Adult identity crisis in *Leucothrips* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) associated with the tropical ornamental plant *Codiaeum variegatum* (Euphorbiaceae)

Thomas L. Skarlinsky^{1,*}, Paul Rugman-Jones², Joe Funderburk³, Richard Stouthamer², and Carlos Sanabria Ujueta⁴

Abstract

Frequent US port of entry quarantine interceptions of unidentifiable larval *Leucothrips* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) species in association with *Codiaeum variegatum* (L.) Rumph. ex A. Juss. (Euphorbiaceae) ornamental plants from Costa Rica, initiated research to determine if these thrips were an invasive threat to US agriculture. Larval and adult *Leucothrips* were collected from the new growth leaves of *C. variegatum* and other plants in Florida and Costa Rica. There were no morphological differences among adult specimens from different hosts in Florida and Costa Rica; all identified as *Leucothrips furcatus* Hood by comparison with type specimens. However, morphological differences in larvae associated with these adult specimens were evident. DNA sequences of the mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase c subunit 1 gene (*COI*), and 2 regions of the nuclear ribosomal cistron (rRNA; the complete internal transcribed spacer 2 [*ITS2*], and a section of the *28S* large subunit rRNA) were used to verify that larvae and adults collected at the same site were the same species. Molecular data revealed species level divergence congruent with larval morphological differences.

Key Words: thrips; immature; molecular; morphology

Resumen

Intercepciones frecuentes de cuarentena en los puertos de entrada de larvas de especies de *Leucothrips* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) no identificables en asociación con plantas ornamentales de *Codiaeum variegatum* (L.) Rumph. ex A. Juss. (Euphorbiaceae) importadas de Costa Rica, inició una investigación para determinar si estos trips son una amenaza invasiva a la agricultura estadounidense. Larvas y adultos de *Leucothrips* fueron recolectados de las nuevas hojas de crecimiento de *C. variegatum* y otras plantas en la Florida y Costa Rica. No hubo diferencias morfológicas entre especímenes adultos de diferentes hospederos en la Florida y Costa Rica; Todos fueron identificados como *Leucothrips furcatus* Hood en comparación con los especímenes tipo. Sin embargo, hubo diferencias morfológicas evidentes en larvas asociadas con estos especímenes adultos. Se utilizaron secuencias de ADN de la subunidad 1 de la citocromo oxidasa mitocondrial del gen (*COI*) y 2 regiones del cistrón ribosómico nuclear (ARNr, el espaciador transcrito interno completo 2 [*ITS2*] y una sección del ARNr de la subunidad grande *28S*) para verificar que las larvas y los adultos recolectados en el mismo sitio eran de la misma especie. Los datos moleculares revelaron divergencia de nivel de especie congruente con las diferencias morfológicas larvales.

Palabras Clave: thrips; inmaduro; molecular; morfología

Leucothrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae: Dendrothripinae) represents an ill-defined genus of minute white thrips, most similar to the neotropical genus Halmathrips Hood and to the more cosmopolitan Pseudodendrothrips Schmutz (Mound 1999). Currently, Leucothrips consists of 5 species (Mound & Tree 2016). The females of Leucothrips pictus Hood, Leucothrips piercei Morgan and Leucothrips nigripennis Reuter can be morphologically distinguished by 3 unique character states: L. nigripennis has uniformly shaded brown forewings, L. pictus has 8 antennal segments, and L. piercei possesses simple sensory cones on antennal segments III and IV (Mound 1999). However, females of the remaining 2 species, Leucothrips furcatus Hood and Leucothrips theobromae Priesner are much more difficult to distinguish, both having 7 antennal segments, unshaded forewings, and forked sensory cones on antennal segments III and IV (Mound 1999). Indeed, morphologically they differ only by the absence or presence, respectively, of a crimson spot between the antennal bases (Hood 1931; Moulton 1933; Bailey 1957; Mound & Tree 2016).

Species differentiation based on male and larval specimens is even more problematic. The males of *L. piercei* and *L. nigripennis* have simple sensory cones on antennal segments III and IV, and males of *L. theobromae* have simple sensory cones on antennal segments III and IV (Mound 1999). Males of both *L. pictus* and *L. furcatus* have not been recorded (Mound 1999).

Published immature morphology of *Leucothrips* is limited to 3 species. Priesner (1923) described and illustrated the dorso-lateral abdominal setae of *L. theobromae* as gradually distally expanded and

¹United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Plant Protection Quarantine (PPQ), Miami Plant Inspection Station, 6302 NW 36th Street, Miami, Florida 33166, USA; E-mail: Thomas.L.Skarlinsky@aphis.usda.gov (T. L. S.)

