Belo Horizonte | Magabeiras | Minas Gerais | Urban forest fragments | S19°57.2520′, W43°54.3821′ | 1 |
| Belo Horizonte | UFMG | Minas Gerais | Colony | S19°51.4953', W 43°57.60002' | August/2013 |
| Belo Horizonte | CPqRR/Fiocruz | Minas Gerais | Colony | S19°55.4390' W43°56.3806' | May/2011 |
| Belo Vale | private property | Minas Gerais | Non-urban forest fragments | S20°24.4796' W44°1.0909' | April/2012 |
| Campo Belo | private property | Minas Gerais | Non-urban forest fragments | S20°51.9503' W45°16.3921' | |
| São João da Missões | Xacriabá | Minas Gerais | Forest | S14°88.2146' W44°21.8105' | August/2012 |

Table 1. Insect collection sites. Insects were collected from different settings: urban, non-urban, forest and forest fragments in northern (Amazonas state) and southeastern (Belo Horizonte and Rio de Janeiro), Brazil (2009–2012).

Untergasser *et al.*, 2012) to amplify a 271 bp fragment of the *ftsZ* gene from as broad a spectrum as possible of known sequences from Supergroups A and B, but not C and D, *Wolbachia*. The specificity of the *ftsZ*qPCR primers to *Wolbachia* was checked using NCBI Primer-BLAST against the non-redundant database. Control DNA samples were prepared using adult females of the mosquito *Aedes aegypti* artificially infected with either the *w*Mel (Walker *et al.*, 2011) or *w*MelPop strains of *Wolbachia* (McMeniman *et al.*, 2009).

Standard PCR had the following components: a final concentration of 0.5X Buffer A and 0.5X Buffer B, 0.13 mM dNTP, 1 µM of each 16S-2 F/R primer, together with 0.3 µl of Elongase (Applied Biosystems[®],Grand Island, New York, USA) and a total of $20-50 \text{ ng }\mu l^{-1}$ of sample DNA, made up with water to a total volume of 25 µl. Amplifications were performed in an automatic thermocycler (Veriti™ Dx Thermal Cycler, Applied Biosystems®, Grand Island, New York, USA) using 35 cycles (30 s 94°C, 30 s 52°C, 1.5 min 68°C) preceded by 5 min at 94°C and followed by a final extension step of 10 min at 68°C. PCR products were visualized on 2% agarose gels stained with Gel Red (diluted 1000×, Biotium, Inc. Hayward, California, USA). qPCR had a final concentration of 1× SYBR® Green PCR Master Mix (Applied Biosystems) and $0.5 \,\mu\text{M}$ of each primer (*wsp* F/R or *ftsZqPCR* F/R), with a total of 20-50 ng of sample DNA and water to a total volume of 20 µl. The DNA was amplified through 40 cycles (15 s at 95° C and 30 s at 60°C) for the *wsp* R/F primers, and for 40 cycles (15 s at 95°C, 60 s at 60°C) for the *fts*ZqPCR F/R primers. All qPCR reactions were carried out in a 96-well microtitre plate (Model 7500, Applied Biosystems). Results were analyzed with the 7500 software v2.0.5, through individual analysis of each amplification curve (compared to the pattern of a positive control) and also their melting curves to check the specificity of the amplification.

In order to confirm the PCR results and therefore, *Wolbachia* infection status, we sequenced a subset of 61 samples (table 2),

that exhibited positive results for only one set of primers. For that, DNA was amplified through conventional PCR under the same conditions as the qPCR (see above). After conventional PCR, the samples were then purified (PCR Purification Kit, Qiagen; Venlo, Limburg, Netherlands), lyophilized and sent for sequencing (Macrogen; Seoul, Korea). As a control, we also sequenced the DNA of *A. aegypti* artificially infected with the *w*MelPop (McMeninam *et al.*, 2008), using the *16S rRNA*, *ftsZ* and *wsp* primers. The raw sequencing reads were trimmed and analyzed using the nucleotide-nucleotide BLAST (BLASTN) tool from NCBI and results are shown on table 2.

Results

A total of n = 396 insect specimens from 194 species were screened for *Wolbachia* in 14 orders and 58 families. The largest group belonged to Diptera (n = 191; 48% of all specimens examined) followed by Hemiptera (n = 56; 14%), Hymenoptera (n = 56; 14%) and Coleoptera (n = 34; 9%). The highest number of species belonged to Diptera (n = 65; 34% of all species examined), followed by Hymenoptera (n = 35; 18%), Hemiptera (n =33; 17%) and Coleoptera (n = 25; 13%) (fig. 1a, b and table 3).

We used three sets of primers to increase the chance of detecting different strains of *Wolbachia* in our insect samples: 16S *rRNA*, *wsp* and *ftsZ*. We found 28.3% specimens positive for the 16S *rRNA* marker, 46.2% for *wsp* and 39.7% for the *ftsZ* primer (table 3). As expected, the *wsp* and *ftsZ* primers were more sensitive in detecting *Wolbachia* infections than the 16S *rRNA* primers, which were used for qPCR.

