Exploring Rubiaceae fungal endophytes across contrasting tropical forests, tree tissues, and developmental stages

Humberto Castillo-González[1, ‡], Jason C. Slot[2], Stephanie Yarwood[3], Priscila Chaverri[4,5]

[1]Department of Plant Science and Landscape Architecture, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742, USA.

[2]Department of Plant Pathology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 43210.

[3]Department of Environmental Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742, USA.

[4]Department of Natural Sciences, Bowie State University, Bowie, Maryland, 20715.

[5]Centro de Investigaciones en Productos Naturales (CIPRONA) and Escuela de Biología, Universidad de Costa Rica, 11501-2060, San José, Costa Rica.

Current address: ‡ Université Marie et Louis Pasteur, CNRS, Chrono-environnement (UMR 6249), F-25200 Montbéliard, France

Corresponding author: Priscila Chaverri, phone: +1 (301) 860-3338, email:

pchaverri@bowiestate.edu

ORCIDs: H. Castillo-González: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3460-8404; J. Slot:

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6731-3405; S. Yarwood: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4593-7908; P.

Chaverri: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8486-6033

Abstract

Fungal endophytes play a pivotal role in tropical forest dynamics, influencing plant fitness through

growth stimulation, disease suppression, stress tolerance, and nutrient mobilization. This study

investigates the effects of region, leaf developmental stage, and tissue type on endophyte

communities in tropical plants. Young and mature leaves were collected from 47 Rubiaceae

species, and sapwood from 23 species, in old-growth forests of Golfito and Guanacaste, Costa

Rica. Fungal diversity and composition were assessed through metabarcoding of the ITS2 nrDNA

region. Most identified ASVs belonged to the phylum Ascomycota. The orders Botryosphaeriales

and Glomerellales significantly contributed to endophytic assemblages, without detection of host-

specific communities. We observed significant differences in species richness across regions,

confirming distinct compositions through beta diversity. No statistically significant variances were

found between mature and juvenile leaf tissues. In contrast, leaves exhibited richer and more

diverse assemblages than sapwood. As plants experienced diverse environments over time and

space, our results may be influenced by changing structural and chemical properties through

ontogeny. Given the potential impact of these fungi on agricultural and forest ecosystems, ongoing

research is crucial to discern the roles of hosts, endophytes, and other ecological mechanisms in

apparent colonization patterns.

Keywords: Costa Rica, ecology, endophytes, fungi, metabarcoding, phytobiome, phyllosphere,

Rubiaceae.

INTRODUCTION

Neotropical forests, which support a high diversity of terrestrial plants (1), host an extraordinary

mosaic of microbial assemblages within plant tissues, driven by their provision of labile nutrients

and niche space (2-5). These microbes play crucial roles in influencing host plants and driving

forest dynamics, engaging in interactions that range from mutualism and commensalism to

pathogenicity (6,7). Among these microbial groups, endophytes—microorganisms that reside in

internal plant tissues without causing disease—are particularly noteworthy. Fungal endophytes

offer numerous benefits to their plant hosts, such as enhanced immunity, improved growth,

resistance to abiotic stressors, and the production of bioactive compounds (8,9). However, despite

the significant diversity of fungal endophytes colonizing leaves and stems (4), they are

traditionally understudied compared to root endophytes, mycorrhizae, and free-living forms.

Consequently, much remains underexplored regarding their roles in natural ecosystems and their

potential applications in improving crop health.

The mechanisms by which endophytic fungi colonize plant tissues remain a topic of

research interest (1–3). Understanding the dynamics that determine their distributions and the

environmental constraints shaping their assemblages is crucial. Evidence shows that broad-scale

environmental factors such as temperature, elevation, precipitation (4,5), and forest type (6)

significantly influence community composition. Additionally, genetic and geographic distance

among host trees (7–9), as well as host growth stage and tissue type (10–12), also play crucial

roles. Given these factors, endophytes that exhibit recurrence or specificity may play a significant

ecological role in forests (13,14). Moreover, under the premise that high diversity maintains the

overall integrity of an ecosystem (i.e., biological insurance hypothesis *sensu* Naeem & Li (15))

the hidden diversity of endophytes can enhance the fitness of individual trees and, by extension,

shape forest composition and demography (16). Efforts to understand endophytic diversity are

necessary for predicting their function in association with different tissues, hosts, specific

environmental conditions, or entire ecosystems. In this sense, tropical forests offer an ideal setting

for studying these patterns and interactions.

Rubiaceae is one of the largest and most complex families of angiosperms, comprising over

13,000 species that range from weedy herbs to large trees and occupy many habitats and

biogeographical regions across all continents (17). However, they are predominantly found in the

neotropics (18,19). In Costa Rica, historical data (20), listed 89 genera and 458 species present,

but recent updates suggest that this count is underestimated. For example, the genus *Palicourea*

alone, previously reported with 44 species, is now known to include 91 (21,22). This increased

knowledge highlights the family's extensive diversity. Noteworthy within Rubiaceae are several

genera of cultural and economic importance such as *Cinchona*, *Coffea*, *Genipa,* and *Psychotria*.

Characterizing the fungal endophyte communities within Rubiaceae and the factors

shaping their assemblages could provide unique insights into understanding their niche preferences

in tropical forests. In this study, we investigated diversity patterns across a broad range of plant

species, expecting to observe a vast taxonomic and functional diversity (7). We hypothesized that

fungal endophytic communities would differ: (i) between forest regions due to varying

environmental conditions; (ii) between individuals but showing similarities within closely related

plants; and (iii) within a single tree, with differences between young and mature leaves, as well as

between leaves and sapwood, exhibiting tissue-specific distributions. To further refine our

hypotheses, we aimed to understand which fungal groups drove these differences by investigating

whether certain endophytes exhibit cosmopolitan behavior or have significant associations with

specific environmental conditions or host characteristics.

METHODS

Study site

Old-growth forests from two regions in Costa Rica were sampled. Specific sampling locations

classified by climatic subregions are shown in Figure 1. Golfito, in the South Pacific, was visited

in April 2017. All of the sampling sites in this area are characterized by typical tropical rainforest

conditions, with no defined dry season, intense rainfall, and dense evergreen vegetation spanning

two to three layers (23). In May 2017, sampling was conducted in Guanacaste, specifically in two

distinct regions (North and North Pacific), comprising three subclimates: seasonal dry forest, semi-

deciduous forest influenced by monsoons, and the forested slopes of a volcano, influenced by

surrounding mountain systems (23). Climate data, including mean annual temperature, mean

annual precipitation and elevation were obtained from the WorldClim database (Table 1) (24).

Sampling

Sampling of leaves and sapwood was conducted following a modified version of the protocol

described by Gazis & Chaverri (25). Young and mature healthy leaves from 50 Rubiaceae

individuals (distributed in 47 species from 27 genera, 10 tribes and 3 subfamilies) were collected

(Supplementary Table S1). The taxonomy was assessed by a local botanist, and vouchers of all

individuals were deposited in the University of Costa Rica Herbarium (USJ). We sampled plants

as we encountered them, aiming to include as many different species as possible. For each

individual sampled, fully expanded leaves were collected from three randomly selected branches,

chosen from various parts of the crown. To differentiate developmental stages, we selected one

newly emerged and one mature leaf per branch, totaling six leaves per plant.

For 23 of the individuals, which were woody trees with a minimum trunk diameter-at-

breast-height of approximately 10 cm, a sterilized knife was used to cut a sliver of outer bark at

shoulder height to expose the alburnum and one piece of living sapwood tissue ca. 30×5 mm was

excised from the exposed area. All collected samples were put in a clean plastic bag and placed on

ice for transport to the field workstation for immediate processing. A leaf section of ca. 20×4 mm

was cut and surface-sterilized using sequential immersions in a 2% sodium hypochlorite solution

(1 min), 70% ethanol (30 sec), and sterile distilled water (30 sec). Finally, leaves were dried with

autoclaved tissue paper and stored in microtubes containing silica gel before being transferred on

ice to the laboratory for DNA extraction (26). Sapwood samples were briefly singed with a flame

to eliminate dust and potential surface contaminants introduced during handling, and then placed

in microtubes.

Sequencing

Samples were transferred to a pre-filled 500-micron Garnet and a 6-mm Zirconium Grinding

Satellite bead tube (OPS Diagnostics LLC, New Jersey, USA) and ground using a FastPrep® bead

mill (MP Biomedicals, Santa Ana, California, USA). Each tube was treated to a grinding cycle of

speed: 6.0 m/s for 45 seconds, or until no visually recognizable fragments remained. Each sample

(tissue section) represented a biological replicate, and no technical replicates were performed.

