

ANNALES
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA
LUBLIN-POLONIA

VOL. LI, 6

SECTIO DD

2001

Katedra Epizootologii i Klinika Chorób Zakaźnych Wydziału
Medycyny Weterynaryjnej AR w Lublinie

ZDZISŁAW GLIŃSKI

Defense strategies of the honey bee to fungal infections

Strategie obronne pszczoły miodnej w infekcjach grzybiczych

Key words: honey bee, immunity, fungal infections.

Słowa kluczowe: pszczoła miodna, odporność, infekcje grzybicze.

INTRODUCTION

The survival of insects depends on the successful defence against microbial invaders, parasites and predators (35). Modern immunologic techniques have brought a new approach to the honey bee immunity. The evidence is accumulated in favour of the concept that bees possess cellular recognition and effector mechanisms that effectively protect the body against infections (7, 8, 9, 10, 19, 20). The honey bee immune system, like other species of holometabolous insects, depends on two main categories of defense reactions: the cell-mediated responses such as phagocytosis and encapsulation of foreign objects (16, 32, 33, 34, 38) and cell-free defense mechanisms represented by the antimicrobial immune proteins (3, 12, 19, 20). The antibacterial activity of insect haemolymph is attributed to innate and inducible immune peptides and small proteins. The innate antibacterial activity is associated primarily with haemolymph lysozyme (25, 29), and other minor factors such as lectins (30), complement-like activity (1) and the phenoloxidase-activating system (37). The inducible immunity appears following microbial infections or experimental inoculation into the insect body cavity of non-living objects that disturb the host body integrity. The expression of insect non-self defence system requires the *de novo* synthesis in the fat body, a specific immune mRNA and

ribosomal protein of a wide range activity directed against bacteria and fungi (4, 26). Among the insect immune proteins, there are biochemically well characterized cecropin-family peptides (4) and attacins (13) in *Lepidoptera*, dipterocins in *Diptera* (27), insect defensins (5, 11) and apidaecins (8, 9, 10), abaecin (9) and hymenoptaecin (7) in the honey bee and other *Apoidea*.

MODES OF INFECTION

Fungi are common saprophytes of bees and combs. Most of the fungi collected by bees are unable to become established within the bee and the bee hive. However, some of the fungal species attack brood (*Ascosphaera apis*), brood and bees (*Aspergillus* sp.), *Aureobasidium pullulans*, molds (*Trichoderma lignorum*, *Mucor hiemalis*, *Rhizopus*) and yeasts (*Torulopsis*) are considered to be the honey bee pathogens.

In the honey bee fungi initiate infection by a spore germination. The developing invasive hypha penetrates the cuticle mechanically and enzymatically enters the bee body cavity where it rapidly develops and overgrows the internal organs. The invasion may sometimes start from ingested fungal spores that germinate in the intestines. Physical, chemical and biological stress factors, mainly extremal temperatures and high humidity, environmental pollution, pesticide poisonings, parasite invasions, attacks of predators are the factors predisposing the development of fungal infection in bees. They all can reduce the resistance pattern of the insect organism to mycoses by compromising the immune system and by impairment of the protective barriers of the body coverings, alimentary tract and tracheae.

Fungal toxins released by fungi, for example aflatoxins produced by *Aspergillus flavus*, act directly on the central nervous system of the bee. By affecting the endocrine system and most probably the internal defence system of the invaded individuals they decrease the resistance in the bees to mycotic infection. The outcome of infection depends upon the genetic potential of the pathogen to grow rapidly, utilizing host body constituents for nutrition, production of cuticle-degrading enzymes to penetrate anatomical protective thresholds of insect body, and to resist the host immune mechanisms. Death of an insect may result from mechanical and enzymatic damage to tissues affected by mycelium, abnormal function of organs, mechanical disturbances of blood circulation, toxic action on the host bee. Competition for food between the growing fungus and the infected bee organism cannot be excluded in pathogenesis of mycoses. For example, *Ascosphaera apis* effectively reduced the level of glucose and trehalose in tissues of the honey bee brood that the larvae normally use for glycogen synthesis (22). Obviously, fungus attacks, like bacterial invasion and other stress factors, affect the neuro-immune network and generate cellular and humoral immune responses that can to some extent protect the host against mycotic disease.