Overall, *Wolbachia* was found in 10 of the 14 insect orders surveyed, with 232 (58.6%) specimens and 120 (61.9%) species positive. We found 100% species infected with *Wolbachia* in Orthoptera/Blattodea/Neuroptera/Siphonaptera, 73% in Hemiptera, 69% in Hymenoptera, 62% in Diptera, 50% in Isoptera, 48% in Coleoptera and 40% in Lepidoptera

| Order | Family/order/species | Primer | Sequenced specimens | Positive for Wolbachia | Max score | Query cover (%) | <i>E</i> value | Ident (%) | Accession |
|------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| Hymenoptera | Formicidae | 16S rRNA | 2 | 2 | 708 | 92 | 0.0 | 100 | IO726771.1 |
| Hymenoptera | Vespidae | 16S rRNA | 1 | 1 | 675 | 56 | 0.0 | 99 | AB746405.1 |
| Diptera | Psychodidae and Phlebotominae | 16S rRNA | 5 | 2 | 682 | 55 | 0.0 | 99 | AB772263.1 |
| Dipteru | 1 by chould are and 1 hebotoning | ายอาก | U | - | 148 | 27 | 5.00×10^{-32} | 89 | AY916133.1 |
| Diptera | Psicodidae Phebotominae Scionemuja sordellij | FstZ | 1 | 1 | 350 | 48 | 1.00×10^{-92} | 98 | AY916134.1 |
| Diptera | Psicodidae Phebotominae Psuchodonyous llanosmartinsi | FstZ | 1 | 1 | 392 | 53 | 2.00×10^{-105} | 98 | KJ659910.1 |
| Diptera | Drosophilidae | 16S rRNA FstZ | 7 | 7 | 682 412 | 94 49 | 0.0 2.00×10 ⁻¹¹¹ | 97 99 | KF250093.1 AY095164.1 |
| Diptera | Culicidae Culex auinauefasciatus | 16SrRNA | 6 | 5 | 665 | 89 | 0.0 | 99 | HG428761.1 |
| Dipteru | Calledade Cinen quinquejuscumus | FstZ | 0 | U | 379 | 46 | 2.00×10^{-101} | 98 | KI6599101 |
| Diptera | Culicidae/Culer sp | 16S rRNA | 3 | 3 | 462 | 94 | 2.00×10^{-126} | 88 | HG428761 1 |
| Dipteru | Culletade, Calex op. | Fst7 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 21 | 3.00×10^{-29} | 95 | IX296508 1 |
| Diptera | Culicidae / Mansonia titilans | FstZ | 2 | 2 | 409 | 88 | 1.00×10^{-110} | 100 | GU573908 1 |
| Diptera | Tachinidae | 165 rRNA | 1 | 1 | 460 | 92 | 5.00×10^{-126} | 89 | KF250093 1 |
| Diptera | Tipulidae | Fet7 | 1 | 1 | 333 | 41 | 1.00×10^{-87} | 99 | HC970644 1 |
| Diptora | Tabanidao | LotZ | 1 | 1 | 195 | 24 | 1.00×10^{-45} | 88 | AV157007.1 |
| Diptera | Dolichopodidao | 1 512 | 1 | 1 | 150 | 64 | 1.00×10^{-35} | 89 | LI83105 1 |
| Colooptora | Anobiidaa | 165 rPNA | 3 | 3 | 728 | 04 | 1.00×10 | 99 | CP003883 1 |
| Icontora | Phinotormitidae | 165 mDNIA | 9 | 8 | 616 | 07 | 0.0×10^{-179} | 99 | AB622501 1 |
| isoptera | Kimotermitidae | wsp | 9 | 8 | 259 | 92 51 | 1.00×10^{-65} | 90 97 | AJ833931.1 |
| Hemiptera | Pirrhocoridae | 16S rRNA | 1 | 1 | 555 | 95 | 2.00×10^{-154} | 92 | KF250093.1 |
| Hemiptera Heteroptera | Rhopalidae | 16S rRNA | 2 | 2 | 339 | 92 | 3.00×10 ⁻⁸⁹ | 83 | EU914940.1 |
| Hemiptera Achenorrhyncha | Cicadellidae | Wsp | 1 | 1 | 265 | 36 | 5.00×10^{-67} | 98 | KC137230.1 |
| Hemiptera Auchenorrhyncha | Coreidae | wsp | 1 | 1 | 241 | 31 | 8.00×10^{-60} | 99 | KJ648498.1 |
| Hemiptera | Reduviidae Triatoma infestans | FstZ Wsv | 2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Hemiptera | Reduviidae Rhodnius prolixus | FstZ wsp | 1 | 0 | | | | | |
| Hemiptera | Reduviidae Triatoma brasiliensis | FstZ wsp | 2 | 0 | | | | | |
| Hemiptera | Reduviidae Panstrongylus megistus | FstZ Wsv | 4 | 0 | | | | | |
| Hemiptera | Bervtidae | wsp | 1 | 1 | 248 | 17 | 1.00×10^{-61} | 97 | KC161952.1 |
| Hemiptera | | พรท | 1 | 1 | 189 | 36 | 3.00×10^{-44} | 90 | KF036313.1 |
| Neuroptera | Chrisopidae | FstZ | 1 | ō | | 20 | 210010 | | |
| Total | | | 61 samples | 46 positive for Wolbachia | | | | | |

Table 2. Sequenced insect samples. Insects samples were sequenced for Wolbachia using wsp, 16S rRNA and fstZ primers.



Fig. 1. Diversity and abundance of insects collected, and the proportion of species infected with *Wolbachia* in each order. In figures C–I: infected (dark grey) and uninfected (light grey) with *Wolbachia*.

(fig. 1c–i). *Wolbachia* was not detected in four insect orders: Odonata, Psocoptera, Diplura or Thysanura. This probably reflects the small sample sizes for these insect groups, rather than the absence of *Wolbachia*, as previous studies have found *Wolbachia* in the Odonata and Psocoptera (Thipaksorn *et al.*, 2003; Dong *et al.*, 2006). *Wolbachia* were present in 46 families from the 10 PCR-positive orders screened. Orders with the largest number of families infected with *Wolbachia* were Hemiptera (n = 12; 20.7%), Diptera (12; 21%) and Coleoptera (7; 12.1%) (table 3).

