

1 **Changes in rearing conditions rapidly modify gut microbiota**

2 **structure in *Tenebrio molitor* larvae**

3 Marine Cambon^{1,2}, Jean-Claude Ogier², Anne Lanois², Jean-Baptiste Ferdy¹ and Sophie
4 Gaudriault²

5 1 Laboratoire Evolution et Diversité Biologique, CNRS-Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse,
6 France.

7 2 Laboratoire Diversité, Génome et Interaction Microorganisme Insectes, INRA-Université de
8 Montpellier, Montpellier, France.

9

10

11

12 Running title: Gut microbiota structure in *T. molitor*

13 Abstract

14 The gut microbiota of multicellular organisms has been shown to play a key role in their host
15 biology. In mammals, it has an invariant component, responsible for establishing a mutualistic
16 relationship with the host. It also contains a dynamic fraction which facilitates adaptation in
17 response to changes in the environment. These features have been well described in mammals, but
18 little is known about microbiota stability or plasticity in insects. We assessed changes in microbiota
19 composition and structure in a reared insect after a change in rearing conditions. We reared
20 *Tenebrio molitor* (Coleoptera, Tenebrioninae) larvae for five days in soil samples from two river
21 banks and analyzed their gut microbial communities by a metabarcoding technique, using the V3-
22 V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene and the housekeeping gene *gyrB*. We found that soil-reared insects
23 had a significantly more diverse microbiota than the control insects and that insects reared in soil
24 from different sites had significantly different microbiota. We confirmed this trend by absolute
25 quantification of the two main fluctuating taxonomic groups: the *Enterobacteriaceae* family and
26 the *Pseudomonas* genus, dominant in the soil-reared insects and in the control insects, respectively.
27 Our results suggest the existence of a resident microbiota in *T. molitor* gut, but indicate that rearing
28 changes can induce rapid and profound changes in the relative abundance of some of the members
29 of this resident microbiota.

30 **Keywords:** resident microbiota, *T. molitor*, soil acclimatization, microbiota plasticity

31 Background

32 Microorganisms have repeatedly been shown to play a key role in plant and animal biology
33 (Bordenstein and Theis 2015). If we are to understand the biology of a pluricellular organism, we
34 must consider its microbiota, the cohort of microorganisms associated with the host. In animals, the

35 gut microbiota is a key component, with major effects on host physiology. For example, the
36 mammalian gut microbiota has been the object of many studies on digestive functions with health
37 implications (Belizário and Napolitano 2015).

38 The composition of the mammalian gut microbiota displays both plasticity and invariant features.
39 The core microbiota, which consists of the microorganisms common to the majority of individuals
40 within a population, is generally defined as the most prevalent of the microbial species detected
41 (Shetty et al. 2017). This common fraction of the microbiota plays a fundamental role in supporting
42 the mutualistic symbiotic relationship with the host (Candela et al. 2012). For example, changes in
43 the human core microbiota are associated with physiological perturbations, such as obesity and
44 Crohn's disease (Turnbaugh et al. 2009; Hedin et al. 2015). However, another key feature of the
45 mammalian gut microbiota is its plasticity, i.e. its ability to change in composition and structure. In
46 humans, dietary changes induce a remarkable degree of variation in gut microbiota in terms of both
47 phylogenetic and functional composition (Candela et al. 2012). These changes depend on various
48 factors including host age, sex, genetic make-up, immune and health status (Shetty et al. 2017), but
49 also exposure to environmental bacteria, geographic origin and climate (Candela et al. 2012). It has
50 been suggested that this plasticity of the human gut microbiota facilitates rapid responses to
51 environmental change, resulting in rapid ecological adaptation (Alberdi et al. 2016).

52 Most studies on the gut microbiota concern mammals. However, the use of mammals, and more
53 generally of vertebrates, in experimental approaches raises numerous practical, financial and ethical
54 issues. Large-scale experiments require model organisms that are easy to manipulate and can be
55 obtained in large numbers. Insects are interesting experimental models in this respect. Although
56 their guts contain fewer microbial species than those of mammals (Engel and Moran 2013), insects
57 also rely on their gut microbiota for diverse functions, including development, nutrition, the
58 modulation of immune responses, gut homeostasis, protection from pathogens and toxins (Engel
59 and Moran 2013; Shi et al. 2013; Broderick et al. 2014; Erkosar and Leulier 2014; Caccia et al.

60 2016; Welte et al. 2016; Shao et al. 2017; Raymann and Moran 2018). The gut microbiota of non-
61 social insects is principally acquired from the environment through feeding (Engel and Moran
62 2013). Its composition depends on environmental conditions and diet in both laboratory and wild
63 individuals (Chandler et al. 2011; Montagna et al. 2015; Staudacher et al. 2016). For example, it has
64 been shown for some coleopteran species that microbiota changes with geographical location,
65 environmental condition, and life stage (Huang and Zhang 2013; Montagna et al. 2014).

66 One potential limit of these previous studies is that they used either insects from the wild, which
67 cannot be controlled for many of their characteristics, or lab-reared insects, which are controlled but
68 have a poorly diversified microbiota. Here we used laboratory-reared *T. molitor* larvae and
69 mimicked a soil environment by rearing the larvae for five days in different soil samples. We
70 assessed the changes in gut microbiota composition after acclimatization to soil samples and
71 demonstrated a large shift in gut microbial structure. We showed in addition that different soil
72 samples induced different modifications in insect microbiota, and that the observed plasticity was
73 probably dependent on changes in the abundance of some of the resident OTUs.

74 **Methods**

75 **Soil samples**

76 We sampled soil from riverside land around Montpellier in the South of France (Figure 1A): on the
77 banks of the Hérault river near Causse-De-La-Selle (N43°49.884' E003°41.222'; CDS sample) and
78 on those of the Lez river near Montferrier-sur-Lez (N43°40.801' E003°51.835'; MTF sample). Both
79 soils had a sand-silt-clay composition typical of riversides on chalky substrata. The sand:silt ratio
80 was higher for MFT than for CDS. We collected three soil subsamples from each plot. These
81 subsamples were taken at a depth of 20 cm and were separated by a distance of 10 m. They were
82 named CDS1, CDS2, CDS3 and MTF1, MTF2, MTF3 (Figure 1B). The use of these six soil

83 subsamples made it possible to compare the variability in microbiota composition both between and
84 within plots. Each soil subsample was split into four portions, each of which was placed in a 1 L
85 plastic box (Figure 1C), in which it was mixed with heat-sterilized (20 min at 121 °C) wheat bran
86 (1:3 (v/v) ratio, as previously described (Jung et al. 2014).

87 **Insects**

88 Larvae were provided by Micronutris (St-Orens, France) and fed with heat-sterilized bran before the
89 experiment. As it was not possible to determine their precise developmental stage, but we used only
90 larvae weighing between 20 and 50 mg, which should correspond to 13th or 14th instar individuals
91 (Huang et al. 2011).

92 **Rearing of *T. molitor* larvae in soil samples**

93 We maintained laboratory-reared *T. molitor* larvae for five days in sterilized wheat bran mixed with
94 soil samples. During this period, the larvae were incubated at 15 °C in the same humidity
95 conditions. They were then starved for 24 hours (Figure 1D) to exclude individuals that were
96 infected with pathogens (which would have died within this 24 hours period) and to limit the risk
97 that the DNA we extract comes from the larval alimentary bolus. This starvation period potentially
98 induces a stress on insect larvae, which might in turn impact their microbiota. We imposed it on all
99 insects, so that the potential bias it creates is identical in all treatments.

