Macroalgae-Derived Fungal Endophytes Promoted The Growth of Mexican Lime Seedlings Under Heat Stress in Greenhouse Condition

Leila Baghazadeh Daryaii¹, Davood Samsampour^{2*}, Abdoolnabi Bagheri³, Jelveh Sohrabipour⁴

Received: 2021-06-25

Revised and accepted: 2021-09-28

Abstract

Fungal endophyte associated with algae represents a rich source of bioactive metabolites and biostimulants, which can be used practically in agriculture as biofertilizers. Here, we aimed to study the associated symbiotic fungi collected from intertidal areas of the southern coastlines of the Persian Gulf and Oman Sea. The extracted endophytic fungi were identified based on morphological, physiological and molecular (based on ITS1-5.8S-ITS4rRNA regions) analyses. 566 fungal isolates were obtained from 190 seaweed segments. Results showed that the genera Aspergillus and Penicillium were the most frequent isolated fungi. The highest frequency of fungal isolates (48.29%) was observed in seaweeds collected from Bushehr province. In vitro, most of the fungal isolates (85%) could grow properly on a PDA medium incorporated with one molar NaCl concentration. Fungal isolates showing the highest resistance to NaCl in vitro assays and with highest frequency were used as biofertilizer agents to study their effects on the morphological characteristics of Mexican lime seedlings. The inoculation results showed that the fungal endophytes could increase the fitness of Mexican lime seedlings under heat stress by improving morphological attributes.

Keywords: Macroalgae, Endophytic Fungi, Biofertilizer, *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium*

Introduction

The marine ecosystem is a unique source of natural biological products from marine creatures with outstanding natural, biochemical, and biosynthesis characteristics (Subramani and Aalbersberg, 2013; Suriya et al., 2016; Jimenez, 2018). Endophytic microorganisms are a diverse group of organisms that live inside the host plant tissue and form colonies in the intercellu-

¹⁻Ph.D. in Horticultural Science-Biotechnology and Molecular Genetic of Horticultural Products, University of Hormozgan, Bandar Abbas, Iran

²⁻Horticultural Science Department, Agriculture and Natural Resources College, University of Hormozgan, Bandar Abbas, Iran

³⁻Plant Protection Research Department, Hormozgan Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, Agricultural Research, Education and Extension Organization (AREEO), Bandar Abbas, Iran

⁴⁻Department of Natural Resources Researches, Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, Agricultural Research, Education and Extension Organization (AREEO), Bandar Abbas, Iran

^{*} E-mail address: Samsampoor@hormozgan.ac.ir

lar spaces or between the xylem vessels of plants without any apparent symptoms (Rodriguez et al., 2009). Although, recently, a few studies have shown that infection by endophytes can increase the host plant's tolerance to abiotic and biotic stresses by inducing the activity of many defense-related genes of the host plants (Mejía et al., 2014; Miliute et al., 2015). Many questions remain unanswered regarding the biological attributes of endophytes (Suryanarayanan, 2013).

Algae in marine ecosystems adapt to frequent and sporadic environmental changes such as low oxygen content, high salinity, excessively high light, and nutrient limitation, which may be associated with endophytes to produce specific bioactive secondary metabolites to participate in the defense mechanisms of the hosts (Zhang et al., 2016).

Fungal endophytes constitute an inexplicably diverse group of polyphyletic fungi ubiquitous in plants and maintain an indiscernible dynamic relationship with their hosts for at least a part of their life cycle (Kusari and Spiteller, 2012). The endophytic fungi activate gene-silencing mechanisms, or vice versa, and start specific biosynthetic pathways. Hence, unique functional/bioactive metabolites will produce due to the reciprocal and advantageous relationship between endophytes and their hosts (Zhang et al., 2016). Symbiotic fungi have already been isolated from various marine habitats, including marine plants (algae and mangrove plants), aquatic invertebrates (sponges, holothurians, corals, and ascidians), and vertebrates (mainly fish). Among these organisms, algae are one of the most prevalent sources of marine-derived fungi for chemical studies (Rateb and Ebel, 2011).

Davati et al. (2013) studied the bioactive compounds extracted from endophytic fungi of macroalgae (Rhodophyta, Chlorophyta, and Phaeophyta) and reported different functions for these products. Anticancer, antibiotic, antiviral, antioxidative, and kinase inhibitory activities have been isolated from seaweed endophytic fungi (Strobel and Daisy, 2003; Kjer et al., 2010). Nevertheless, there is not much information regarding endophytic fungi in marine seaweeds, especially those are grown in tropical and subtropical regions (Suryanarayanan et al., 2010; Narayanan et al., 2013; Flewelling et al., 2015). Since no documented information is available regarding symbiotic fungi with seaweed species of the Persian Gulf and Oman Sea in the south of Iran, in the current study, we aimed to investigate the diversity of fungal endophytes of seaweeds of the Persian Gulf and Oman Sea and their role as stress-modifiers in Mexican lime seedlings under heat stress in greenhouse conditions.

Material and methods

Sampling and isolation of endophytic fungi

From April 2018 to March 2019, A total of 190 seaweed samples (37 species) belonging to 12 brown algae (62 samples), 15 red (79 pieces), and 10 green algae species (49 pieces) were collected from 18 intertidal locations of three southern provinces of Iran including; Hormozgan, Bushehr and Sistan and Baluchistan (Table 1). Seaweeds were identified based on morphological keys (Sohrabipour and Rabiei, 2007; 2008; 2010).

The seaweed species in different sites were replicated. For example, we collected *Ulva* or *Gracilaria* from different sides and different seasons.

The physicochemical properties of seawater including EC, pH, and salinity were measured using the multimeter (HACH, HQ 40d USA) and refractometer (ATAGO, S/Mill-E Japan) devices (Table 2).

Fresh and healthy algal species were harvested and transferred to the biotechnology laboratory of Hormozgan University in sterile polyethylene bags. The surface of the samples was sterilized to isolate the exophytes from the collected seaweeds, as follows: washing the seaweeds with running tap water; soaking the illustrations in 70% ethanol for 5 S and, finally soaking in sterile distilled water for 10 S (Zhang et al., 2009). Sterilized tissues were cut into 0.5 cm^2 segments, then three segments of each seaweed sample were placed onto Petri plates containing Potato Dextrose Agar (PDA). Accordingly, 1674 sterilized segments of 190 seaweed specimens were used to isolate their endophytic fungi. The Petri plates were sealed and incubated in a light chamber at 26 ± 2 °C and a light period (12L:12D) for four weeks (Suryanarayanan, 1992). Most fungi grew within three days after incubation. The colonization frequency (CF) was calculated based on Yuan et al. (2010) as follows:

CF= total number of colonized endophytic fungi/ total number of incubated segments. The grown fungi of each seaweed segment were periodically isolated and transferred to the fresh PDA plates. Identification of the isolated fungi was made based on morphological, physiological, and molecular methods. Microscopic characteristics of the isolates (hypha type, spore shape, and colony color) were also investigated to determine the morphological features of fungal isolates.