PROTECTIVE BARRIERS OF THE HONEY BEE AGAINST MYCOTIC INVASION

Various immune mechanisms can operate in the honey bee in fungal infections. The best known are those active in chalkbrood and stonebrood. Among them, the most important are protective barriers of the cuticle, tracheal system and intestines (2, 31). In internal defence, nondegradable materials and large parasites are encapsulated by a large mass of haemocytes that serve as a barrier between the haemocoel and the object. Bee haemocytes may also directly kill bacteria, fungal spores and other small foreign molecules in phagocytic process (16). Neither lysozyme nor the inducible haemolymph antibacterial proteins seem able to inhibit or kill fungal spores or mycelia in the invaded bee. Hygienic behaviour is important in resistance of the bee colony to chalk brood and stone brood (18).

The impermeable and hard cuticle, the biochemical environment of the midgut juice, its peritrophic membrane together with tracheal system form mechanical and physiological barrier effectively protecting the bee's body cavity against fungal invasion. Fungal spores, fragments of mycelia occurring on the body surface of the bee are removed mechanically with the sloughing of the epidermis. The antifungal activity of the cuticle results from the presence of waxes and unsaturated fatty acids impregnating the cuticle or present on its surface. Only yeasts and moulds that produce chitinase can actively penetrate the cuticular lining of the body and then enter the haemocoel. The cuticle damaged mechanically or enzymatically by growing hyphae also allow bacteria to enter body cavity and develop fatal septicaemias.

The chitinous lining of the fore- and hindgut is an adequate protective mechanical barrier for ingested microbes, excluding the chitinase producers. The midgut, however, is completely devoid of a chitinous lining and, therefore it is potentially the most vulnerable part of the alimentary canal from which microbes can penetrate into the haemocoel.

The biochemical environment of the midgut juice prevents the growth and multiplication of many bacterial species. Antimicrobial substances such as phytoncides, volatile essences present in ingested food can destroy bacterial and fungal invaders. Competition for food between gut bacteria and fungi could efficiently eliminate the massive doses of fungal spores from the gut. The role of acellular, gelatinous peritrophic membrane in protecting the midgut epithelium from mechanical and chemical damage by growing mycelium can not be excluded entirely. The epithelium and muscle layers of the intestines form barriers that restrict penetration of mycelium from the gut lumen into the haemocoel. The relatively low humidity in the tracheae is an important in restricting germination of spores and growth of fungus in the bee respiratory tract. Nevertheless, infections with heavy doses of spores or infections caused by highly pathogenic fungal species destroy the anatomo-

mical and physiological barrier of the honey bee (19). Fungi enter the haemolymph and cause severe deleterious effects in invaded brood and bees. *Ascosphaera apis* and *Aspergillus flavus* infect brood through the alimentary canal or via cuticle abrasions. In adult bees, the intestines are important portals of entry for pathogenic *Aspergilli*.

The antimicrobial activity of honey, nectar and pollen is an important factor in the colony that inhibits the development of many saprophytic bacteria and fungi in stored food, and that could destroy some pathogenic microorganisms (6). The acidity, osmotic pressure and production and accumulation of hydrogen peroxide is responsible for this effect in honey and nectar (41). Honey as a hyperosmotic medium may kill many living cells, except for those of osmophilic fungi and bacteria.

Secretions from honey bee exocrine glands contain biologically significant components. The hypopharyngeal gland secretions of young workers contain proteins which are bacteriostatic and bactericidal to a wide range of bacterial species (36). At least two bacterial inhibitors are identified in royal jelly: 10-hydroxy-2-decenoic acid and glucose oxidase. It can also inhibit or delay the growth of many fungi, for example *A. apis*.

Propolis that is a highly complex mixture of waxes, resins, balsams, oils and a small amount of pollen form a part of antimicrobial defense of the bee colony. Flavanones together with flavones, caffeic acid and its esters are considered to be responsible for antibacterial action of propolis (23). It is quite possible that fungi of plant origin and from animal sources, polluting environment and contaminating pollen sources and water gathered by bees are inhibited by biologically active compound of propolis.