100 Control insects were reared in the same conditions than other insects except that they were
101 incubated in sterile wheat bran, with no soil mixed. Control insects microbiota should thus be close
102 to what it was for all insects before the experiment.

103 **DNA extraction**

104 We extracted DNA from two randomly sampled insects per box (which makes a total of 24 insects

105 per site) and 5 control insects. However, we failed to amplify 16S rRNA during PCR step for 2
106 samples, ending with 24 samples for CDS, 22 samples for MTF and 5 controls. Insect larvae were
107 sterilized in 70% ethanol, rinsed in water and then killed. The guts of the larvae were dissected in
108 sterile Ringer solution (Jung et al. 2014). Dissection tools were sterilized with 70% ethanol between
109 insects. Dissected guts were placed in an Eppendorf tube with 100 μ L of lysis solution and 1 μ L
110 lysozyme (Quick Extract, Bacterial DNA extraction TEBU-BIO) and ground with 3 mm steel beads
111 for 30 seconds at 20 Hz with a TissueLyzer (Qiagen). The resulting homogenates were incubated at
112 room temperature for two days, then frozen in liquid nitrogen and heated at 95 °C to ensure that all
113 the cells were lysed. DNA was prepared by the phenol-chloroform-alcohol and chloroform
114 extraction method. The DNA was resuspended in sterile water and quantified with a NanoDrop
115 spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). We performed extraction blank controls using DNA-free
116 water.

117 **16S and *gyrB* DNA amplification**

118 We targeted the V3-V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene, which is classically used for bacterial
119 identification in microbial ecology studies, as clean and complete reference databases are available
120 for this region. We also used the bacterial housekeeping gene *gyrB*, to support the data for the 16S
121 rRNA (Barret et al. 2015). The V3-V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene was amplified with the
122 PCR1F_460 (5'-ACGGRAGGCAGCAG-3') / PCR1R_460 (5'-TACCAGGGTATCTAATCCT-3')
123 primers (modified versions of the primers used in a previous study Klindworth et al. (2012)).
124 Amplification was performed with the MTP Taq polymerase (Sigma, ref 172-5330), according to
125 the manufacturer's protocol, with 1 μ L of 1/10 diluted DNA extract for each sample. The PCR
126 protocol used for these primers was 60 s at 94 °C, followed by 30 cycles of 60 s at 94 °C, 60 s at 65
127 °C, 60 s at 72 °C, and then 10 min at 72 °C. The *gyrB* gene was amplified with primers described
128 elsewhere: *gyrB*_aF64 5'-MGNCCNGSNATGTAYATHGG-3' and *gyrB*_aR353 5'-

129 ACNCCRTGNARDCCDCCNGA-3' (Barret et al. 2015). Amplification was performed with the
130 iProof High-Fidelity Taq polymerase (Bio-Rad, ref. 172-5301), according to the manufacturer's
131 protocol, with 1 μ L of 1/10 diluted DNA extract for each sample. The PCR protocol used for these
132 primers was 30 s at 98 °C, followed by 40 cycles of 10 s at 98 °C, 30 s at 60 °C, 30 s at 72 °C, and
133 then 10 min at 72 °C. For each PCR, we performed negative and positive controls with water and
134 bacterial DNA extracted from a pure culture of *Xenorhabdus nematophila* (*Enterobacteriaceae*),
135 respectively, and checked PCR amplicons by electrophoresis in a 1% agarose gel. We performed
136 technical replicates for the PCR and sequencing steps and obtained identical microbiota patterns
137 (see Additional File 2, for example). Amplicon libraries were sequenced by the GeT-Plage genomics
138 platform at Genotoul (Toulouse, France) with Illumina MiSeq technology and a 2x250 bp kit. Raw
139 sequence data of both 16S rRNA and *gyrB* are available from
140 <http://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena/data/view/PRJEB21797>.

141 **Metabarcoding data treatment**

142 Sequence data for both markers were analyzed with OBITools (Boyer et al. 2015). Raw paired-end
143 reads were aligned and merged, taking into account the phred quality score of each base to compute
144 an alignment score. Reads with a low alignment score (>50), containing unknown bases or with an
145 unexpected size (outside 400 bp and 470 bp, and 230 bp and 260 bp after primer trimming for the
146 16S rRNA gene and *gyrB* respectively) were removed from the dataset. After primer trimming,
147 singletons (i.e. sequences only found once in the dataset) were removed (Auer et al. 2017).
148 Sequences were then clustered into OTUs with the Sumacust algorithm (Mercier et al. 2013), using
149 a 97% similarity threshold (OBITools workflows and the raw count table are available in Additional
150 Files 3 and 4). We then removed from the datasets all clusters containing less than 0.005% of the
151 total number of reads (Bokulich et al. 2013). The remaining OTUs were assigned to a taxonomic
152 group with RDPclassifier (Wang et al. 2007) and the RDP-II reference database for the 16S rRNA

153 marker and with seq_classifier.py from the mothur pipeline (Schloss et al. 2009) and the reference
154 database from Barret et al. (2015) for *gyrB* gene (OTU assignments are available in Additional File
155 5).

156 Quantitative PCR analysis

157 To check for changes in OTU abundances, we performed quantitative PCR (qPCR) on two
158 randomly picked insects per soil subsample among those used in the metabarcoding analysis. The
159 sampling probability for each sample was adjusted for the total number of 16S rRNA reads for the
160 sample. The five DNA samples corresponding to control insects were all analyzed.

161 All qPCRs were performed in triplicate, with 3 μ L of reaction mixture, on a LightCycler480
162 machine (Roche Diagnostics), after the plate had been filled by an Echo 525 liquid handler
163 (Labcyte). The reagent concentrations were identical in all SYBR Green I assay reactions: 1X
164 Light-Cycler 480 SYBR Green I Master Mix (Roche Diagnostics), 500 nM each of the forward and
165 reverse primers specific for genus *Pseudomonas* (here named *Pse*-16S, Bergmark et al. (2012)), the
166 *Enterobacteriaceae* family (here named Entero-*rplP*, Takahashi et al. (2017)) or the *Eubacteria*
167 kingdom (here named *uni16S*, Vandeputte et al. (2017)) (see sequences in Additional File 6) and
168 DNA matrix. The DNA used was either genomic DNA (0.5 ng/ μ L) from the various reference
169 strains, to check primer specificity (*Escherichia coli*, *Serratia marcesens*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*,
170 *Salmonella typhimurium*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, *Pseudomonas protegens*, *Stenotrophomonas*,
171 *Acinetobacter*, *Enterococcus*) or a 1/100 dilution of insect gut DNA for metabarcoding. The qPCR
172 conditions were 10 minutes at 95 $^{\circ}$ C, followed by 45 cycles of 5 s at 95 $^{\circ}$ C, 10 s at 62 $^{\circ}$ C and 15 s at
173 72 $^{\circ}$ C, with a final dissociation curve segment. Cycle threshold (Ct) values were determined with
174 Light-Cycler 480 software. After the validation of primer specificity (13 < Ct < 37 for positive
175 controls, Ct > 40 for negative controls), absolute quantifications were calculated by the standard
176 curve method. Serial dilutions of standard samples consisting of genomic DNA from *E. coli*

177 ATCC25922 for the *rpLP* gene and the rRNA16S gene (*uni16S* primers) and genomic DNA from
178 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* CIP76.110 (=ATCC27853) for the 16S rRNA gene (*Pse* -16S primers)
179 were prepared and used for calibration. The gene copy number of the target gene ($GC N_{target}$
180 [copies]) in standard samples was estimated using the total amount of genomic DNA in the
181 calibration samples M_{DNA} [g], the size of the bacterial chromosome L_{DNA} [bp], the number
182 of targets per bacterial chromosome n_{target} [copies], Avogadro's constant N_A (6.022×10^{23}
183 bp mol⁻¹) and the mean weight of a double-stranded base pair M_{bp} (660 g mol⁻¹ bp⁻¹) as follows:

$$184 \quad GC N_{target} = \frac{N_A \times M_{DNA}}{L_{DNA} \times M_{bp}} \times n_{target}$$

185 Using the parameters of the curves linking $GC N_{target}$ and Ct in standard samples, we then
186 estimated the GCN of target genes in our gut samples. This estimation was possible because PCR
187 efficiency (PE) was very close to that for standard samples (Additional File 6).