Total DNA was extracted using the commercial kit Qiagen DNeasy Plant Mini Kit® according to

the manufacturer's instructions (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Genomic DNA was sent to Naturalis

Biodiversity Centre (NBC, Leiden, The Netherlands) for targeted amplicon metagenomics

(metabarcoding) of the ITS2 nrDNA region using Ion PGM Torrent™ technology (Thermo Fisher

Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). The primers used were fITS7 and ITS4, which are fungal specific

and with less amplification of plant ITS (27). To ensure accuracy in downstream analyses, a

positive control with a non-Costa Rican *Russula galochroa* DNA and a negative control (blank)

were included throughout. According to NBC, PCR was performed in a BioRad C1000

thermocycler (Hercules, CA, USA), quality of the PCR products was checked with a QIAxcel

(Qiagen), PCR products were cleaned with NucleoMag NGS Clean-up and Size Select magnetic

beads (Takara Bio Inc., Japan), the pool was run in an Agilent Bioanalyzer (Santa Clara, CA, USA)

using a DNA High Sensitivity chip and amplified on the Ion One Touch system (Ion PGM™ Hi-

Q^{TM} View OT2 kit), the results were measured on the Qubit (ThermoFisher) for the Ion Sphere^{TM}

Quality Control kit (ThermoFisher), and finally the sequence run was done on the Ion PGM Torrent

using the Ion PGM^{TM} Hi-Q^{TM} View Sequencing kit. The resulting raw data (fastq files) are

deposited in GenBank under the BioProject identifier PRJNA889378.

Fungal community analyses

ASV classification and taxa assignment. Primers and barcodes were trimmed from each read

using the command line tool 'cutadapt' [28]. Subsequent processing was performed in RStudio

v. 2022.12.0+353 [29] with R v. 4.0.3, employing the DADA2 v1.18.0 pipeline [30]. Raw

reads were subjected to data curation aimed at identifying and removing spurious contigs

through various filtering processes. For instance, chimeric sequences were removed. Reads with

total counts below 0.001% of the total reads and singletons were excluded. Quality filtering

included a maximum expected error rate of 2 for both forward and reverse reads, and sequences

were trimmed to a minimum length of 100 bp [36]. Amplicon Sequence Variants (ASVs) were

assigned taxonomically by comparing them to the UNITE database [36] v8.3 [31] training set

from the DECIPHER package, v 2.18.1 [32]. Only sequences classified as fungi were retained.

Additional independent filtering steps included the exclusion of samples with total read counts

below 0.001% of the total reads, and taxa with low variance across samples (variance threshold

of 1e-5). A prevalence threshold of 1% of total samples was applied, retaining taxa appearing in

at least this proportion of samples. The accuracy of the pipeline was validated using the positive

controls, and sequences from negative controls were removed to ensure dataset integrity.

Diversity and community structure analyses. Statistical analyses and plotting were conducted

using the phyloseq v1.38.0 (33), vegan v2.5.7 (34), microbiome v1.12.0 (35) and ggplot2

v3.4.1 (36) packages. Endophyte alpha diversity for each dataset was estimated using the

Shannon, Simpson, and Chao1 indices for each variable and then transformed to Hill Effective

Species Numbers (37,38) for comparisons by Mann-Whitney U test. This transformation

integrates species richness and abundance distribution, adjusts sensitivity to rare versus common

species, and provides a consistent measure of diversity (43,44). It also allows for more robust

comparisons across sites with varying numbers of species and levels of evenness. To visualize

community patterns (beta diversity), non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) was

performed using the 'metaMDS' function from the vegan package with the 'bray' method and

100 random starts. For statistical analyses, data were normalized by total count per sample,

converting them into proportions (relative abundances), and Bray-Curtis distances were

calculated with the 'vegdist' function. Homogeneity of dispersion was assessed with the

'betadisper' function, followed by a permutation test using 'permutest'. Statistical differences in

endophyte assemblages across variables (forest regions, tissue types, developmental stages) were

evaluated with the 'adonis2' function for PERMANOVA.

Relative abundance at the family level was calculated. We retained groups contributing to

more than 1% of the average relative abundance across the six categories: forest regions (Golfito

and Guanacaste), tissue types (leaf and sapwood) and developmental stages (young and mature).

These groups are referred to as the 'top families' in downstream analyses. The overall prevalence

(i.e., the number of samples in which the taxa appear) of these families was computed. To estimate

how strongly they deviate from a random preference among the plant partners available at the

study sites, we calculated the d' index of specialization using the bipartite v 2.18 package (39),

function 'dfun'. ASVs were statistically classified as generalists or specialists based on their

habitat affinity using a multinomial species classification method (CLAMtest) in vegan. Indicator

taxa (ASVs with p-values < 0.05) from the six categories were identified using the 'multipatt'

function in the indicspecies v1.7.12 package (40). Methods regarding Species Accumulation

Curves, Mantel Correlation Tests, Distance Decay, Canonical Correlation Analysis and the

assignment of functional traits are described in Supplementary Methods S2.

RESULTS

A total of 6,467,267 reads passed the quality control filters. The mean number of sequences per

sample was 58,465 for leaves and 26,989 for sapwood. We identified 3,218 putative taxa (ASVs)

belonging to at least 232 different genera (Supplementary Table S3). ASV identification rate was

67%, 50% and 33% at the order, family, and genus levels, respectively. The species richness or

number of unique ASVs recovered per sample (triplicates, in the case of leaf tissue) ranged from

2 to 337, with a mean of 67.

All datasets had a high number of single occurrences, and no asymptote was reached in the

species accumulation curves (Supplementary Figure S4) indicating that the datasets are

incomplete, and the number of samples was not sufficient in capturing the expected endophyte

diversity (Hill's q = 0). However, when focusing on dominant species only (Hill's q = 2), all curves,

except for sapwood, reached a plateau.

Fungal endophyte assemblages differed between forest regions and tissue types (Table 2).

Samples originating from Golfito exhibited consistently higher alpha diversity indices compared

to those from Guanacaste, as supported by a Hill numbers comparison (q=0,1,2) that demonstrated

statistical differences for q=0 ($p \leq 0.05$) and q=1 ($p \leq 0.01$). Notably, leaf and sapwood tissues

were found to harbor distinct fungal communities, with leaves exhibiting significantly richer

assemblages ($p \leq 0.001$ in all instances). Regarding the developmental stage, the taxa richness

index (q=0) was significantly higher in mature leaves compared to new leaves. In contrast, the

other two diversity indices (q=1, q=2) showed slightly greater diversity in new leaves, though these

differences were not statistically significant.

Using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) we observed differences between

location and dispersion of points, with Guanacaste samples appearing more scattered (Figure 2A);

three outliers were removed for visualization purposes. Community dissimilarities between these

variables were corroborated via PERMANOVA, which indicated significant separation in fungal

assemblages when comparing between the different forest regions ($p < 0.001$). In the case of tissue

type, points from leaf and bark communities were dispersed differently in the NMDS analysis

(Figure 2B) and presented significant heteroscedasticity ($p < 0.01$), which has been shown to affect

PERMANOVA testing ($p < 0.001$). No clear location effect was observed in the NMDS plot;

however, the dispersion of the points varied: leaf samples converged on the interior of the cluster

while sapwood samples, being more variable, were found mostly around it; two samples were

removed for better visualization (figure 2B). Considering just the leaves at the two different

development stages, no effect was detected, there was a high overlap between the fungal

communities (Figure 2C), and the PERMANOVA indicated no significant differences (p =

0.8122). Fungal endophyte communities did not cluster based on individual plants or at any higher

taxonomic level (i.e., genus, tribe, subfamily). The pattern for tribe is shown in Figure 2C, other

levels of taxonomy are depicted in Supplementary Figure S5.

The phylum Ascomycota was the most abundant, representing 83% of all fungal ASVs.

Within this group, the most abundant and prevalent classes were Sordariomycetes followed by

Dothideomycetes. Tremellomycetes and Agaricomycetes were the most abundant and prevalent

Basidiomycota, making up 8.2% of the ASVs. We characterized endophytic assemblages

dominated by a few abundant dominant taxa and many rare taxonomic groups. For example, we

identified 156 different families (Supplementary Table S6) from which Glomerellaceae,

Phyllostictaceae and Mycosphaerellaceae composed the bulk of biodiversity (45.14%) present

within the endophytic assemblages (Figure 3).

The most abundant fungal families were not the most prevalent in all cases (e.g.,

Xylariaceae), but they tended to correspond (Figure 3). The top 12 families comprised 59% of the

total relative abundance. With the d' index, we determined that the most prevalent and abundant

families (i.e., Glomerellaceae and Phyllostictaceae) had values closer to 0 (no specialization). This

indicates that members of these fungal families interact with a broad host range. In contrast,

Irpicaceae, had a low prevalence and presented a value closer to 1 (perfect specialist). Interesting

is the case of Apiosporaceae, that despite a low prevalence, showed little specialization. The major

fungal families were similar between Golfito and Guanacaste (Figure 3), but some of the groups

that presented very low abundance in Golfito, such as Schizoporaceae and Irpicaceae, were more

abundant in Guanacaste and such preference was highlighted by the CLAM test (Figure 3).

We did not find indicator species among the top 12 families in the sapwood communities.

In contrast, some indicator species were identified for leaves. For example, Phyllostictaceae,

despite being the second most abundant and prevalent family overall, was not found in sapwood.