Within Diptera (families Culicidae and Psychodidae) and Hemiptera (Reduviidae), which include several human disease vectors species, we screened 41 species and 19 were positive for *Wolbachia* (table 3). In Culicidae, we found *Wolbachia* in four species and two genera. Positive results for *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say, 1823 and *Aedes albopictus* (Skuse, 1894) and *Culex* sp. were expected as their infectious status is widely reported. However, for *Mansonia titillans* (Walker, 1848), *Psorophora cingulata* (Fabricius, 1805) and *Limatus* sp. this is first report of *Wolbachia*. In Psychodidae, we report here for the first time the presence of *Wolbachia* in four phlebotomine species: *Psychodopygus llanosmartinsi* (Fraiha & Ward, 1980), *Sciopemyia sordellii* (Shannon & Del Ponte, 1927), *Psychodopygus davisi* (Root, 1934), *Trichophoromyia flochi* (Abonnenc & Chassignet, 1948), and two genera whose species have not been identified: *Evandromyia* sp. and *Psychodopygus* sp. In Reduviidae we did not find *Wolbachia* in any of screened species of triatominae: *Triatoma infestans* (Klug, 1934), *Panstrongylus megistus* (Klug, 1934), *Triatoma brasiliensis* Neiva, 1911 and *Rhodnius prolixus* Stål, 1859. These species are exclusively hematophagous, and have been reported with their association with Chagas disease transmission (table 4).

Sequencing a subset of samples allowed us to confirm the majority of samples that showed positivity with the PCR

Table 3. Number of insects collected and infected with *Wolbachia*. Insects were screened for Wolbachia using *wsp*, 16S rRNA and fstZ primers.

| | | Number of specimens | Number of infected | Number of species | Number of infected | 16S | | 6.17 |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|-----|--------|
| Order | Family | collected | specimens | collected | species | rKNA | wsp | fstZ |
| Diptera | Drosophilidae | 20 | 18 | $\frac{4}{7}$ | 3 | 13 | 17 | 18 |
| | Chironomidae | 9 | 4 | / | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| | Tachinidae | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Calliphoridae | 6 | 5 | $\frac{2}{4}$ | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| | Culicidae | 70 | 65 | 13 | 6 | 52 | 55 | 61 |
| | Tabanidae | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Psychodidae | 66 | 26 | 24 | 13 | 5 | 19 | 13 |
| | Anthomyiidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Muscidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | Dolichopodidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Sarcophagidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Õ | 1 | ĩ |
| | Unidentified | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| | Total | 191 | 130 | 65 | 40 | 75 | 107 | 103 |
| Hymenoptera | Apidae | 20 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | Formicidae | 21 | 12 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 8 |
| | Braconidae | 9 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| | Pompilidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | Unidentified | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| | Total | 56 | 28 | 35 | 24 | 9 | 21 | 13 |
| Hemiptera/ | Psyllidae | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Stemorrhyncha | Aphididae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | Gerridae | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | Reduviidae | 20 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 1 | 14 | 3 |
| | Cvdnidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | ů 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Hemiptera/Heteroptera | Berytidae | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | Pyrrhocoridae | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | Rhopalidae | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| | Pentatomidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Coreidae | 1 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Hemiptera/ | Cixiidae | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Auchenorrhyncha | Cicadidae | 1 | $\overline{0}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hemiptera | Unidentified | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Total | 56 | 30 | 33 | 24 | 11 | 23 | 17 |
| Coleoptera | Cantharidae | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Chrysomelidae | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | Tenebrionidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Scarabaeidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | ů 0 | 0 | 0 | Ő |
| | Passalidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Haliplidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | Nitidulidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Cerambycidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Brontidae | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| | Unidentified | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| | Total | 34 | 19 | 25 | 12 | 6 | 16 | 12 |
| Odonata | Libellulidae | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Coenagrionidae | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ortherntern | Total | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Orthoptera | Acriaiaae | 1 | 1 | 1 1 | 1 | 1 1 | 0 | U 1 |
| | Tettigoniidae | 1 1 | 1 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 0 | 1 | 1 1 |
| | Unidentified | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | Total | $\overline{4}$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Lepidoptera | Sphingidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Nymphalidae | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Unidentified | 13 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| | Total | 16 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 3 |

Table 3. (Cont.)

| Order | Family | Number of specimens collected | Number of infected specimens | Number of species collected | Number of infected species | 16S rRNA | wsp | fstZ |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Blatodea | Blaberidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Blattidae | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | Total | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Diplura | Parajapygidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Siphonaptera | Pulicidae | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Thysanura | Lepismatidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Neuroptera | Chrysopidae | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Psocoptera | Psocidae | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Isoptera | Rhinotermitidae | 23 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| Total % | | 396 | 232 58.6 | 194 | 120 61.9 | 112 28.3 | 183 46.2 | 156 39.39 |

Table 4. Species and genus of hemipterans, Culicidae and phlebotomines collected and screened for Wolbachia. Hemipterans from colony, Culicidae from several localities, and phlebotomines from colony and Amazon.

| Species | Family | Number collected | Number infected with <i>Wolbachia</i> | wsp | 16S rRNA | fstZ |
|---|-------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|----------|------|
| Triatoma infestans ^{1,2} | Triatominae | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Triatoma brasiliensis ^{1,2} | Triatominae | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rhodniusprolixus ¹ , ² | Triatominae | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Panstrongylus megistus ^{1,2} | Triatominae | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anopheles darlingi ² | Culicidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anopheles sp. | Culicidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Urotaenia sp. | Culicidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Culex quinquefasciatus ² | Culicidae | 8 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Culex spp. | Culicidae | 31 | 31 | 29 | 27 | 30 |
| Mansonia titilans | Culicidae | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Limatus sp. | Culicidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Psorophora cingulata | Culicidae | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Aedes albopictus ² | Culicidae | 19 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 17 |
| Trichophoromyia ubiquitalis | Psychodidae | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trichophoromyia flochi | Psychodidae | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Psychodopygus claustrei ² | Psychodidae | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Psychodopygus davisi ² | Psychodidae | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Psychodopygus serie chagasi ² | Psychodidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Psychodopygus llanosmartinsi ² | Psychodidae | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Psychodopygus sp. | Psychodidae | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Evandromyia begonae | Psychodidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Evandromyia sp. | Psychodidae | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Nyssomyia richardwardi | Psychodidae | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nyssomyia antunesi | Psychodidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nyssomyia sp. | Psychodidae | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Psathyromyia aragaoi | Psychodidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sciopemyia sordellii | Psychodidae | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Lutzomyia longipalpis ² , ³ | Psychodidae | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deanemyia maruaga | Psychodidae | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

¹Specimens from CPqRR/Fiocruz colony.