188 **Community analysis**

189 All analyses were performed with R version 3.3.3 (R Core Team 2015) (see Additional File 7 and 8
190 for the overall workflow). We did not rarefy data (McMurdie and Holmes 2014), but we used
191 Chao1 index which is the estimated OTU richness of each sample, taking into account the possible
192 lack of detection of some rare OTUs. Chao1 index is thus the observed OTU richness per insect
193 plus an estimation of the unseen OTUs per insect. The Shannon index is based on relative
194 abundance data, to represent the effective OTU richness of the sample based on the predominant
195 OTUs. We estimated the Chao1 and Shannon alpha diversity indices with the *vegan* package of R
196 (Oksanen et al. 2017). We also calculated Pielou's evenness which is the Shannon diversity divided
197 by the natural logarithm of the OTU richness of the sample, and reflects how similar the relative
198 abundances of OTUs in a sample are.

199 We calculated the beta diversity distance matrix from the Jaccard and Bray-Curtis distances for
200 presence/absence and relative abundance data, respectively, using the vegan package. We also
201 computed Unifrac and wUnifrac distances for presence/absence and relative abundance data,
202 respectively (Lozupone and Knight 2005), with the Phyloseq package (McMurdie and Holmes
203 2013). Unifrac and wUnifrac distances include phylogenetic distances between pairs of OTUs. A
204 phylogenetic tree of the OTU sequences was, therefore, required. We generated this tree by aligning
205 OTU sequences with Seaview software and the muscle method. The phylogenetic tree was built
206 with RAxML and the GTRCAT substitution model for nucleotide sequences (Stamatakis 2014)
207 (Additional File 9). Differences in the gut bacterial community between soil-reared insects and
208 control insects were evaluated based on the beta diversity distance matrix, in PERMANOVA tests
209 implemented in the vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2017), with treatment as the explanatory
210 variable. We investigated differences between the gut bacterial communities of soil-reared insects,
211 by performing PERMANOVA tests on distance matrices with two explanatory variables: soil
212 sample (i.e. CDS or MTF) and soil subsample (i.e. CDS1-3, MTF1-3). Beta-diversity distances
213 were represented using a PcoA analysis from the vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2017).

214 **Results**

215 **Incubation of *T. molitor* larvae with soil increases the richness and** 216 **diversity of their gut microbiota**

217 After cleaning, the total dataset of the metabarcoding experiment contained 792,395 sequences
218 clustered into 106 bacterial OTUs. Rarefaction curves showed that most of the samples had reached
219 the saturation plateau (Figure 2A). We used the Chao1 index, which assesses the extrapolated
220 richness of OTUs, including an estimation for undetected rare OTUs, to compare alpha diversity
221 between soil-reared and control insects. The mean Chao1 index of the microbiota of soil-reared

222 insects (MTF and CDS) was a 48 ± 13 OTUs whereas that of control insects (BRAN) was 25
223 ± 9 OTUs (Figure 2B). The OTU richness of the gut microbiota therefore increased significantly
224 after the incubation of the insects with soil samples (Chao1 index, soil vs. control: Wilcoxon rank
225 sum test, $W=221$, $p\text{-value} = 1e-3$). A similar conclusion was drawn for analyses based on the
226 Shannon index, which reflects relative OTU abundance within samples (Figure 2B, soil vs. control:
227 Wilcoxon rank sum test, $W=216$, $p\text{-value} = 1e-3$). Moreover, control insects harbored bacterial
228 communities dominated by a very small number of dominant OTUs (low Shannon index ≈ 0.2
229 and low Pielou's evenness ≈ 0.02). OTU assignment identified these dominant OTUs as
230 belonging to the *Pseudomonadaceae* family (Figure 2C). By contrast, soil-reared insects harbored
231 bacterial communities with more balanced relative OTU abundances (Shannon index ≈ 1.7).
232 The gut microbiota of these insects was dominated by *Enterobacteriaceae*, together with
233 *Pseudomonadaceae* and other less frequent families, such as *Moraxellaceae* and *Aeromonadaceae*
234 (Figure 2C). This was confirmed by the analysis of Pielou's evenness index which was significantly
235 lower in control insects than in soil-reared insects (Wilcoxon rank sum test, $W=0$, $p\text{-value} = 7.6e-7$).
236 Thus, five days in soil significantly increased the richness of the microbiota in the gut of *T. molitor*
237 larvae, and modified the balance of OTUs present.

238 We also investigated the effect of soil treatments according to soil origin, by comparing the alpha
239 diversity of CDS and MFT samples. The Chao1 and Shannon indices were significantly lower in
240 MTF than in CDS samples (Figure 2B; Chao1 index: Kruskal-Wallis test, $\chi^2=12.93$, $p\text{-value} =$
241 $3e-4$; Shannon index: Kruskal-Wallis test, $\chi^2=9.6136$, $p\text{-value} = 1e-3$). The CDS and MTF
242 soils had therefore different impacts on both richness and bacterial balance.

243 **Soil treatment induces a change in microbiota composition that is** 244 **variable between soil sampling sites**

245 We investigated the effect of soil treatment on insect microbiota, by calculating the beta-diversity

246 between insect gut microbiota with various distance indices (Figure 3). We first calculated a
247 distance based on pairwise Jaccard and Bray-Curtis distances. These two indices are
248 complementary, because Jaccard distance depends purely on the presence/absence of OTUs,
249 whereas Bray-Curtis distance also takes into account the number of reads for each OTU as a proxy
250 for their relative abundance. We performed PCoA analysis on distance matrices (Figure 3A) where
251 control insects tended to cluster together. PERMANOVA analysis confirmed that community
252 composition differed between soil-reared insects and control insects (13 to 19% of the variance
253 explained by soil treatment, Table 1A).

254 The microbiota profiles of insects placed in soils from the same site (i.e. CDS or MTF) or in the
255 same soil subsample (e.g. CDS1, CDS2 or CDS3) did not cluster together perfectly. However, a
256 second PERMANOVA model for these samples identified two explanatory factors, soil sampling
257 site (i.e. CDS or MTF) and subsample identity (e.g. CDS1, CDS2 or CDS3), as having a significant
258 impact on gut community composition (Table 1B). Indeed, sample site explained 14 and 8% of the
259 variance and soil subsample explained 17 and 18% of the variance, for the Jaccard and Bray-Curtis
260 indices, respectively.

261 As reported above, the soil-reared insects had a microbiota dominated by *Enterobacteriaceae*
262 (Figure 2C). We thus estimated Unifrac distances, which take into account the phylogenetic
263 distances between OTUs, and wUnifrac distances, which also take relative OTU abundance into
264 account. With these corrections, the differences between control insects and soil-reared insects were
265 significant only when relative OTU abundance was taken into account (Figure 3; Table 1A). Subtle
266 but significant effects of sample site and soil subsample on community composition were also
267 observed with the Unifrac and wUnifrac indices (Figure 3; Table 1B).

