

## Getting the Hologenome Concept Right:

### An Eco-Evolutionary Framework for Hosts and Their Microbiomes

Kevin R. Theis<sup>1,2#</sup>, Nolwenn M. Dheilly<sup>3</sup>, Jonathan L. Klassen<sup>4</sup>, Robert M. Brucker<sup>5</sup>, John F. Baines<sup>6,7</sup>, Thomas C.G. Bosch<sup>8</sup>, John F. Cryan<sup>9</sup>, Scott F. Gilbert<sup>10</sup>, Charles J. Goodnight<sup>11</sup>, Elisabeth A. Lloyd<sup>12</sup>, Jan Sapp<sup>13</sup>, Philippe Vandenkoornhuys<sup>14</sup>, Ilana Zilber-Rosenberg<sup>15</sup>, Eugene Rosenberg<sup>16</sup>, Seth R. Bordenstein<sup>17#</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Immunology and Microbiology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48201, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Perinatal Research Initiative, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48201, USA.

<sup>3</sup>School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-5000, USA.

<sup>4</sup>University of Connecticut, Department of Molecular & Cell Biology, Storrs, CT 06269, USA.

<sup>5</sup>The Rowland Institute at Harvard, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA.

<sup>6</sup>Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, August-Thienemann-Strasse 2, D-24306 Plön, Germany.

<sup>7</sup>Institute for Experimental Medicine, Christian-Albrechts-University of Kiel, Arnold-Heller-Strasse 3, D-24105 Kiel, Germany.

<sup>8</sup>Zoological Institute, Christian-Albrechts-University, D-24118 Kiel, Germany.

<sup>9</sup>Department of Anatomy and Neuroscience, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland; Alimentary Pharmabiotic Centre, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland.

<sup>10</sup>Department of Biology, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA 19081, USA.

<sup>11</sup>Department of Biology, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, USA.

<sup>12</sup>History and Philosophy of Science Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA.

<sup>13</sup>Department of Biology, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, M3J 1P3, Canada.

<sup>14</sup>Université de Rennes 1, CNRS, UMR6553 EcoBio, F-35042 Rennes, France.

<sup>15</sup>Independent Scholar, Rachavat Ilan St., Givat Shmuel 51905, Israel.

<sup>16</sup>Department of Molecular Microbiology and Biotechnology, Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel.

<sup>17</sup>Departments of Biological Sciences and Pathology, Microbiology and Immunology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37225, USA.

#Corresponding authors:

Kevin Theis (ktheis@med.wayne.edu), Seth Bordenstein (s.bordenstein@vanderbilt.edu)

Abstract word count: 150

Text word count: 2090

35 **Abstract**

36           Given the complexity of host-microbiota symbioses, scientists and philosophers are  
37 asking questions at new biological levels of hierarchical organization - What is a holobiont and  
38 hologenome? When should this vocabulary be applied? Are these concepts a null hypothesis for  
39 host-microbe systems or limited to a certain spectrum of symbiotic interactions such as host-  
40 microbial coevolution? Critical discourse is necessary in this nascent area, but productive  
41 discourse requires that skeptics and proponents use the same lexicon. For instance, critiquing the  
42 hologenome concept is not synonymous with critiquing coevolution, and arguing that an entity is  
43 not a primary unit of selection dismisses that the hologenome concept has always embraced  
44 multi-level selection. Holobionts and hologenomes are incontrovertible, multipartite entities that  
45 result from ecological, evolutionary and genetic processes at varying levels. They are not  
46 restricted to one special process but constitute a wider vocabulary and framework for host  
47 biology in light of the microbiome.