²Species vectors of disease.

³Specimens from UFMG (Minas Gerais) colony.

analysis. From a total of 61 DNA samples, 46 returned sequences belonging to *Wolbachia* (table 2).

Discussion

We studied the incidence of *Wolbachia* in insects collected from northern and southern parts of Brazil. Most of the insects collected belong to Coleoptera, Diptera, Hemiptera and Hymenoptera. Although we used light and CO_2 traps, as well as manual sampling to collect insects near or within urban areas, targeting a great diversity of insect groups, most of the insects sampled were Diptera, Heteroptera, Hymenoptera and Coleoptera. This is because these orders are large and well-diversified, making it easier to collect representatives in different habitats. The higher prevalence of *Wolbachia* in Diptera was expected, since many species in this order have previously been reported to be infected with the endosymbiont, and we collected more specimens and species from this order, so that we would be more likely to detect rare infections (Duron *et al.*, 2008; Hilgenboecker *et al.*, 2008; Zug & Hammerstein, 2012). In dipteran insects, especially mosquitoes (Hertig & Wolbach, 1924) and drosophilids, *Wolbachia* is commonly found (Boyle *et al.*, 1993; Braig *et al.*, 1994). Furthermore, many other insect groups are known to carry *Wolbachia*: e.g., leafhoppers, thrips and whiteflies (Nirgianaki *et al.*, 2003), termites (Bandi *et al.*, 1997; Lo *et al.*, 2002; Bordenstein & Rosengaus, 2005), beetles (Werren & Windsor, 2000; Nirgianaki *et al.*, 2003), odonates (dragonflies and damselflies) (Thipaksorn *et al.*, 2003) and crickets (Kamoda *et al.*, 2000). Although in our collections, Hemiptera and Hymenoptera had fewer species and specimens collected compared to Diptera, *Wolbachia* had a higher incidence.

Heteroptera, known as true bugs, is one of the most diverse groups of insects with incomplete metamorphosis. *Wolbachia* infection was previously reported in this group (Kikuchi & Fukatsu, 2003) and here we observed a 28.6% frequency of infection distributed in eight different families (Gerridae, Corixidae, Cydnidae, Berytidae, Pyrrhocoridae, Rhopalidae, Pentatomidae and Coreidae), six of them previously reported by Kikuchi & Fukatsu (2003). In many groups of Heteroptera, the removal of the endosymbionts can result in stunted growth and/or mortality of the nymphs, suggesting a major role for *Wolbachia* in this host association (Fukatsu & Hosokawa, 2002).

Wolbachia also influence reproductive patterns in social Hymenoptera. Studies on ants in Indonesia showed that Wolbachia was common, with 50% of the species infected (Wenseleers et al., 1998). In our study, from 13 species of ants screened, nine were infected with Wolbachia, representing an incidence of infection greater than 69%. Wolbachia infection has been reported to cause parthenogenesis in some families of Coleoptera (Werren et al., 1995a; Rodriguero et al., 2010). Furthermore, evidence of horizontal transfer of Wolbachia was also found in Curculionidae, Chrysomelidae and Tenebrionidae (Rodriguero et al., 2010). We collected 19 species of beetles from these and others families. Wolbachia was present in 12 species: Cantharidae (n = 1), Chrysomelidae (n = 1)3), Curculionidae (n = 2), Haliplidae (n = 1), Cerambicidae (n = 1) 1), Anobiidae (n = 1), Brentidae (n = 1) and two other species. Based on 16S rRNA and wsp sequence detection, Wolbachia had already been reported in siphonapteran hosts (Jeyaprakash & Hoy, 2000; Gorham et al., 2003; Dittmar & Whiting, 2004) and in this study we collected a flea [Ctenocephalides canis Curtis (Siphonaptera, Pulicidae)] from a domestic dog that was also positive for Wolbachia. According to Dittmar & Whiting (2004), the discovery of symbiotic bacteria in wild populations of Siphonaptera suggests a potentially widespread association with fleas. Although we collected only two specimens of the same species, one specimen was positive.

In the present study, the overall incidence of *Wolbachia* among species was similar to that reported by Hilgenboecker *et al.* (2008) who estimated that the percentage of infected *Wolbachia* species is approximately 66%, when rarely infected species are included. Most of the species that we screened were based on one or only a few individuals. Within each species from the same population, we found that 40 to 100% specimens were infected with *Wolbachia* (i.e., the intra-specific prevalence of *Wolbachia* varied from low to high frequency). This could be because the levels of infection within a host population may depend on the age of the endosymbiont–host association (i.e., whether there has been sufficient time for *Wolbachia* to invade the host population) and how *Wolbachia* manipulates the reproduction of their hosts (Hurst & Jiggins, 2000).

Wolbachia is naturally present in many genera of mosquitoes, including Aedes, Culex, Mansonia and Coquillettidia (Kittayapong et al., 2000; Ricci et al., 2002; Dean & Dobson, 2004) and recently it has been reported in Anopheles gambiae (Baldini et al., 2014). Our survey also revealed the presence of Wolbachia in a number of other potential vectors of human pathogens. Wolbachia has previously been found in the gonads and salivary glands of Rhodnius pallescens Barber, 1932, which is considered the most important vector of Trypanosoma cruzi and Trypanosoma rangeli in the Neotropics (Espino et al., 2009), but the role of this endosymbiont in the relationship between the insect and parasite is not yet known. In Brazil, there are several kissing bug species, which are important vectors of Chagas disease, such as T. infestans, T. brasiliensis, R. prolixus and P. megistus (Costa & Lorenzo, 2009), but there are no reports about the presence of Wolbachia in these insects. Although the *wsp* marker detected *Wolbachia* in five specimens of *P. megistus* and *T. brasiliensis*, while the *ftsZ* primers detected the bacterium in two specimens of *R. prolixus* and one *P. megis*tus, the infection was not confirmed by sequencing (table 2), as the blasted sequences had no hits to Wolbachia. It is important to emphasize that these particular samples were derived from the laboratory. Broader screening of field specimens should be envisaged, increasing the chance of Wolbachia detection.