Molecular identification and phylogenetic analysis

DNA extraction

The fungal endophytes were identified molecularly using ITS primers (ITS1-5.8S-ITS4 region of rRNA). Genomic DNA was extracted according to the method proposed by Soltani and Moghaddam (2015). Colonies of each isolated fungi were grown at 28 °C and shaking rate of 90 rpm in the 15 ml Erlenmeyer flasks containing 2 ml Potato Dextrose Broth (PDB; Merck, Germany). After 15 days, the genomic DNA of each isolate was extracted using the CTAB method.

PCR amplification

The extracted DNA was subjected to Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) to amplify the ITS1-5.8S-ITS4rRNA region using the following primers, ITS1 (5'-TCCG-TAGGTGAACCTGCGG-3') and ITS4 (5'-TCCTCCGCTTATTGATATGC-3')

No	Scientific name	Classification
1	Stoechospermum marginatum	Phaeophyta
2	Padina australis	Phaeophyta
3	Padina crassa	Phaeophyta
4	Padina gymnospora	Phaeophyta
5	Rosenvingea orientalis	Phaeophyta
6	Sargassum boveanum	Phaeophyta
7	Sargassum bov. Var. aterrimum	Phaeophyta
8	Sargassum angustifolium	Phaeophyta
9	Dictyota sp.	Phaeophyta
10	Sirophysalis trinodis	Phaeophyta
11	Grateloupia lithophila	Phaeophyta
12	Iyengaria stellata	Phaeophyta
13	Galaxaura rugosta	Rhodophyta
14	Acanthophora spicifera	Rhodophyta
15	<i>Hypnea</i> sp.	Rhodophyta
16	Digenenia simplex	Rhodophyta
17	Gracilaria folliifera	Rhodophyta
18	Gracillaria corticata	Rhodophyta
19	Gracilaria sp.	Rhodophyta
20	Gracilaria salicornia	Rhodophyta
21	Gracilariopsis persica	Rhodophyta
22	Palisada perforata	Rhodophyta
23	Champia glublifera	Rhodophyta
24	Champia parvulla	Rhodophyta
25	Jania robens	Rhodophyta
26	Laurencia snideria	Rhodophyta
27	Grateloupia flicina	Rhodophyta
28	Halimeda tuna	Chlorophyta
29	Caulerpa sertularioides	Chlorophyta
30	Caulerpa peltata	Chlorophyta
31	Caulerpa taxifolia	Chlorophyta
32	Cladophoropsis sp.	Chlorophyta
33	Ulva ohnii	Chlorophyta
34	Ulva sp.	Chlorophyta
35	Chondrus crispus	Chlorophyta
36	Chaetomorpha sp.	Chlorophyta
37	Enteromorpha sp.	Chlorophyta

Table 1. List of seaweed species and their classification

Province	Location	Longitu	Latitu	EC	pН	Salinit
		de (E)	de (N)	(ms/cm)		y (PPT)
Hormozgan	Bandar Abbas	E56.27	N27.1	56.9	7.4	39.3
			8		9	
Hormozgan	Bandar-e	E54.30	N26.1	56.6	7.9	38.4
	Lengeh		8		7	
Hormozgan	Bandar-e Kong	E54.54	N29.3	57.9	7.9	39.6
			3		9	
Hormozgan	Qeshm Island	E56.16	N26.5	56.6	7.9	38.9
			7		4	
Hormozgan	Hormoz Island	E56.27	N27.0	56.5	7.5	39.0
			3		2	
Hormozgan	Sirik	E57.10	N26.5	54.5	7.4	38.2
			1		4	
Sistan and	Chabahar	E60.39	N25.1	52.8	8.1	37.6
Baluchistan			7			
Sistan and	Gavader	E61.31	N25.1	54.5	7.1	36.9
Baluchistan			0		2	
Sistan and	Ramin	E60.25	N25.1	56.3	7.8	38.6
Baluchistan			2		7	
Sistan and	Great see	E60.39	N25.1	55.4	8.1	38.2
Baluchistan			6		3	
Sistan and	Kachu	E60.51	N25.1	56.4	8.2	38.1
Baluchistan			5			
Sistan and	Beris	E61.11	N25.0	55.5	7.9	38.3
Baluchistan			8		8	
Sistan and	Konarak	E60.23	N25.2	56.4	7.8	38.9
Baluchistan			1		8	
Bushehr	Bushehr	E50.83	N28.9	62.7	8.2	42.0*
			5		7	
Bushehr	Shif Island	E50.52	N29.0	49.8	7.7	33.9
			4		4	
Bushehr	Nuclear Power	E50.53	N28.4	60.5	8.0	41.0
	plant		9		6	
Bushehr	Sabz Abad	E50.51	N28.4	60.2	8.0	41.0
	park		4		6	
Bushehr	Airport seaside	E50.50	N28.5	49.9	7.8	33.9
			6		0	

Table 2. List of provinces, locations and their GPS coordinates as well as chemical properties of seawater in different sampling sites

*Samples with ≥40 PPT salinity, were detected by refractometer device

(White et al., 1991). Each 25 μ l reaction mixture included 2 μ l of DNA, 12.5 μ l of Taq DNA Polymerase (amplicon), 2 μ l of primers, and 8.5 μ l ddH₂O. Techno TC-572 thermocycler (Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany) was used for PCR amplification which was programmed for 94 °C for 5 min, 35 cycles of 94 °C for 45 S, 53 °C for 30 S, 72 °C for 1 min, and 72 °C for 5 min. PCR products were subjected to electrophoresis on 1% agarose gel stained with blue stain. *DNA sequencing*

All PCR products were sequenced directly by Macrogen Sequencing Service (Seoul, South Korea). The sequences of amplified ITS1-5.8S-ITS4rRNA regions were deposited in the GenBank database (NCBI, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The edited sequences were blasted against the NCBI GenBank nucleotide database (http://ncbi. nlm.nih.gov/blast/Blast.cgi) to search for closest relatives. Phylogenetic tree was reconstructed using MrBayes v3.1.2 (Ron-



Fig. 1. Fungal inoculum preparation using autoclaved water in 1×10^6 CFU mi⁻¹ colony formation

quist and Huelsenbeck, 2003). The fungal isolates were archived as living vouchers at $4 \, {}^{\circ}C$.

Potential of endophytic fungi to grow under salt conditions

The potential of fungal endophytes to grow under salt conditions were investigated using the method proposed by Vatsyayan and Ghosh (2013). In brief, fungal isolates were grown in PDA medium supplemented with various concentrations of sodium chloride (1, 2 and 3 molar) and after 7 days their growth potential was scored from 1 to 8 (from weak to very severe), which was based on their ability to form a colony. *The effect of isolated fungi as modulator of heat shock factor*

Three fungal species [*Aspergillus niger* (F1), *Penicillium chrysogenum* (F2), *Aspergillus flavus* (F3)] and their combination (F1 with F2) were used as modulator of heat shock factors and biofertilizers to inoculate eight months old Mexican lime seedlings under heat stress (45 ± 2 °C for seven days) (Chhabra et al., 2009). The seedlings were planted and grown in sterile soil. Fungal inoculum preparation using autoclaved water in 1×10^6 CFU mi⁻¹ colony formation (Fig. 1). The study was carried out in completely randomized design with 4 treatments, and three replications. The endophytes were inoculated three times (over three weeks).