268 Overall, our results show that soil treatment changes the community composition of the gut
269 microbiota and that this change is detectable despite inter-individual variability. The bacterial
270 communities present in the gut differ both between sample sites and between soil subsamples.

271 Most of the changes in the microbiota concern the relative abundances 272 of OTUs

273 We then pooled all individuals of a given treatment to determine which OTUs are found in at least
274 one individual for each treatment. The 47 OTUs found in control insects were also present in the
275 insects of the soil treatment groups (Figure 4A). The 44 OTUs common to all three conditions
276 matched 97% of the reads for soil-reared insects (gray area in Figure 4B and Figure 4C). However,
277 after soil treatment, *Pseudomonas*, the dominant OTU in control insects (98% of the reads)
278 accounted for only 27 and 23% of the reads in CDS and MTF samples, respectively (Figure 4C).
279 Conversely, *Serratia* species, together with the *Enterobacter* group, which accounted for less than
280 1% of sequence reads in controls, accounted for 35% and 43% of the reads for CDS and MTF,
281 respectively.

282 For confirmation of our initial metabarcoding results, we performed a second metabarcoding
283 analysis with another marker, a 300 bp region of the *gyrB* housekeeping gene (see Additional File
284 1). This single-copy marker has been shown to provide assignments to more precise taxonomic
285 levels than the 16S rRNA gene (Barret et al. 2015). In accordance with the results obtained with the
286 16S rRNA gene marker, *Pseudomonas* was the dominant OTU in control insects (more than 99 % of
287 the reads) and its relative abundance was lower in soil-reared insects (CDS: 14 % MTF: 17 % of the
288 reads). The genus *Serratia* and the *Enterobacter* group accounted for less than 0.06 % of the reads
289 in control insects and a large proportion of those for the insects in the two soil treatment groups
290 (CDS: 57 % MTF:70 % of the reads).

291 Finally, we also identified with 16S rRNA 59 OTUs that were not detectable in control insects but
292 were present at low abundance (3% of the reads) in at least one soil-reared insect (red dashed area
293 in Figure 4B and Figure 4D). These OTUs may correspond to taxa that were absent from the insects
294 before soil treatment, and that colonized the insect gut during incubation in soil. Alternatively, they

295 may have been present in the control insects at densities below the PCR detection threshold. Their
296 abundance would then have increased above this threshold during incubation, just like the
297 abundances of *Serratia* or *Enterobacter*. Overall, our data strongly suggest that the main effect of
298 soil treatment is a change in the relative abundances of OTUs, although low levels of bacterial
299 colonization from soil cannot be ruled out.

300 **The balance between members of the resident OTUs contributes to the** 301 **variation of abundances after soil treatment**

302 We assessed the variation of OTU balance after soil treatment further, by quantifying the bacterial
303 taxonomic groups present in all treatments but with different relative abundances between the two
304 contrasting sets of conditions studied (control versus soil-reared). We first characterized the gut
305 resident microbiota in our larvae, as the OTUs present in at least 95% of our samples (following
306 (Falony et al. 2016)). Based on 16S rRNA gene metabarcoding, we identified five resident OTUs:
307 four *Enterobacteriaceae* (*Enterobacteriaceae* 1, *Enterobacteriaceae* 2, *Serratia* and *Enterobacter*
308 group) and *Pseudomonas*. The resident OTUs obtained with the *gyrB* gene consisted of two OTUs,
309 *Pseudomonas* and *Serratia*, confirming the existence of an invariant bacterial population in our
310 insect gut microbiota. Based on the composition of this resident microbiota, we chose to monitor
311 *Pseudomonas* and the *Enterobacteriaceae* to check for changes in the abundance of these bacteria
312 following treatment. We performed quantitative PCR (qPCR) on a subset of 17 samples, including
313 the five control insects and two insects for each soil subsample. We first calculated the gene copy
314 number (GCN) of the 16S rRNA gene in each sample, using a universal primer pair targeting
315 *Eubacteria* (uni16S primers). As the number of 16S rRNA gene copies varies across *Eubacteria*
316 lineages (between 1 and 15 copies per genome, Lee et al. (2008)), the GCN cannot be used to
317 quantify the number of bacterial cells with precision (Angly et al. 2014). However, in our samples,
318 GCN/ μL ranged from 10^7 to 10^8 and did not differ significantly between samples (Kruskal-

319 Wallis rank sum test, chi squared = 2.66, df = 2, p-value = 0.26), which suggests that the total
320 number of bacteria was similar in our 17 samples. We then targeted a region of the 16S rRNA gene
321 specific to the *Pseudomonas* genus, (*Pse* -16S: 251 nucleotides of the V3-V4 hypervariable region,
322 with 4 to 7 copies per genome Bodilis et al. 2012), and a region of the *rplP* gene, region specific to
323 the *Enterobacteriaceae* family (Entero-*rplP* : 185 nucleotides of the *rplP* gene, one copy by
324 genome). The *Pse* -16S GCN in soil-reared insects was one tenth that in control insects (Figure 5A).
325 Conversely, the Entero-*rplP* GCN was 100 times higher in soil-reared insects (Figure 5B). Soil
326 acclimation therefore seems to induce a decrease in *Pseudomonas* abundance and an increase in
327 *Enterobacteriaceae* abundance. Our data suggest that the main effect of soil treatment is to modify
328 the relative abundances of the resident bacterial communities of the gut microbiota.

329 Discussion

330 Rearing larvae in soil rather than in bran caused major changes in gut microbiota structure. Soil-
331 reared larvae have a richer and more diverse gut microbiota than control larvae. Despite
332 considerable inter-individual variability, we found that the changes in community composition
333 depended on both the site from which the soil was obtained, and the precise soil subsample used.
334 An analysis of the OTUs found in the different samples suggested that the main effect of the soil
335 treatment was a change in the relative abundance of OTUs. We confirmed this trend by qPCR for
336 the two main taxonomic groups displaying changes in abundance: the *Enterobacteriaceae* family
337 and the genus *Pseudomonas*, which predominated in soil-reared insects and in the control,
338 respectively.

339 Our rearing conditions (laboratory versus soil acclimatization) were associated with two types of
340 gut microbial patterns, consistent with previous findings for laboratory-reared and wild insects. On
341 the one hand, gut microbiota communities of laboratory-reared insects, which are usually
342 maintained on very simple media and diets, are dominated by one or two bacterial strains:

343 *Pseudomonas* in our study, *Enterococcus* in moths (Chen et al. 2016; Staudacher et al. 2016) or the
344 *Enterobacteriaceae* group *Orbus* in fruit flies (Chandler et al. 2011). On the other hand, following
345 soil treatment, our larvae harbored more complex community profiles, with several
346 *Enterobacteriaceae* together with the *Pseudomonas* strain that we found in control insects. Wild
347 coleopterans, such as the forest cockchafer, *Melolontha hippocastani*, which has a soil-dwelling
348 larval stage, have a microbiota dominated by *Enterobacteriaceae*, essentially a consortium of
349 *Serratia*, and a Shannon diversity index close to that observed here for soil-reared insects (Arias-
350 Cordero et al. 2012). Other coleopterans, such as *Agrilus planipennis* and *Nicrophorus vespilloides*
351 (Vasanthakumar et al. 2008; Wang and Rozen 2017), both sampled from the wild and reared on a
352 natural diet, also have microbiotas dominated by *Pseudomonas sp.*, the *Enterobacter* group and
353 *Serratia sp.* These findings suggest that our protocol can be used to mimic soil-dwelling insects
354 effectively with reared insects. This might make it possible to obtain large numbers of individuals
355 while working on a relevant set of bacteria in further studies of the insect gut microbiota. Moreover,
356 we focused here on the gut microbiota, but soil treatment probably modifies the entire microbiota,
357 including the cuticular bacterial community. Our methodology is therefore likely to be of particular
358 interest for holobiont studies (Bordenstein and Theis 2015) involving controlled hypothesis-driven
359 experiments on insects with a relevant total bacterial community.