48

## 49 **Main Text**

50           Holobiont is a term used to describe an individual host and its microbial community,  
51 including viruses and cellular microorganisms (1-6) (Figure 1). It is derived from the Greek word  
52 *holos* that means whole or entire. Microbial symbionts can be constant or inconstant, vertically  
53 or horizontally transmitted, and can interact with a host in a context-dependent manner as  
54 harmful, harmless or helpful. In most cases, the net outcome of these interspecies relationships  
55 varies with the presence of other symbionts. The term holobiont distinguishes itself by not only  
56 recognizing hosts and their obligate symbionts, but also emphasizing the diversity of facultative  
57 symbionts and their dynamic associations within a host. In contrast to binary host-microbial  
58 interactions, the properties of complex microbial communities and their hosts are newly  
59 appreciated and potentially universal. The host and microbial genomes of a holobiont are  
60 collectively defined as its hologenome (1, 2), and the pluralistic attributes of a holobiont scale  
61 directly to the hologenome (Figure 1). Microbial genomes can be stable or labile components of  
62 the hologenome, vertically or horizontally transmitted, and the functional traits that they encode  
63 are context dependent and may result in damage, benefit, or be of no consequence to the  
64 holobiont (7). Having settled on these terms, one can look at holobionts and hologenomes as  
65 incontrovertible realities of nature. Hologenome is fundamentally similar to the words genome  
66 and chromosome in that they reflect different levels of biological information. The terms  
67 holobiont and hologenome are therefore structural definitions, although their utility remains  
68 subject to debate (8).

69           The first question then is why are these terms useful? They are useful because they  
70 replace misnomers in the context of host-microbiota symbioses like superorganism (i.e., an  
71 integrated social unit comprised of conspecifics), organ, and metagenome with a vocabulary that

72 aligns with recent advances demonstrating that host phenotypes are profoundly affected by their  
73 complex microbial communities, in both cooperative and competitive ways (9-11). Holobionts  
74 and their hologenomes are less entities that elucidate something *per se* than they are entities that  
75 need elucidation.

76         The next question then is what is in need of elucidation? For any given symbiosis, host  
77 genetic variation may affect susceptibility to colonization of diverse microbes or even promote it  
78 in a highly specific way, microbial genetic variation may favor colonization while also affecting  
79 competition with coinfecting microbes, and environmental variation may substantively influence  
80 these dynamics and drive rapid microbial community changes. What is then in need of  
81 elucidation is how common and influential these forces are across host-microbial systems.  
82 Moreover, covariance between hosts and members of their microbiota is another important area  
83 of future research. Covariance can be achieved via vertical inheritance or selective filtering from  
84 the environment. The relative importance of these modes of holobiont assembly is not well  
85 resolved, yet either way, covariance in genetic compartments of the hologenome can yield  
86 variation in phenotypes upon which evolutionary processes can act. Finally, hologenomic  
87 variation may arise not only by mutation and recombination in the host and microbiome, but also  
88 by acquisition of new microbial strains from the environment, microbial amplification that  
89 involves a change in microbial abundance, and horizontal gene transfer among microbes (2).

90         Another area in need of elucidation is whether variation in traits caused by different host-  
91 microbiota assemblies drives a multigenerational response to selection. If there is a response to  
92 selection, then did it occur at the host, microbe, or microbial community levels? Can shifts at the  
93 microbial community level act akin to shifts in allele frequencies in host genomes? Preliminary  
94 indications are that not only can this occur, but that we can capitalize on its occurrence by

95 artificially selecting (i.e., microbiome engineering) holobiont phenotypes in applied contexts (12,  
96 13).

97         The hologenomic view of biology importantly does not prescribe host-centric or microbe-  
98 centric attributes to changes in holobiont macrobe functions, but rather takes into account the  
99 emergent interactions and outcomes of hosts and their microbiota. It is a relatively new view and  
100 is therefore liable to be interpreted in ways that misrepresent its original conception. For  
101 example, a recent paper expressed skepticism of the hologenome concept, yet did so by relying  
102 on alternative definitions that incorrectly restricted hologenomes to only those situations when  
103 holobionts are primary units of selection that arose by vertical inheritance and coevolution (8).  
104 The result is a straw man argument. The hologenome concept requires evaluation as any new  
105 idea does. However, to have a robust debate, skeptics and proponents must use the same  
106 terminology and framework. Here we highlight errors in these recent narrow definitions of the  
107 holobiont and hologenome, keeping them consistent with their original pluralistic definitions,  
108 and attempt to stimulate understanding of the link between holobiont phenotype and genotype.