After 120 days, morphological characteristics of the seedlings, including the root length, root width, leaf fresh weight, leaf dry weight, root fresh weight, root dry weight, stem fresh weight, stem dry weight, stem length, chlorophyll content (using SPAD-502; Konica Minolta, Osaka, Japan), trunk width, and numbers of leaves and branches were measured. The data were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (SAS Institute, 1988), and in the cases of significant differences, mean grouping was performed by the least significant difference (LSD) test (P< 0.05).

Results

Result of fungal isolation

From 1674 tissue segments belonging to 190 seaweed samples (79 red, 62 brown, and 49 green), in total, 566 colonies were recovered from red (285), brown (185), and green (96) seaweed species. The seaweeds collected from Bushehr province had the highest colonization rate (48.29%) (Table 3). In addition, the red seaweed species of Bushehr had the highest rate of colonization among three seaweed species both in summer (53.08%) and winter (50.61%) seasons. Likewise, red seaweed species, the brown seaweed species collected from Bushehr province, with 85 isolates, had a higher colonization rate than Hormozgan and Sistan and Baluchistan. Regarding green seaweed species, Hormozgan provinces with 43 isolates had a higher colonization rate than Bushehr and Sistan, and Baluchistan. Red seaweed species with 285 colonies had the highest isolation rate, followed by brown (185 colonies) and green (96 colonies) algae (Table 3).

Phylogenetic analyses

The phylogeny constructed using the se-

quence data of ITS1-5.8S-ITS4rRNA molecular region grouped all isolates in three distinct clusters (Fig. 2). Results of molecular identification, phylogenetic analysis, and GenBank accession numbers of all 20 sequences (Identified in the present study) and other supplementary information are shown in Table 4. Additional details regarding the endophytic fungi have been depicted in Table 5.

As descript in Table 5, all fungi isolation belonged to the Ascomycota phylum and had a transverse wall. Morphological and microscopy analysis showed that colonies' color varied from black to white (black, dark and light brown, gold, purple, dark and light green, yellow and white). Some fungi isolation like *Aspergillus niger* was mono-color (black), and some isolation like *A. carlsbadensis* was di color (white/ purple). The spores' shapes were varied: Circle (in *Aspergillus, Penicillium* and *Paecilomyces* sp.), Spindle (in *Curvularia spicifera*) and Oval (in *Cladosporium macrocarpum*).

Spore array was in three forms, clustered (in *Aspergillus* and *Paecilomyces* sp. genus) (Fig. 3a), filamentous (in *Penicillium* genus) (Fig 3b), and sporadic (in *Curvularia spicifera* and *Cladosporium macrocarpum* genus) (Fig. 3c). All isolates have transverse walls in their septate hypha (Fig. 3d).

The fungi isolated by the F10 code (*Asper-gillus carlsbadensis*) was extracted only from *G. folliifera* seaweed species collected from Bushehr province in the spring sea-

Province	Season	No. of	Color	No. of	No.	Colonization%
		seaweed		segments	isolates	
		spices			generated	
Hormozgan	Spring	18	5 red	45	14	31.11
			7 brown	63	9	14.28
			6 green	54	12	22.22
	Summer	21	8 red	72	12	16.66
			7 brown	63	16	25.39
			6 green	54	7	12.96
	Winter	37	15 red	135	46	34.07
			15 brown	135	31	22.96
			7 green	63	24	38.09
	Total	76	76	684	171	25
Sistan and	Spring	2	1 red	9	2	22.22
Baluchistan						
			1 green	9	1	11.11
	Summer	45	24 red	216	101	46.75
			6 brown	54	21	38.88
			15 green	135	13	9.62
	Winter	14	3 red	27	11	40.74
			7 brown	63	23	36.50
			4 green	36	10	27.77
	Total	61	61	549	182	33.15
Bushehr	Spring	11	5 red	45	15	33.33
			5 brown	45	23	51.11
			1 green	9	0	0
	Summer	17	9 red	81	43	53.08
			7 brown	63	25	39.68
			1 green	9	3	33.33
	Winter	25	9 red	81	41	50.61
			8 brown	54	37	68.51
			8 green	54	26	48.14
	Total	53	53	441	213	48.29
	Total+	190	190	1674	566	33.81

 Table 3. Numbers of fungal colonies isolated from various seaweed samples collected from

 three province

son (Fig. 4). It was individual isolation that did not found in any other seaweed species. *Salinity test*

Although, most of fungal endophytes (85%) could grow properly on PDA medium incorporated with one molar NaCl concentration and got the number 8 and 7 ranking scores in salinity test, in 2 molar NaCl, only 60% of the isolates were able to grow decently. In 3 molar NaCl, only 35% of the isolates were grown (Table 6, Fig. 5 and Fig. 6).

Result of fungal endophytes inoculation as biofertilizer

After 120 days post-inoculation, Mexican lime seedlings were analyzed. As shown in Figure 8, fungal endophytes could improve the morphological characteristics of the Mexican lime seedlings. Selected fungal endophytes (F1, F2, F3, and F1F2),

Table 4. Name, identification code and accession number of the isolated endophytic fungi along with

 other additional information regarding their seaweed host, sampling site and sampling time

No	Fungi isolates	Code	Accession No.	Seaweed host	location	Season
1	Aspergillus niger	F1	MT420720	Cladophoropsis sp.	BU	Spring
2	Penicillium	F2	MT420723	S. bov, var. attrimum	BU	Spring
	chrysogenum					
3	A. flavus	F3	MT420731	<i>Chaetomorpha</i> sp.	B. S	Summer
4	P. chrysogenum	F4	MT476156	<i>Gracilaria</i> sp.	RA	Summer
5	Penicillium sp.	F5	MT476164	Champia parvulla	BU	Spring
6	A. terrus	F7	MT476158	Champia parvulla	\mathbf{BU}	Spring
7	A. puniceus	F8	MT476159	Champia parvulla	\mathbf{BU}	Spring
8	A. terrus	F9	MT420850	<i>Hypnea</i> sp.	B. S	Summer
9	A. carlsbadensis	F10	MT476165	G. follifera	BU	Spring
10	P. chrysogenum	F11	MT476166	S. angustifolium	B. L	Summer
11	A. terrus	F14	MT420880	<i>Gracilaria</i> sp.	BE	Summer
12	A. niger	F15	MT420884	Cladophoropsis sp.	Q. I	Spring
13	Curvularia spicifera	F16	MT420887	Iyengaria stellata	B. L	Winter
14	A. egyptiacus	F17	MT420890	<i>Gracillaria</i> sp.	BU. P	Winter
15	A. chevalieri	F18	MT420889	<i>Gracilaria</i> sp.	Q. I	Winter
16	P. chrysogenum	F20	MT420891	<i>Gracilaria</i> sp.	B. A	Winter
17	Cladosporium	F24	MT420892	S. boveanum	B. A	Spring
	macrocarpum					
18	Paecilomyces sp.	F25	MT476163	Iyengaria stellata	B. L	winter
19	P. chrysogenum	F29	MT420908	G.persica	B. A	Winter
20	P. chrysogenum	F33	MT476157	Grateloupia	B. A	Winter
				lithophila		

BU, B. S, RA, B. L, BE, BU. P, Q. I, B. A denote Bushehr, Bandar-e Sirik, Ramin in Sistan and Baluchistan province, Bandar-e Lengeh, Beris in Sistan and Baluchistan province, Bushehr power plant, Qeshm Island and Bandar Abbas, respectively.