360 The changes we observed in gut microbiota structure may result from major changes in insect diet,
361 as insects may have access to different sources of food when incubated in soil compared to sterile
362 bran. Our results fit well to the diet influences on microbiota documented in several *Drosophila*
363 species (Chandler et al. 2011; Staubach et al. 2013; Vacchini et al. 2017), omnivorous cockroaches
364 (Pérez-Cobas et al. 2015), termites (Mikaelyan et al. 2015), lepidopterans (Broderick et al. 2004;
365 Belda et al. 2011; Priya et al. 2012) and a few coleopterans (Colman et al. 2012; Jung et al. 2014;
366 Franzini et al. 2016; Kim et al. 2017). Changes in microbiota structure could also depend on
367 physiochemical properties of the insect gut. In wood-feeding cockroaches, different parts of

368 intestinal tract showed differences in pH, redox potential and hydrogen contents, and were
369 associated to different bacterial communities (Bauer et al. 2015). The ingestion of soil particles
370 probably modifies some of these properties of the gut. The fact that the soil characteristics differed
371 between the two sampling sites (low sand/silt ratio for Causse-De-La-Selle (CDS), and higher
372 sand/silt ratio for Montferrier (MTF)) could thus explain in part their different impacts on *T. molitor*
373 gut microbiota.

374 The changes in the gut bacterial population may depend not only on treatment, but also on the
375 bacterial community initially present in the gut. Previous studies (Jung et al. 2014; Osimani et al.
376 2018) showed that a *Spiroplasma* species predominated in the gut microbiota of the larval lineage,
377 even after and environmental change. *Spiroplasma* has been shown to be a heritable endosymbiont
378 in *Drosophila* (Mateos et al. 2006). Similar effects were observed for other endosymbionts, such as
379 *Wolbachia*, *Cardinium*, *Blattabacterium*-like and putative *Bartonella*-like symbionts in mites
380 *Tyrophagus putrescentiae* following dietary changes (Erban et al. 2017). In all these case,
381 endosymbiont seem to impede major shifts in the gut microbiota or conceal changes in frequencies
382 that may occur in low-abundance OTUs. This effect is absent in our experiment, probably because
383 the insects we used are associated to *Spiroplasma* or any other endosymbiotic bacteria.

384 Our results also provide interesting insight into the spatial variation of the gut bacterial community
385 in insect populations. The differences observed after incubation in soil from different plots were
386 consistent with the findings of other studies on coleopterans, in which the dissimilarity of the gut
387 bacterial community between individuals is correlated with the distance between sampling sites
388 (Adams et al. 2010). However, we also observed a difference in the gut microbiota between insects
389 incubated with soils collected a few meters apart, at the same sampling site, and this difference was
390 detectable despite high levels of inter-individual variation. Minor environmental differences thus
391 have a detectable impact on the gut microbiota and structure this microbiota within insect
392 populations over very small geographic scales.

393 Overall, our experiments indicate that gut microbiota can be readily changed by modifying the
394 environment in which the insects are living. We identified resident taxa present in all the
395 environments we tested. These taxa change in relative abundance with environmental changes. The
396 range of environmental conditions tested here is narrower than that experienced by insects in the
397 wild, but results suggest that, following changes in environmental conditions, the insect gut
398 microbiota maintains a stable composition, but displays plasticity in terms of its structure.

399 **Availability of data and material**

400 Both the 16S rRNA and *gyrB* datasets generated and analyzed in this study are available from the
401 ENA (European Nucleotide Archive) repository, <http://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena/data/view/PRJEB21797>

402 **Funding**

403 MC obtained PhD funding from the French Ministry of Higher Education, Research and Innovation.
404 Metabarcoding sequencing was funded by the MEM-INRA metaprogram (P10016). This work was
405 also supported by the French Laboratory of Excellence project “TULIP” (ANR-10-LABX-41 ;
406 ANR-11-IDEX-0002-02)

407 **Authors' contributions**

408 MC, JBF and SG conceived the study. MC designed and performed the experiments. AL performed
409 qPCR analysis. MC and JCO analyzed the data. JBF and SG supervised the project. All authors
410 wrote, read and approved the final manuscript.

411 Acknowledgments

412 We thank Marie Frayssinet for help with soil sampling and insect acclimatization, and Lucie Zinger
413 for help with data analysis.

414 References

- 415 **Adams, A. S., Adams, S. M., Currie, C. R., Gillette, N. E. and Raffa, K. F.** 2010. Geographic
416 variation in bacterial communities associated with the red turpentine beetle (Coleoptera:
417 Curculionidae). *Environmental entomology* **39**, 406-414.
- 418 **Alberdi, A., Aizpurua, O., Bohmann, K., Zepeda-Mendoza, M. L., and Gilbert, M. T. P.** 2016.
419 Do vertebrate gut metagenomes confer rapid ecological adaptation?. *Trends Ecol Evol* **31**, 689 -
420 699.
- 421 **Angly, F. E., Dennis, P. G., Skarszewski, A., Vanwonderghem, I., Hugenholtz, P. and Tyson, G.**
422 **W.** 2014. CopyRighter: a rapid tool for improving the accuracy of microbial community profiles
423 through lineage-specific gene copy number correction. *Microbiome* **2**, 11.
- 424 **Arias-Cordero, E., Ping, L., Reichwald, K., Delb, H., Platzer, M. and Boland, W.** 2012.
425 Comparative evaluation of the gut microbiota associated with the below-and above-ground life
426 stages (larvae and beetles) of the forest cockchafer, *Melolontha hippocastani*. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e51557.
- 427 **Auer, L., Mariadassou, M., O'Donohue, M., Klopp, C. and Hernandez-Raquet, G.** 2017.
428 Analysis of large 16S rRNA Illumina datasets: impact of singleton read filtering on microbial
429 community description. *Mol Ecol Resour*, 00:1–11.
- 430 **Barret, M., Briand, M., Bonneau, S., Préveaux, A., Valière, S., Bouchez, O., Hunault, G.,**
431 **Simoneau, P. and Jacques, M. A.** 2015. Emergence shapes the structure of the seed microbiota.
432 *Appl Environ Microbiol* **81**, 1257-1266.
- 433 **Bauer, E., Lampert, N., Mikaelyan, A., Köhler, T., Maekawa, K. and Brune, A.** 2015.
434 Physicochemical conditions, metabolites and community structure of the bacterial microbiota in the
435 gut of wood-feeding cockroaches (Blaberidae: Panesthiinae). *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* **91**, 1-14.
- 436 **Belda, E., Pedrola, L., Peretó, J., Martínez-Blanch, J. F., Montagud, A., Navarro, E.,**
437 **Urchueguía, J., Ramón, D., Moya, A. and Porcar, M.** 2011. Microbial diversity in the midguts of
438 field and lab-reared populations of the european corn borer *Ostrinia nubilalis*. *PLoS ONE* **6**, 1-14.
- 439 **Belizário, J. E. and Napolitano, M.** 2015. Human microbiomes and their roles in dysbiosis,
440 common diseases, and novel therapeutic approaches. *Front Microbiol* **6**.
- 441 **Bergmark, L., Poulsen, P. H. B., Al-Soud, W. A., Norman, A., Hansen, L. H. and Sørensen, S.**
442 **J.** 2012. Assessment of the specificity of *Burkholderia* and *Pseudomonas* qPCR assays for detection
443 of these genera in soil using 454 pyrosequencing. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **333**, 77-84.