Wolbachia has also been reported in the Phlebotominae (Diptera: Psychodidae) both in New (Ono et al., 2001; Azpurua et al., 2010) and Old World species (Zhou et al., 1998). Phlebotomines are vectors of several viral, bacterial and protozoal diseases of humans and other animals, but there are few studies on the presence of Wolbachia in sand flies (Cui et al., 1999; Ono et al., 2001; Benlarbi & Ready, 2003; Matsumoto et al., 2008; Azpurua et al., 2010; de Sousa et al., 2013) and about the biological relationship of the endosymbiont with the host (Kassem et al., 2003; Kassem & Osman 2007). In Iran, a new strain of Wolbachia was recently found in Phlebotomus perfiliewi transcaucasicus Perfil'ev, 1937 (Parvizi et al., 2013), increasing the list of phlebotomines known to be infected with this endosymbiont. Further studies should explore the potential for Wolbachia to be used as a biological control agent for Leishmania vectors. Here, we collected 21 sand fly species (20 wild species from Amazonas and one from a colony), and Wolbachia was found only in wild species. In six wild species, the bacterium was found using both wsp and ftsZ primers. Only in a single wild species of the genus Evandromyia was Wolbachia detected by all three markers.

Conclusions

Due to the high diversity amongst different *Wolbachia* strains, it is difficult to detect a wide range of strains using one set of universal primers. Currently, new strains of *Wolbachia* in different host species have been found, mainly due to the use of a combination of primers to improve detection of this bacterium (Lo *et al.*, 2002). Here, we used three different primer sets and two PCR methods to enhance the detection of *Wolbachia* in an extensive collection of insects. According to Simões *et al.* (2011), the *16S rRNA* primers are sensitive to detect a broad-spectrum of *Wolbachia*. However, these primers do not detect all *Wolbachia* strains. It was clear in our results that the primers used for real-time qPCR (*wsp* and *ftsZ*) showed a higher number of positive samples than conventional PCR (using the *16S rRNA* primer set), which can be explained by the higher sensitivity provided by qPCR.

In summary, one should take into account the difficulty of designing primers covering all existing groups of *Wolbachia*, but on the other hand be cautious of using a single marker, such as *wsp* or *ftsZ*, as this could potentially underestimate *Wolbachia* prevalence in a given sample. Finally, we recommend the use of real-time qPCR because it is the most sensitive and fastest method to detect *Wolbachia* in a wide variety of arthropod samples.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Wanderli Tadei, Alessandra Guarneri, Liléia Diotaiuti and Rafael Freitas for providing specimens and Edelberto Dias for lending us traps. Also, Taís Souza for helping with sequencing analysis. The authors thank the Program for Technological Development in Tools for Health-PDTIS-FIOCRUZ for using its facilities. Financial support was provided by INCT-EM, FAPEMIG and CNPq. LAM is a CNPq fellow.

References

- Almerão, M.P., Fagundes, N.J.R., de Araújo, P.B., Verne, S., Grandjean, F., Bouchon, D. & Araújo, A.M. (2012) First record of Wolbachia in South American terrestrial isopods: prevalence and diversity in two species of Balloniscus (Crustacea, Oniscidea). Genetics and Molecular Biology 35, 980–989.
- Augustinos, A.A., Santos-Garcia, D., Dionyssopoulou, E., Moreira, M., Papapanagiotou, A., Scarvelakis, M., Doudoumis, V., Ramos, S., Aguiar, A.F., Borges, P.A., Khadem, M., Latorre, A., Tsiamis, G. & Bourtzis, K. (2011) Detection and characterization of *Wolbachia* infections in natural populations of aphids: is the hidden diversity fully unraveled? *PLoS ONE* 6, e28695.
- Azpurua, J., De La Cruz, D., Valderama, A. & Windsor, D. (2010) Lutzomyia sand fly diversity and rates of infection by Wolbachia and an exotic Leishmania species on Barro Colorado Island, Panama. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 4, e627.
- Baldini, F., Segata, N., Pompon, J., Marcenac, P., Robert Shaw, W., Dabiré, R.K., Diabaté, A., Levashina, E.A. & Catteruccia, F. (2014). Evidence of natural Wolbachia infections in field populations of Anopheles gambiae. Nature Communications 5, 3985.
- Bandi, C., Sironi, M., Nalepa, C.A., Corona, S. & Sacchi, L. (1997) Phylogenetically distant intracellular symbionts in termites. *Parassitologia* 39, 71–75.
- Baton, L.A., Pacidônio, E.C., da Silva Gonçalves, D. & Moreira, L.A. (2013) wFlu: characterization and evaluation of a native Wolbachia from the mosquito Aedes fluviatilis as a potential vector control agent. PLoS ONE 8, e59619.
- Benlarbi, M. & Ready, P.D. (2003) Host-specific Wolbachia strains in widespread populations of *Phlebotomus perniciosus* and *P. papatasi* (Diptera: Psychodidae), and prospects for driving genes into these vectors of *Leishmania*. Bulletin of *Entomological Research* 93, 383–391.
- Bordenstein, S. & Rosengaus, R.B. (2005) Discovery of a novel Wolbachia super group in Isoptera. Current microbiology 51, 393–398.
- Boyle, L., O'Neill, S.L., Robertson, H.M. & Karr, T.L. (1993) Interspecific and intraspecific horizontal transfer of Wolbachia in Drosophila. Science 260, 1796–1799.