BEHAVIOURAL RESISTANCE TO FUNGAL INFECTIONS IN HONEY BEES

Hygienic behaviour can be characterized by the rapid detection of sick and dead brood by worker bees, removal of dead insects from the colony, and the thorough cleaning of the cell of honey comb. Worker bees groom their own bodies and those of other bees, maintain the hygiene of the nest and remove debris from the hive. This hygienic activity is important in the resistance to chalkbrood and stone brood. The adults remove the mummified larvae using their mandibles and carry the larvae away from the nest. Bees that have no means of removing the pathogenic fungi from the gut and the body hair subsequently reinfect susceptible larvae when feeding them or pass on infections fungal spores to other adults to the colony (39). Resistance is supported by an ability of some worker bees to filter ingested spores

and mycelial fragments from the proventriculus. Inhibitors in the glandular-produced brood food are strong antibacterial and antifungal agents.

There are at least two mechanisms of behavioural resistance; both are genetic in nature. Hygienic behaviour is believed to be controlled by two recessive genes, one for uncapping diseased brood, and one for the removal of the mummy (40). The expression of hygienic behaviour depends on the strength of the bee colony. When colony size is reduced by removing frames of brood and associated bees, hygienic activity is depressed in hygienic colonies but there is no effect in non-hygienic colonies. The expression of hygienic behaviour is also altered by adding hygienic or non-hygienic bees to the colony, and by the colony composition. T a u b e r (40) has stated that all bees with hygienic behaviour tested to chalkbrood were resistant. S o u t h w i c k (39), however, has suggested that there is not a straightforward correlation between hygienic behaviour and resistance to chalkbrood. The chalkbrood infected colonies showed a weak correlation with hygienic behaviour.

HAEMOCYTE-MEDIATED ANTIFUNGAL IMMUNE RESPONSES

Antifungal activity of insect haemolymph includes haemocyte-mediated immune responses and cell-free immunity. Phagocytosis and encapsulation are two common types of defence reactions in the honey bee against invading fungal pathogens. These cellular immune reactions have been shown to be accompanied by changes both in the number of circulating haemocytes and in the relative proportions of different haemocyte types in the blood (24). In general, the infection of the haemocoel initiates a premature differentiation of haemocytes and their migration towards chemotactic stimulus. Phagocytosis predominates when the body cavity is exposed to small numbers of bacteria or fungal spores. In the final stage of phagocytic process, the engulfed spores or small fragments of fungal mycelium are digested in a phagolysosome that is formed by the combination of a lysosome with a phagosome. The lysosomal hydrolytic enzymes that destroy bacteria in some instances act against engulfed fungous material. Most probably, plasmatocytes and granular cells active in phagocytosis of bacterial cells can ingest and destroy fungi in phagocytic process. The role of the phenoloxidase system, melanins cannot be excluded in phagocytosis of insect pathogenic fungi.

Encapsulation consists of the formation of a capsule-like envelope around foreign objects with a diameter more than 10 μm that cannot be phagocytized by a single cell. Encapsulation is the most effective haemocyte-mediated immune response in protection of insect haemocoel in fungal infections. In general, the capsule is formed by attaching foreign material by blood cells, mainly granular cells and

plasmotocytes. The granulocytes release haemotactic factors which attract plasmatocytes to form the outer layer of the capsule around the encapsulated fungus. In some cases, melanin in melanotic crusts is deposited in the wall of the capsule.

IMMUNE PEPTIDES OF ANTIMICROBIAL ACTION

Neither lysozyme nor inducible antimicrobial peptides nor small proteins of the honey bee possess antifungal activity. Lysozyme, N-acetylmuramylhydrolase, is commonly found in haemolymph of several orders of insects. Lysozyme attacks primarily Gram positive bacteria, although there are some exceptions, for example, Gram negative bacteria such as mutants of *Escherichia coli*. Haemolymph of normal bees contains low levels of lysozyme. In larval honey bees and in adult worker bees it ranges from 5 to 25 µg/ml, and in pupae from 5-10 µg/ml of haemolymph (17, 29). The activity of bee lysozyme drastically increased during infection.