Sporocadaceae and Nectriaceae, both of which had very low abundance in the foliar tissues,

comprised around 10% of the relative abundance in sapwood samples. As a matter of fact, most

families with less than 5% relative abundance in leaves clearly presented higher values in sapwood,

except for Diaporthaceae and Xylariaceae. The CLAM test classified most families as specialists

in one or the other habitat, except for Cladosporiaceae, which happened to be the only group that

did not show habitat preference in any of the evaluated instances (Figure 3). Interestingly, some

of the families preferred sapwood over leaves but displayed a preference for a developmental stage

when found in foliar tissues: Schizoporaceae, Irpicaceae, and Apiosporaceae. Within

developmental stage, less than half of the families showed habitat preference or specialization and

only two were recognized as indicators for mature leaves and none for new. Some of the families

exhibited habitat preference in all the evaluated instances, for example, Mycosphaerellaceae and

Xylariaceae preferred Golfito, leaf tissue, and mature stages; while Schizoporaceae and Irpicaceae

preferred Guanacaste, sapwood, and new leaves (Figure 3).

DISCUSSION

The diversity of fungi found in the leaves and sapwood of tropical plants belonging to the

Rubiaceae family did not show discernible patterns of specific host affiliation. Highly abundant

community members seemed to be consistently present within the microbiome across different

habitats and diverse host species. Fungal communities in leaves appear to be stable in early tissue

development and persist in mature stages. As expected, tissues contained distinct habitats for

symbionts. The mechanisms of community assemblage at regional scales are not clear. We found

weak evidence for dispersal limitation and environmental partitioning; therefore, the observed

patterns may be a result of unknown environmental variables that are correlated with the different

geographic locations.

Cosmopolitan fungi dominate hyperdiverse endophyte communities

A fungus' niche preference is largely determined by the interaction between genotype and

environment (41). Therefore, it can vary among forests that differ in plant community composition

and biogeographic and environmental conditions. Communities of endophytes with a broad host

range may be completely shaped by the environment, while for those with host restrictions the

plant might exert a stronger influence (42). Results from this study support previous findings that

in high-diversity natural systems, such as tropical forests, the endophyte communities are typically

composed of numerous taxa of low relative abundances (43), and tend to be dominated by few

fungal taxa with a broad host range. The latter are predicted to have a widespread availability of

suitable partners, displaying loose host affiliation, and occupying geographically and

taxonomically disparate plant hosts (44–46), patterns also found in this study (Figure 3).

Host jumps or shifts by microbial symbionts usually occur among closely related host taxa

and are driven by the exploitation of new adaptive zones (47). Endophytes may display host

preferences at the plant family (48) or order (49) level. In our study, we focused exclusively on

samples from a single plant family, Rubiaceae, and found that taxonomy did not predict fungal

community clustering (Figure 2C, Supplementary Figure S5). However, this does not exclude the

possibility of host effects in other contexts, at a finer scale (e.g., within genus) or with more

individuals per plant species (50,51).

299 Forest regions shape fungal endophytic communities

The results of our study support the hypothesis that fungal endophytic communities differ between

forest regions. Samples from the tropical rainforests of Golfito exhibited higher alpha diversity

compared to those from Guanacaste (Table 2), which includes sampling sites classified as tropical

dry forest. Notably, these ecosystems experience significant seasonal changes, including extended

periods of drought. These shifting conditions lead to the presence of semi-deciduous trees, which

alters the availability of host tissues and results in fluctuations in endophyte activity and diversity.

For instance, some taxa may become dormant during dry periods, potentially leading to an

underestimation of the local pool of endophytes. The temporal distribution of endophytes,

documented in both temperate (52) and, more recently, tropical forests (44), supports this

phenomenon. Differences between the regions were also evident in community similarity.

Moreover, our analysis revealed that endophytic communities in Guanacaste exhibited a more

scattered pattern, suggesting higher intra-regional variability among those samples (Figure 2A).

This observation aligns with and may be related to the variability in environmental conditions

across the region (Table 1; Figure 1).

The environment can serve as a filter, regulating which particular taxa can colonize and

persist within hosts (42,53). However, in this study, we did not find strong associations between

environmental variables (i.e., elevation, temperature, or precipitation) and fungal community

composition (Supplementary Figure S7, Supplementary Table S8). This suggests that

environmental factors may not be the primary drivers of community variation. Instead, biotic

processes such as priority effects may be more predictive of community structure. For instance,

horizontally transmitted endophytes must compete with already established horizontally or

vertically transmitted microbes, thereby restricting the pool of species able to colonize a given

host.

Additionally, neutral processes, such as dispersal limitation and ecological drift, also play

a significant role in the distribution pattern of endophytes (54–56). Successful host colonization

and taxa distribution depend on factors such as dispersal opportunities and movement restrictions

across different environments (57). Consequently, the similarity in species composition between

ecological communities typically decreases with increasing distance, a phenomenon known as

distance decay (58). Although dispersal limitation is not considered strong for endophytes,

distance decay has been reported with varying magnitudes (59–61). Our study found a marginally

significant interaction between geographic location and community structuring (Supplementary

Table S8). Moreover, the endophytic communities were more strongly correlated with the

geographic distance than environmental parameters (Supplementary Table S8), despite no clear

evidence of distance decay (Supplementary Figure S9).

Both Golfito and Guanacaste shared the same dominant generalist taxa (Figure 3),

characterized by high prevalence and abundance across a variety of plant hosts. In contrast, some

fungi exhibited specialist behavior, such as Irpicaceae in Guanacaste samples, and Apiosporaceae

in Golfito. This suggests that while generalists are broadly distributed, specialized interactions are

more localized, likely due to habitat- and niche- specific factors. For instance, the availability of

suitable plant hosts in a given ecosystem may limit the geographical distribution these specialized

taxa (57,62). This differentiation underscores the role of niche processes in shaping fungal

communities, leading to variations in both taxonomic composition and functional traits. At this

broad spatial scale, environmental heterogeneity between regions may influence trait values more

than to taxonomy, producing community variations that are not solely explained by taxonomic

classifications (63,64).

Tissue type predicts endophyte community variations

The phyllosphere is a dynamic and heterogeneous environment, whose surfaces are often

considered relatively oligotrophic (65). The ability to colonize plant tissues is largely conditioned

by complex physical-chemical interactions with their hosts. For example, fungi must pass through

several lines of defense (66) and resist the host production of antimicrobial compounds (54,67).

Results from the present study support our hypothesis, and previous studies, that endophyte

communities are structured by plant tissue (43,68,69). We observed large differences in

endophytes between leaves and sapwood. Leaves harbored more robust and rich assemblages than

sapwood, although the latter is considered rich in organic nutrients and is a target of many different

organisms (70). We observed little overlap between foliar and sapwood endophytes, suggesting

spatial heterogeneity across plant compartments (71–73).

While most of the top families of fungi were present in both tissues, they differed in relative

abundance and were not dominated by the same taxa. The most abundant family in sapwood was

Sporocadaceae, and not surprisingly, both families belonging to the Basidiomycota in the top 12

families preferred sapwood according to the CLAM test (Figure 3). In the present study,

Phyllostictaceae, the second most abundant family on the dataset was not detected in sapwood,

indicating an affinity of this taxon towards foliar tissues. Meanwhile, other families (i.e.,

Nectriaceae, Apiosporaceae and Irpicaceae) almost imperceptible in leaves, presented higher

abundance in sapwood, suggesting that tissue type correlates with selective enrichments of specific

endophytes (74,75), and some fungi may not be able to persist or disperse between different tissues.

Specificity of fungal endophytes in bark has been previously reported (76). These fungi

hold great but underappreciated ecological significance, for they inhabit large surfaces often

targeted by insects and pathogens (77,78) and represent a passive reservoir of spores and latent life

that will eventually play an important role in wood decay dynamics (79,80). Several studies on

endophytic community profiles suggest broad correlations between diversity and select defense

mechanisms in bark (81), e.g., reaction zones, the vascular cambium, and the transpiration stream

in the sapwood (82). Furthermore, the presence of certain fluids, such as sap, can also act as a

barrier depending on their levels of specific compounds (83,84). The sapwood of trees consists of

dead xylem cells, and the presence of air-filled vessels and pits can create physical barriers that

limit endophyte movement within the tissue (85,86). Similarly, the negative pressure within the
xylem can hinder endophytes from colonizing this tissue (87), as they may not be able to penetrate
the vessel walls or survive under conditions of low oxygen and nutrient availability and high-water
stress (88,89). Therefore, bark acts as an environmental filter structuring inner bark fungal
communities (79) which might explain the differences in community richness, diversity and
composition observed in this study.