Code	Таха	Fugal order	phylum	Fungal class	Family
F1	Aspergillus niger	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F2	Penicillium	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
	chrysogenum				
F3	A. flavus	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F4	P.chrysogenum	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F5	Penicillum sp.	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F7	A. terrus	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F8	A. puniceus	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F9	A. terrus	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F10	A. carlsbadensis	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F11	P. chrysogenum	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F14	A. terrus	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F15	A. niger	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F16	Curvularia spicifera	Pleosporales	Ascomycota	Dothideomycetes	Pleosporaceae
F17	A. egyptiacus	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F18	A. chevalieri	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F20	P. chrysogenum	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F24	Cladosporium	Capnodiales	Ascomycota	Dothideomycetes	Cladosporiaceae
	macrocarpum				
F25	Paecilomyces sp.	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F29	P. chrysogenum	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae
F33	P. chrysogenum	Eurotiales	Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	Trichocomaceae

 Table 5. Endophyte isolate code and Supplementary information of the endophytic fungi associated with some

 Iranian Macroalgae

were able to increase the root length, root width, leaf fresh weight, leaf dry weight, root fresh weight, root dry weight, stem fresh weight, stem dry weight, stem length, trunk width, SPADE number, leaf number and branches number in the inoculated Mexican lime seedlings (Fig. 7). The combination of F1F2 isolates resulted in higher trunk width, leaf number, leaf fresh/dry weight, root fresh/dry weight, stem fresh weight, and root length compared to when they were used alone (Fig. 7). The highest chlorophyll SPAD and root width were obtained by F1 inoculation. The highest stem length was obtained by F3 inoculation (Fig. 7).

Significant differences were found in all morphological characteristics measured by colonizing the Mexican lime seedling with endophytic fungi (Table 7 and Fig. 8).

Discussion

Numerous research studies have shown that asymptomatic, systemic fungi that colonize the healthy leaves, stems, roots, reproductive organs of the host significantly affect the physiology, ecology, and reproductive biology (Bonnet et al., 2000; Clay



Fig. 2. The 50% majority rule consensus tree inferred from Bayesian analysis under the GTR + G + I model. The accession numbers of strains and their reference codes are shown

and Schardl, 2002; Clay et al., 2005; Malinowski and Belesky, 2006; Knop et al., 2007; Alfaro and Bayman, 2011) of the host plants. It showed that applying microbial products as inoculants can improve crop production under stress conditions or enhance disease resistance. Endophytic fungi can confer protection to hosts against insect pests and abiotic stresses (Thrower and Lewis, 1973; Clay and Schardl, 2002). The simulations of plant growth executed by plant growth promoters could be attributed to tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses and improved plant nutrition (Machungo et al., 2009).

DNA analyzing method is a rapid approach



Fig. 3. Microscopic results for fungal isolates spore array; **a**: clustered form in *Aspergillus* genus, **b**: filamentous form in *Penicillium* genus and **c**: sporadic form in *Curvularia spicifera* genus, **d**. septate hypha in fungal isolates (a the isolates have transverse wall in their septate hypha).



Fig. 4. Aspergillus carlsbadensis (F10), a fungal endophyte that was isolated just from *G*. *folliifera* species that collected from Bushehr Province in spring

to identifying fungi, especially in no sporulation endophytes (Lee et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 1996). The ITS1-5.8S-ITS4rRNA is a highly conserved region in fungi and can differentiate higher taxonomic levels. In contrast, ITS regions are highly variable and can be used to analyze lower taxonomic ones (Sugita and Nishikawa, 2003). Marine-derived endophytic fungi have been widely studied due to their bioactive metabolites (Bhadury et al., 2006; Newman et al., 2006). In the present study, the iden-



Fig. 5. Result of salinity test of the fungal endophyte (F33) on mediums incorporated with different NaCl concentrations (0, 1, 2, and 3 mol NaCl) after seven days; a, b, s, d, and e means: main stock, medium without NaCl, medium with 1 mol NaCl, medium with 2 mol NaCl and medium with 3 mol NaCl respectively





tification of fungi endophytes associated by different seaweed species (Rhodophyta, Chlorophyta, and Phaeophyta) collected from coastal regions of the Persian Gulf and Oman Sea was confirmed by PCR assay using universal primers (ITS1-5.8S-ITS4r-RNA sequence). Most isolates belonged to *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* genera. The type of endophytes varied based on seaweed species, sampling site, and sampling season. All isolates belonged to the Ascomycota phylum (Table 5).

Phosphate is one of the essential compounds needed for plant growth, generally found in insoluble form and not utilized by plants. Plant growth-promoting fungi with phosphate solubilizing ability belong to *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* genera (Noor-

No	Code	1	2	3	Colony color	Mono/Di	Spore shape	Septate
		mol	mol	mol		color		hypha
1	F1	8	7	5	Black	Mono	Circle/Clustered	+
2	F2	5	3	1	green	Mono	Circle/filamentous	+
3	F3	8	7	4	Green	Mono	Circle/Clustered	+
4	F4	8	8	6	Green	Mono	Circle/filamentous	+
5	F5	8	7	6	Green/creamy	Di	Circle/filamentous	+
6	F7	8	7	3	Brown/gold	Di	Circle/Clustered	+
7	F8	2	1	1	Brown	Mono	Circle/Clustered	+
8	F9	8	7	3	Brown	Mono	Circle/Clustered	+
9	F10	7	5	1	White/purple	Di	Circle/Clustered	+
10	F11	7	6	2	Black/white	Di	Circle/filamentous	+
11	F14	8	7	6	Yellow/green	Di	Circle/Clustered	+
12	F15	6	2	1	White	Mono	Circle/Clustered	+
13	F16	7	6	4	Dark gray	Mono	Spindle/sporadic	+
14	F17	7	5	2	Gray green	Di	Circle/Clustered	+
15	F18	8	8	6	Yellow	Mono	Circle/Clustered	+
16	F20	8	7	6	Purple	Mono	Circle/filamentous	+
17	F24	7	5	1	Dark green	Mono	Oval/ sporadic	+
18	F25	8	7	5	Dark green	Mono	Circle/Clustered	+
19	F29	8	8	7	Light brown	Mono	Circle/filamentous	+
20	F33	8	8	7	Dark green	Mono	Circle/filamentous	+

Table 6.	Physiological	and morphologica	characteristics reports	of endophytic	fungi isolations
----------	---------------	------------------	-------------------------	---------------	------------------

For salinity test, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 means; very weak, weak, relatively weak, relatively intermediated, intermediated, relatively severe, severe and very severe, respectively.

jahan et al., 2019). Numerous studies indicate that *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* are two common endophytes in different seaweed species (Suryanarayanan et al., 2010; Narayanan et al., 2013; Venkatachalam et al., 2015; Flewelling et al., 2015). Among the different genera identified in the seaweed species, the *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* genus had the highest number of colonies (55% and 30%, respectively). Out of 190 seaweed samples, 32 isolates (16.84%) belonged to *A. niger*. This is the first study that describes indigenous fungal endophytes isolated from Iranian seaweeds. It has been revealed that most endophytic fungi isolated from plants are members of the Ascomycota or their anamorphs (Rungjindamai et al., 2008).