²University of California, Department of Entomology, 3401 Watkins Drive, Riverside, California 92507, USA; E-mail: paulrj@ucr.edu (P. R.-J.), richard.stouthamer@ucr.edu (R. S.)

³University of Florida, North Florida Research and Education Center, 155 Research Road, Quincy 32351, Florida, USA; E-mail: jef@ufl.edu (J. F.)

⁴Ministerio Agricultura y Ganadería, Servicio fitosanitario del Estado, Laboratorio de Diagnóstico, Costa Rica; E-mail: csanabriau_07@yahoo.es (C. S. U.) *Corresponding author; E-mail: Thomas.L.Skarlinsky@aphis.usda.gov (T. L. S.)

increasing in length from abdominal segment VII to IX. In contrast, the lateral abdominal setae on *L. piercei* terminate in minute knobs (Vance 1974) and *L. nigripennis* possesses slender capitate setae posterolaterally on segments VII to IX (Mound 1999).

Specific differences may exist in host plant use. The plant Theobroma cacao L. (Malvaceae) is a host for L. theobromae (Priesner 1923), Capsicum annuum L. (Solanaceae) for L. piercei (Zamar et al. 2014), and Pteris cretica L. (Pteridaceae) for L. nigripennis (Mound 1999). Leucothrips pictus seem to be associated with leaves of forest trees and L. nigripennis with ferns (Mound 1999). Adults of L. furcatus have been reported from; Erythrina sp. L. (Fabaceae; Hood 1931); Codiaeum variegatum var. pictum (L.) Rumph. ex A. Juss. (Euphorbiaceae) (Halbert 1996), Albizzia julibrissin Durazz. (Fabaceae) (Diffie & Srinivasan 2010), and Lablab purpureus (L.) Sweet (Fabaceae) (Etienne et al. 2015). Undetermined species of Leucothrips were reported from the leaves of Cochlospermum vitifolium (Willd.) Spreng. (Bixaceae), and Ricinus species (Euphorbiaceae) (Mound & Marullo 1996). Also, records of undetermined species of Leucothrips intercepted from Sechium edule (Jacq.) Swartz (Cucurbitaceae) during US quarantine inspections were found using the United States Department of Agriculture, Plant Protection Quarantine, Agricultural Quarantine Activity System, PestID database queried from January 1, 1985 to January 1, 2016.

The final project proposal report of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF 2009) presented to the World Trade Organization identified *C. variegatum* as 1 of 4 key ornamental live plant crops in Costa Rica that posed a phytosanitary risk for the USA based on frequent quarantine pest interceptions from 2007 to 2009. The regular interception of unidentifiable larval *Leucothrips* with *C. variegatum* was cited as a high priority problem by growers due to economic loss from fumigation costs at the US port of entry and reduced plant quality after fumigation. Proposed goals developed by the STDF (2009) were to minimize the phytosanitary risk and to maintain access to the USA market for *C. variegatum*. The strategy to achieve these goals included better management practices at the farm level and additional research to determine if *Leucothrips* were an invasive threat to USA agriculture. The objective of this study was to establish the identity of *Leucothrips* populations on *C. variegatum* in Costa Rica.

Materials and Methods

Larval and adult thrips were collected from new growth leaves of: *C. variegatum* cultivar 'Petra', *Sechium edule*, and *T. cacao* in Costa Rica; and, from *C. variegatum* cultivar 'Petra' in Florida, USA (Table 1). The thrips were captured individually with a small artist brush and transferred to 70% ethyl or isopropyl alcohol. In the laboratory the thrips were separated into 2 groups, thrips in group 1 were slide mounted and those in group 2 were transferred to >95% ethyl alcohol for molecular analysis. Slides were prepared with Canada balsam media using modified methods from Mound and Marullo (1996) or Hoyer's media. The slides were cured in an oven at approximately 40 °C. After curing, the cover slips of the Hoyer slides were sealed with clear nail polish. All specimens were examined with a compound microscope (DM LB2; Leica, Wetzlar, Germany) under phase contrast at 100×, 200×, and 400× magnification, and were deposited at the Miami Plant Inspection Station (MPIS, Florida). Images were taken with Helicon Focus 6.1.0. software (HeliconSoft Ltd., Kharkiv, Ukraine), and adjusted for visual clarity with Photoshop® Elements 10 (Abobe Systems, San Jose, California).

The slide-prepared specimens (Table 1) were morphologically compared with *L. theobromae*, $1 \parent parent periods (US National Museum of Natural History [USNM], Beltsville Maryland) collected from$ *T. cacao*in Paramaraibo, Suriname;*L. furcatus* $, <math>2 \parent \parent periods (USNM)$, collected from *Erythrina* sp. in Guadeloupe (12 Mar 1915); *L. furcatus*, $1\parent$ (Florida State Collection of Arthropods [FSCA], Gainesville, Florida), collected from *C. variegatum*, Fort Lauderdale, Florida (1959); and *L. theobromae*, $3\ppropto \parent periods$, collected from *T. cacoa*, Quevedo, Ecuador (31 Oct 2008).