The honey bee generates several groups of humoral immune factors to resist microbial infections. The apidaecin-family peptides represent a large group of inducible small (about 2.0 kDa) proline-rich immune peptides of antibacterial activity against plant-associated, phytopathogenic and enteric bacteria (7, 8, 9). They are the most prominent component of the honey bee's inducible humoral defence against bacterial invasions. Antibacterial action of apidaecins is supported in honey bee defense by abaecin (9) and hymenoptaecin (10). Abaecin is a large inducible proline-rich peptide (4.0 kDa) of a moderate effect on both Gram negative and Gram positive bacteria. Hymenoptaecin is a glycine-rich small protein (10 kDa) with bactericidal activity for Gram negative and Gram positive bacteria.

In addition to the production of antibacterial peptides, the fat body of infected insects synthesizes cyclic molecules with antifungal activity and other immune entities of activity directed against both bacteria and fungi (5, 21).

Two cyclic antifungal peptides have been characterized so far, drosomycin from the fruitfly *Drosophila melanogaster* and thanatin from the bug *Podisus maculiventris*. Both peptides have a potent activity against phytopathogenic and human pathogenic filamentous fungi (14). Drosomycin of 44 amino acid residues with 8 cysteines engaged in the formation of four intramolecular disulfide bridges exhibits activity against a wide range of phytopathogenic and human pathogenic fungi, but it is inactive against bacteria (15). Thanatin, a 21 residue inducible immune peptide with a single disulfide bridge forming a C-terminal loop of 8 residues, is active against Gram positive and Gram negative bacteria and against phytopathogens and fungous human invaders (5, 21). At least, two inducible proline-rich peptides metalnikowins from *Palomera prasina* and *Drosophila* (5) and mietchnikowins from *Drosophila melanogaster* (28) act both on bacteria and fungi.

CONCLUSIONS

The honey bee is known to produce immune proteins in response to pathogens, which participate in the host defence system against invading bacteria. At least three families of the response antibacterial proteins, the apidaecins, abaecin and hymenoptaecin have a broad activity spectrum directed against a large variety of bacterial invaders. Bee lysozyme kills the Gram positive bacteria and participates in the haemocyte-mediated defense reactions. Neither lysozyme nor inducible immune proteins of the bee act against fungal invaders. The antifungal immune peptides such as drosomycin in the fruitfly (*Drosophila melanogaster*), thanatin in the bug (*Podissus maculiventris*), mietchnikowins and metalnikowins that exhibit activity against both bacteria and fungi have not been detected in the native and infected honey bees. Phagocytosis and encapsulation are the most common mechanisms in bees against entomopathogenic fungi. The hygienic behaviour, antimicrobial secretions of worker bees and protective barriers of the body coverings forming the effective thresholds and protecting the bee haemocoel against fungal invasions are supported by the haemocyte-mediated immune responses in defense against mycotic diseases. It, therefore, can be assumed that the protection of the bee colony against parasitic fungi is realized by hygienic behaviour and secretions, that of but individuals – by body coverings and cellular immune reactions that are realized under the control of the neuro-immune-endocrine network.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson R. S., Day N. K. B., Good R. A.: Specific hemagglutinin and a modulator of complement in cockroach hemolymph. *Infection and Immunity* **5**, 55, 1972.
2. Barr A. R., Shope R. E.: The invertebrate gut as a barrier to invading parasites. [In:] Maramorosh K., Shope R. E. (eds), *Invertebrate Immunity*. Academic Press; New York, USA, 1975, pp. 113-114.
3. Boman H.G., Hultmark D.: Cell-free immunity in insects. *Trends in Biochem. Sci.* **6**, 306, 1981.
4. Boman H.G., Hultmark D.: Cell-free immunity in insects. *Ann. Rev. Microbiol.* **41**, 103, 1987.
5. Bulet P., Hoffman N. D., Hetru C.: Antimicrobial peptides/polypeptides from insects: biochemical aspects. Cooperation in Science and Techniques, Action – 819 Entomopathogenic Nematodes Workshop, Univ. of Azores, Ponta Delgada, March 18-22; 1996, pp. 1-14.
6. Burgess D. M.: Antibiotic systems in honey, nectar and pollen. [In:] Morse R. A. (ed.), *Honey Bee Pests, Predators, and Diseases*. Comstock Publ. Ass. Ithaca and London, 1978, pp. 297-308.
7. Casteels P., Ampe C., Jacobs F., Tempst P.: Functional and chemical characterisation of hymenoptaecin, an antibacterial peptide that is infection-inducible in the honeybee (*Apis mellifera*). *J. Biol. Chem.* **268**, 7044, 1993.
8. Casteels P. R., Ampe C., Jacobs F., Vaeck M., Tempst P.: Apidaecins: antibacterial peptides from honeybees. *EMBO J.* **8**, 2387, 1989.