Seven different species of *Aspergillus* were identified in the present study, including *A. niger*, *A. terras*, *A. flavus*, *A. puniceus*, *A. carlsbadensis*, *A. egyptiacus* and *A. chevalieri*. We also found differences in endophyte colonization between different sam-

SPAD $37.56\pm0.04^{***b}$ $59.73\pm0.04^{***a}$ 59.02 $59.66\pm0.03^{***a}$ 5 Trunk width $2.91\pm0.00^{***d}$ $3.93\pm0.00^{***b}$ 35.05 $3.6\pm0.01^{***bc}$ 2 Leaf no $2.2.00\pm0.1^{***d}$ $3.93\pm0.00\pm0.27^{***c}$ 36.36 $40.66\pm0.21^{***bc}$ 8 Branches $2.66\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.0.00\pm0.27^{***c}$ 36.36 $40.66\pm0.21^{***bc}$ 8 Branches $2.66\pm0.03^{**b}$ $30.33\pm0.08^{***b}$ 97.84 $25.66\pm0.11^{***c}$ 6 Leaf FW $4.99\pm0.02^{***c}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***b}$ 99.19 $10.06\pm0.01^{***b}$ 3 Leaf DW $0.45\pm0.00^{***c}$ $9.4\pm0.02^{***c}$ 99.19 $10.06\pm0.01^{***b}$ 3 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $12.28\pm0.02^{***c}$ 144.13 $16.66\pm0.01^{***b}$ 1 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***b}$ 1 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***b}$ 1 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.70\pm0.00^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***b}$ 7 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***d}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***b}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.33\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2	IRCC F2		IRCC	F1F2	IRCC	F3	IRCC
Trunk width $2.91\pm0.00^{***6}$ $3.93\pm0.00^{***6}$ 35.05 $3.6\pm0.01^{***6c}$ 2 Leaf no $22.00\pm0.1^{***6}$ $3.93\pm0.02^{***6}$ 35.35 $40.66\pm0.21^{***6c}$ 2 Branches $2.66\pm0.03^{**6}$ $3.33\pm0.03^{**6}$ $3.5.56\pm0.03^{**6}$ $3.66\pm0.03^{**6}$ 3 Stem length $15.33\pm0.03^{**6}$ $3.33\pm0.03^{**6}$ 37.84 $25.66\pm0.01^{***6}$ 3 Leaf FW $4.99\pm0.02^{***6}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***6}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***6}$ 9.919 $10.06\pm0.01^{***6}$ 6 Leaf DW $0.45\pm0.00^{***6}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***6}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***6}$ 9.919 $10.06\pm0.01^{***6}$ 6 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***6}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***6}$ $9.144.13$ $16.66\pm0.01^{***6}$ $2.10\pm0.00^{***6}$ 1 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***6}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***6}$ 81.61 $3.19\pm0.00^{***6}$ 1 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***6}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***6}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***6}$ 1 Stem FW $1.53\pm0.02^{***6}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***6}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***6}$ 1 Stem FW $1.53\pm0.02^{***6}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***6}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***6}$ 1 Stem FW $1.53\pm0.00^{**}6$ $2.53\pm0.06\pm0.00^{**}6$ $2.53\pm0.00^{**}6$ $2.53\pm0.00^{**}6$ $2.53\pm0.00^{**}6$ $2.55\pm0.00^{**}6$ 1 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***6}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***6}$ 9.01 $35.3\pm0.08^{**}6$ $2.55\pm0.16^{***6}$ $2.63\pm0.01^{**}6$ $2.55\pm0.01^{**}6$	1 59.02 59.6	66±0.03***a	58.83	$59.13\pm0.01^{***a}$	57.42	$59.53\pm0.04^{**a}$	58.49
Leaf no $22.00\pm0.1^{***d}$ $30.00\pm0.27^{***c}$ 36.36 $40.66\pm0.21^{***b}$ 8 Branches $2.66\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.33\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.5.36$ $40.66\pm0.21^{***b}$ 3 Branches $2.66\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.33\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.5.3\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.6.4\pm0.03^{**b}$ 3 Stem length $15.33\pm0.03^{**d}$ $30.33\pm0.08^{***b}$ 97.84 $25.66\pm0.11^{***c}$ 6 Leaf FW $4.99\pm0.02^{***c}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***b}$ 99.19 $10.06\pm0.01^{***b}$ 1 Leaf DW $0.45\pm0.00^{***c}$ $2.11\pm0.00^{***b}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{**b}$ 3 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $12.28\pm0.02^{***c}$ 144.13 $16.66\pm0.01^{**b}$ 2 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***b}$ 34.83 $2.10\pm0.00^{**b}$ 1 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***b}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{**b}$ 1 Root DW $1.35\pm0.00^{*b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{**b}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{**b}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{**c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{**c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{**b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.1^{**b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{**a}$ 9.01 $35.33\pm0.15^{**a}$ 1	35.05 3.6≟	±0.01***bc	23.71	$4.3\pm0.01^{***a}$	47.76	$3.37\pm0.01^{***c}$	15.80
Branches $2.66\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.33\pm0.03^{**b}$ $3.5.18$ $3.66\pm0.03^{**b}$ 3 Stem length $15.33\pm0.03^{***d}$ $3.33\pm0.03^{***b}$ $3.5.18$ $3.66\pm0.03^{**b}$ 3 Leaf FW $4.99\pm0.02^{***c}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***b}$ 97.84 $25.66\pm0.11^{***b}$ 1 Leaf DW $0.45\pm0.00^{***c}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***b}$ 99.19 $10.06\pm0.01^{***b}$ 3 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $12.28\pm0.02^{***c}$ 144.13 $16.66\pm0.01^{***b}$ 2 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***b}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{***b}$ 2 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***b}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{***b}$ 2 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***b}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{***b}$ 2 Root DW $1.53\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***b}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{***b}$ 2 Root DW $1.53\pm0.00^{**b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{***b}$ 54.90 $2.63\pm0.01^{**}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.16^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.3\pm0.15^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.3\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	36.36 40.6	66±0.21***b	84.81	$66.33\pm0.08^{***a}$	201.5	$40.00{\pm}0.1^{**b}$	81.81
Stem length $15.33\pm0.03^{***6}$ $30.33\pm0.08^{***6}$ 97.84 $25.66\pm0.11^{***c}$ 6 Leaf FW $4.99\pm0.02^{***c}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***b}$ 99.19 $10.06\pm0.01^{***b}$ 1 Leaf DW $0.45\pm0.00^{***c}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***c}$ 99.19 $10.06\pm0.01^{***b}$ 3 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.11\pm0.00^{***b}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{***b}$ 3 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $12.28\pm0.02^{***c}$ 144.13 $16.66\pm0.01^{***b}$ 2 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***c}$ 81.61 $3.19\pm0.00^{***b}$ 1 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***d}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***b}$ 7 Stem FW $1.53\pm0.00^{*b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{*ab}$ 54.90 $2.63\pm0.01^{*a}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{**b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.1^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	25.18 3.66	5±0.03**b	37.59	$3.66\pm0.03^{**b}$	37.59	$5.33\pm0.03^{**a}$	100.37
Leaf FW $4.99\pm0.02^{***c}$ $9.94\pm0.02^{***b}$ 99.19 $10.06\pm0.01^{***b}$ 1 Leaf DW $0.45\pm0.00^{***c}$ $2.11\pm0.00^{***b}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{***b}$ 3 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $12.28\pm0.02^{***c}$ 144.13 $16.66\pm0.01^{***b}$ 3 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***c}$ 81.61 $3.19\pm0.00^{***b}$ 1 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***d}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***b}$ 7 Stem FW $1.53\pm0.00^{*b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{*ab}$ 54.90 $2.63\pm0.01^{*a}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.1^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	97.84 25.6	56±0.11***c	67.38	$34.66\pm0.13^{***a}$	126.09	$38.00{\pm}0.1^{***a}$	147.87
Leaf DW $0.45\pm0.00^{***6}$ $2.11\pm0.00^{***6}$ 368.88 $2.10\pm0.00^{***6}$ 3 Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***d}$ $12.28\pm0.02^{***6}$ 144.13 $16.66\pm0.01^{***6}$ 2 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***d}$ $2.47\pm0.02^{***c}$ 81.61 $3.19\pm0.00^{***b}$ 1 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***d}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***b}$ 1 Stem FW $1.53\pm0.00^{*b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{*ab}$ 54.90 $2.63\pm0.01^{*a}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{**b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.16^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	99.19 10.0)6±0.01*** ^b	101.60	$13.87\pm0.01^{***a}$	177.95	$10.02\pm0.09^{**b}$	100.80
Root FW $5.03\pm0.02^{***6}$ $12.28\pm0.02^{***6}$ 144.13 $16.66\pm0.01^{***b}$ 2 Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***6}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***6}$ 81.61 $3.19\pm0.00^{***b}$ 1 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***6}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***ab}$ 1 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***6}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{**ab}$ 1 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{**}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{**ab}$ 1 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.01^{*a}$ 2 Root length $27.00\pm0.1^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	368.88 2.10)±0.00***b	366.66	$3.29{\pm}0.00^{**a}$	631.11	$2.16\pm0.01^{**b}$	380
Root DW $1.36\pm0.02^{***4}$ $2.47\pm0.00^{***5}$ 81.61 $3.19\pm0.00^{***4b}$ 1 Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***4}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***4b}$ 1 Stem DW $1.53\pm0.00^{*b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{*ab}$ 54.90 $2.63\pm0.01^{*a}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.1^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	144.13 16.6	66±0.01***b	218.54	$17.8\pm0.00^{**a}$	253.87	$15.99\pm0.04^{**b}$	217.89
Stem FW $3.11\pm0.00^{***4}$ $6.06\pm0.02^{***c}$ 94.85 $7.01\pm0.00^{***ab}$ 1 Stem DW $1.53\pm0.00^{*b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{*ab}$ 54.90 $2.63\pm0.01^{*a}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.1^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	81.61 3.15)±0.00***b	134.55	$4.31{\pm}0.00^{**a}$	216.91	$3.44{\pm}0.01^{**b}$	152.94
Stem DW $1.53\pm0.00^{*b}$ $2.37\pm0.00^{*ab}$ 54.90 $2.63\pm0.01^{*a}$ 7 Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***c}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***c}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.1^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	94.85 7.01	$[\pm 0.00^{**ab}$	125.40	$8.71{\pm}0.05^{**a}$	180.06	$7.81{\pm}0.01^{***ab}$	151.12
Root length $29.5\pm0.16^{***6}$ $32.16\pm0.05^{***6}$ 9.01 $35.83\pm0.08^{***b}$ 2 Root width $27.00\pm0.1^{***b}$ $55.5\pm0.16^{***a}$ 105.55 $55.33\pm0.15^{***a}$ 1	54.90 2.63	$\pm 0.01^{*a}$	71.89	$2.59{\pm}0.06^{*a}$	69.23	$2.83{\pm}0.02^{*a}$	84.96
Root width 27.00±0.1***b 55.5±0.16***a 105.55 55.33±0.15***a 1	9.01 35.8	33±0.08*** ^b	21.45	$44.73{\pm}0.1^{***a}$	51.62	$44.16\pm0.04^{**a}$	49.69
	105.55 55.3	33±0.15 ^{***a}	104.92	$51.5\pm0.07^{**a}$	90.74	$52.16\pm0.06^{**a}$	93.18