109         The first argument proposed against the hologenome concept is that if X did not coevolve  
110 *sensu stricto* with Y, then the hologenome is not real (8, 14, 15). In this case, X and Y are  
111 respectively a microbe/microbial community and a host. As emphasized above and in the  
112 original literature, hologenome is a term that encompasses all of the genomes of the holobiont at  
113 a given point in time. Thus, holobionts can be formed through neutral processes, selection at the  
114 level of the host, symbiont or both (Figure 1). Although a component of it, coevolution is not the  
115 sole feature of the hologenome and its associated concepts. By way of illustration, one would not  
116 similarly say that if genes X and Y did not coevolve in a host, then they are not part of the same  
117 genome. Evolution of genomes and hologenomes is not a monolithic process, nor is it simply

118 beanbag genetics. Genetic conflict, epistasis, selection, drift, etc. are all operational (1, 2). Thus,  
119 objections to the hologenome concept based on a lack of coevolution misrepresent what  
120 constitutes a hologenome and holobiont for that matter. To put it simply, coevolution is a  
121 process; the hologenome is an entity that embraces the eco-evolutionary processes inherent in  
122 much of macroscopic biology.

123         When referencing the original definitions of the hologenome, it was suggested that a non-  
124 coevolutionary application of the word hologenome would make it “sufficiently general that it  
125 can be interpreted in any number of ways” (8). This comment refers to the more generally  
126 accepted definition of the hologenome as all of the genomes in the holobiont, all of which in turn  
127 are evolving in that context (6). However, using the same logic, the word genome would be as  
128 unhelpful to biology as the term hologenome because it would be an insufficiently general  
129 definition of the types of evolutionary processes occurring within the genome. The main lesson  
130 here is that coevolution, genetic conflict, selection, and drift at multiple levels (host genomes,  
131 symbiont genomes, hologenomes) all occur. In arguing for a hologenomic status of macro-  
132 organisms, we noted that interspecies interactions underlying holobiont phenotypes follow a  
133 conceptual and theoretical continuum from genetic interactions or epistasis between genes in the  
134 same genome (1, 16). Both types of interactions can be transient or stable under varying  
135 conditions such as population structure and selection. Indeed, the (in)stability of a host and its  
136 horizontally-transmitted microbes follows a theoretical continuum under the same math from the  
137 (in)stability of interacting genes in the same genome that undergo recombination (16). Here we  
138 note that vertical transmission versus horizontal transmission is a false dichotomy to draw  
139 against the hologenome concept.

140           Prevalent misuse of coevolution in the microbiome literature is a legitimate concern and  
141 was the impetus for some of us coining the word “phylosymbiosis” (17). It describes the  
142 concordance between a host phylogeny (evolutionary relationships) and microbial community  
143 dendrogram (ecological relationships) based on the degree of shared taxonomy and/or abundance  
144 of members of the community (18-21). Phylosymbiosis does not *a priori* imply coevolution,  
145 cospeciation, cocladogenesis, or codiversification because this latter vocabulary implies  
146 concordant splitting of new species from a common ancestral one (19, 20, 22). Phylosymbiosis  
147 avoids these assumptions because it "does not presume that microbial communities are stable or  
148 even vertically transmitted from generation to generation" (19, 20). Rather, it refers to a pattern  
149 in which changes in separate parts of the holobiont (host and microbiota) are related in a  
150 concordant manner. It is also a stepping-stone from population genetics to community genetics  
151 because when phylosymbiosis is observed under strictly controlled conditions, it tests whether  
152 variation in holobiont assembly is primarily stochastic or deterministic (17, 19, 23). Stochastic  
153 assembly means that each microbe has an equal opportunity of colonizing a host. Deterministic  
154 assembly reflects ecological selection of a particular non-random microbial community and its  
155 host, without reference to which partner, or potentially both, is doing the selecting, and it can be  
156 affected by genetic variation in the host or microbial species. Controlled studies of microbial  
157 community assembly across different species of *Nasonia* wasps and *Hydra* have yielded such  
158 phylosymbiotic patterns (17, 18). When genetic variation in the interacting species affects  
159 community assembly, it has been defined as broad sense "community heritability," or  $H^2_C$  (24,  
160 25). Similar to population genetic heritability estimates of phenotypes that are abiotic,  $H^2_C$   
161 measures a "heritable basis to trophic-level interactions" (26). If there is a significant  $H^2_C$ , natural

162 selection can act on genetic variation affecting ecological community structure (23, 27),  
163 including organization of the holobiont and its emergent phenotypes (25).