Whole genomic DNA was extracted from representative specimens (Table 1), using the non-destructive EDNA HiSp-ExTM tissue kit (Fisher Biotec, Wembly, Australia) with the following modifications to the manufacturer protocol. Individual specimens were immersed in a 60 μ L mix of the proprietary solutions 1A (48 μ L) and 1B (12 μ L) in a microcentrifuge tube and incubated at 95 °C for 30 min. Subsequent to incubation, 15 μ L of proprietary solution 2 was added. The contents of the tube were mixed by gentle vortexing, and, taking care to avoid touching the specimen, 60 μ L of the DNA template was transferred to a new microcentrifuge tube, and stored at -10 °C. Isopropyl alcohol (70%) was added to the original tube containing the specimen carcass. The extracted voucher specimens were prepared and curated as previously described.

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was initially used to amplify part of the mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase c subunit 1 gene (*COI*) and the complete internal transcribed spacer 2 gene (*ITS2*) of the nuclear ribosomal cistron (rRNA). A section of *COI* was amplified using the mtD-7.2F and mtD-9.2R primers of Brunner et al. (2002). PCR was performed in 25 μ L reactions containing 2 μ L DNA template, 1× Thermopol Buffer (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, Massachusetts), 2.5 μ L dNTP/dUTP mix (Thermo Scientific [#R0251], Waltham, Massachu-

Table 1. Collection data for adult (♀ or ♂) and larval (LV) *Leucothrips* specimens sequenced and examined morphologically in this study. Large numbers of additional specimens were subject to morphological examination only (**bold**).

Locality (geographic coordinates, decimal degrees)	Plant	Specimens	Date collected	
Florida, USA				
(25.814693°N, 80.288156°W)	Codiaeum variegatum	PR12-771 (♀), PR12-772 (ೆ), PR12-773 (LV), 17 × ♀ , 2 × ೆ	22 Aug 2012	
(25.823387°N, 80.292098°W)	Codiaeum variegatum	18 × LV	04 Jul 2016	
Costa Rica				
(10.29530°N, 83.74634°W)	Codiaeum variegatum	PR12-776 (♀), PR12-777 (♂), 18 × ♀ , 2 × ♂	24 Aug 2011	
(10.56542°N, 83.65580°W)	<i>Ricinus</i> sp.	PR12-778 (♀), PR12-779 (ೆ), PR12-780 (LV), 11 × ♀ , 2 × ೆ	23 Feb 2012	
(9.88566°N, 83.83165°W)	Sechium edule	PR12-781 (♀), PR12-782 (♀), PR12-965 (LV), 19 × ♀	17 Jan 2012	
(9.97080°N, 83.64235°W)	Sechium edule	158 × ♀	10 Jan 2013	
(9.87138°N, 83.80222°W)	Sechium edule	155 (♀), 156 (LV), 157 (LV), 24 × LV	17 Jun 2016	
(9.87598°N, 83.65580°W)	Theobroma cacao	PR12-783 (♀), PR12-784 (♀), 6 × ♀	27 Jul 2012	

Skarlinsky et al.: Adult identity crisis in Leucothrips


setts), 1 mM of MgCl₂, 10 µg BSA (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, Massachusetts), 0.4 µM of each primer, and 1.5 U Taq polymerase (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, Massachusetts). Following initial denaturing at 94 °C for 3 min, amplification was performed on a Mastercycler[®] ep gradient S thermocycler (Eppendorf North America Inc., New York, New York) employing 38 cycles of 94 °C for 30 s, 47 °C for 1 min, and 68 °C for 1 min 30 s. Reactions then were held at 68 °C for a further 3 min to ensure complete extension of all amplicons. ITS2 was amplified using the ITS2-forward and CS250 primers and protocol described in Rugman-Jones et al. (2006) with a single modification incorporating 0.4 μM dUTP instead of 0.2 μM dTTP in case of carryover contamination (Hartley & Rashtchian 1993). Based on our comparison of COI and ITS2 sequences, we subsequently used the primers 28sF3633 and 28b to amplify a section of the conserved 28S large subunit rRNA, following Rugman-Jones et al. (2010a), with the same dUTP modification detailed above. The success of the PCR was confirmed by standard gel electrophoresis, and amplicons were purified using Wizard PCR Preps (Promega, Madison, WI) or ExoSAP-IT (Affymetrix, Santa Clara, CA), prior to direct sequencing in both directions at the Institute for Integrative Genome Biology, University of California, Riverside, California.