lai	
1	
8	
Ĕ.	
Ξ	
õ	
u	
2	
Ę	
ŏ	
ar	
d	
Ħ	
3	
Š	
- SO	
Ξ.	
g	
ö	
Š	
g	
Ξ.	
Ξ	
ц	
ö	
. <u>X</u>	
le	
\geq	
q	
S	
-E	
ot	
5	
ŏ	
.20	
ũ	
£	
ō	
, Ř	
1	
.=	
SS	
ΤĔ	
Ę,	
Ξ.	
ц	
ö	
qi.	
Ξ	
Ś	
Je	
tł.	
fc	
č	
Щ	
\mathbf{v}	
Æ	
) U	
aı	
1 e	
\geq	
Ч.	
e	
_	



Fig. 7. Morphological analysis (Chlorophyll SPAD number, trunk width, leaf and branch number, stem length, leaf fresh weight, leaf dry weight, root fresh weight, root dry weight, stem fresh weight, stem dry weight, root length and root width) of Mexican lime seedling after 120 days. N, means; without inoculation. F2 is the F4 isolate in Table 3.



Fig. 8. Mexican lime seedling inoculated with fungal endophytes (F1+F2) compared to uninoculated seedling (N), 120 days post inoculation and seven days heat stress (45±2 °C)

pling sites. High differences in the number of colonization were found between the three provinces in which the sampling was made. The highest number of isolates were found in the seaweeds collected from Bushehr province (213 isolates), followed by Sistan and Baluchistan (182 isolates) and Hormozgan (171 isolates) provinces. Also, Bushehr had the highest colonization rate (48.29%), followed by Sistan and Baluchistan (33.15%) and Hormozgan (25%). These results could be due to Bushehr's position in the Persian Gulf region.

In this study, it was found that some endophytic fungi were restricted only to one seaweed species. For instance, some fungal endophytes such as *A. carlsbadensis* was observed only in *G. folliifera* collected from Bushehr in the spring season. The ecological and environmental conditions such as seawater temperature or salinity rate may affect the colonization of host tissues by endophytes. In another example, the species *G. persica* collected from Qheshm Island in spring had no endophytes. When it was collected from Bandar Abbas in winter, it was associated with four fungal endophytes.

In the genus Gracilaria, the highest number of isolates was observed in summer (66 isolates) in Ramin (38 isolates) and Beris (13 isolates) regions. The association of these seaweed species with high salinity-resistant endophytes may be one of the reasons for their abundance in the sea. Interestingly, some seaweeds (Gracilariopsis persica) had no endophyte in warm seasons whereas, in cool winter, several fungal endophytes were isolated from them. Gracilariopsis persica is an endangered species that has limited growth in warm seasons. The association of endophytes with this species in cold seasons seems to be an adopted defense mechanism to save this species from extinction.