164 Discussion of evolutionary processes brings forth a second argument against the  
165 hologenome concept, namely that holobionts and their hologenomes must be the "primary" unit  
166 of selection (8). This strict claim leads biologists into error, as all of the literature emphasizes the  
167 reality that multiple levels of selection can operate simultaneously. For example, selfish genetic  
168 elements can be selected within a genome that is in turn selected for any number of phenotypes  
169 that affect fitness—this is uncontroversial. While the holobiont is posited to be "a unit of  
170 selection in evolution" (2, 28-30), it is naturally not proposed as the only or necessarily primary  
171 unit of selection (1, 2). Primariness varies with what traits are targeted by natural selection.

172 As we have emphasized in different venues, it is also true that just as large parts of the  
173 nuclear genome can evolve neutrally or be in conflict, so too can large parts of the hologenome  
174 (1, 2). For example, "hologenomic drift can occur at all the different levels of the holobiont from  
175 single genes of the microbes or the host to the holobiont itself" (2). We would be remiss to not be  
176 critical of our own inconsistent statements about the relative roles of cooperation and conflict in  
177 hologenomic evolution. In *The Hologenome Concept*, some of us stated that "evolution of  
178 animals and plants was driven primarily by natural selection for cooperation between and with  
179 microorganisms" (2) while in other venues the concept "places as much emphasis on cooperation  
180 as on competition" (31). This latter statement is more precisely aligned with the pluralistic nature  
181 of the holobiont, namely that "natural selection...on holobiont phenotypes...can work to remove  
182 deleterious nuclear mutations or microbes while spreading advantageous nuclear mutations or  
183 microbes" (1). In fact, some of us argued that conflicts of interests resulting from the nature of  
184 the transmission of microbes to the next host could select for microbes that can manipulate the

185 biology of their host to improve their own transmission (32). The holobiont is not a conglomerate  
186 that arises solely from cooperation. Rather, it is a hierarchical level that can supersede the  
187 individual host that lives in association with its microbial community, incorporating both  
188 competitive and cooperative selective systems (33). Hologenomes then exist as hierarchically  
189 nested, although not necessarily integrated levels of genomes, in which all levels of selection are  
190 in play.

191 In summary, we anticipate that many subdisciplines in biology will benefit from a  
192 conceptual, theoretical, and experimental framework that broadly encompasses the ecology of  
193 holobionts and evolution of hologenomes. The hologenome concept is a comprehensive and  
194 relevant eco-evolutionary framework for which critical questions remain. For example, can a  
195 response to selection on host traits be driven solely by changes in the genomes and/or  
196 membership of a host-associated microbial community? How taxonomically widespread among  
197 hosts is phylosymbiosis? How common is vertical inheritance of complex microbial  
198 communities? What is the strength of selection required to maintain consistent association  
199 between a host and environmentally-acquired microbes each generation? How does selection  
200 operate on community phenotypes if  $H^2_C$  is variable due to the lability of microbial  
201 communities? Evolution of the hologenome refers to the genetic basis of eco-evolutionary  
202 processes underlying community phenotypes of the holobiont. This terminology and framework  
203 for the newly appreciated complexities in the host-microbe consortia and their genomes is not  
204 restricted to one special process but constitute an incontrovertible vocabulary and framework for  
205 host biology in light of the microbiome.

206

207 **Figure Legend**

208 Figure 1. Holobionts are entities comprised of the host and all of its symbiotic microbes,  
209 including those which affect the holobiont's phenotype and have coevolved with the host (blue),  
210 those which affect the holobiont's phenotype but have not coevolved with the host (red), and  
211 those which do not affect the holobiont's phenotype at all (gray). Microbes may be transmitted  
212 vertically or horizontally, acquired from the environment, and can be constant or inconstant in  
213 the host. Therefore, holobiont phenotypes can change in time and space as microbes come into  
214 and out of the holobiont. Microbes in the environment are not part of the holobiont (white).  
215 Hologenomes then encompass the genomes of the host and all of its microbes at any given time  
216 point, with individual genomes and genes falling into the same three functional categories of  
217 blue, red and gray. Holobionts and hologenomes are entities, whereas coevolution or host-  
218 symbiont interactions are processes.