Sequences were compiled and trimmed (to remove primers) using Sequencher[®] 4.9 (Gene Codes Corporation, Ann Arbor, Michigan). Flanking 5.8S and 28S regions of the ITS2 were identified using the annotate tool in ITS2 database (Keller et al. 2009, Ankenbrand et al. 2015), and removed. Sequence sets were aligned in MAFFT version 7.293 (Katoh & Standley 2013) using the G-INS-1 strategy and all sequences were deposited in GenBank (Benson et al. 2008); accession numbers KY679041-KY679088. COI sequences were translated using the EMBOSS-Transeq website (Rice et al. 2000; Goujon et al. 2010) to confirm the absence of nuclear pseudogenes (Song et al. 2008), and then collapsed into haplotypes using DnaSP v5.10.01 (Librado & Rozas 2009). The number and nature of polymorphic sites in the COI dataset was characterized using DnaSP, and pairwise divergence between the different haplotypes was estimated by calculating Kimura 2-parameter distances (K2P) using MEGA version 6 (Tamura et al. 2013). K2P was used to construct an unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean (UPGMA) tree and branch support was estimated using a bootstrap procedure with 1000 replicates. Sequences of the 2 rRNA genes (ITS2 and 28S) were not subject to formal analysis, but instead, the aligned dataset of each was examined by eye, for evidence of differentiation.

Results

No morphological differences were detected between the collected *Leucothrips* adults and the paratypes of *L. furcatus*. The collected adults, before maceration, did not have a hypodermal crimson spot between the antennal bases as observed in the paratype of *L. theobromae*. However, 2 distinct 2nd instar morphotypes were observed in larval specimens. The 2nd instar morphotype-A, collected from *S. edule* in Costa Rica had between 7 to 15 circular pores within each spiracular area of abdominal tergite II (Fig. 1) and the pronotal setae pair VI were ~19 to 24 μ m in length (Fig. 2). The 2nd instar morphotype-B that were collected from *C. variegatum* and *T. cacao* possessed 3 to 5 pores within each spiracular area of abdominal tergite II (Fig. 4).

Aligned sequences of a 434 base pair (bp) section of *COI* from 16 *Leucothrips* specimens (GenBank accessions KY679057–KY679072) harbored 74 polymorphic sites and collapsed into 7 haplotypes. The



Figs. 1–4. Second instar larva of *Leucothrips* species: (1) morphotype-A abdominal tergite II spiracle at 1000× magnification; (2) morphotype-A prothorax; arrow indicates setae D6; (3) morphotype-B abdominal tergite II spiracle at 1000× magnification; (4) morphotype-B prothorax; arrow indicates setae D6; scale = $50 \mu m$.

Costa Rican specimens from *S. edule* harbored a single haplotype, which in the UPGMA analysis formed a clade (Clade A), with 100% support, that differed by approximately 18% from a second fully supported clade containing all remaining haplotypes (Clade B; K2P ranged from 0.180–0.186; Fig. 5). Within Clade B, maximum divergence among the 6 haplotypes was 1.6% (K2P = 0.016; Fig. 5). The majority of nucleotide substitutions were synonymous, but changes at 4 positions (47–48, 254, and 368) resulted in 3 changes to the encoded amino acid chain, 2 of which (47–48, and 254) were diagnostic of the Costa Rican specimens from *S. edule*.

The same division was evident in the sequences of both regions of rRNA. There were multiple, consistent differences in a 505 bp aligned matrix of *ITS2* sequences (GenBank accessions KY679073–KY679088), between Costa Rican specimens from *S. edule* and those from the other hosts or localities (Fig. 6). Similarly, across a 786 bp section of the highly conserved *28S*, there were consistent substitutions at 4 nucleotide positions; 109, 180, 287, and 558 (GenBank accessions KY679041–KY679056).

Discussion

Based on adult morphology, specimens of *Leucothrips* from populations in Costa Rica and Florida could not be differentiated. However, differences in larval morphology, and the DNA sequences of 3 separate genes (*COI*, *ITS2*, and *28S*), divided these *Leucothrips* specimens into 2 concordant groups. One group (Clade B; Fig. 5) consisted of specimens collected from *C. variegatum* in both Florida and Costa Rica, and also Costa Rican specimens from *T. cacao* and *Ricinus* sp. Low genetic divergence (*COI* <1.6%) and high morphological affinity (adult and 2nd instar larva) among the specimens in this group provide strong evidence that they constitute a single species. In contrast, despite the absence of adult morphological differences, the second group (Clade A; Fig. 5), consisting only of specimens collected from *S. edule* in Costa Rica, was clearly genetically divergent (*COI* ~18%). The




Fig. 5. An unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean (UPGMA) tree of Kimura 2-parameter distances (K2P) among the cytochrome oxidase c subunit 1 gene (*COI*) sequences of *Leucothrips* collections that are indistinguishable based on adult morphology. The optimal tree with the sum of branch length = 0.19814793 is shown. The percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test (1000 replicates) is shown next to the branches. The tree is drawn to scale. Analyses were conducted in MEGA version 6.

