The hemolymph of *Biomphalaria* snail vectors of schistosomiasis supports a diverse microbiome

Frédéric D. Chevalier*, Robbie Diaz, Marina McDew-White, Timothy JC. Anderson, Winka Le Clec'h*

Texas Biomedical Research Institute, PO Box 760549, San Antonio, TX 78258

Author information:

- Frédéric D. Chevalier*: fcheval@txbiomed.org – ORCID: 0000-0003-2611-8106

- Robbie Diaz: robbied@txbiomed.org

- Marina McDew-White: mwhite@txbiomed.org – ORCID: 0000-0001-7821-260X

- Timothy JC. Anderson: tanderso@txbiomed.org – ORCID: 0000-0002-0191-0204

- Winka Le Clec'h*: winkal@txbiomed.org – ORCID: 0000-0002-1111-2492

* Corresponding authors

Running title: The hemolymph microbiome of Biomphalaria snails

SUMMARY

The microbiome – the microorganism community that is found on or within an organism's body – is

increasingly recognized to shape many aspects of its host biology and is a key determinant of health and disease.

Microbiomes modulate the capacity of insect disease vectors (mosquitos, tsetse flies, sandflies) to transmit

parasites and disease. We investigate the diversity and abundance of microorganisms within the hemolymph

(*i.e.* blood) of *Biomphalaria* snails, the intermediate host for *Schistosoma mansoni*, using Illumina MiSeq

sequencing of the bacterial 16S V4 rDNA. We sampled hemolymph from 5 snails from 6 different laboratory

populations of *B. glabrata* and one population of *B. alexandrina*. We observed 279.84 ± 0.79 amplicon sequence

variants (ASVs) per snail. There were significant differences in microbiome composition at the level of individual

snails, snail populations and species. Snail microbiomes were dominated by Proteobacteria and Bacteroidetes

while water microbiomes from snail tank were dominated by Actinobacteria. We investigated the absolute

bacterial load using qPCR: hemolymph samples contained $2,784 \pm 339$ bacteria per µL. We speculate that the

microbiome may represent a critical, but unexplored intermediary in the snail-schistosome interaction as

hemolymph is in very close contact to the parasite at each step of its development.

INTRODUCTION

The microbiome – the community of microorganisms that inhabit both the human body and that of

multiple other phyla (Lee and Hase, 2014) – is increasingly recognized to play a critical role in many aspects of

biology and as a key determinant of health and disease. For example, the human gut microbiome is thought to

play a role in the development of diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and

obesity (Kinross *et al.*, 2011). In invertebrates, symbiotic bacteria are involved in synthesizing essential amino

acids or vitamins (Hosokawa *et al.*, 2010; Oliver *et al.*, 2010), in digesting cellulose (Brune, 2014), in protection

against parasites (Oliver *et al.*, 2010), in feminization and parthenogenesis (Werren *et al.*, 2008), and even in

speciation (Flintoft, 2013).

In host-parasite interactions, the host microbiome frequently plays an important role in the ability of

parasite to colonize its host. This tripartite interaction (i.e. host-microbiome-parasite/pathogen) has been

investigated widely in invertebrate hosts. Recent research on the widespread endosymbiotic bacteria *Wolbachia*

demonstrates that *Wolbachia*-infected mosquitoes are unable to transmit dengue fever (Slatko *et al.*, 2014).

This bacterium is now a major focus of efforts to control or eliminate dengue, and has stimulated new interest in

utilizing bacterial symbionts to modify disease vectors (Slatko *et al.*, 2014). Similarly, the aphid microbiome

protects these insects against parasitoid wasps (Oliver *et al.*, 2010), the microbiome of sandflies provides

protection against *Leishmania* infection (Sant'Anna *et al.*, 2014), while the microbiome of mosquitoes and tsetse

flies impedes infection by malaria parasites and trypanosomes respectively (Stathopoulos *et al.*, 2014).