219 **Acknowledgements**

220 We thank Jay Evans and Phil Pellett for helpful feedback on the manuscript.

221

222

223

## 224 References

- 225 1. **Bordenstein SR, Theis KR.** 2015. Host biology in light of the microbiome: Ten  
226 principles of holobionts and hologenomes. *PLoS Biol* **13**:e1002226.
- 227 2. **Rosenberg E, Zilber-Rosenberg I.** 2013. *The Hologenome Concept: Human, Animal*  
228 *and Plant Microbiota.* Springer, Switzerland.
- 229 3. **Margulis L.** 1991. Symbiogenesis and symbiogenesis, p 1-14. *In* Margulis L, Fester R  
230 (ed), *Symbiosis as a Source of Evolutionary Innovation: Speciation and Morphogenesis.*  
231 MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- 232 4. **Mindell DP.** 1992. Phylogenetic consequences of symbioses: Eukarya and Eubacteria are  
233 not monophyletic taxa. *Biosystems* **27**:53-62.
- 234 5. **Rohwer F, Seguritan V, Azam F, Knowlton N.** 2002. Diversity and distribution of  
235 coral-associated bacteria. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **243**:1-10.
- 236 6. **Gordon J, Knowlton N, Relman DA, Rohwer F, Youle M.** 2013. Superorganisms and  
237 holobionts, vol 8, p 2. American Society for Microbiology, Washington, DC.
- 238 7. **Casadevall A, Pirofski LA.** 2015. What is a host? Incorporating the microbiota into the  
239 damage-response framework. *Infection and Immunity* **83**:2-7.
- 240 8. **Moran NA, Sloan DB.** 2015. The hologenome concept: Helpful or hollow? *PLoS Biol*  
241 **13**:e1002311.
- 242 9. **Vandenkoornhuysen P, Quaiser A, Duhamel M, Le Van A, Dufresne A.** 2015. The  
243 importance of the microbiome of the plant holobiont. *New Phytologist* **206**:1196-1206.
- 244 10. **McFall-Ngai M, Hadfield MG, Bosch TCG, Carey HV, Domazet-Lošo T, Douglas**  
245 **AE, Dubilier N, Eberl G, Fukami T, Gilbert SF, Hentschel U, King N, Kjelleberg S,**  
246 **Knoll AH, Kremer N, Mazmanian SK, Metcalf JL, Nealson K, Pierce NE, Rawls JF,**  
247 **Reid A, Ruby EG, Rumpho M, Sanders JG, Tautz D, Wernegreen JJ.** 2013. Animals  
248 in a bacterial world, a new imperative for the life sciences. *Proceedings of the National*  
249 *Academy of Sciences* **110**:3229-3236.
- 250 11. **Bosch TCG, McFall-Ngai MJ.** 2011. Metaorganisms as the new frontier. *Zoology*  
251 **114**:185-190.
- 252 12. **Mueller UG, Sachs JL.** 2015. Engineering microbiomes to improve plant and animal  
253 health. *Trends in Microbiology* **23**:606-617.
- 254 13. **Voss JD, Leon JC, Dhurandhar NV, Robb FT.** 2015. Pawnobiome: manipulation of  
255 the hologenome within one host generation and beyond. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **6**:5.
- 256 14. **Hester ER, Barott KL, Nulton J, Vermeij MJA, Rohwer FL.** 2016. Stable and  
257 sporadic symbiotic communities of coral and algal holobionts. *The ISME Journal* **In**  
258 **Press.**
- 259 15. **Chandler JA, Turelli M.** 2014. Comment on "The hologenomic basis of speciation: Gut  
260 bacteria cause hybrid lethality in the genus *Nasonia*". *Science* **345**:2.
- 261 16. **Fitzpatrick BM.** 2014. Symbiote transmission and maintenance of extra-genomic  
262 associations. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **5**.
- 263 17. **Brucker RM, Bordenstein SR.** 2013. The hologenomic basis of speciation: gut bacteria  
264 cause hybrid lethality in the genus *Nasonia*. *Science* **341**:667-669.
- 265 18. **Fraune S, Bosch TCG.** 2007. Long-term maintenance of species-specific bacterial  
266 microbiota in the basal metazoan Hydra. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
267 *Sciences* **104**:13146-13151.