2nd instar larva of Clade A also were morphologically different from those of Clade B, further indicating that the former likely represents another, cryptic species.

This is not the first time that such cryptic diversity has been uncovered in Thysanoptera, with the aid of DNA sequence data. For example, previous molecular studies of important thrip (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) pest species such as Frankliniella occidentalis Pergande (Rugman-Jones et al. 2010b), Scirtothrips dorsalis Hood (Dickey et al. 2015), and Thrips tabaci Lindeman (Brunner et al. 2004; Jacobson et al. 2016), have all revealed evidence of cryptic species within those taxa. In each of these species, reexamination of adult morphology in light of DNA evidence, has failed to reveal any differential characters (Rugman-Jones et al. 2010b; Dickey et al. 2015; Brunner et al. 2004). However, an earlier morphological and biological study of T. tabaci, conducted before the invention of DNA barcoding, noted a difference in larval morphology between, what were therein proposed to be biotypes; the "tabaci type" and the "communis type" (Zawirska 1976). The types differed not only in larval morphology (absence of abdominal tergite IX posteromarginal teeth in tabaci vs. presence in communis), but also in reproductive strategy (arrhenotoky in tabaci vs. thelytoky in communis), and behavior (specialized feeding in tabaci vs. polyphagy

in *communis*). These differences were later corroborated by the finding of deep genetic divergence between the types (Brunner et al. 2004). Similarly, we also found a morphological difference between the larvae of our 2 *Leucothrips* genetic types. Furthermore, and again similar to *T. tabaci*, we also found potential differences in both reproductive strategy and feeding behavior between the *Leucothrips* types, although this is based on a relatively limited sample. There was a complete absence of males in the genetic type that was collected only from *S. edule*, suggesting that this species may be thelytokous and monophagous. Conversely we were able to find males in the genetic type collected from *C. variegatum* and *Ricinus* sp.

From our limited dataset, it appears that only 1 of the 2 types is established in Florida, however the specific identity of the 2 *Leucothrips* types remains ambiguous. Female adult morphology of both types matches that of *L. furcatus*. Interestingly, there is a complete absence of males in the type series of *L. furcatus* (Hood 1931), and, therefore, it may be inferred that the specimens from *S. edule*, that contained no males, are in fact the true *L. furcatus*. Indeed a much broader sampling of plant hosts and locations, accompanied by morphological and molecular study, is warranted before any taxonomic decisions are made.