9. Casteels P.R., Ampe C., Riviere L., van Damme J., Elicone C., Fleming, M., Jacobs F., Tempst P.: Isolation and characterization of abaecin, a major antibacterial response peptide in the honeybee (*Apis mellifera*). Eur. J. Biochem. **187**, 381, 1990.
10. Casteels - Jossion K., Capaci T., Casteels P. R., Tempst P.: Apidaecin multipetide precursor structure: a putative mechanisms for amplification of the insect antibacterial response. Eur. Molecular Biology Org. J. **12**, 1569, 1993.
11. Dimarcq J. L., Keppi E. B., Lambert J., Reichhart J. M., Hoffmann D., Rankine S. M., Fothergill J. E., Hoffmann J. A.: Insect immunity: purification and characterization of a family of novel inducible antibacterial proteins from immunized larvae of the dipteran *Phormia terranova* and complete amino acid sequence of the predominant member, dipterecin A. Eur. J. Biochem. **171**, 17, 1988.
12. Dunn P. E.: Biochemical aspects of insect immunology. Ann. Rev. Entomol. **31**, 321, 1986.
13. Engström A., Engström P., Tao Z., Carlsson A., Bennich H.: Insect immunity: The primary structure of the antibacterial protein attacin F and its relation to two native attacins from *Hyalophora cecropia*. EMBO J. **3**, 2119, 1984.
14. Fehlbauer P., Bulet P., Michaut L., Lagueux M., Broekaert W. F., Hetru C., Hoffmann J. A.: Insect immunity: septic injury of *Drosophila* induces the synthesis of a potent antifungal peptide with sequence homology to plant antifungal peptides. J. Biol. Chem. **264**, 33156, 1994.
15. Flyg C., Dalhammar G., Rasmuson B., Boman H. G.: Insect immunity. Inducible antibacterial activity in *Drosophila*. Insect Biochem. **17**, 153, 1987.
16. Götz P.: Encapsulation in Arthropods. [In:] Brehčlin M., Boemare N. (eds), Immunity in Invertebrates. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986, pp. 153-170.
17. Götz P., Trenczek T.: Antibacterial proteins in insects other than *Lepidoptera* and *Diptera* and in some other Arthropods. [In:] Gupta A. P. (ed.), Immunology of Insects and Other Arthropods. CRC Press, London, 1991, pp. 323-348.
18. Gilliam M., Taber III S., Richardson G. V.: Hygienic behavior of honey bees in relation to chalkbrood disease. Apidologie **14**, 29, 1983.
19. Gliński Z., Jarosz J.: Mechanical and biochemical defences of honey bees. Bee World **76**, 110, 1995.
20. Gliński Z., Jarosz J.: Cellular and humoral defences in honey bees. Bee World **76**, 195, 1995.
21. Gliński Z., Jarosz J.: Novel antibacterial insect immune peptides and proteins. Folia Veterinaria (Kosice) **42**, 33, 1998.
22. Gochnauer T. A., Margetts V. J.: Properties of honeybee larvae killed by chalkbrood disease. J. Apicult. Res. **18**, 212, 1979.
23. Greenway W., Scaysbrook T., Whatley F. R.: The composition and plant origins of propolis: a report work at Oxford. Bee World **71**, 107, 1990.
24. Hink W. F.: Immunity in insects. Transpl. Proc. **2**, 233, 1970.
25. Jarosz J.: Simultaneous induction of protective immunity and selective synthesis of haemolymph lysozyme protein in larvae of *Galleria mellonella*. Biol. Zentralbl. **98**, 459, 1979.
26. Jarosz J.: Induction kinetics of immune antibacterial proteins in pupae of *Galleria mellonella* and *Pieris brassicae*. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. **106B**, 415, 1993.
27. Keppi E., Zachary D., Robertson M., Hoffmann D., Hoffmann J. A.: Induced antibacterial proteins in the haemolymph of *Phormia terranova* (*Diptera*). Insect Biochem. **16**, 395, 1986.
28. Levaschina E., Ohresser S., Bulet P.: Metchnikowin a novel immune inducible proline-rich peptide from *Drosophila* with antibacterial and antifungal properties. Eur. J. Biochem. **233**, 694, 1995.