The canopy cover of trees creates dynamic microclimates that affect endophyte distribution
and growth by modifying temperature, humidity, and wind conditions (90–92). Fungi release
spores from within and upon canopies, that are then dispersed onto vegetation and exposed to
various elements (93). During precipitation, for example, natural events such as throughfall and
stemflow transport bioaerosols and spores through different habitats within a plant microbiome,
including bark and leaves (94). The accumulation of endophyte propagules is then influenced by
surface area, as plant structures of various sizes interact differently with rainwater and wind
(95,96). Woody stems can be challenging to saturate with water due to their fiber content,
cylindrical shape and thickness (97,98). Additionally, the large surface area on certain tree species,
often covered in small grooves or ridges, increases the number of accumulation areas, such as
fissures, cracks, tree hollows, and dendrotelmata (99,100). These structures enable the storage of
a vast number of spores and serve as reservoirs for fungi, offering wide niches for their survival
(101). In fact, a recent study found that large water-insoluble particles (e.g., conidia, spores) tend
to accumulate more on bole surfaces than on leaves or branches (102). Although these spaces and
other structures, such as lenticels, may act as entry points for fungal endophytes, complex polymers
in this tissue, including lignin and suberin, pose significant barriers to endophyte colonization
(103–105).

In foliar tissue, water droplets containing spores can adhere to trichomes, epidermal cell

grooves, and the curvature of leaves (94), and use stomata, trichomes, and other structures to enter

the tissue (106–108). However, the hydrophobic nature of the cuticle causes aerial depositions to

be washed off during rainfalls, leading to self-cleaning surfaces (94). Despite leaves being rich in

bioactive compounds with antifungal properties such as phenolics, alkaloids and terpenes

(109,110), endophytes thrive in these environments due to high moisture content, and nutrient

availability.

Leaf developmental stage does not drive endophyte community differences

Generally, newly emerged leaves in woody plants start endophyte-free but rapidly become

colonized by fungal spores (111). In this study, differences in foliar endophyte richness due to leaf

developmental stage (young vs. mature) were not consistent across diversity indices (Table 2). We

predicted that new leaves would present lower endophyte abundance due to hypothetical higher

concentration of chemical defenses (112–114). Ontogeny-related shifts in endophyte diversity

could also be anticipated due to various changes in tissue characteristics, including genetic traits,

chemistry and topology (65), plant hormonal or physiological properties, and physical

characteristics, such as tissue structure and geometry (115). However, it is important to note that

these factors were not directly measured.

Our beta diversity analyses (Figures 2B, 2C) show that leaf developmental stage was not a

strong predictor of the observed community compositions. Defense syndromes in plants are

usually associated to strategies of resource conservation vs resource acquisition (e.g., young vs

mature leaves) (116). In fact, some studies have found large qualitative and quantitative differences

in metabolomic composition between expanding and mature leaves (117) (i.e., Optimal Defense

Theory); however, this is not universally observed (118). Research in tropical trees has found low

variation in defense traits and weak shifts in secondary chemistry during leaf maturation (110).

This aligns with the "grow fast, die fast" hypothesis, which suggests that plants in these biomes

adjust carbon allocation to balance early growth against defenses due to shorter leaf lifespans

(119,120). Similarly, the resource availability hypothesis suggests that plants in resource-limited

environments (e.g., boreal regions) invest more in constitutive defenses than those in resource-rich

habitats (e.g., tropical regions) (121). This implies that plants in the tropics may not necessarily

experience strong selective pressure to evolve higher levels of chemical defense against biotic

threats (122).

Consequently, tropical plants may not exhibit significant variations in the phytochemical

profiles of young versus mature leaves. This could account for the absence of significant

differences in endophyte communities across developmental stages, as we observed no increase in

endophyte relative abundance with tissue maturity. Additionally, both habitats were dominated by

the same families, which can be considered prominent components of foliar endophyte

communities in Rubiaceae tropical plants and are likely to play a significant role in ecosystem

functioning. The CLAM test identified Xylariaceae and Mycosphaerellaceae as the two families

that displayed a preference for the mature leaves' habitat. These families are commonly known as

foliar endophytes, but they also include pathogens, litter decomposers, and wood saprotrophs

(Supplementary Figure S10).

Endophytes interact with both the internal environment of the host plant and the broader

external abiotic conditions, that influence their distribution and functions in complex ways (123).

We observed intriguing patterns in the composition and diversity of foliar endophytes in tropical

Rubiaceae. However, important caveats must be considered when interpreting these findings.

Although our analysis accounted for certain environmental parameters, we did not measure other

significant factors such as shade and light availability (124,125), humidity (126,127), wind (128),

ground topography (129), and soil characteristics (e.g., carbon content, texture, and

physicochemical properties) (130,131). For instance, stable and functional soils, like those of

tropical forests, are likely to host robust microbial reservoirs (132), facilitating the horizontal

transfer of endophytes to the phyllosphere, adding another layer of complexity to plant-endophyte

interactions.

Moreover, when accounting for geographic factors and habitat effects, it is crucial to

acknowledge the potential influence of other unmeasured variables, including forest structure and

composition, plant density (111), tree diversity, climatic gradients (123,133), and landscape-scale

elements (134). Temporal factors, such as forest succession and seasonal variations also contribute

(135–137). Moreover, the host's age (138), genetics, architecture and spatial structure (111,139)

introduce additional complexity that we did not capture. Nonetheless, the diverse nature of the

observed endophytes implies that no single ecological effect is universal. While the determined

patterns may be constrained by the specific environmental and climatic factors herein considered,

endophyte-plant interactions represent a novel dimension of niche differentiation for coexisting

tree species (132), still highly unexplored and nuanced by the intricate and context-dependent

trade-offs shaping these communities.

With the imminent threat of climate change and the constant challenges in ecosystem

management and agriculture, endophytes have the potential to transform the way we think about

and manage plant stress resistance (140–142). Understanding their distributions and functioning

in association with different host plants and ecosystems, and their response to environmental

disturbances, is key to predicting the potential impact of many of these fungi in managed and

natural ecosystems. How to translate this acquired knowledge into practical applications for forest

conservation and agricultural practices remains a challenge. Many cryptic and undiscovered taxa,

whose ecological roles are still unknown, await exploration. In the future, functional group and

single trait approaches could offer valuable insights into how ecosystem and plant traits influence

endophytic fungi, and how these microorganisms, in turn, affect host and ecosystem functions. It

is imperative to continue the efforts to understand the degree to which apparent patterns of host

colonization and selection for diverse endophytes are dictated by the host, the endophyte or other

ecological mechanisms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank botanist Pedro Juarez-Retana for the plant identification, Efraín Escudero-Leyva for his

help in sample collection, and Wilber Alvarado for assistance in the field. Dr. Gloriana Chaverri

and Dr. Óscar Quirós from Fundación ProSur, for the access to sites in Golfito and lab space during

fieldtrips. Samples were collected under the Institutional Biodiversity Commission (University of

Costa Rica) resolutions VI07723-2018 and VI5152-2016, and Costa Rica's National System of

Conservation Areas (SINAC), permit Nº ACG-PI-017-2017. Thanks to Dr. Maile Neel for her

feedback; and Dr. David Zelený and Joseph Murphy for help with bioinformatics.

FUNDING

This study was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation grant DEB-1638976 to P. Chaverri.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Supplementary information is publicly available in Zenodo

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13892068

Supplementary Table S1. List of putative plant species collected based on morphology. In bold

are the species collected twice.

Supplementary Methods S2.

Supplementary Table S3. Taxonomic assignment (7 ranks) of all ASVs identified in the

dataset, plus their functional traits, can be found publicly available on the Github repository

https://github.com/humb15/RuFEnTroFo.

Supplementary Figure S4. Species accumulation and diversity curves for endophytes sampled

from (A) young leaves (YL), mature leaves (ML) and sapwood (Sa) tissues, and; (B) Golfito and

Guanacaste forests. Metrics include richness (q = 0), Shannon (q = 1) and Simpson (q = 2).

Supplementary Figure S5. NMDS of Bray Curtis distances showing the distribution of

endophytic community assemblages according to (A) genus within tribes and (B) tribes within

subfamilies.

Supplementary Table S6. List of identified fungal families among endophyte communities.

Supplementary Figure S7. CCA analysis for correlation between Amplicon Single Variants

distribution and environmental variables: Elevation, Annual Mean Temperature and Annual

Precipitation). Red crosses represent ASVs and black circles represent samples. p-values:

Elevation 0.001, AMT 0.073, AP 0.119; CCA1 0.007, CCA2 0.143.

Supplementary Table S8. Mantel correlation values for community dissimilarity and geographic

and environmental factors. Based on Spearman, p-value reported.

Supplementary Figure S9. Distance decay of taxonomic similarity along spatial distance, every

point represents pairwise similarities between samples. Panels A: combined; B: Golfito; C:

Guanacaste.

Supplementary Figure S10. Main lifestyles (primary and secondary) of the genera identified

among the top 12 families.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The resulting raw data (fastq files) and supporting metadata are deposited and publicly available
in GenBank under the BioProject identifier PRJNA889378.

REFERENCES

1. Dubey A, Malla MA, Kumar A, Dayanandan S, Khan ML. Plants endophytes: unveiling hidden agenda for bioprospecting toward sustainable agriculture. Crit Rev Biotechnol. 2020;40(8):1210–31.

2. Mishra S, Bhattacharjee A, Sharma S. An ecological insight into the multifaceted world of plant-endophyte association. CRC Crit Rev Plant Sci. 2021;40(2):127–46.