- 444 **Bokulich, N. A., Subramanian, S., Faith, J. J., Gevers, D., Gordon, J. I., Knight, R., Mills, D.**
445 **A. and Caporaso, J. G.** 2013. Quality-filtering vastly improves diversity estimates from Illumina
446 amplicon sequencing. *Nat Methods* **10**, 57.
- 447 **Bordenstein, S. R. and Theis, K. R.** 2015. Host biology in light of the microbiome: ten principles
448 of holobionts and hologenomes. *PLoS Biol* **13**, e1002226.
- 449 **Boyer, F., Mercier, C., Bonin, A., Le Bras, Y., Taberlet, P. and Coissac, E.** 2015. obitools: a unix-
450 inspired software package for DNA metabarcoding. *Mol Ecol Resour* **16**, 176-182.
- 451 **Broderick, N. A., Buchon, N. and Lemaitre, B.** 2014. Microbiota-induced changes in *Drosophila*
452 *melanogaster* host gene expression and gut morphology. *MBio* **5**, e01117-14.
- 453 **Broderick, N. A., Raffa, K. F., Goodman, R. M. and Handelsman, J.** 2004. Census of the
454 bacterial community of the gypsy moth larval midgut by using culturing and culture-independent
455 methods. *Appl and Environ Microbiol* **70**, 293-300.
- 456 **Caccia, S., Di Lelio, I., La Stora, A., Marinelli, A., Varricchio, P., Franzetti, E., Banyuls, N.,**
457 **Tettamanti, G., Casartelli, M., Giordana, B., Ferré, J., Gigliotti, S., Ecolini, D. and**
458 **Pennacchio, F.** 2016. Midgut microbiota and host immunocompetence underlie *Bacillus*
459 *thuringiensis* killing mechanism. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **113**, 9486-9491.
- 460 **Candela, S., Biagi, E., Maccaferri, S., Turrone, S. and Brigidi, P.** 2012. Intestinal microbiota is a
461 plastic factor responding to environmental changes. *Trends Microbiol* **20**, 385 - 391.
- 462 **Chandler, J. A., Lang, J. M., Bhatnagar, S., Eisen, J. A. and Kopp, A.** 2011. Bacterial
463 communities of diverse *Drosophila* species: ecological context of a host-microbe model system.
464 *PLoS Genet* **7**, e1002272.
- 465 **Chen, B., Teh, B. S., Sun, C., Hu, S., Lu, X., Boland, W. and Shao, Y.** 2016. Biodiversity and
466 activity of the gut microbiota across the life history of the insect herbivore *Spodoptera littoralis*. *Sci*
467 *Rep* **6**, 29505.
- 468 **Colman, D. R., Toolson, E. C. and Takacs-Vesbach, C. D.** 2012. Do diet and taxonomy influence
469 insect gut bacterial communities?. *Mol Ecol* **21**, 5124-5137.
- 470 **Engel, P. and Moran, N.** 2013. The gut microbiota of insects--diversity in structure and function.
471 *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **37**, 699-735.
- 472 **Erban, T., Ledvinka, O., Nesvorna, M. and Hubert, J.** 2017. Experimental manipulation shows a
473 greater influence of population than dietary perturbation on the microbiome of *Tyrophagus*
474 *putrescentiae*. *Appl Env Microbiol* **83**, e00128-17.
- 475 **Erkosar, B. and Leulier, F.** 2014. Transient adult microbiota, gut homeostasis and longevity: novel
476 insights from the *Drosophila* model. *FEBS Lett* **588**, 4250-4257.
- 477 **Franzini, P. Z. N., Ramond, J. B., Scholtz, C. H., Sole, C. L., Ronca, S. and Cowan, D. A.** 2016.
478 The Gut microbiomes of two *Pachysoma* Macleay desert dung beetle species (Coleoptera:
479 Scarabaeidae: Scarabaeinae) feeding on different diets. *PLoS ONE* **11**, e0161118.

- 480 **Hedin, C., van der Gast, C. J., Rogers, G. B., Cuthbertson, L., McCartney, S., Stagg, A. J.,**
481 **Lindsay, J. O. and Whelan, K.** 2015. Siblings of patients with Crohn's disease exhibit a
482 biologically relevant dysbiosis in mucosal microbial metacommunities. *Gut*, gutjnl-2014.
- 483 **Huang, Q., Hu, J., Zhou, D. G., Ling, S., Ruan, H. B., Wang, X. N., Chen, G., Zhu, T. H., Yang,**
484 **C. P. and Yang, W.** 2011. Comparison of growth, development, survivorship and food utilization of
485 two color varieties of *Tenebrio molitor* (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae). *Acta Entomol Sinica* **3**, 008.
- 486 **Huang, S. and Zhang, H.** 2013. The impact of environmental heterogeneity and life stage on the
487 hindgut microbiota of *Holotrichia parallela* larvae (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *PLoS ONE* **8**, 1-14.
- 488 **Jung, J., Aram, H., Park, Y. W., Kim, Y. J., Koh, H. and Woojun, P.** 2014. Gut microbiota of
489 *Tenebrio molitor* and their response to environmental change. *J Microbiol Biotechnol* **24**, 888-897.
- 490 **Kim, J. M., Choi, M. Y., Kim, J. W., Lee, S. A., Ahn, J. H., Song, J., Kim, S. H. and Weon, H.**
491 **Y.** 2017. Effects of diet type, developmental stage, and gut compartment in the gut bacterial
492 communities of two *Cerambycidae* species (Coleoptera). *J Microbiol* **55**, 21-30.
- 493 **Klindworth, A., Pruesse, E., Schweer, T., Peplies, J., Quast, C., Horn, M. and Glöckner, F.**
494 2012. Evaluation of general 16S ribosomal RNA gene PCR primers for classical and next-
495 generation sequencing-based diversity studies. *Nucleic Acids Res* **41**, e1-e1.
- 496 **Lee, Z. M. P., Bussema III, C. and Schmidt, T. M.** 2008. rrn DB: documenting the number of
497 rRNA and tRNA genes in bacteria and archaea. *Nucleic Acids Res* **37**, D489-D493.
- 498 **Lozupone, C. and Knight, R.** 2005. UniFrac: a new phylogenetic method for comparing microbial
499 communities. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **71**, 8228-8235.
- 500 **Mateos, M., Castrezana, S. J., Nankivell, B. J., Estes, A. M., Markow, T. A. and Moran, N. A.**
501 2006. Heritable endosymbionts of *Drosophila*. *Genetics* **174**, 363-376.
- 502 **McMurdie, P. J. and Holmes, S.** 2013. phyloseq: An R package for reproducible interactive
503 analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e61217.
- 504 **McMurdie, P. J. and Holmes, S.** 2014. Waste not, want not: why rarefying microbiome data is
505 inadmissible. *PLoS Comput Biol* **10**, e1003531.
- 506 **Mercier, C., Boyer, F., Bonin, A. and Coissac, E.** 2013. SUMATRA and SUMACLUSt: fast and
507 exact comparison and clustering of sequences.
- 508 **Mikaelyan, A., Dietrich, C., Köhler, T., Poulsen, M., Sillam-Dussès, D. and Brune, A.** 2015.
509 Diet is the primary determinant of bacterial community structure in the guts of higher termites. *Mol*
510 *Ecol* **24**, 5284-5295.
- 511 **Montagna, M., Chouaia, B., Mazza, G., Prosdocimi, E. M., Crotti, E., Mereghetti, V., Vacchini,**
512 **V., Giorgi, A., De Biase, A., Longo, S., Cervo, R., Lozzia, G. C., Alma, A., Bandi, C. and**
513 **Daffonchio, D.** 2015. Effects of the diet on the microbiota of the Red Palm Weevil (Coleoptera:
514 Dryophthoridae). *PLoS ONE* **10**, 1-22.
- 515 **Montagna, M., Gómez-Zurita, J., Giorgi, A., Epis, S., Lozzia, G. and Bandi, C.** 2014.