- Braig, H.R., Guzman, H., Tesh, R.B. & O'Neill, S.L. (1994) Replacement of the natural Wolbachia symbiont of Drosophila simulans with a mosquito counterpart. Nature 367, 453–455.
- Brucker, R.M. & Bordenstein, S.R. (2012) Speciation by symbiosis. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 27, 443–451.
- Casiraghi, M., Bordenstein, S.R., Baldo, L., Lo, N., Beninati, T., Wernegreen, J.J., Werren, J.H. & Bandi, C. (2005) Phylogeny of *Wolbachia pipientis* based on *gltA*, *groEL* and *ftsZ* gene sequences: clustering of arthropod and nematode symbionts in the F supergroup, and evidence for further diversity in the *Wolbachia* tree. *Microbiology* **151**, 4015–4022.
- Consoli, R.A.G.B. & de Oliveira, R.L. (1994) Principais Mosquitos de Importância Sanitária no Brasil. p. 228. Rio de Janeiro, Fiocruz.
- Costa, J. & Lorenzo, M. (2009) Biology, diversity and strategies for the monitoring and control of triatomines – Chagas disease vectors. *Memorias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz* 104, 46–51.
- Cui, L., Chang, S.H., Strickman, D. & Rowton, E. (1999) Frequency of Wolbachia infection in laboratory and field sand fly (Diptera: Psychodidae) populations. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association* 15, 571–572.
- de Albuquerque, A.L., Magalhães, T. & Ayres, C.F.J. (2011) High prevalence and lack of diversity of *Wolbachia pipientis* in *Aedes albopictus* populations from Northeast Brazil. *Memorias Instituto Oswaldo Cruz* 106, 773–776.
- de Almeida, F., Moura, A.S., Cardoso, A.F., Winter, C.E., Bijovsky, A.T. & Suesdek, L. (2011) Effects of Wolbachia on fitness of Culex quinquefasciatus (Diptera; Culicidae). Infection, Genetics and Evolution 11, 2138–2143.
- Dean, J.L. & Dobson, S.L. (2004) Characterization of Wolbachia infections and interspecific crosses of Aedes (Stegomyia) polynesiensis and Ae. (Stegomyia) riversi (Diptera: Culicidae). Journal of Medical Entomology 41, 894–900.
- de Sousa, K.B.A., da Silva, T.R.R., Alencar, R.B., Baton, L.A., Naveca, F.G. & Shimabukuro, P.H.F. (2013) 16S rRNA gene-based identification of microbiota associated with the parthenogenetic troglobiont sand fly *Deanemyia maruaga* (Diptera, Psychodidae) from central Amazon, Brazil. *Brazilian Journal of Microbiology* **44**, 325–328.
- Dittmar, K. & Whiting, M.F. (2004) New Wolbachia endosymbionts from Nearctic and Neotropical fleas (Siphonaptera). *Journal of Parasitology* **90**, 953–957.
- Dong, P., Wang, J-J. & Zhao, Z-M. (2006) Infection by Wolbachia bacteria and its influence on the reproduction of the stored-product psocid, *Liposcelis tricolor*. *Journal of Insect Science* 6, 1–7.
- Dumler, J.S., Barbet, A.F., Bekker, C.P.J., Dasch, G.A., Palmer, G. H., Ray, S.C., Rikihisa, Y. & Rurangirwa, F.R. (2001). Reorganization of genera in the families Rickettsiaceae and Anaplasmataceae in the order Rickettsiales: unification of some species of *Ehrlichia* with *Anaplasma*, *Cowdria* with *Ehrlichia* and *Ehrlichia* with *Neorickettsia*, descriptions of six new species combinations and designation of *Ehrlichia equi* and 'HGE agent' as subjective synonyms of *Ehrlichia phagocytophila*. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary *Microbiology* **51**, 2145–2165.
- Duron, O., Bouchon, D., Boutin, S., Bellamy, L., Zhou, L., Engelstädter, J. & Hurst, G.D. (2008) The diversity of reproductive parasites among arthropods: *Wolbachia* do not walk alone. *BMC Biology* 6, 27.
- Espino, C.I., Gómez, T., González, G., do Santos, M.F.B., Solano, J., Sousa, O., Moreno, N., Windsor, D., Ying, A., Vilchez, S. & Osuna, A. (2009) Detection of *Wolbachia* bacteria in multiple organs and feces of the triatomine insect *Rhodnius*

pallescens (Hemiptera, Reduviidae). Applied and Environmental Microbiology **75**, 547–550.