3. Redkar A, Sabale M, Zuccaro A, Di Pietro A. Determinants of endophytic and pathogenic lifestyle in root colonizing fungi. Curr Opin Plant Biol. 2022 Jun 1;67.

4. Vaz ABM, da Costa AGFC, Raad LVV, Góes-Neto A. Fungal endophytes associated with three South American Myrtae (Myrtaceae) exhibit preferences in the colonization at leaf level. Fungal Biol. 2014 Mar 1;118(3):277–86.

5. Zimmerman NB, Vitousek PM. Fungal endophyte communities reflect environmental structuring across a Hawaiian landscape. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2012; 109(32):13022–7.

6.   Suryanarayanan TS, Murali TS, Thirunavukkarasu N, Govinda Rajulu MB, Venkatesan G,

Sukumar R. Endophytic fungal communities in woody perennials of three tropical forest

types of the Western Ghats, southern India. Biodivers Conserv. 2011; 20 (5):913–28.

7.   Cordier T, Robin C, Capdevielle X, Desprez-Loustau ML, Vacher C. Spatial variability of

phyllosphere fungal assemblages: genetic distance predominates over geographic distance

in a European beech stand (*Fagus sylvatica*). Fungal Ecol. 2012 Oct 1;5(5):509–20.

8.   Solis MJL, Dela Cruz TE, Schnittler M, Unterseher M. The diverse community of leaf-

inhabiting fungal endophytes from Philippine natural forests reflects phylogenetic patterns

of their host plant species *Ficus benjamina, F. elastica* and *F. religiosa*. Mycoscience.

2016; 57(2):96–106.

9.   Vaz ABM, Fontenla S, Rocha FS, Brandão LR, Vieira MLA, de Garcia V, et al. Fungal

endophyte β-diversity associated with Myrtaceae species in an Andean Patagonian forest

(Argentina) and an Atlantic forest (Brazil). Fungal Ecol. 2014 Apr 1;8(1):28–36.

10.   Lin H, Liu C, Peng Z, Tan B, Wang K, Liu Z. Distribution pattern of endophytic bacteria

and fungi in tea plants. Front Microbiol. 2022 Sep 23;13.

11.   Fang K, Miao YF, Chen L, Zhou J, Yang ZP, Dong XF, et al. Tissue-specific and

geographical variation in endophytic fungi of *Ageratina adenophora* and fungal

associations with the environment. Front Microbiol. 2019; 10:454967.

553 12. Marag PS, Suman A. Growth stage and tissue specific colonization of endophytic bacteria

554   having plant growth promoting traits in hybrid and composite maize (*Zea mays* L.).

555   Microbiol Res. 2018 Sep 1;214:101–13.

556 13. Guo LD, Huang GR, Wang Y. Seasonal and tissue age influences on endophytic fungi of

557   *Pinus tabulaeformis* (Pinaceae) in the Dongling Mountains, Beijing. J Integr Plant Biol.

558   2008 Aug;50(8):997–1003.

559 14. Molina L, Rajchenberg M, de Errasti A, Aime MC, Pildain MB. Sapwood-inhabiting

560   mycobiota and *Nothofagus* tree mortality in Patagonia: Diversity patterns according to tree

561   species, plant compartment and health condition. For Ecol Manage. 2020 Apr

562   15;462:117997.

563 15. Naeem S, Li S. Biodiversity enhances ecosystem reliability. Nature.

564   1997;390(December):507–9.

565 16. Terhonen E, Blumenstein K, Kovalchuk A, Asiegbu FO. Forest tree microbiomes and

566   associated fungal endophytes: Functional roles and impact on forest health. Forests.

567   2019;10(1):1–32.

568 17. Bremer B, Eriksson T. Time tree of rubiaceae: Phylogeny and dating the family,

569   subfamilies, and tribes. Int J Plant Sci. 2009;170(6):766–93.

570 18. Manns U, Wikstrom N, Taylor CM, Bremer B. Historical biogeography of the

571   predominantly neotropical subfamily cinchonoideae (Rubiaceae): Into or out of America?

572   Int J Plant Sci. 2012 Mar;173(3):261–89.

19.   Kiehn M, Berger A. Neotropical Rubiaceae: Synthesis of chromosome data from Costa

Rican taxa, with insights on the systematics of the family. Annals of the Missouri

Botanical Garden. 2020;105(4):423–58.

20.   Hammel B, Grayum M, Herrera C, Zamorra N. Manual de Plantas de Costa Rica. Hammel

BE, Grayum MH, Herrera C, Zamora N, Troyo S, editors. Missouri Botanical Garden

Press. Missouri Botanical Garden Press; 2014. 848 p.

21.   Berger A, Schinnerl J. Taxonomical and phytochemical diversity of Costa Rica

Palicoureeae and Psychotrieae (Rubiaceae). Acta Zoobot Austria. 2019;231–48.

22.   Berger A. Synopsis and typification of Mexican and Central American *Palicourea*

(Rubiaceae : Palicoureeae), part I: The entomophilous species. Ann Nat Hist Mus Wien

Ser B Bot Zool. 2018;(120):59–140.

23.   Solano J, Villalobos R. Aspectos fisiográficos aplicados a un bosquejo de regionalización

geográfico climático de Costa Rica. Top Meteor Oceanog. 2001;8(1):26–39.

24.   Fick SE, Hijmans RJ. WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for

global land areas. International Journal of Climatology. 2017; 37(12):4302–15.

25.   Gazis R, Chaverri P. Diversity of fungal endophytes in leaves and stems of wild rubber

trees (*Hevea brasiliensis*) in Peru. Fungal Ecol. 2010; 3(3):240–54.

26.   Castillo-González H, Bloomberg J, Alvarado-Picado E, Yarwood S, Chaverri P.

Agricultural practices influence foliar endophytic communities in coffee plants of

different varieties. Agrosystems, Geosciences & Environment. 2024; 7(1):e20476.

27.   Ihrmark K, Bödeker ITM, Cruz-Martinez K, Friberg H, Kubartova A, Schenck J, et al.

New primers to amplify the fungal ITS2 region – evaluation by 454-sequencing of

artificial and natural communities. FEMS Microbiol Ecol. 2012 Dec 1;82(3):666–77.

28.   Martin M. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.

EMBnet J. 2011 May 2;17(1):10.

29.   RStudioTeam. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. Boston, MA:

RStudio, PBC; 2023.

30.   Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJA, Holmes SP. DADA2:

High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nat Methods. 2016 May

23;13(7):581–3.

31.   Abarenkov K, Zirk A, Piirmann T, Pöhönen R, Ivanov F, Nilsson RH, et al. UNITE

general FASTA release for eukaryotes. UNITE Community; 2021.

32.   Wright ES. Using DECIPHER v2.0 to analyze big biological sequence data in R. R

Journal. 2016;8(1):352–9.

33.   McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive Analysis

and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. PLoS One. 2013 Apr 22;8(4):e61217.

34.   Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, et al. vegan:

Community Ecology Package. 2020.

35.   Lahti L, Shetty S, et al. Tools for microbiome analysis in R. 2017.

36.   Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New York;

2016.

37.   Modin O, Liébana R, Saheb-Alam S, Wilén BM, Suarez C, Hermansson M, et al. Hill-

based dissimilarity indices and null models for analysis of microbial community assembly.

Microbiome. 2020; 8(1):1–16.

38.   Jurburg SD, Buscot F, Chatzinotas A, Chaudhari NM, Clark AT, Garbowski M, et al. The

community ecology perspective of omics data. Vol. 10, Microbiome. BioMed Central Ltd;

2022.

39.   Dormann CF, Gruber B, Fründ J. Introducing the bipartite Package: Analysing Ecological

Networks. R News. 2008;8(2):8–11.

40.   De Cáceres M, Legendre P. Associations between species and groups of sites: indices and

statistical inference. Ecology; 2009.

41.   Toju H, Yamamoto S, Sato H, Tanabe AS. Sharing of diverse mycorrhizal and root-

endophytic fungi among plant species in an oak-dominated cool-temperate forest. PLoS

One. 2013 Oct 21;8(10):e78248.

42.   David AS, Seabloom EW, May G. Plant host species and geographic distance affect the

structure of aboveground fungal symbiont communities, and environmental filtering

affects belowground communities in a coastal dune ecosystem. Microb Ecol. 2016 May

1;71(4):912–26.

43.   Harrison JG, Griffin EA. The diversity and distribution of endophytes across biomes,

plant phylogeny and host tissues: how far have we come and where do we go from here?

Environ Microbiol. 2020 Jun 1;22(6):2107–23.

44.   Oita S, Ibáñez A, Lutzoni F, Miadlikowska J, Geml J, Lewis LA, et al. Climate and

seasonality drive the richness and composition of tropical fungal endophytes at a

landscape scale. Commun Biol. 2021 Mar 9;4(1):1–11.

45.   Suryanarayanan TS. Dark Septate Endophytes and Mycorrhizal. In: Pirttilä AM, Frank

AC, editors. Endophytes of Forest Trees: Biology and Applications. 1st ed. Springer,

Dordrecht; 2011. p. 67–80.

