



What happens to the mycorrhizal communities of native and exotic seedlings when *Pseudotsuga menziesii* invades Nothofagaceae forests in Patagonia, Argentina?

María Eugenia Salgado Salomón^{a,b,c,*}, Carolina Barroetaveña^{a,b,c}, María Belén Pildain^{a,b,c}, Emilio Adolfo Williams^b, Mario Rajchenberg^{a,b,c}

^a Centro Forestal CIEFAP, CC 14, 9200, Esquel, Chubut, Argentina

^b Universidad Nacional de la Patagonia S.J. Bosco, Sarmiento 849, Esquel, Chubut, Argentina

^c Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Argentina

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Ectomycorrhizae
Arbuscular mycorrhizae
Richness
Interaction
Invasion
Spore bank

ABSTRACT

Pseudotsuga menziesii is one of the most widely planted conifers in the Patagonian Andes of Argentina, having invading characteristics that are broadly reported. We studied the mycorrhizal status of seedlings along six Nothofagaceae + *P. menziesii* invasion matrices to investigate their role in the invasive process, according to these hypothesis: a) The abundance and richness of EM will be higher in seedlings grown in their own soil; b) In the presence of native EM inoculum, the invasive plant will be associated with generalist mycorrhizae (EM and/or AM), c) AM associations will be more abundant in *P. menziesii* seedlings grown in Interface or native forest soils, d) Mycorrhizal community differences between treatments will alter host fitness (growth and nutritional parameters). Seedlings from *Nothofagus dombeyi*, *N. antarctica*, *Lophozonia alpina*, *L. obliqua* and *Pseudotsuga menziesii* were set up in a soil-bioassay that included soils from non-invaded Nothofagaceae forests, pure *P. menziesii* plantations, and the interface between both. *Pseudotsuga menziesii* seedlings showed a decreasing, although never null, ectomycorrhizal (EM) colonization pattern from plantations to non-invaded forests, mainly with exotic EM species. *Hebeloma mesophaeum* and *Wilcoxina* sp. 1, two EM species with cosmopolitan distribution, were found to be shared by both tree species. *Hebeloma hiemale* and *Wilcoxina* sp. 1, common mycorrhizal partners of *P. menziesii* in Patagonia although not registered from Nothofagaceae forest, were found to be associated with *N. antarctica*, being the first report for both fungal species. *Pseudotsuga menziesii* seedlings showed the ability to form different arbuscular mycorrhiza (AM) colonization types (*Paris-*, *Arum-*, Both- and Intermediate-types) depending on the treatments, with significantly higher presence of Intermediate-type in the Interface treatment, where colonization was low. The shared EM species and the presence of different AM colonization types imply enhanced possibilities for invasive *P. menziesii* seedlings establishment and development. Seedling features and EM colonization rates evidenced that *P. menziesii* invasion could produce maladaptation (defined as a relative decline in host fitness due to altered mycorrhizal communities from native settings) of mycorrhizal communities, seriously injuring native ecosystem.

1. Introduction

One of the most perplexing questions of ecology is how some plants, when moved or introduced to new areas for productive purposes, can surpass the development of native species and be more abundant than in their natural range (Blossey and Nötzold, 1995; Elton, 1958; Hierro et al., 2005). Given the facts that the majority of plants depend at least on one fungal mutualism (Brundrett, 2009; Núñez and Dickie, 2014),

and mutualistic interactions can prevent or facilitate biological invasions (Richardson et al., 2008; Núñez et al., 2009; Spence et al., 2011), a better understanding of invasion on plant communities requires a consideration of the role of fungal partner(s) in the symbiosis (Schnoor et al., 2011).

During the last decade several authors have warned about the invasive capability of *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Mirb.) Blanco in native Nothofagaceae forests in Patagonia, Argentina (Núñez et al., 2009;

* Corresponding author. MESS, CC 14, Esquel, Chubut, Argentina.

E-mail addresses: mesalgadosalomon@ciefap.org.ar (M.E. Salgado Salomón), cbarroetavena@ciefap.org.ar (C. Barroetaveña), mbpildain@ciefap.org.ar (M.B. Pildain), emilioadolfowilliams@gmail.com (E.A. Williams), mrajchenberg@ciefap.org.ar (M. Rajchenberg).

Table 1
Sampling sites, with indication of matrix type, maximum effective recruitment distance (ERD), transect length, main understory species and sites features.