- 516 Metamicrobiomics in herbivore beetles of the genus *Cryptocephalus* (Chrysomelidae): toward the
517 understanding of ecological determinants in insect symbiosis. *Insect Science* **22**, 340-352.
- 518 **Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P.**
519 **R., O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, H., Szoecs, E. and Wagner, E.** 2017.
520 vegan: Community Ecology Package.
- 521 **Osimani, A., Milanović, V., Cardinali, F., Garofalo, C., Clementi, F., Pasquini, M., Riolo, P.,**
522 **Ruschioni, S., Isidoro, N., Loreto, N., Franciosi, E., Tuohy, K., Petruzzelli, A., Foglini, M.,**
523 **Gabucci, C., Tonucci, F. and Aquilanti, L.** 2018. The bacterial biota of laboratory-reared edible
524 mealworms (*Tenebrio molitor* L.): From feed to frass. *Int J Food Microbiol* **272**, 49 - 60.
- 525 **Pérez-Cobas, A. E., Maiques, E., Angelova, A., Carrasco, P., Moya, A. and Latorre, A.** 2015.
526 Diet shapes the gut microbiota of the omnivorous cockroach *Blattella germanica*. *FEMS Microbiol*
527 *Ecol* **91**, fiv022.
- 528 **Priya, N. G., Ojha, A., Kajla, M. K., Raj, A. and Rajagopal, R.** 2012. Host plant induced
529 variation in gut bacteria of *Helicoverpa armigera*. *PLoS ONE* **7**, 1-10.
- 530 **Raymann, K. and Moran, N. A.** 2018. The role of the gut microbiome in health and disease of
531 adult honey bee workers. *Curr Opin Insect Sci*.
- 532 **Schloss, P. D., Westcott, S. L., Ryabin, T., Hall, J. R., Hartmann, M., Hollister, E. B.,**
533 **Lesniewski, R. A., Oakley, B. B., Parks, D. H., Robinson, C. J. and others** 2009. Introducing
534 mothur: open-source, platform-independent, community-supported software for describing and
535 comparing microbial communities. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **75**, 7537-7541.
- 536 **Shao, Y., Chen, B., Sun, C., Ishida, K., Hertweck, C. and Boland, W.** 2017. Symbiont-derived
537 antimicrobials contribute to the control of the lepidopteran gut microbiota. *Cell Chem Biol* **24**, 66-
538 75.
- 539 **Shetty, S. A., Hugenholtz, F., Lahti, L., Smidt, H. and de Vos, W. M.** 2017. Intestinal
540 microbiome landscaping: insight in community assemblage and implications for microbial
541 modulation strategies. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **41**, 182-199.
- 542 **Shi, W., Xie, S., Chen, X., Sun, S., Zhou, X., Liu, L., Gao, P., Kyrpides, N. C., No, E. and Yuan,**
543 **J. S.** 2013. Comparative genomic analysis of the endosymbionts of herbivorous insects reveals eco-
544 environmental adaptations: biotechnology applications. *PLoS Genet* **9**, 1-12.
- 545 **Stamatakis, A.** 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large
546 phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1312-1313.
- 547 **Staubach, F., Baines, J. F., Künzel, S., Bik, E. M. and Petrov, D. A.** 2013. Host species and
548 environmental effects on bacterial communities associated with *Drosophila* in the laboratory and in
549 the natural environment. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e70749.
- 550 **Staudacher, H., Kaltenpoth, M., Breeuwer, J. A. J., Menken, S. B. J., Heckel, D. G. and Groot,**
551 **A. T.** 2016. Variability of bacterial communities in the moth *Heliothis virescens* indicates transient
552 association with the host. *PLoS ONE* **11**, 1-21.

- 553 **Takahashi, H., Saito, R., Miya, S., Tanaka, Y., Miyamura, N., Kuda, T. and Kimura, B.** 2017.
554 Development of quantitative real-time PCR for detection and enumeration of Enterobacteriaceae.
555 *Int J of Food Microbiol* **246**, 92 - 97.
- 556 **R Core Team** 2015. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.
- 557 **Turnbaugh, P. J., Hamady, M., Yatsunencko, T., Cantarel, B. L., Duncan, A., Ley, R. E., Sogin,**
558 **M. L., Jones, W. J., Roe, B. A., Affourtit, J. P. and others** 2009. A core gut microbiome in obese
559 and lean twins. *Nature* **457**, 480.
- 560 **Vacchini, V., Gonella, E., Crotti, E., Prosdocimi, E., Mazzetto, F., Chouaia, B., Callegari, M.,**
561 **Mapelli, F., Mandrioli, M., Alma, A. and Daffonchio, D.** 2017. Bacterial diversity shift
562 determined by different diets in the gut of the spotted wing fly *Drosophila suzukii* is primarily
563 reflected on acetic acid bacteria. *Env Microbiol Rep* **9**, 91-103.
- 564 **Vandeputte, D., Kathagen, G., D'hoel, K., Vieira-Silva, S., Valles-Colomer, M., Sabino, J.,**
565 **Wang, J., Tito, R. Y., De Commer, L., Darzi, Y. and others** 2017. Quantitative microbiome
566 profiling links gut community variation to microbial load. *Nature* **551**.
- 567 **Vasanthakumar, A., Handelsman, J. O., Schloss, P. D., Bauer, L. S. and Raffa, K. F.** 2008. Gut
568 microbiota of an invasive subcortical beetle, *Agrilus planipennis* Fairmaire, across various life
569 stages. *Environ Entomol* **37**, 1344-1353.
- 570 **Wang, Q., Garrity, G. M., Tiedje, J. M. and Cole, J. R.** 2007. Naive Bayesian classifier for rapid
571 assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **73**, 5261-
572 5267.
- 573 **Wang, Y. and Rozen, D. E.** 2017. Gut microbiota colonization and transmission in the burying
574 beetle *Nicrophorus vespilloides* throughout development. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **83**, e03250-16.
- 575 **Welte, C. U., de Graaf, R. M., van den Bosch, T. J. M., Op den Camp, H. J. M., van Dam, N.**
576 **M. and Jetten, M. S. M.** 2016. Plasmids from the gut microbiome of cabbage root fly larvae
577 encode SaxA that catalyses the conversion of the plant toxin 2-phenylethyl isothiocyanate. *Environ*
578 *Microbiol* **18**, 1379-1390.