46.   Zimmerman NB, Vitousek PM. Fungal endophyte communities reflect environmental

structuring across a Hawaiian landscape. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences. 2012;109(32):13022–7.

47.   Chaverri P, Samuels GJ. Evolution of habitat preference and nutrition mode in a

cosmopolitan fungal genus with evidence of interkingdom host jumps and major shifts in

ecology. Evolution (N Y). 2013 Oct 1;67(10):2823–37.

48.   Zuo Y, Hu Q, Zhang K, He X. Host and tissue affiliations of culturable endophytic fungi

associated with xerophytic plants in the desert region of northwest China. Agronomy.

2022 Mar 17;12(3):727.

49.   Kembel SW, Mueller RC. Plant traits and taxonomy drive host associations in tropical

phyllosphere fungal communities. Botany. 2014;92(4):303–11.

50.   Christian N, Sedio BE, Florez-Buitrago X, Ramírez-Camejo LA, Rojas EI, Mejía LC, et

al. Host affinity of endophytic fungi and the potential for reciprocal interactions involving

host secondary chemistry. Am J Bot. 2020 Feb 18;107(2):219–28.

51.   David AS, Seabloom EW, May G. Plant host species and geographic distance affect the

structure of aboveground fungal symbiont communities, and environmental filtering

affects belowground communities in a coastal dune ecosystem. Microb Ecol. 2016;

71(4):912–26.

52.   Quilliam RS, Jones DL. Fungal root endophytes of the carnivorous plant *Drosera

rotundifolia*. Mycorrhiza. 2010 Jun;20(5):341–8.

53.   Vaz ABM, Fontenla S, Rocha FS, Brandão LR, Vieira MLA, de Garcia V, et al. Fungal

endophyte β-diversity associated with Myrtaceae species in an Andean Patagonian forest

(Argentina) and an Atlantic forest (Brazil). Fungal Ecol. 2014 Apr 1;8(1):28–36.

54.   Van Bael S, Estrada C, Arnold AE. Foliar endophyte communitis and leaf traits in tropical

trees. In: Dighton J, White JF, editors. The Fungal Community: Its Organization and Role

in the Ecosystem. 4th ed. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.; 2017. p.

79–93.

55.   Koide RT, Ricks KD, Davis ER. Climate and dispersal influence the structure of leaf

fungal endophyte communities of *Quercus gambelii* in the eastern Great Basin, USA.

Fungal Ecol. 2017 Dec 1;30:19–28.

56.   Moroenyane I, Mendes L, Tremblay J, Tripathi B, Yergeau. Plant compartments and developmental stages modulate the balance between niche-based and neutral processes in soybean microbiome. Microb Ecol. 2021 Aug 1;82(2):416–28.

57.   U'Ren JM, Lutzoni F, Miadlikowska J, Zimmerman NB, Carbone I, May G, et al. Host availability drives distributions of fungal endophytes in the imperiled boreal realm. Nat Ecol Evol. 2019;3(10):1430–7.

58.   Graco-Roza C, Aarnio S, Abrego N, Acosta ATR, Alahuhta J, Altman J, et al. Distance decay 2.0 – A global synthesis of taxonomic and functional turnover in ecological communities. Global Ecology and Biogeography. 2022 May 12;25.

59.   DeMers M, May G. Habitat-scale heterogeneity maintains fungal endophyte diversity in two native prairie legumes. Mycologia. 2021;113(1):20–32.

60.   Oono R, Rasmussen A, Lefèvre E. Distance decay relationships in foliar fungal endophytes are driven by rare taxa. Environ Microbiol. 2017 Jul 1;19(7):2794–805.

61.   Vincent JB, Weiblen GD, May G. Host associations and beta diversity of fungal endophyte communities in New Guinea rainforest trees. Mol Ecol. 2016; 25(3):825–41.

62.   Gilbert GS, Reynolds DR, Bethancourt A. The patchiness of epifoliar fungi in tropical forests: host range, host abundance, and environment. Ecology. 2007 Mar 1;88(3):575–81.

63.   Crowther TW, Maynard DS, Crowther TR, Peccia J, Smith JR, Bradford MA. Untangling the fungal niche: The trait-based approach. Vol. 5, Frontiers in Microbiology. Frontiers Media S.A.; 2014.

690 64. Rueda-Almazán JE, Hernández VM, Alcalá-Martínez JR, Fernández-Duque A, Ruiz-

691   Aguilar M, Alcalá RE. Spatial and temporal differences in the community structure of

692   endophytic fungi in the carnivorous plant *Pinguicula moranensis* (Lentibulariaceae).

693   Fungal Ecol. 2021 Oct 1;53:101087.

694 65. Liu H, Brettell LE, Singh B. Linking the phyllosphere microbiome to plant health. Trends

695   Plant Sci. 2020 Sep 1;25(9):841–4.

696 66. Khare E, Mishra J, Arora NK. Multifaceted interactions between endophytes and plant:

697   developments and prospects. Frontiers in Microbiology. 2018;9:2732.

698 67. Ludwig-Mü J. Plants and endophytes: equal partners in secondary metabolite production?

699   Biotechnol Lett. 2015;37:1325–34.

700 68. Rodriguez RJ, White JF, Arnold AE, Redman RS, White Jr JF, Arnold AE, et al. Fungal

701   endophytes: diversity and functional roles. New Phytologist. 2009 Apr 1;182(2):314–30.

702 69. Skaltsas DN, Badotti F, Vaz ABM, Silva FF da, Gazis R, Wurdack K, et al. Exploration of

703   stem endophytic communities revealed developmental stage as one of the drivers of fungal

704   endophytic community assemblages in two Amazonian hardwood genera. Sci Rep. 2019

705   Dec 1;9(1).

706 70. Franceschi VR, Krokene P, Christiansen E, Krekling T. Anatomical and chemical

707   defenses of conifer bark against bark beetles and other pests. New Phytologist. 2005 Aug

708   1;167(2):353–76.

71. Molina L, Rajchenberg M, de Errasti A, Vogel B, Coetzee MPA, Aime MC, et al.

Sapwood mycobiome varies across host, plant compartment and environments in

Nothofagus forests from Northern Patagonia. Mol Ecol. 2023 Dec;32(23):6599–6618.

72. Zahid MS, Li D, Javed HU, Sabir IA, Wang L, Jiu S, et al. Comparative fungal diversity

and dynamics in plant compartments at different developmental stages under root-zone

restricted grapevines. BMC Microbiol. 2021 Dec 1;21(1).

73. Petrolli R, Augusto Vieira C, Jakalski M, Bocayuva MF, Vallé C, Cruz EDS, et al. A fine-

scale spatial analysis of fungal communities on tropical tree bark unveils the epiphytic

rhizosphere in orchids. New Phytologist. 2021 Sep 1;231(5):2002–14.

74. Fang K, Miao YF, Chen L, Zhou J, Yang ZP, Dong XF, et al. Tissue-specific and

geographical variation in endophytic fungi of *Ageratina adenophora* and fungal

associations with the environment. Front Microbiol. 2019;10(December):1–16.

75. Given C, Häikiö E, Kumar M, Nissinen R. Tissue-specific dynamics in the endophytic

bacterial communities in arctic pioneer plant *Oxyria digyna*. Front Plant Sci.

2020;11(May):1–13.

76. Wang Y, Guo LD. A comparative study of endophytic fungi in needles, bark, and xylem

of *Pinus tabulaeformis*. https://doi.org/101139/B07-084. 2007 Oct;85(10):911–7.

77. Menkis A, Redr D, Bengtsson V, Hedin J, Niklasson M, Nordén B, et al. Endophytes

dominate fungal communities in six-year-old veteranisation wounds in living oak trunks.

Fungal Ecol. 2020 Dec 3;101020.

78. Takemoto S, Masuya H, Tabata M. Endophytic fungal communities in the bark of canker-

diseased *Toxicodendron vernicifluum*. Fungal Ecol. 2014 Feb;7(1):1–8.

79. Pellitier PT, Zak DR, Salley SO. Environmental filtering structures fungal endophyte

communities in tree bark. Mol Ecol. 2019 Dec 1;28(23):5188–98.

80. Gilmartin EC, Jusino MA, Pyne EJ, Banik MT, Lindner DL, Boddy L. Fungal endophytes

and origins of decay in beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) sapwood. Fungal Ecol. 2022 Oct 1;59.

81. Bailey JK, Deckert R, Schweitzer JA, Rehill BJ, Lindroth RL, Gehring C, et al. Host plant

genetics affect hidden ecological players: links among *Populus*, condensed tannins, and

fungal endophyte infection. https://doi.org/101139/b05-008. 2011 Apr;83(4):356–61.

82. Morris H, Hietala AM, Jansen S, Ribera J, Rosner S, Salmeia KA, et al. Using the CODIT

model to explain secondary metabolites of xylem in defence systems of temperate trees

against decay fungi. Vol. 125, Annals of Botany. Oxford Academic; 2020. p. 701–20.

83. Tejera N, Ortega E, Rodes R, Lluch C. Nitrogen compounds in the apoplastic sap of

sugarcane stem: Some implications in the association with endophytes. J Plant Physiol.