Among human helminth parasites, schistosomes are the most important in terms of global morbidity

and mortality, infecting over 206 million people in 78 countries in 2016 (WHO), and causing more than 200,000

deaths per year. Schistosome parasites have a complex lifecycle, involving freshwater snails as intermediate

hosts and mammals as definitive hosts. In humans, adult schistosomes live in the blood vessels surrounding the

intestine, and pathology results from immune reactions to eggs which become trapped in the liver, resulting in

granulomas, calcification of blood vessels, portal hypertension and liver failure (van der Werf *et al.*, 2003; Colley

et al., 2014). There is no licensed vaccine, and control is reliant on a single monotherapy (praziquantel) to which resistance has been recorded, so there is an urgent need for alternative approaches to schistosome control. Understanding the snail-schistosome interaction is therefore critical to develop these approaches. When a single parasite larva (miracidium) penetrates a snail, this develops into a primary sporocyst, which then divides asexually to generate multiple clonally-produced secondary sporocysts in the snail tissue. These produce hundreds to tens of thousands of motile cercariae larvae that are released into the water where they penetrate and infect the definitive host (human or rodent). Snail populations vary in susceptibility to schistosomes (Files and Cram, 1949) and while genetics certainly plays a role (Tennessen et al., 2015), the mechanisms determining whether infections develop are poorly understood and the influence of the microbiome on schistosome parasite development is currently unknown.

The Biomphalaria snail microbiome was firstly characterized using classical microbial culture methods and biochemical characterization almost 40 years ago (Ducklow et al., 1979). Bacteria were found in the whole snail but also on its surface, gut and body cavity. With this relatively limited technique, the authors observed changes in whole snail microbiome when those were moved between different environments (Ducklow et al., 1979). More recently, two papers (Allan et al., 2018; Huot et al., 2020) have examined Biomphalaria spp. microbiomes using deep sequencing of rDNA. Allan et al. (2018) showed that snails carrying alleles conferring resistance to Schistosoma mansoni infection, show distinctive microbiomes from those carrying sensitive alleles, suggesting possible links between the microbiome composition and S. mansoni susceptibility. Huot et al. (Huot et al., 2020) examined core microbiomes from several laboratory populations, showing a high specificity between these microbiomes and their snail host populations, as well as complete congruence between core microbiome and host phylogeny. Importantly, both these studies examined microbiomes of whole snails, so it is unclear whether the bacteria characterized are from the gut, shell surface, mantle cavity or internal organs of the snail, each of which may have a distinctive microbiome. Rather than characterize composite microbiomes from whole snails, we focus on the microbiomes from a single tissue – the hemolymph (i.e., invertebrate blood).

We chose this tissue because developing schistosome parasites are in continuous contact with the snail

hemolymph during the 30-day development within the snail. Therefore the hemolymph microbiome is likely to

be most relevant for understanding interactions between snails, bacteria and developing schistosomes.

Furthermore, evidence from other mollusk species provide a precedent for investigating the *Biomphalaria*

microbiome: hemolymphs from several fresh and seawater mollusks and crustaceans are known to harbor

specific microbiomes (Antunes *et al.*, 2010; Desriac *et al.*, 2014; Vezzulli *et al.*, 2018; Zhang *et al.*, 2018; Offret *et*

al., 2019; Musella *et al.*, 2020; Table 1) that can be modified by environmental stress (Lokmer and Mathias

Wegner, 2015), pollutants (Leite *et al.*, 2017; Auguste *et al.*, 2019a) or pathogens (Vezzulli *et al.*, 2013; Lokmer

and Mathias Wegner, 2015).

In this study, we characterized the hemolymph microbiome of two *Biomphalaria spp.* freshwater snail

species (i.e. *B. glabrata* and *B. alexandrina*), both vectors of *S. mansoni* using a 16S rDNA approach. We

demonstrate that snail hemolymph harbors a diverse microbiome, and that different *Biomphalaria* species and

populations harbor distinctive hemolymph microbiomes that are independent of the water environment. As the

microbiome is critical in other host-parasite systems we speculate that it may represent a critical, but

unexplored, intermediary in the snail-schistosome interaction.