29. Mohrig W., Messner B.: Immunreaktionen bei Insekten. I. Lysozym as Grundlegender antibakterieller Faktor in humoralen abwehrmechanismus der Insekten. *Biologische Zentrbl.* **87**, 439, 1968.
30. Olafsen J. A.: Invertebrate lectins: Biochemical heterogeneity as possible key to their biological function. [In:] Brehelin M. (ed.), *Immunity in Invertebrates*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Tokyo, 1986, pp. 94-111.
31. Orihel T. C.: The peritrophic membrane: its role as a barrier to infection of the arthropod host. [In:] Maramorosh K., Shope R. E. (eds), *Invertebrate Immunity*. Academic Press, New York, 1975, pp. 67-73.
32. Poinar G. O. Jr., Leutenegger R.: Ultrastructure of the formation of a melanotic capsule of *Diabrotica* (Coleoptera) in response to parasitic nematode (*Mermithidae*). *J. Ultrastruct. Res.* **25**, 293, 1968.
33. Ratcliffe N. A.: Cellular defense reactions of insects. [In:] Frank W. (ed.), *Immune Reaction to Parasites*. Gustaw Fisher Verlag, Stuttgart, 1982, pp. 233-244.
34. Ratcliffe N. A., Götz P.: Functional studies on insect haemocytes including non-self recognition. *Research in Immunology* **141**, 919, 1990.
35. Rinkevich B., Müller W. E. G.: Invertebrate immunology. *Progress in Molecular and Subcellular Biology*, **15**, 1996.
36. Rose R. I., Briggs J. D.: Resistance to American foulbrood in honey bees. IX. Effects of honey-bee larval food on the growth and viability of *Bacillus larvae*. *J. Invert. Pathol.* **13**, 74, 1969.
37. Söderhäll K., Smith V. J.: The prophenoloxidase activating system: the biochemistry of its activation and role in arthropod cellular immunity with special reference to crustaceans. [In:] Brehelin M., Boemare N. (eds), *Immunity in Invertebrates*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986, pp. 208-223.
38. Salt G.: The cellular defense reactions of insects. *Monographs in Exp. Biol.* **16**, 118, 1970.
39. Southwick E. E.: Hygienic behavior and disease resistance in honey bees. *Amer. Bee J.* **134**, 751, 1994.
40. Taber S.: Studies on chalkbrood disease. *Amer. Bee J.* **132**, 327, 1992.
41. White J. W., Subers M. H.: Studies on honey inhibine 2. A chemical assay. *J. Apicult. Res.* **2**, 93, 1963.

STRESZCZENIE

Grzyby patogenne dla owadów dysponują wieloma mechanizmami, które umożliwiają infekcję. Należą do nich: działanie mechaniczne grzybni, produkcja enzymów niszczących strukturę okrywy ciała i tkanki owada, wytwarzanie toksyn porażających układ nerwowy. Pszczoła miodna, podobnie jak i inne owady, dysponuje zespołem odczynów obronnych chroniących rodzinę, a także poszczególne osobniki wchodzące w jej skład przed szkodliwym działaniem grzybów. Odporność behawioralna związana z wykrywaniem i usuwaniem z rodziny chorego i martwego czerwia, oczyszczaniem komórek plastrów, a także obecność w zapasach pyłku, w miodzie i propolisie substancji o działaniu przeciwegrzybiczym hamuje rozmnażanie entomopatogennych grzybów w rodzinie pszczelej.

Istotną rolę w odporności czerwia i pszczoł na infekcje grzybicze odgrywa okrywa ciała, struktury przewodu pokarmowego i układu tchawkowego. Wśród mechanizmów obronnych jamy ciała przed infekcją grzybiczą najważniejsze znaczenie posiadają hemocytyczne odczyny obronne, takie jak fagocytoza i inkapsulacja. Pszczoła, w odróżnieniu od wielu innych gatunków owadów, w efekcie infekcji grzybiczej jamy ciała nie produkuje polipeptydów odpornościowych o aktywności przeciwgrzybiczej.