	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90
PR12-781	GTTGAATTAA	CCAAACGACC	AGACTGCTGG	AGA CCCAC	50 CCC	GGGTC	TCTCAGCGAG	ATTGGAGG - T	TCCGCGACTT
PR12-782 PR12-965									
155 ADUL 156 LARV									
157 LARV PR12-771	A			ст.т.т.	 T.TCCCC	GAGAG			
PR12-772 PR12-773	A			CT.T.T. 		G A G A G		. A T . . A T .	
PR12-776 PR12-777	A			T . T .	T.TCCCC			. A T .	
PR12-778 PR12-779	A			T.T. CT.T.T.	T.TCCCC	GAGAG		. A T .	
PR12-780	A			CT . T . T .	T.TCCCC T.TCCCC T.TCCCC	GAGAGA		. A	
PR12-783 PR12-784	A			CT.T.T.	T.TCCCC	GAGAG.A		. A	
	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180
PR12-781	CGGTCGTGGT		TCCGTGAAGG	CGGAGGGTGC	GGGGCACTTG	TGCTTCGTAT	CCTCCGCTAA	AACACTGCAC	GGGACTCTGT
PR12-782 PR12-965									
155 ADUL 156 LARV									
157 LARV PR12-771						cc.	G .	c	
PR12-772 PR12-773						cc	G . G .	C	
PR12-776 PR12-777						cc	G . 	C C	
PR12-778 PR12-779							G.		
PR12-780							CG.	C	
PR12-783 PR12-784						cc	CG.	C	
	190	200	210	220	230	240 		250	270
PR12-781	TAAGAGAACC	AGGCGTTAAC	GGCAAACGAG	ACAAAGAGTA	TGGGGGAGAT	CGATCTCTTC	CTCCTTATTC	TGCGCCTCTA	CCCGAACCTG
PR12-782 PR12-965									
155 ADUL 156 LARV									
157 LARV PR12-771			· · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
PR12-772 PR12-773									
PR12-776 PR12-777						CG			
PR12-778 PR12-779									
PR12-780						C G			
PR12-783 PR12-784									
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	280	290	300	310	320	330	340	350	360
PR12-781	290 AT-ATCGTCC	290 TCGGTGACGG	300 CCCGGCGTGA	310 TGTTTTGAGT	CTATCATAAC	GTCTCGCTCG	340 CGAGTCGACA	350 CGCTT - AAGA	360 GAGAGGATGG
PR12-782 PR12-965	280 AT - ATCGTCC 	200 TCGGTGACGG	300 CCCGGCGTGA	310 TGTTTTGAGT		330 GTCTCGCTCG	340 CGAGTCGACA	350 CGCTT - AAGA	380 GAGAGGATGG
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV	AT - AT C GT C C 	290 TCGGTGACGG	300 CCCGGCGTGA	310 TGTTTTGAGT		GTCTCGCTCG	340 CGAGTCGACA		380 GAGAGGATGG
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV PR12-771	280 AT - AT C GT C C 	200 TCGGTGACGG		310 TGTTTTGAGT		GTCTCGCTCG			360 GAGAGGATGG
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV PR12-771 PR12-772 PR12-773	280 AT - ATCGTCC	200 TCGGTGACGG	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	310 TGTTTTGAGT		GTCTCGCTCG	340 CGAGTCGACA TT		300 GAGAGGATGG
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV PR12-771 PR12-772 PR12-773 PR12-776 PR12-777	280 AT - AT C GT C C 	200 TCGGTGACGG		3100		300 GTCTCGCTCG	340 CGAGTCGACA 		300 GAGAGGATGG A AAA
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV PR12-771 PR12-772 PR12-773 PR12-776	200 AT - AT CGT CC 	200		310 TGTTTTGAGT		GTCTCGCTCG	340 CGAGTCGACA T		300 GAGAGGATGG A AA AA
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV PR12-771 PR12-772 PR12-776 PR12-777 PR12-777	200 AT - AT CGTCC 	280 TCGGTGACGG		310 TGTTTTGAGT		GTCTCGCTCG	300 CGAGTCGACA T. T. T. T. T. T. T. T. T. T. T. T.		360 GAGAGGAT GG
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV PR12-771 PR12-773 PR12-776 PR12-777 PR12-779 PR12-779 PR12-779	200 AT - AT COTTO 	TCGGTGACGG		300 TGTTTTGAGT		GTCTCGCTCG		CCA. CCA. CCA. CCA. CCA. CCA. CCT. CCA. CCA	GAGAGGATGG GAGAGGATGG
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV PR12-771 PR12-772 PR12-776 PR12-777 PR12-778 PR12-778 PR12-770 PR12-780 PR12-780	200 AT - ATCGTCC - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	380	G. G. G. G. G. G. G. G. G. G. G. G. G. G	TGTTTTGAGT	CTATCATAAC	2000	TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT.		A
PR12-782 PR12-782 PR12-965 155 AOUL 156 LARV PR12-771 PR12-772 PR12-773 PR12-777 PR12-778 PR12-7780 PR12-780 PR12-781 PR12-784	200 AT - ATCGTCC - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	380		TGTTTTGAGT		2000	300 CGAGTCGACA T		300 GAGAGGATGG
Ph12-782 Ph12-965 Ph12-965 Ph12-965 Ph12-965 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-779 Ph12-779 Ph12-779 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784	200 AT - AT CGTCC 	380		TGTTTTGAGT	CTATCATAAC	2000	TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT.		A
PR12-782 PR12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV PR12-771 PR12-771 PR12-773 PR12-778 PR12-778 PR12-778 PR12-778 PR12-778 PR12-784 PR12-781 PR12-782	200 AT - AT CGTCC 	380		TGTTTTGAGT	CTATCATAAC	2000	TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT. TT.		A
Ph12-782 Ph12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV Ph12-771 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784	200 AT - ATCGTCC 	380		TGTTTTGAGT TGCATACAAG	CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGGTCG	T T		A
Ph12-782 Ph12-965 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-783 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 IS5 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773	200 AT - ATCGTCC 	380		TGTTTTGAGT TGCATACAAG AGG AGG	CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGGTCG	T T		A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-787 Ph12-787 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778	200 AT - AT CGT CC 	380		TGTTTTGAGT TGCATACAAG TGCATACAAG AGG AGG AGG AGG	CTATCATAAC 	۲۵۵۲۲۲۵۵۲۲۵۵ ۲۵۵۶۲۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰۰	T T		A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-777 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-783 Ph12-784 Ph12-783 Ph12-784 Ph12-787 Ph12-787 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778		300 AACCCGGGAC		TGTTTTGAGT	CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGCTCG	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-776 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-787 Ph12-784 Ph12-787 Ph12-784 Ph12-787 Ph12-778 Ph1		300 AACCCGGGAC		TGTTTTGAGT	CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGCTCG	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-781 Ph12-784 Ph12-781 Ph12-784 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778	G	AACCCGGGAC			CTATCATAAC 	CG. CG. CG. CG. CG. CG. CG. CG. CG. CG.	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-771 Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-783 Ph12-784 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778		300 AACCCGGGAC AACCCGGGAC AA AA AA AA AA AA AA AA AA AA AA AA A		TGTTTTAAGT	CTATCATAAC G	GTCTCGCTCG 	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-776 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784		300 AACCCGGGAC AACCCGGGAC A			CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGCTCG 	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-776 Ph12-776 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-783 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784	G G A C G A T C T C T C T C T C T C T C T C T C T	AACCCGGGGAC			CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGGTCG GTCTCGGTCG GTCATTCC GTCATTCC CG CG CG CG CG CG CG CG CG CG CG CG C	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-776 Ph12-776 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-783 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778	G	AACCCGGGAC 			CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGCTCG 	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV 157 LARV Ph12-771 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-781 Ph12-781 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-786 Ph12-778 Ph12-786 Ph12-778 Ph12-786 Ph12-778 Ph12-786 Ph12-778 Ph12-786 Ph12-778				TGTTTTAAGT	CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGCTCG GTCATTTCCT GTCATTTCCT CG 	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-778 Ph1				TGTTTTAAGT	CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGCTCG GTCATTTCCT GTCATTTCCT CG CG CG CG CG 	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-781 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-778 Ph12-7	GCCCGTCGTC	AACCCGGGAC			CTATCATAAC 	GTCTCGCTCG 	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-778 Ph12-785 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-778	G			TGTTTTAAGT	GTATCATAAC 	GTCATTTCCT GTCATTTCCT GTCATTTCCT CG 	T T		A A A A A A A A
Ph12-782 Ph12-985 155 ADUL 156 LARV Ph12-772 Ph12-772 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-773 Ph12-778 Ph12-778 Ph12-784 Ph12-781 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-784 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-785 Ph12-778 Ph12-7	G	AACCCGGGAC		TGTTTTAAGT	GTATCATAAC 	GTCATTTCCT GTCATTTCCT GTCATTTCCT CG 	T T		A A A A A A A A