2006 Jan 4;163(1):80–5.

84. Anguita-Maeso M, Haro C, Montes-Borrego M, De La Fuente L, Navas-Cortés JA, Landa

BB. Metabolomic, ionomic and microbial characterization of olive xylem sap reveals

differences according to plant age and genotype. Agronomy. 2021 Jun 1;11(6):1179.

85.   Ingel B, Caldwell D, Duong F, Parkinson DY, McCulloh KA, Iyer-Pascuzzi AS, et al.

Revisiting the source of wilt symptoms: x-ray microcomputed tomography provides direct

evidence that *Ralstonia* biomass clogs xylem vessels. PhytoFrontiers^{TM}. 2022;2(1):41–51.

86.   Petit G, Bleve G, Gallo A, Mita G, Montanaro G, Nuzzo V, et al. Susceptibility to *Xylella*

fastidiosa and functional xylem anatomy in *Olea europaea*: Revisiting a tale of plant-

pathogen interaction. AoB Plants. 2021;13(4):1–9.

87.   Yadeta KA, Thomma BPHJ. The xylem as battleground for plant hosts and vascular wilt

pathogens. Front Plant Sci. 2013;4(APR):1–12.

88.   McElrone AJ, Sherald JL, Forseth IN. Interactive effects of water stress and xylem-limited

bacterial infection on the water relations of a host vine. J Exp Bot. 2003 Jan

2;54(381):419–30.

89.   Deyett E, Rolshausen PE. Temporal dynamics of the sap microbiome of grapevine under

high pierce's disease pressure. Front Plant Sci. 2019;10(October):1–15.

90.   Herrmann M, Geesink P, Richter R, Küsel K. Canopy position has a stronger effect than

tree species identity on phyllosphere bacterial diversity in a floodplain hardwood forest.

Microb Ecol. 2021;81(1):157–68.

91.   Fort T, Pauvert C, Zanne AE, Ovaskainen O, Caignard T, Barret M, et al. Maternal effects

shape the seed mycobiome in *Quercus petraea*. New Phytologist. 2021 May

1;230(4):1594–608.

92. Gomes T, Pereira JA, Benhadi J, Lino-Neto T, Baptista P. Endophytic and epiphytic
phyllosphere fungal communities are shaped by different environmental factors in a
Mediterranean ecosystem. Microb Ecol. 2018 Oct 1;76(3):668–79.

93. Ponette-González AG, Van Stan JT, Magyar D. Things seen and unseen in throughfall and
stemflow. Precipitation Partitioning by Vegetation: A Global Synthesis. 2020 Jan 1;70–
87.

94. Van Stan JT, Morris CE, Aung K, Kuzyakov Y, Magyar D, Rebollar EA, et al.
Precipitation partitioning—hydrologic highways between microbial communities of the
plant microbiome? Precipitation Partitioning by Vegetation: A Global Synthesis. 2020 Jan
1;228–51.

95. Del Olmo-Ruiz M, Arnold AE. Community structure of fern-affiliated endophytes in three
neotropical forests. J Trop Ecol. 2017 Jan 1;33(1):60–73.

96. Xiao Q. A new approach to modeling tree rainfall interception. Journal of Geophysical
Research Atmospheres. 2000;105(D23):29173–88.

97. Shah DU, Reynolds TPS, Ramage MH. The strength of plants: Theory and experimental
methods to measure the mechanical properties of stems. J Exp Bot. 2017;68(16):4497–
516.

98. Ilek A, Siegert CM, Wade A. Hygroscopic contributions to bark water storage and
controls exerted by internal bark structure over water vapor absorption. Trees - Structure
and Function. 2021;35(3):831–43.

99.   Magyar D, Vass M, Oros G. Dendrotelmata (Water-Filled Tree Holes) as Fungal Hotspots

787   - A Long Term Study. https://doi.org/107872/crym/v38.iss1201755. 2017 Mar

788   1;38(1):55–66.

789   100.   Gönczöl J, Révay Á. Treehole fungal communities: Aquatic, aero-aquatic and

790   dematiaceous hyphomycetes. Fungal Divers. 2003;12:19–34.

791   101.   Magyar D, Van Stan JT, Sridhar KR. Hypothesis and theory: fungal spores in stemflow

792   and potential bark sources. Frontiers in Forests and Global Change. 2021;4(March):1–18.

793   102.   Xu X, Yu X, Mo L, Xu Y, Bao L, Lun X. Atmospheric particulate matter accumulation on

794   trees: A comparison of boles, branches and leaves. J Clean Prod. 2019 Jul 20;226:349–56.

795   103.   Harman-Ware AE, Sparks S, Addison B, Kalluri UC. Importance of suberin biopolymer in

796   plant function, contributions to soil organic carbon and in the production of bio-derived

797   energy and materials. Biotechnol Biofuels. 2021;14(1):1–21.

798   104.   Kawa D, Brady SM. Root cell types as an interface for biotic interactions. Trends Plant

799   Sci. 2022 Nov 1;27(11):1173–86.

800   105.   Ninkuu V, Yan J, Fu Z, Yang T, Ziemah J, Ullrich MS, et al. Lignin and its pathway-

801   associated phytoalexins modulate plant defense against fungi. Journal of Fungi.

802   2022;9(1):52.

803   106.   Gudesblat GE, Torres PS, Vojnov AA. Stomata and pathogens: Warfare at the gates. Plant

804   Signal Behav. 2009;4(12):1114–6.

805   107.   Kim KW. Plant trichomes as microbial habitats and infection sites. Eur J Plant Pathol.

806   2019;154(2):157–69.

807   108.   Wang X, Shen C, Meng P, Tan G, Lv L. Analysis and review of trichomes in plants. BMC

808   Plant Biology 2021 21:1. 2021 Feb 1;21(1):1–11.

809   109.   Castro-Moretti FR, Cocuron JC, Castillo-Gonzalez H, Escudero-Leyva E, Chaverri P,

810   Guerreiro-Filho O, et al. A metabolomic platform to identify and quantify polyphenols in

811   coffee and related species using liquid chromatography mass spectrometry. Front Plant

812   Sci. 2023;13(January):1–33.

813   110.   Barton KE, Edwards KF, Koricheva J. Shifts in woody plant defence syndromes during

814   leaf development. Funct Ecol. 2019 Nov 1;33(11):2095–104.

815   111.   Saikkonen K. Forest structure and fungal endophytes. Fungal Biol Rev. 2007 May 1;21(2–

816   3):67–74.

817   112.   Koricheva J, Barton KE. Temporal changes in plant secondary metabolite production. In:

818   Iason GR, Dicke Marcel, Hartley SE, editors. The Ecology of Plant Secondary

819   Metabolites. Cambridge: Cambrigde University Press; 2012. p. 34–55.

820   113.   Zhang DX, Nagabhyru P, Schardl CL. Regulation of a chemical defense against herbivory

821   produced by symbiotic fungi in grass plants. Plant Physiol. 2009;150(2):1072–82.

822   114.   Endara MJ, Forrister DL, Coley PD. The evolutionary ecology of plant chemical defenses:

823   from molecules to communities. Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. System. 2023;54:107–127.

824   115.   Gupta R, Elkabetz D, Leibman-Markus M, Jami E, Bar M. Cytokinin-microbiome

825   interactions regulate developmental functions. Environmental Microbiomes. 2022 Dec

826   1;17(1):1–16.

827   116.   Ruiz-Guerra B, García A, Velázquez-Rosas N, Angulo D, Guevara R. Plant-functional

828   traits drive insect herbivory in a tropical rainforest tree community. Perspect Plant Ecol

829   Evol Syst. 2021 Feb 1;48.

830   117.   Wiggins NL, Forrister DL, Endara MJ, Coley PD, Kursar TA. Quantitative and qualitative

831   shifts in defensive metabolites define chemical defense investment during leaf

832   development in *Inga*, a genus of tropical trees. Ecol Evol. 2016 Jan 1;6(2):478–92.

833   118.   Sedio BE, Archibold AD, Echeverri JCR, Debyser C, Boya P. CA, Wright SJ. A

834   comparison of inducible, ontogenetic, and interspecific sources of variation in the foliar

835   metabolome in tropical trees. PeerJ. 2019 Sep 20;2019(9):e7536.

836   119.   Bhadra S, Cai ZQ. Ontogenetic shifts in resource allocation and potential defense

837   syndromes of a tropical medicinal treelet. Ind Crops Prod. 2019 Oct 5;138:111450.

838   120.   Yang H, Ciais P, Wang Y, Huang Y, Wigneron JP, Bastos A, et al. Variations of carbon

839   allocation and turnover time across tropical forests. Global Ecology and Biogeography.

840   2021 Jun 1;30(6):1271–85.

841   121.   Chen SC, Moles AT. Factors shaping large-scale gradients in seed physical defence: Seeds

842   are not better defended towards the tropics. Global Ecology and Biogeography. 2018;

843   27(4):417–28.

122.   Chen SC, Moles AT. Factors shaping large-scale gradients in seed physical defence: Seeds
are not better defended towards the tropics. Global Ecology and Biogeography. 2018 Apr
1;27(4):417–28.