Sites	GPS point	Matrix type	ERD (m) Transect length (m)	Understory species ^a		Treatment	AM SD ^b	AP ^c	MT ^d	SpH ^e	OM ^f	PC ^g	TN ^h	ST ⁱ	EC ^j	CaC ^k	MgC ^l	KC ^m	NaC ⁿ
				ERD (m)	Transect length (m)														
Corcovado	Lat.: -43.63, Long.: -71.44	<i>P. menziesii</i> - N. <i>P. antarctica</i>	55/235	COSP, SCPA, LOHI, FAIM, MACH, CYSC, RUAC, ACPI, ACSP, POLI, POLA, HOSP, FRCH, OSCH, OBAN, RUAD.	Forest Interface	16 18	810 810	9 9	5.81 6.49	18.5 13.6	21 33	0.43 0.66	Sandy loam	0.09 0.20	6.80 4.50	3.00 6.25	0.30 0.53	1.30 1.00	
Foyel	Lat.: -41.67, Long.: -71.45	<i>P. menziesii</i> - N. <i>P. antarctica</i>	86.4/266.4	SCPA, LOHI, MABO, MACH, CHCU, MUHA, VISP, FRCH, BEBU, MUDE, POLI, FEAR, BRAU, OSCH, ACPI.	Forest Interface	19.6 26	1490 1490	9 9.58	5.87 6.49	21.7 12.2	25 34	0.47 0.47	Sandy loam	0.14 0.11	6.80 16.00	0.80 7.50	0.90 0.91	0.80 0.80	
ENFORSA	Lat.: -41.23, Long.: -71.42	<i>P. menziesii</i> - N. <i>P. antarctica</i>	78.2/258.2	SCPA, MACH, LOHI, EMC0, BEBU, OSCH, POLI, POLA, FEAR, BRAU, FRCH, VISP, MUDE, PLLA, RUAD, MUHA, ACPI, TRRE.	Forest Interface	18 21.6	1490 1490	9.58 5.13	5.26 17.4	17.1 31	18 10.6	0.67 1.3	Sandy loam	0.08 0.18	9.80 8.75	0.60 5.75	0.90 0.51	0.90 0.90	
Isla Victoria	Lat.: -40.97, Long.: -71.53	<i>P. menziesii</i> - N. <i>P. dombeyi</i>	218.6/398.6	BEBU, RUAD, MACH, VISP, MUHA, SCPA, ARCH, LOHI, AUCH, LUAP, CHCU, MUDE, POLI, POLA, FEAR, BRAU, ROEG.	Forest Interface	8.8 4.4	1544 1544	8.68 8.68	6.32 6.07	9.6 12.9	22 35	0.32 0.46	Sandy loam	0.06 0.09	16.30 14.75	8.30 6.00	0.90 0.76	0.90 0.90	
Est. Quechuaquina	Lat.: -40.15, Long.: -71.59	<i>P. menziesii</i> - L. <i>P. dипina</i> - L.	44.61/224.61	CHCU, MACH, ARCH, MUHA, TAOF, SCPA, POLI, POLA, FEAR, BRAU, TRRE, OSCH, FRCH, CATH, CIVU, ALAU, RUAD, BEBU, RUAC, AUCH, MOPE.	Forest Interface	18 15.2	1834 1834	12.2 12.2	5.17 5.67	16.1 13.1	22 29	0.36 0.62	Sandy loam	0.44 0.19	9.80 8.00	3.50 6.75	0.40 0.43	2.10 0.60	
Est. Newmeyer	Lat.: -40.12, Long.: -71.32	<i>P. menziesii</i> - N. <i>P. dombeysi</i>	19/199	SCPA, SOAC, SASP, PRCE, MACH, LOHI, MUHA, OSCH, RUAD, POLI, FEAR, BRAU.	Forest Interface	25.6 21.6	1834 2258	12.2 12.2	5.5 5.7	13.2 26.5	37 33	0.33 0.54	Sandy loam	0.26 0.32	12.00 11.30	7.00 5.30	0.50 0.40	1.80 1.00	
					Plantation	19.2	2258	12.2	5.57	8.25	35	0.31	Sandy loam	0.24	12.50	5.25	1.03	0.90	
					Plantation	19.2	2258	12.2	6.79	9.8	12	0.28	Loamy sand	0.08	17.50	2.30	0.20	1.20	

^a Understory species: ACPI: *Acaena pinnatifida*; ACSP: *A. splendens*; ALUA: *Alstroemeria aurea*; ARCH: *Astrocedrus chilensis*; AUCH: *Aristotelia chilensis*; BIBU: *Berberis buxifolia*; BRAU: *Bromus auleticus*; CATH: *Carduus thoenneri*; CHCU: *Chusquea culeou*; CIVU: *Cirsium vulgare*; COSP: *Colletia spinosissima*; CYSC: *Cytisus scoparius*; EMCO: *Embothrium coccineum*; FAIM: *Fabiana imbricata*; FEAR: *Festuca argentina*; FRCH: *Fragaria chiloensis*; HOSP: *Hordium sp.*; LOHI: *Lomatia hispida*; LUAP: *Luma apiculata*; MABO: *Magnus boaria*; MACH: *M. chubutensis*; MOPE: *Montia perfoliata*; MUDE: *Mutisia decurrens*; MUHA: *Muehlenbeckia hastulata*; OBAN: *Obione andina*; OSCH: *Osmorrhiza chilensis*; POLA: *Polygonum avicinatum*; POLI: *P. ligulata*; PRCE: *Plantago lanceolata*; RUAD: *Rumex acetosa*; RUAC: *Rosa glazanieria*; RUAD: *Ruhmora adiantiformis*; SASP: *Sambucus sp.*; SCPA: *Schinus patagonicus*; SOAC: *Sorbus acuata*; TAOF: *Taraxacum officinale*; TRRE: *Trifolium repens*; VISP: *Vicia sp.*

^b AM SD: AM spore density (spores/100 gr. Of dry soil).

^c AP: annual precipitation (mm).

^d MT: mean temperature (°C).

^e SpH: soil pH.

^f OM: organic matter (%).

^g PC: soil phosphorous content (mg/kg of soil).

^h TN: total soil nitrogen content (%).

ⁱ ST: soil texture.

^j EC: Electrical conductivity (ds/m).

^k Calcium content (meq/100 g).

^l Magnesium content (meq/100 g).

^m Potassium content (meq/100 g).

ⁿ Sodium content (meq/100 g).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8846462>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8846462>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)