In the current study, the ability of endophytic fungi to produce colony on the PDA medium incorporated with different con-

centrations of NaCl was studied and found, in one mol NaCl; most of the isolates (85%) were able to colonize the medium and allocated the score of 7 and 8 in the test of resistance to salinity conditions. In 2 mol NaCl, 60% of the studied isolates could produce a colony. The species Penicillium chrysoganum (F4), A. chevalieri (F18), P. chrysogenum (F29), and P. chrysogenum (F33) were able to colonize in the PDA culture over the experiment fully. These fungal endophytes were isolated from Gracilaria sp., Gracilariopsis persica, and Grateloupia litho*phila*, indicating the resistance to salinity in endophytes can vary based on seaweed species (Koch et al., 2017). In addition, it seems that the genus *Penicillium* was more tolerable to salinity than the other studied genus (Yadav et al., 2018).

Identifying the relationship between seaweeds and their associated endophytes provides important opportunities for research. Some endophytes like *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* genus have shown potential to produce pectinases, cellulases, xylanases, and proteases (Bezerra et al., 2012). Over 300 natural endophyte-derived products were identified from 32 endophytic fungi, with 22% of the investigated fungi being from the *Aspergillus* genus (Flewelling et al., 2015).

Aspergillus niger (MT420720), P. chrysogenum (MT476156), and A. flavus (MT420731) for F1, F2, and F3 isolates, respectively, were used for inoculation purposes. We selected these isolates due to their high frequency in the studied seaweed species in the current study.

We showed that the fungal endophytes F1, F2, F3, and F1F2 could improve the root length, root width, leaf fresh weight, leaf dry weight, root fresh weight, root dry weight, stem fresh weight, stem dry weight, stem length, trunk width, SPAD number, the number of leaf and branches in inoculating Mexican lime seedlings. Therefore, the fungal community present in the internal parts of the roots and foliage of Mexican lime seedlings has the potential role of promoting plant growth. One of the problems of lemon trees in summer is susceptibility to the fungus Nattrassia. In the present study, the endophyte-inoculated seedlings did not have any exposure to Nattrassia and had a higher growth rate than the control. Ngamau et al. (2014) showed that endophytes, through P solubilization or siderophore production (iron chelation), can help plants grow better. For instance, Nadeem et al. (2010) studied the plant growth-promoting activity and stress resistance capability of the genus Penicillium and Aspergillus. They found these two endophytic fungi produced physiologically active gibberellins. A previous study showed that seaweeds with high endophyte colonization had more ability to metal (Fe, Cu, Zn) absorption (Baghazadeh et al., 2020). So, some endophytes have a high capacity to metal absorbance from soil to host plants. It needs more investigation to understand the skills of the other seaweeds fungi endophytes obtained in this study, especially for biofertilizer aims.

Overall, our findings indicate that the fungal endophyte diversity in the seaweeds can be affected highly by seaweed species, sampling sites, and sampling season. Although this is the first study on fungal endophytes of Iranian seaweed, more research is needed to identify the functional and ecological significance of these fungal endophytes. This study showed that some of the identified species have a high potential to increase plant tolerance to salinity conditions that can be used to produce bio-fertilizers in the future. Accordingly, to reach this critical goal, establishing microbial reservoirs of seaweed endophytes is highly recommended.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Dr. Reza Rabiei, the head of the Natural Resources Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources Researches and Education Center of Hormozgan, for providing the facilities and their technicians' assistance for periodical algal samples collection. Also, we appreciate all members of the Biotechnology laboratory of Hormozgan University and the Environmental protection Department of Hormozgan for their kind collaboration in all processes of the experiments of the current study.

References

Alfaro AP and Bayman P. (2011). Hidden fungi, emergent properties: endophytes and microbiomes. Annual Review of Phytopathology. 49:291–315.

- Baghazadeh Daryaii L, Samsampour D, Bagheri A, Sohrabipou J. (2020). High content of heavy metals in seaweed species: A case study in the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman in the southern coast of Iran. Journal of Phycological Research. 4 (2): 544-560.
- Bezerra JDP, Santos MGS, Svedese VM. (2012). Richness of endophytic fungi isolated from *Opuntia ficus-indica* Mill. (Cactaceae) and preliminary screening for enzyme production. World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology. 28 (5):1989-1995.
- Bhadury P, Mohammad BT, Wright PC. (2006). The current status of natural products from marine fungi and their potential as anti-infective agents. Journal of Industrial Microbiology and Biotechnology. 33:325-337
- Bonnet M, Camares O, Veisseire P. (2000). Effects of zinc and influence of Acremonium lolii on growth parameters, chlorophyll-a fluorescence and antioxidant enzyme activities of ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L. cv Apollo). Journal of Experimental Botany. 51 (346): 945-953.
- Chhabra ML, Dhawan A, Sangwan N, Dhawan K, Singh D. (2009). Phytohormones induced amelioration of high temperature stress in *Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern and Coss. Proceedings of 16th Australian Research Assembly on Brassicas, Ballarat, Australia. 9-11.
- Clay K and Schardl C. (2002). Evolution origin and ecological consequences of endophyte symbiosis with grasses. American Naturalist. 160:99-127.
- Clay K, Holah J, Rudgers JA. (2005). Herbivores cause a rapid increase in hereditary

symbiosis and alter plant community composition. Proceeding of the National Academy Sciences of the United States of America. 102: 12465-12470.

- Davati N, Najafi MBH. (2013). Overproduction strategies for microbial secondary metabolites: A review. International Journal of Life Sciences and Pharma Research. 3: 23-27.
- Flewelling AJ, Currier J, Gray C, Johnson A. (2015). Endophytes from marine macroalgae: promising sources of novel natural products. Current Science. 109 (1): 88-111. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24905694.
- Jimenez C. (2018). Marine natural products in medicinal chemistry. ACC Medicinal Chemistry Letters. 9: 959-961. DOI: 10.1021/acsmedchemlett.8b00368
- Kjer J, Debbab A, Aly AH, Proksch P. (2010). Methods for isolation of marine-derived endophytic fungi and their bioactive secondary products. Nature Protocols 5 (3):479-490
- Knop M, Pacyna S, Voloshchuk N, Kjant S, Mullenborn C, Steiner U, Kirchmair M, Scherer HW, Schulz M. (2007). *Zea Mays*: Benzoxalinone Detoxification under sulfur deficiency conditions-A complex allelopathic alliance including endophytic *Fusarium verticilloides*. Journal of Chemistry Ecology. 33 (2): 225-237.
- Koch ED, Honig J, Vaiciunas J, Meyer WA, Bonos SA. (2017). Effect of endophyte on salinity tolerance in *Perennial ryegrass*. International Turfgrass Society Research Journal. 13 (1):459-465.
- Kusari S and Spiteller M. (2012). Metabolomics of endophytic fungi producing associat-

ed plant secondary metabolites: progress, challenges and opportunities. In: Roessner U (ed) Metabolomics. Rijeka, Croatia, In-Tech. 241-266. Doi: 10.5772/31596.