Fig. 6. Divergence in the internal transcribed spacer 2 (*ITS2*) DNA sequence of *Leucothrips* specimens from *Sechium edule* in Costa Rica relative to those from other hosts. Sequences were aligned with MAFFT v7.293 using the G-INS-1 strategy.

Acknowledgments

References Cited

We thank Debra Creel and Gary Miller, USDA, ARS, SEL, Beltsville, Maryland, for arranging the loan of the type specimens. Also to Laurence Mound, CSIRO, Canberra, Australia for critical review of a previous manuscript. Ankenbrand MJ, Keller A, Wolf M, Schultz J, Förster F. 2015. ITS2 database V: Twice as much. Molecular Biology and Evolution 32: 3030–3032.

Bailey SF. 1957. The thrips of California, part 1: suborder Terebrantia. Bulletin of the California Insect Survey 4: 143–220.

- Benson DA, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Lipman DJ, Ostell J, Wheeler DL. 2008. GenBank. Nucleic Acids Research 36: 25–30.
- Brunner PC, Fleming C, Frey JE. 2002 A molecular identification key for economically important thrips species (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) using direct sequencing and a PCR-RFLP-based approach. Agricultural and Forest Entomology 4: 127–136.
- Brunner PC, Chatzivassiliou EK, Katis NI, Frey JE. 2004. Host-associated genetic differentiation in *Thrips tabaci* (Insecta; Thysanoptera), as determined from mtDNA sequence data. Heredity 93: 364–370.
- Dickey AM, Kumar V, Hoddle MS, Funderburk JE, Morgan K, Jara-Cavieres A, Shatters Jr RG, Osborne LS, McKenzie CL. 2015. The Scirtothrips dorsalis species complex: endemism and invasion in a global pest. PLoS ONE 10: e0123747.
- Diffie S, Srinivasan R. 2010. Occurrence of *Leucothrips furcatus*, *Scirtothrips dorsalis*, and *Tenothrips frici* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) previously unreported from Georgia. Journal of Entomological Science 45: 394–396.
- Etienne J, Ryckewaert P, Michel B. 2015. Thrips (Insecta: Thysanoptera) of Guadeloupe and Martinique: updated check-list with new information on their ecology and natural enemies. Florida Entomologist 98: 298–304.
- Goujon M, McWilliam H, Li W, Valentin F, Squizzato S, Paern J, Lopez R. 2010. A new bioinformatics analysis tools framework at EMBL-EBI. Nucleic Acids Research 38 Suppl: W695–W699.