- 268 19. **Brucker RM, Bordenstein SR.** 2012. The roles of host evolutionary relationships  
269 (Genus: *Nasonia*) and development in structuring microbial communities. *Evolution*  
270 **66**:349-362.
- 271 20. **Brucker RM, Bordenstein SR.** 2012. Speciation by symbiosis. *Trends in Ecology &*  
272 *Evolution* **27**:443-451.
- 273 21. **Franzenburg S, Walter J, Kunzel S, Wang J, Baines JF, Bosch TCG, Fraune S.**  
274 2013. Distinct antimicrobial peptide expression determines host species-specific bacterial  
275 associations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
276 *America* **110**:E3730-E3738.
- 277 22. **de Vienne DM, Refregier G, Lopez-Villavicencio M, Tellier A, Hood ME, Giraud T.**  
278 2013. Cospeciation vs host-shift speciation: methods for testing, evidence from natural  
279 associations and relation to coevolution. *New Phytologist* **198**:347-385.
- 280 23. **Whitham TG, Bailey JK, Schweitzer JA, Shuster SM, Bangert RK, Leroy CJ,**  
281 **Lonsdorf EV, Allan GJ, DiFazio SP, Potts BM, Fischer DG, Gehring CA, Lindroth**  
282 **RL, Marks JC, Hart SC, Wimp GM, Wooley SC.** 2006. A framework for community  
283 and ecosystem genetics: from genes to ecosystems. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **7**:510-523.
- 284 24. **Shuster SM, Lonsdorf EV, Wimp GM, Bailey JK, Whitham TG.** 2006. Community  
285 heritability measures the evolutionary consequences of indirect genetic effects on  
286 community structure. *Evolution* **60**:991-1003.
- 287 25. **van Opstal EJ, Bordenstein SR.** 2015. Rethinking heritability of the microbiome.  
288 *Science* **349**:1172-1173.
- 289 26. **Bailey JK, Wooley SC, Lindroth RL, Whitham TG.** 2006. Importance of species  
290 interactions to community heritability: a genetic basis to trophic-level interactions.  
291 *Ecology Letters* **9**:78-85.
- 292 27. **Goodnight CJ.** 2011. Evolution in metacommunities. *Philosophical Transactions of the*  
293 *Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **366**:1401-1409.
- 294 28. **Zilber-Rosenberg I, Rosenberg E.** 2008. Role of microorganisms in the evolution of  
295 animals and plants: the hologenome theory of evolution. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*  
296 **32**:723-735.
- 297 29. **Rosenberg E, Sharon G, Atad I, Zilber-Rosenberg I.** 2010. The evolution of animals  
298 and plants via symbiosis with microorganisms. *Environmental Microbiology Reports*  
299 **2**:500-506.
- 300 30. **Rosenberg E, Zilber-Rosenberg I.** 2011. Symbiosis and development: The hologenome  
301 concept. *Birth Defects Research Part C: Embryo Today: Reviews* **93**:56-66.
- 302 31. **Rosenberg E, Sharon G, Zilber-Rosenberg I.** 2009. The hologenome theory of  
303 evolution contains Lamarckian aspects within a Darwinian framework. *Environmental*  
304 *Microbiology* **11**:2959-2962.
- 305 32. **Dheilly NM, Poulin R, Thomas F.** 2015. Biological warfare: Microorganisms as drivers  
306 of host-parasite interactions. *Infection Genetics and Evolution* **34**:251-259.
- 307 33. **Lloyd EA.** In Press. Holobionts as units of selection: Holobionts as interactors,  
308 reproducers, and manifestors of adaptation. *In* Gissis SB, Lamm E, Shavit A (ed),  
309 *Landscapes of Collectivity in the Life Sciences.* MIT Press.

# Environmental metagenome

## Hologenome

### Host genome

### Microbiome



 Host and symbiont genes that alone and/or together affect a holobiont phenotype

 Coevolved host and symbiont genes that affect a holobiont phenotype

 Host genes and symbionts that do not affect a holobiont phenotype

 Environmental microbes that are not part of the holobiont