RESULTS

1) *Library statistics*

We sequenced microbiomes from snail hemolymph and water samples from seven laboratory populations (Table 2). For each population, we selected 5 snails, efficiently removed shell contaminants by cleaning the shell surface with ethanol (Supp. Fig. 1) and collected hemolymph by heart puncture to avoid contamination from the tegument. In parallel, we collected a sample of the tank water the snails were collected from. To test the reproducibility of our protocol, we split each sample and prepared libraries independently for each half (Fig. 1). After MiSeq sequencing, we obtained an average of 155,491.5 ± 29,277.9 reads per library (mean ± s.d.) (Supp. Table 1). We retained on average 87 ± 0.04% of the initial reads after sequencing error filtering, 85 ± 0.03% of the initial reads after denoising the data using the dada2 module, 73 ± 0.05% of the initial reads after merging reads and 71 ± 0.06% of the initial reads after removing chimeras. Sequencing depth was relatively even between sample types and replicates (Supp. Table 1). Rarefaction curve analysis of each library showed a plateau, indicating that our sequencing effectively captured the microbiome diversity (Supp. Fig. 2). Taxonomy assignment of the 16S rDNA sequences from all libraries revealed a total of 2,688 amplicon sequence variants (ASVs). Among them, 897 had unassigned taxonomy as typically seen in microbiome study of non-model organisms, with 39 (4.3%) being eukaryote contaminants (snails or others), 836 with match to uncultured bacteria mainly, and 22 (2.5%) with no similarity to known sequences suggesting potential new bacterial or archaeal species. The eukaryote contaminants and 5 ASVs with mitochondria or chloroplast assignment were removed in subsequent analysis.

2) *Microbiome diversity*

a) α *diversity (microbial diversity within samples)*

We computed several α diversity indices (Table 3) to investigate the bacterial richness (the number of taxa) and

diversity (a composite measure of richness and abundance of bacterial taxa) within hemolymph and water

samples (Fig. 2). The observed species richness and the Chao1 index revealed that snail hemolymph had higher

bacterial richness than water, with the exception of the BgNMRI population. Overall, we found twice the

number of ASVs in snail hemolymph (279.84 ± 0.79; mean ± s.e.) than in the tank water (145.43 ± 4.02). Most of

the snail populations showed similar mean richness, with Bg26 showing the highest and BgNMRI the lowest. The

close similarity between the observed richness and the Chao1 index plots suggests that we effectively captured

rare taxa, consistent with the rarefaction analysis.

The bacterial richness of the hemolymph is correlated with a higher bacterial diversity as expected. The

Shannon diversity index showed lower mean diversity in the water when compared to the hemolymph. Among

the snail populations, we observed the highest mean diversity in Bg26 and Bg121 and the lowest in Bg36 and

BgNMRI. Individuals from the BgBS90 population showed the greatest variability between snails suggesting high

heterogeneity in this population. The Faith's phylogenetic diversity showed a similar trend: we observed a lower

diversity in the water while hemolymph displayed similar diversity across snail populations. This suggests that

the differences between snail populations observed with the Shannon index were likely due to differences in

evenness rather than in richness.

The Simpson indices for evenness and dominance were low for both hemolymph and water samples, in

accordance with the over representation of particular taxa. Hemolymph from Bg36 population, closely followed

by Ba population, showed the lowest evenness and the highest dominance of the snail populations. BgNMRI

snails, which had similar richness and diversity profile as Bg36 snails, showed slightly more evenness in their

bacterial community. Water samples, which consistently showed low richness and diversity, showed a

comparable evenness to snail samples but a higher dominance than some of the snail populations consistent

with the Shannon diversity index.