Halbert SE. 1996. Entomology Section. Coile NC, Dixon WN [eds.]. TRI-OLOGY 35: 5.

- Hartley JL, Rashtchian A. 1993. Dealing with contamination: enzymatic control of carrvover contamination in PCR. Genome Research 3: 10–14.
- Hood JD. 1931. Notes on New York Thysanoptera, with descriptions of new species III. Bulletin of the Brooklyn Entomology Society 26: 151–170.
- Jacobson AL, Nault BA, Vargo EL, Kennedy G. 2016. Restricted gene flow among lineages of *Thrips tabaci* supports genetic divergence among cryptic species groups. PLoS One 11: e0163882.
- Kazutaka K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT Multiple sequence alignment software version 7: improvements in performance and usability. Molecular Biology and Evolution 30: 772–780.
- Keller A, Schleicher T, Schultz J, Müller T, Dandekar T, Wolf M. 2009. 5.8S-28S rRNA interaction and HMM-based ITS2 annotation. Gene 430: 50–57.
- Librado P, Rozas J. 2009. DnaSP v5: a software for comprehensive analysis of DNA polymorphism data. Bioinformatics 25: 1451–1452.
- Moulton D. 1933. The Thysanoptera of South America (I). Revista Entomologia, Rio de Janeiro 3: 107–122.
- Mound LA. 1999. Saltatorial leaf-feeding Thysanoptera (Thripidae, Dendrothripinae) in Australia and New Caledonia, with newly recorded pests of ferns, figs and mulberries. Australian Journal of Entomology 38: 257–273.

- Mound LA, Marullo R. 1996. The thrips of Central and South America: an introduction. Memoirs on Entomology International 6: 1–488.
- Mound LA, Tree DJ. 2016. Genera of the leaf-feeding Dendrothripinae of the world (Thysanoptera, Thripidae), with new species from Australia and Sulawesi, Indonesia. Zootaxa 4109: 569–582.
- Priesner H. 1923. Ein beitrag zur kenntnis der Thysanopteren Surinams. Tijdschrift voor Entomologie 66: 88–111.
- Rice P, Longden I, Bleasby A. 2000. EMBOSS: The European Molecular Biology Open Software Suite. Trends in Genetics 16: 276–277.
- Rugman-Jones PF, Hoddle MS, Mound LA, Stouthamer R. 2006. Molecular identification key for pest species of *Scirtothrips* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae). Journal of Economic Entomology 99: 1813–1819.
- Rugman-Jones PF, Andersen JC, Morse JG, Normark BB, Stouthamer R. 2010a. Molecular phylogenetic placement of the recently described armored scale insect *Abgrallaspis aguacatae* and several congeners (Hemiptera: Diaspididae). Annals of the Entomological Society of America 103: 30–38.
- Rugman-Jones PF, Hoddle MS, Stouthamer R. 2010b. Nuclear-mitochondrial barcoding exposes the global pest western flower thrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) as two sympatric cryptic species in its native California. Journal of Economic Entomology 103: 877–886.
- Song H, Buhay JE, Whiting MF, Crandall KA. 2008. Many species in one: DNA barcoding overestimates the number of species when nuclear mitochondrial pseudogenes are coamplified. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 105: 13486–13491.
- STDF (Standards and Trade Development Facility). 2009. Accessing new ornamental plant markets by reducing phytosanitary issues through participatory research and extension: the Clean Stock Program. Project Preparation Grant STDF 286, http://www.standardsfacility.org/PPG-286 (last accessed 31 Mar 2017).
- Tamura K, Stecher G, Peterson D, Filipski A, Kumar S. 2013. MEGA6: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis version 6.0. Molecular Biology and Evolution 30: 2725–2729.
- Vance TC. 1974. Larvae of the Sericothripini (Thysanoptera:Thripidae), with reference to other larvae of the Terebrantia of Illinois. Bulletin of the Illinois Natural History Survey 31: 144–208.
- Zamar MI, de Borbón CM, Aguirre A, Miño V, Cáceres S. 2014. Primer registro del daño de *Leucothrips piercei* (Morgan) (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) en cultivos de pimiento (*Capsicum annuum* L.) (Solanaceae) en la Argentina. Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias UNCuyo 46: 213–219.
- Zawirska I. 1976. Untersuchungen über zwei biologische typen von *Thrips tabaci* Lind. (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) in der VR Polen. Archiv für Phytopathologie und Pflanzenschutz 12: 411–422.