579

580 Tables

Table 1: *PERMANOVA analysis of the community composition of the insect microbiota based on different diversity indices, with the percentage of the variance explained by each variable and the p-value in brackets*

Variable	Jacc	BC	Uni	wUni
A.	<i>All insects</i>			
Treatment	0.13 (1e-3)	0.19 (2e-3)	0.03 (0.07)	0.18 (1e-3)
B.	<i>Soil-reared insects</i>			
Site	0.14 (1e-3)	0.08 (2e-3)	0.09 (1e-3)	0.07 (6e-3)
Subsample	0.17 (1e-3)	0.18 (1e-3)	0.14 (3e-3)	0.20 (1e-3)

581 Jaccard distances (Jacc), Bray-Curtis distances (BC), Unifrac distances (Uni), weighted Unifrac distances (wUni).

582 **A.** Comparison of soil-reared insects and control insects. Models contain one explanatory variable: soil treatment. **B.**

583 Comparison of soil-reared insects. Models contained two explanatory variables: site and soil subsample

584

585 **Figures Legends**

Figure 1: Experimental design **A.** Location of the two sampling sites. CDS: Causse-De-La-Selle (N43°49.884' E003°41.222'; CDS sample); MTF: Montferrier-sur-Lez (N43°40.801' E003°51.835'; MTF sample). **B.** At each sampling site, we obtained three soil subsamples at positions 10 m apart. **C.** Distribution of insects in soil subsamples. Each soil subsample was split into four portions, each of which was placed in a plastic box, in which it was mixed with sterilized wheat bran. Eight insects per soil subsample (two insects/box) were analyzed. Five insects placed in a box containing sterile wheat bran only were used as a control. **D.** Insects were placed, for five days, at 15 °C, in plastic boxes containing the soil subsamples mixed with sterile wheat bran. They were then starved by incubation for 24 hours in Petri dishes. The insects were then killed, their guts were dissected, and total DNA was extracted from each gut.

586

Figure 2: Alpha diversity of the gut microbiota **A.** Rarefaction curves. Each curve represents one insect. Control insects, insects reared in CDS soil samples and insects reared in MTF soil samples are shown in yellow, blue and red, respectively. **B.** Alpha diversity indices for the insect gut microbiota. CDS1-3 and MTF1-3 are the subsamples from the sampling sites (three for CDS and three for MTF). BRAN is the control treatment: insects reared on sterile wheat bran. (i) Chao1 extrapolated richness. Pairwise Wilcoxon rank-sum test, CDS-MTF: p-value = 2e-3, BRAN-CDS: p-value = 2e-3, BRAN-MTF: p-value = 0.01 (ii) Shannon diversity index. Pairwise Wilcoxon rank-sum test, CDS-MTF: p-value = 1e-3, BRAN-CDS: p-value = 5e-05, BRAN-MTF: p-value = 8e-05 **C.** Taxonomic assignment of OTUs to family level. Each bar represents an insect. Each subsample (i.e. CDS1-3 and MTF1-3) was divided into four portions, each of which was placed in a separate plastic box before the experiment. For each subsample, insects sharing the same letter (A, B, C or

D) were taken from the same plastic box. The 10 families with the largest relative abundances are shown in different colors, and the others are grouped together in the “Others” category.

587

Figure 3: *PCoA analysis based on the four beta diversity distances.* Each dot corresponds to one insect. The percentage of variance explained by each axis is indicated in brackets. Yellow, blue and red dots correspond to BRAN (control), CDS and MTF samples respectively. For CDS and MTF samples, dot shape represents the identity of the soil subsample, i. e. CDS1, CDS2 and CDS3, or MTF1, MTF2 and MTF3.

588

Figure 4: *Assignment of shared OTUs according to the V3-V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene* **A.** Venn diagram of OTUs found in at least one insect from each treatment. **B.** Bar plot of the relative abundance of the 44 OTUs common to the three treatments (in gray) and the 59 OTUs found only in soil treatments (CDS and MTF) (red stripes). The taxonomic assignment of these OTUs is detailed in **C.** and **D.**. Insects from the various treatment were pooled for these bar plots: 5 insects for BRAN, 24 insects for CDS and 22 insects for MTF. The relative abundance of OTUs was calculated from the total number of reads for each insect pool. We show here taxonomic assignments to genus level or to the lowest taxonomic level, for which the bootstrap score was < 80%. Some OTUs differ in sequence, but were assigned to the same taxonomic group. These sequences are differentiated by a number. On each graph, the 15 OTUs with the largest relative abundance are shown in color and the others are grouped together in the “Others” category. OTU names followed by a star (*) belong to the *Enterobacteriaceae* family.

589

Figure 5: *Quantitative PCR on two taxa of the core microbiota* **A.** Gene copy number (GCN) per μL of DNA extract for *Pse-16S*, a specific marker of the genus *Pseudomonas*. Pairwise Wilcoxon

rank sum test with Holm p-value adjustment, BRAN-CDS: p-value = 0.013, BRAN-MTF: p-value = 0.013, MTF-CDS: p-value = 0.18. **B.** GCN per μL of DNA extract of *Entero-rplP*, a specific marker of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family. Samples from control (BRAN) had the maximum Ct value of 40, meaning that the initial *Entero-rplP* quantity was under the qPCR detection threshold, i.e. < 246 GCN. Pairwise Wilcoxon rank sum test with Holm p-value adjustment, BRAN-CDS: p-value = 0.016, BRAN-MTF: p-value = 0.016, MTF-CDS: p-value = 0.31.

591 **Additional Files**

592 **Additional file 1: Relative abundance and taxonomic assignment of OTUs** 593 **according to the *gyrB* gene**

594 Insects from the various treatments were pooled for these bar plots: 5 insects for BRAN, 24 insects
595 for CDS and 22 insects for MTF. The relative abundance of OTUs was calculated from the total
596 number of reads for each insect pool. We show here taxonomic assignments to genus level or to the
597 lowest taxonomic level for which the bootstrap score was > 80%. Some OTUs differ in sequence
598 but were assigned to the same taxonomic group. These sequences are differentiated by a number.
599 On each graph, the 15 OTUs with the largest relative abundances are shown in color and the others
600 are grouped together in the “Others” category. OTU names followed by a star (*) belong to the
601 *Enterobacteriaceae* family.

602 **Additional file 2: Example of a microbiota pattern in PCR replicates**

603 We checked the reproducibility of PCR, by performing three technical PCR replicates (the three
604 bars of the chart) on a sample chosen at random, with the whole metabarcoding procedure
605 performed separately for each replicate. We show here the results for the CDS1D3 sample.

606 **Additional file 3: OBITools workflow for 16S rRNA analysis**

607 RMD_OBITools_workflow_V3V4.pdf and RMD_OBITools_workflow_gyrB.pdf contain
608 OBITools, bash and R scripts used to obtain the OTU abundance table from raw sequencing data for
609 both the 16S rRNA and *gyrB* genes.

610 **Additional file 4: Raw table of reads counts**

611 tab_div_V3V4.csv and tab_div_gyrB.csv contain raw abundance data and diversity indices for each
612 sample, as determined with the 16S rRNA and *gyrB* genes, respectively. Samples are shown in rows
613 and OTUs in columns.

614 **Additional file 5: OTU taxonomic assignment**

615 V3V4_assignment.txt is the assignment data for each 16S rRNA OTU obtained with RDPclassifier
616 and the RDP-II database. gyrB_assignment.csv is the assignment data for each *gyrB* OTU obtained
617 with the MOTHUR classifier and the Barret et. al 2014 reference database.

618 **Additional file 6: Primers used for qPCR**

619 $PE_{standard}$ corresponds to PCR efficiency on gDNA standard samples, PE_{gut} corresponds to PCR
620 efficiency on a pool of gut DNA from samples used for qPCR analysis.


621 **Additional file 7: Statistical analysis workflow**

622 RMD_R_workflow.pdf contains R scripts used to perform statistical analysis and to produce the
623 figures presented in this study.


624 **Additional file 8: R functions used in the statistical analysis workflow**

625 • src_routine_bootstrap_threshold.R is an R function for extracting the lowest taxonomic level
626 according to a given bootstrap threshold from assignment files


A.




B.











C.



D.



A.**B. (i)****(ii)****C.**





Jaccard**Bray-Curtis****Unifrac****wUnifrac**

Treatment:


- ◆ BRAN
- CDS
- MTF

Subsample:

- 1
- 2
- △ 3



A.

Pse-16S

B.

Entero-rpIP