- Faran, M.E. & Linthicum, K.J. (1981) A handbook of the Amazonian species of Anopheles (Nyssorhynchus) (Diptera: Culcidae). Mosquito System 13, 1–81.
- Fu, Y., Gavotte, L., Mercer, D.R. & Dobson, S.L. (2010) Artificial triple Wolbachia infection in Aedes albopictus yields a new pattern of unidirectional cytoplasmic incompatibility. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 76, 5887–5891.
- Fukatsu, T. & Hosokawa, T. (2002) Capsule-transmitted gut symbiotic bacterium of the Japanese common plataspid stinkbug, Megacopta punctatissima. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 68, 389–396.
- Galati, E.A.B. (2003) Classificação de Phlebotominae. pp. 23–175 in Rangel, E.F. & Lainson, R. (Ed.) Flebotomíneos do Brasil. Rio de Janeiro, Fiocruz.
- Gorham, C.H., Fang, Q.Q. & Durden, L.A. (2003) Wolbachia endosymbionts in fleas (Siphonaptera). Journal of Parasitology 89, 283–289.
- Grimaldi, D. & Engel, M.S. (2005) Evolution of the Insects. p. 772. London, England, Cambridge University Press.
- Haegeman, A., Vanholme, B., Jacob, J., Vandekerckhove, T.T. M., Claeys, M., Borgonie, G. & Gheysen, G. (2009) An endosymbiotic bacterium in a plant-parasitic nematode: member of a new Wolbachia supergroup. International Journal for Parasitology 39, 1045–1054.
- Hertig, M. (1936) The rickettsia, Wolbachia pipientis (gen. et sp.n.) and associated inclusions of the mosquito, Culex pipiens. Parasitology 28, 453–486.
- Hertig, M. & Wolbach, S.B. (1924) Studies on rickettsia-like microorganisms in insects. *Journal of Medical Research* 44, 329–374.
- Hilgenboecker, K., Hammerstein, P., Schlattmann, P., Telschow, A. & Werren, J.H. (2008) How many species are infected with Wolbachia? – a statistical analysis of current data. FEMS microbiology letters 281, 215–220.
- Hurst, G.D.D. & Jiggins, F.M. (2000) Male-killing bacteria in insects: mechanisms, incidence, and implications. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 6, 329–336.
- Jeyaprakash, A. & Hoy, M.A. (2000) Long PCR improves Wolbachia DNA amplification: wsp sequences found in 76% of sixty-three arthropod species. *Insect Molecular Biology* 9, 393–405.
- Kamoda, S., Masui, S., Ishikawa, H. & Sasaki, T. (2000) Wolbachia infection and cytoplasmic incompatibility in the cricket *Teleogryllus taiwanemma*. Journal of Experimental Biology 203, 2503–2509.
- Kassem, H.A. & Osman, G. (2007) Maternal transmission of Wolbachia in Phlebotomus papatasi (Scopoli). Annals of Tropical Medicine and Parasitology 101, 435–440.
- Kassem, H.A., Hassan, A.N., Abdel-Hamid, I., Osman, G., El Khalab, E.M. & Madkour, M.A. (2003) Wolbachia infection and the expression of cytoplasmic incompatibility in sandflies (Diptera: Psychodidae) from Egypt. Annals of Tropical Medicine and Parasitology 97, 639–644.
- Kikuchi, Y. & Fukatsu, T. (2003) Diversity of Wolbachia endosymbionts in heteropteran bugs. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 69, 6082–6090.
- Kittayapong, P., Baisley, K.J., Baimai, V. & O'Neill, S.L. (2000) Distribution and diversity of Wolbachia infections in Southeast Asian mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae). Journal of Medical Entomology 37, 340–345.
- Linthicum, K.J. (1988) A revision of the Argyritarsis Section of the subgenus Nyssorhynchus of Anopheles (Diptera: Culicidae). Mosquito System 20, 101–271.

- Lo, N., Casiraghi, M., Salati, E., Bazzocchi, C. & Bandi, C. (2002). How many Wolbachia supergroups exist? Molecular Biology and Evolution 19, 341–346.
- Lo, N., Paraskevopoulos, C., Bourtzis, K., O'Neill, S.L., Werren, J.H., Bordenstein, S.R. & Bandi, C. (2007) Taxonomic status of the intracellular bacterium Wolbachia pipientis. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology 57, 654–657.
- Martins, C., Souza, R.F. & Bueno, O.C. (2012) Presence and distribution of the endosymbiont *Wolbachia* among *Solenopsis* spp. (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) from Brazil and its evolutionary history. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 109, 287–296.
- Matsumoto, K., Izri, A., Dumon, H., Raoult, D. & Parola, P. (2008) First detection of *Wolbachia* spp., including a new genotype, in sand flies collected in Marseille, France. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 45, 466–469.
- McMeniman, C.J., Lane, A.M., Fong, A.W., Voronin, D.A., Iturbe-Ormaetxe, I., Yamada, R., McGraw, E.A. & O'Neill, S.L. (2008 Nov) Appl Environ Microbiol. 74(22):6963–9. doi: 10.1128/AEM.01038-08. Epub 2008 Oct 3.
- McMeniman, C.J., Lane, R.V., Cass, B.N., Fong, A.W.C., Sidhu, M., Wang, Y-F. & O'Neill, S.L. (2009) Stable introduction of a life-shortening Wolbachia infection into the mosquito Aedes aegypti. Science 323, 141–144.
- Morais, S.A., de Almeida, F., Suesdek, L. & Marrelli, M.T. (2012) Low genetic diversity in Wolbachia-infected Culex quinquefasciatus (Diptera: Culicidae) from Brazil and Argentina. Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de São Paulo 54, 325–329.
- Moreira, L.A., Iturbe-Ormaetxe, I., Jeffery, J.A., Lu, G., Pyke, A. T., Hedges, L.M., Rocha, B.C., Hall-Mendelin, S., Day, A., Riegler, M., Hugo, L.E., Johnson, K.N., Kay, B.H., McGraw, E.A., van den Hurk, A.F., Ryan, P.A. & O'Neill, S.L. (2009) A Wolbachia symbiont in Aedes aegypti limits infection with dengue, Chikungunya, and Plasmodium. Cell 139, 1268–1278.
- Nirgianaki, A., Banks, G.K., Frohlich, D.R., Veneti, Z., Braig, H. R., Miller, T.A., Bedford, I.D., Markham, P.G., Savakis, C. & Bourtzis, K. (2003) Wolbachia infections of the whitefly Bemisia tabaci. Current Microbiology 47, 93–101.
- O'Neill, S.L., Giordano, R., Colbert, A.M.E., Karr, T.L. & Robertson, H.M. (1992). 16S rRNA phylogenetic analysis of the bacterial endosymbionts associated with cytoplasmic incompatibility in insects. *Proceedings of the National Academy* of Sciences 89, 2699–2702.
- Ono, M., Braig, H.R., Munstermann, L.E., Ferro, C. & O'Neill, S.L. (2001) *Wolbachia* infections of phlebotomine sand flies (Diptera: Psychodidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology* **38**, 237–241.
- Parvizi, P., Fardid, F. & Soleimani, S. (2013) Detection of a new strain of Wolbachia pipientis in Phlebotomus perfiliewi transcaucasicus, a potential vector of visceral Leishmaniasis in north west of Iran, by targeting the major surface protein gene. Journal of Arthropod-Borne Diseases 7, 46–55.
- Pugedo, H., Barata, R.A., França-Silva, J.C., Silva, J.C. & Dias, E. S. (2005) HP: um modelo aprimorado de armadilha luminosa de sucção para a captura de pequenos insetos. *Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Medicina Tropical* 38, 70–72.
- Rafael, J.A., Melo, G.A.R., de Carvalho, C.J.B., Casari, S.A. & Constantino, R. (2012) Insetos do Brasil: Diversidade e Taxonomia. p. 810. São Paulo, Holos.
- Ricci, I., Cancrini, G., Gabrielli, S., D'Amelio, S. & Favia, G. (2002) Searching for *Wolbachia* (Rickettsiales: Rickettsiaceae) in mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae): large polymerase chain reaction survey and new identifications. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 39, 562–567.