123.   DeMers M, May G. Habitat-scale heterogeneity maintains fungal endophyte diversity in
two native prairie legumes. Mycologia. 2021;113(1):20–32.

124.   Garnica S, Liao Z, Hamard S, Waller F, Parepa M, Bossdorf O. Environmental stress
determines the colonization and impact of an endophytic fungus on invasive knotweed.
Biol Invasions. 2022; 24(6):1785–95.

125.   Zhu J, Sun X, Tang QY, Zhang ZD. Seasonal dynamics and persistency of endophyte
communities in *Kalidium schrenkianum* shifts under radiation stress. Front Microbiol.
2021;12(December):1–14.

126.   Silva RMF, Neto WPP, Oliveira RJV, Bezerra JDP, Bezerra JL, de Lima VX, et al. Effect
of climate and phenological stage on fungal endophytes community in *Sorghum bicolor*
leaves. Mycol Prog. 2023; 22(3):1–17.

127.   Walter J. Effects of changes in soil moisture and precipitation patterns on plant-mediated
biotic interactions in terrestrial ecosystems. Plant Ecol. 2018; 219(12):1449–62.

128.   Golan JJ, Pringle A. Long-Distance Dispersal of Fungi. Microbiol Spectr. 2017; 5(4).

129.   Thomas D, Vandegrift R, Roy BA, Hsieh HM, Ju YM. Spatial patterns of fungal
endophytes in a subtropical montane rainforest of northern Taiwan. Fungal Ecol. 2019 Jun
1;39:316–27.

130.   Hosseyni Moghaddam MS, Safaie N, Tedersoo L, Hagh-Doust N. Diversity, community
composition, and bioactivity of cultivable fungal endophytes in saline and dry soils in
deserts. Fungal Ecol. 2021 Feb 1;49:101019.

131.   Wang YL, Gao C, Chen L, Ji NN, Wu BW, Lü PP, et al. Community assembly of
endophytic fungi in ectomycorrhizae of Betulaceae plants at a regional scale. Front
Microbiol. 2020 Jan 21;10.

132.   Griffin EA, Carson WP. Tree Endophytes: Cryptic Drivers of Tropical Forest Diversity.
In: Pirttilä, A., Frank, A. (eds) Endophytes of Forest Trees. Forestry Sciences, 2018; vol
86. Springer, Cham.

133.   Rojas-Jimenez K, Hernandez M, Blanco J, Vargas LD, Acosta-Vargas LG, Tamayo G.
Richness of cultivable endophytic fungi along an altitudinal gradient in wet forests of
Costa Rica. Fungal Ecol. 2016; 20:124–31.

134.   Oita S, Ibáñez A, Lutzoni F, Miadlikowska J, Geml J, Lewis LA, et al. Climate and
seasonality drive the richness and composition of tropical fungal endophytes at a
landscape scale. Commun Biol. 2021; 4(1):1–11.

135.   Langenfeld A, Prado S, Nay B, Cruaud C, Lacoste S, Bury E, et al. Geographic locality
greatly influences fungal endophyte communities in *Cephalotaxus harringtonia*. Fungal
Biol. 2013 Feb;117(2):124–36.

136.   Joshee S, Paulus BC, Park D, Johnston PR. Diversity and distribution of fungal foliar
endophytes in New Zealand Podocarpaceae. Mycol Res. 2009 Sep;113(9):1003–15.

137. Osono T. Endophytic and epiphytic phyllosphere fungi of *Camellia japonica*: seasonal

and leaf age-dependent variations. Mycologia. 2008 May;100(3):387–91.

138. Yu Z, Ding H, Shen K, Bu F, Newcombe G, Liu H. Foliar endophytes in trees varying

greatly in age. Eur J Plant Pathol. 2021; 160(2):375–84.

139. Donald J, Roy M, Suescun U, Iribar A, Manzi S, Péllissier L, et al. A test of community

assembly rules using foliar endophytes from a tropical forest canopy. Journal of Ecology.

2020;(December 2019):1–12.

140. Giauque H, Connor EW, Hawkes C V. Endophyte traits relevant to stress tolerance,

resource use and habitat of origin predict effects on host plants. New Phytologist. 2019

Mar 1;221(4):2239–49.

141. Omomowo OI, Babalola OO. Bacterial and fungal endophytes: Tiny giants with immense

beneficial potential for plant growth and sustainable agricultural productivity.

Microorganisms. 2019;7(11).

142. White JF, Kingsley KL, Zhang Q, Verma R, Obi N, Dvinskikh S, et al. Review:

Endophytic microbes and their potential applications in crop management. Pest Manag

Sci. 2019 Oct 1;75(10):2558–65.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: P.C., H.C., J.S.; Formal analysis: H.C.; Funding acquisition: P.C., J.S.;

Investigation: H.C.; Methodology: H.C., P.C., S.Y.; Project administration: P.C., S.Y.; Resources:

P.C.; Supervision: P.C., S.Y.; Validation: P.C., S.Y., J.S., H.C.; Visualization: H.C., S.Y; Writing:

H.C., J.S., S.Y., P.C.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

 FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1. Map of Costa Rica showing climatic subregions and sample locations. Legend: RN1 –

Eastern slopes of the Guanacaste and Tilarán mountain range (very humid subtropical forest), PN2

– North Pacific Central subregion (tropical dry forest), PN3 – Slopes and foothills of the

Guanacaste and Tilarán mountain range subregion (monsoon-influenced rainforest), PS5 – Pacific

slopes of the Talamanca mountain range (low montane rainforest). GPS locations for each site:

Guanacaste: 10.668483 N, -85.147333 W; 10.677167 N, -85.143889 W; 10.681444 N, -

85.068889 W; 10.686972 N, -85.161389 W; 10.735542 N, -85.151997 W; 10.735675 N, -

85.163583 W; 10.735928 N, -85.168861 W; 10.736069 N, -85.173694 W; 10.754444 N, -

85.169244 W; 10.754583 N, -85.182722 W; 10.755889 N, -85.251833 W; 10.762333 N, -

85.254639 W; 11.01725 N, -85.490778 W; 11.018633 N, -85.601944 W; **Golfito**: 8.392333 N, -

83.13863 W; 8.635881 N, -83.075394 W; 8.6367222 N, -83.0815556 W; 8.668781 N, -83.149222

W; 8.679278 N, -83.143139 W; 8.698944 N, -83.118911 W; 8.701139 N, -83.138722 W; 8.706139

N, -83.119631 W. Figure created by the National Meteorological Institute of Costa Rica at our

request based on Solano & Villalobos (2001).

Figure 2. NMDS of Bray Curtis distances showing dissimilarities between the structure of
endophyte community assemblages from (A) different locations, (B) different tissues and (C)
different plant tribes, developmental stage represented here by shape.

Figure 3. Prevalence and mean percent relative abundance of the 12 most abundant families

weighting all habitats within location, tissue type and foliar developmental stage. Families are

organized based on abundance, high to low, top to bottom. Mean abundance is plotted with error

bars representing the standard error. d' index calculates how specialized the identified taxa are in

relation to the 47 plant putative species. Denoted with a diamond symbol (♦) are the families with

indicator species within the different habitats; and habitat specialization is indicated by the CLAM

test.

Table 1. Characterization of collecting sites, including mean environmental variables in locations

(± SE).

Location	Sites	Plants (n)	Annual Mean Temperature (ºC)	Annual Precipitation (mm)	Elevation (m)
Guanacaste	14	23	22.94 ± 0.12	2718.32 ± 45.03	749.56 ± 41.72
Golfito	8	27	24.65 ± 0.19	3522.09 ± 21.17	124.18 ± 12.23

940   **Table 2.** Alpha diversity represented by Hill Effective Species Numbers (± SE) for the evaluated

941   variables. Hill numbers represent taxa richness (Chao1), Shannon diversity (the exponential of

942   Shannon entropy), and Simpson diversity (the inverse of Simpson index). Mann-Whitney U test

943   p-values reported.

Variable	Category	Sample size	Obs. Species richness	Shared number of ASVs	Taxa richness (q = 0)	Shannon diversity (q =1)	Simpson diversity (q = 2)
Location	Golfito	66	2146	315	79.52 ± 7.91	25.41 ± 2.26	13.75 ± 1.08
	Guanacaste	57	1387		51.81 ± 6.69	20.06 ± 2.38	11.48 ± 1.21
	p-value				**0.00655**	**0.04821**	0.07629
Tissue type	Leaf	46	1514	96	61.89 ± 7.03	21.22 ± 2.61	11.84 ± 1.38
	Sapwood	23	240		11.83 ± 1.64	1.57 ± 0.17	0.66 ± 0.05
	p-value				**4.99E-06**	**8.22E-06**	**2.41E-04**
Development stage	Mature	50	2253	912	92.40 ± 8.56	22.80 ± 2.51	14.31 ± 1.22
	New	50	1756		66.18 ± 7.87	25.62 ± 2.63	14.56 ± 1.31
	p-value				**0.0067**	0.4628	1.0000