- Lee JS, Lee HK, Hur JS, Andreev M, Hong SG. (2008). Diversity of the lichenized fungi in King George Island, Antarctica, revealed by phylogenetic analysis of partial large subunit rDNA sequences. Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology. 18:1016-1023.
- Machungo C, Losenge T, Kahangi E, Coyne D, Dubois T, Kimenju J. (2009). Effect of endophytic *Fusarium oxysporum* on growth of tissue-cultured Banana plants. African Journal of Horticultural Science. 2:160-167.
- Malinowski DP and Belesky DP. (2006). Ecological importance of Neotyphodium sp. grass endophyte in agroecosystems. Grassland Science. 52 (1): 23-28.
- Mejía LC, Herre EA, Sparks JP, Winter K, Garcia MN, Van Bael SA, Stitt J, Shi Z, Zhang Y, Gultinan MJ, Maximova SN. (2014). Pervasive effects of a dominant foliar endophytic fungus on host genetic and phenotypic expression in a tropical tree. Frontiers in Microbiology. Doi:10.3389/fmicb.2014.00479
- Miliute I, Buzaite O, Baniulis D, Stanys V. (2015). Bacterial endophytes in agricultural crops and their role in stress tolerance: a review. Zemdirbyste-Agriculture. 102 (4): 465-478.
- Nadeem A, Hamayun M, Khan SA, Khan AL, Lee IJ, Shin DH. (2010). Gibberellin-producing endophytic fungi isolated from *Monochoria vaginalis*. Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology. 20 (12): 1744-1749.

- Narayanan K, Chopade N, Vasanth Raj P, Subrahmanyam VM, Venkata Rao J. (2013). Fungal chitinase production and its application in biowaste management. Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research. 72: 393-399.
- Newman DJ and Hill RT. (2006). New drugs from marine microbes: the tide is turning. J. Ind. Microbial Biotechnology. 33: 539-544.
- Ngamau CN, Matiru VN, Tani A, Muthuri CW. (2014). Potential use of endophytic bacteria as biofertilizer for *sustainable banana* (Musa spp.) production. African Journal of Horticultural Science. 8:1-11.
- Noorjahan A, Aiyamperumal B, Anantharaman
 P. (2019). Isolation and Charecterisation of
 Seaweed Endophytic Fungi as an Efficient
 Phosphate Solubiizers. Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia. 16 (1):33-39.
- Rateb ME and Ebel R. (2011). Secondary metabolites of fungi from marine habitats. Natural Product Reports. 28 (2):290-344.
- Rodriguez RJ, White Jr JF, Arnold AE, Redman ARA. (2009). Fungal endophytes: diversity and functional roles. New Phytologist. 182 (2): 314-330.
- Ronquist F and Huelsenbeck JP. (2003). Mr-Bayes 3: Bayesian phylogenetic inference under mixed models. Bioinformatics. 19 (12): 1572-1574.Doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btg180.
- Rungjindamai N, Pinruan U, Choeyklin R, Hattori T, Jones EBG. (2008). Molecular characterization of basidiomycetous endophytes isolated from leaves, rachis and petioles of the oilpalm, *Elaeis guineensis*, in Thailand. Fungal Diversity. 33: 139-161.

- SAS Institute. (1988). SAS/StAT User Guide, Release 6, 06, SAS Inst., Cary, NC.
- Sohrabipour J and Rabiei R. (2007). The checklist of green algae of the Iranian coast lines of the Persian Gulf and Gulf of Oman. Iranian Journal of Botany. 23 (1):146-149.
- Sohrabipour J and Rabiei R. (2008). Rhodophyta of Oman Gulf (South east of Iran). The Iranian journal of botany. 14 (1): 70-74.
- Soltani J and Moghaddam MSH. (2015). Fungal endophyte diversity and bioactivity in the mediterranean cypress *Cupressus sempervirens*. Current Microbiology. 70 (4):580-586.
- Strobel G, Daisy B. (2003). Bioprospecting for microbial endophytes and their natural products. Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews. 67 (4):491-502.
- Subramani R, Aalbersberg W. (2013). Culturable rare Actinomycetes: diversity, isolation and marine natural product discovery. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology. 97 (21): 9291-9321.
- Sugita T and Nishikawa A. (2003). Fungal identification method based on DNA sequence analysis: reassessment of the methods of the pharmaceutical society of Japan and the Japanese pharmacopoeia. Journal of Health Science. 49 (6): 531-533.
- Suriya J, Bharathiraja S, Krishnan M, Manivasagan P, Kim SK. (2016). Extremozymes from Marine Actinobacteria. Advances in Food and Nutrition Research. 79: 43-66.
- Suryanarayanan TS. (1992). Light-incubation: a neglected procedure in mycology. Mycologist 6:144
- Suryanarayanan TS, Venkatachalam A,

- Thirunavukkarasu N, Ravishankar JP, Doble M, Geetha V. (2010). Internal mycobiota of marine macroalgae from the Tamilnadu coast: distribution, diversity and biotechnological potential. Botanica Marina. 53: 457-468.
- Suryanarayanan TS. (2013). Endophyte research: going beyond isolation and metabolite documentation. Fungal Ecology. 6: 561-568.
- Thrower LB, Lewis DH. (1973). Uptake of sugars by *Epichloe typhina* (Pers. Ex Fr.)
 Tul, in culture and from its host, *Agrostis stolonifer* L. New Phytologist. 72: 501-508.
- Vatsyayan N, Ghosh AK. (2013). Isolation and characterization of microbes with biofertilizer potential. IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology. 7 (4):5-9.
- Venkatachalam A, Guvinda RMB, Thirunavukkarasu N, Suryanarayanan TS. (2015).
 Endophytic fungi of marine algae and seagrasses: a novel source of chitin modifying enzymes. Mycosphere. 6(3):345-355.
 Doi:10.5943/mycosphere/6/3/10.
- White Jr JF, Morrow AC, Morgan-Jones G, Chambless DA. (1991). Endophyte-host associations in forage grasses. XIV. Primary stromata formation and seed transmission in *Epichloë typhina*: developmental and regulatory aspects. Mycologia. 83 (1):72-81.
- Yadav AN, Verma P, Kumar V, Sangwan P, Mishra S, Panjiar N, Gupta VK, Saxena AK. (2018). Biodiversity of the genus *Penicillium* in different habitats. New and Future Developments in Microbial Biotechnology and Bioengineering. 3-18.

- Yuan ZL, Zhang CL, Lin FC, Kubicek CP. (2010). Identity, diversity, and molecular phylogeny of the endophytic mycobiota in the roots of rare wild rice (*Oryza granulate*) from a nature reserve in Yunnan, China. Applied and Environmental Microbiology.76 (5): 1642-1652.
- Zhang D, Yang Y, Castlebury LA, Cerniglia CE. (1996). A method for the large-scaleisolation of high transformation efficiency fungal genomic DNA. FEMS Microbiology Letters. 145 (2): 261-265.
- Zhang Y, Mu J, Feng Y, Kang Y, Zhang J, Gu P, Wang Y, Ma L, Zhu YH. (2009). *Broadspectrum* antimicrobial epiphytic and endophytic fungi from marine organisms: Isolation, bioassay and taxonomy. Marine Drugs 7 (2): 97-112. Doi:10.3390/md7020097.
- Zhang P, Li X, Wang BG. (2016). Secondary metabolites from the marine algal-derived endophytic fungi: Chemical diversity and biological activity. Planta Medica. 82 (09/10): 832-842.