- Rodriguero, M.S., Confalonieri, V.A., Guedes, J.V. & Lanteri, A. A. (2010) Wolbachia infection in the tribe Naupactini (Coleoptera, Curculionidae): association between thelytokous parthenogenesis and infection status. *Insect Molecular Biology* 19, 631–640.
- Rousset, F., Bouchon, D., Pintureau, B., Juchault, P. & Solignac, M. (1992) Wolbachia endosymbionts responsible for various alterations of sexuality in arthropods. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 250, 91–98.
- Rozen, S. & Skaletsky, H. (2000) Primer3 on the www for general users and for biologist programmers. *Methods in Molecular Biology* 132, 365–386.
- Russell, J.A. (2012) The ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) are unique and enigmatic hosts of prevalent *Wolbachia* (Alphaproteobacteria) symbionts. *Myrmecological News* 16, 7–23.
- Russell, J.A., Funaro, C.F., Giraldo, Y.M., Goldman-Huertas, B., Suh, D., Kronauer, D.J.C., Moreau, C.S. & Pierce, N.E. (2012) A veritable menagerie of heritable bacteria from ants, butterflies, and beyond: broad molecular surveys and a systematic review. *PLoS ONE* 7, e51027.
- Schilthuizen, M. & Stouthamer, R. (1997) Horizontal transmission of parthenogenesis-inducing microbes in *Trichogramma* wasps. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 264, 361–366.
- Simões, P.M., Mialdea, G., Reiss, D., Sagot, M-F. & Charlat, S. (2011) Wolbachia detection: an assessment of standard PCR protocols. Molecular Ecology Resources 11, 567–572.
- Skinner, S.W. (1982) Maternally inherited sex ratio in the parasitoid wasp Nasonia vitripennis. Science 215, 1133–1134.
- Stouthamer, R., Breeuwer, J.A.J. & Hurst, G.D.D. (1999) Wolbachia pipientis: microbial manipulator of arthropod reproduction. Annual Review of Microbiology 53, 71–102.
- Thipaksorn, A., Jamnongluk, W. & Kittayapong, P. (2003) Molecular evidence of *Wolbachia* infection in natural populations of tropical odonates. *Current microbiology* 47, 314–318.
- Triplehorn, C.A. & Johnson, N.F. (2005) Introduction to the study of insects. p. 809 *in* Borror, and Delong's Belmont (Ed.). CA, USA, Cengage Learning.

- Untergasser, A., Cutcutache, I., Koressaar, T., Ye, J., Faircloth, B. C., Remm, M. & Rozen, S.G. (2012) Primer3 – new capabilities and interfaces. *Nucleic Acids Research* 40, e115.
- Walker, T., Johnson, P.H., Moreira, L.A., Iturbe-Ormaetxe, I., Frentiu, F.D., McMeniman, C.J., Leong, Y.S., Dong, Y., Axford, J., Kriesner, P., Lloyd, A.L., Ritchie, S.A., O'Neill, S. L. & Hoffmann, A.A. (2011) The *w*Mel Wolbachia strain blocks dengue and invades caged *Aedes aegypti* populations. Nature 2011, 476, 450–453.
- Weeks, A.R. & Breeuwer, J.A.J. (2001) Wolbachia-induced parthenogenesis in a genus of phytophagous mites. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 268, 2245–2251.
- Wenseleers, T., Ito, F., Van Borm, S., Huybrechts, R., Volckaert, F. & Billen, J. (1998) Widespread occurrence of the microorganism Wolbachia in ants. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 265, 1447–1452.
- Werren, J.H. (1997) Biology of Wolbachia. Annual Review of Entomology 42, 587–609.
- Werren, J.H. & Windsor, D.M. (2000) Wolbachia infection frequencies in insects: evidence of a global equilibrium? Proceedings of the Royal Society B 267, 1277–1285.
- Werren, J.H., Zhang, W. & Guo, L.R. (1995a) Evolution and phylogeny of Wolbachia: reproductive parasites of arthropods. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 261, 55–63.
- Werren, J.H., Windsor, D. & Guo, L. (1995b) Distribution of Wolbachia among neotropical arthropods. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 262, 197–204.
- Werren, J.H., Baldo, L. & Clark, M.E. (2008) Wolbachia: master manipulators of invertebrate biology. Nature Reviews Microbiology 6, 741–751.
- West, S.A., Cook, J.M., Werren, J.H. & Godfray, H.C.J. (1998) Wolbachia in two insect host-parasitoid communities. Molecular Ecology 7, 1457–1465.
- Zhou, W., Rousset, F. & O'Neill, S. (1998) Phylogeny and PCR-based classification of *Wolbachia* strains using *wsp* gene sequences. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 265, 509–515.
- Zug, R. & Hammerstein, P. (2012) Still a host of hosts for Wolbachia: analysis of recent data suggests that 40% of terrestrial arthropod species are infected. *PLoS ONE* 7, e38544.