Data from the replicated libraries showed similar results. We obtained a strong correlation ($0.85 < R^2 <$

0.98, $p < 0.01$) between the replicated libraries (Supp. Fig. 3) when comparing the different indices, highlighting

the robustness and reproducibility of our protocol.

b) ß diversity (microbial diversity between samples)

We computed several β diversity indices to investigate how the bacterial communities discriminate between

each snail population (Fig. 3, Supp. Fig. 4). We first compared microbiomes using qualitative metrics that are

based on the presence or absence of bacterial taxa (Jaccard index) adjusted with phylogenetic distance

(unweighted unifrac index), independently of taxa abundance. We statistically compare these metrics using

Permanova analysis. These analyses demonstrate that water samples have significantly different bacterial

communities from the snail populations. Similarly, all pairwise comparisons between snail communities showed

statistically different composition. Comparisons of centroid distances revealed a significantly greater distance

between Ba and Bg than between each Bg populations in at least one of our replicate for both indices (Jaccard

index: Ba-Bg distance = 0.62, Bg populations distance = 0.57, $p = 0.021$; unweighted unifrac index: Ba-Bg

distance = 0.49, Bg populations distance = 0.45, $p = 0.010$). In addition, the principal component analysis from

the Jaccard index and, to a lesser extent, from the unweighted unifrac revealed clear groups: (i) Ba is distant

from all Bg snail populations as supported by centroid distances strongly suggesting that hemolymph

microbiome can discriminate snail species; (ii) Two clusters of Bg snails can be identified: the first cluster

comprises BgBS90, BgBRE, Bg121 and Bg36 (all from Brazil) and the second cluster comprises Bg26 and BgNMRI

(from Carribbean) (Fig. 3A-B).

We also compared populations of snails or water microbiome for the Jaccard and unweighted unifrac

indices using a β dispersion test (Fig. 3A-B). This test compares the homogeneity of β-diversity measures across

different sampling units (individual snails, or water from different tanks) between populations. All the snail

populations showed similar variance when compared to each other. In contrast, the water population showed

over dispersion when compared to all the snail populations. This may be explained by the fact that samples of

water come from different aquariums, each of them carrying characteristic bacteria, while individual snails

within a population come from the same tank.

We performed similar comparisons using quantitative metrics that take into account the abundance of

each bacterial taxa (Bray index) adjusted with phylogenetic information (weighted unifrac index). Comparisons

of Bray indices using a permanova analysis revealed that all snail populations and water showed different

composition from each other (Fig. 3C). We obtained similar results when adding phylogenetic information (Fig.

3D) except for the pairs Bg121-Bg36 and BgBS90-BgNMRI, suggesting that these microbiomes shared similar

abundant taxa between these pairs (Fig. 3D). Centroid distances were again a greater between Ba and Bg than

between each Bg populations in at least one of our replicate for both indices (Bray index: Ba-Bg distance = 0.69,

Bg populations distance = 0.63, p = 0.014; weighted unifrac index: Ba-Bg distance = 0.26, Bg populations distance

= 0.18, p = 3.7 × 10^{-5}). These results suggest that abundant bacterial taxa drive the distinction between species

and within populations and revealed similar microbiomes in some genetically related snail populations (Bg121-

Bg36).

c)   ***Taxonomic diversity***

We found dramatic differences between populations in terms of taxonomic composition of bacteria (Fig. 4).

While considering the populations, hemolymph microbiomes were dominated by bacteria from the phyla

Proteobacteria (in all Bg populations) and Bacteroidetes (in Ba population) while water microbiomes were

dominated by bacteria from the Actinobacteria phylum (Fig. 4C). These differences in dominating phyla reflect

the previous observations from the β diversity analyses: a clear distinction (i) between the water and snails and

(ii) between the two snail species (i.e., Bg and Ba). We also observed differences in proportion of bacteria from

minor phyla among the different snail populations. For instance, Bg26 showed a greater proportion of the

phylum Acidobacteria in most of the comparisons while BgNMRI and Ba showed the lowest proportion of the

phylum Verrucomicrobia in most of the comparisons (Supp. Table 2). These differences may reflect differences

in the physiology of these different populations. Microbiomes from snail samples (and at a lesser extent from

water samples) also contained a relatively high proportion of bacteria with unassigned taxa: 5% to 43% of ASVs

from snails while 0.2% to 17% of ASVs from the water were uncharacterized.

Individual snails from a population tended to show a similar taxonomic composition as they clustered

together (Fig. 4A). The relatedness between populations reflects what is observed with the qualitative analysis

of the β diversity (Fig. 3A-B).

We identified 93 snail and population specific ASVs not found in water and 1 water specific ASV not

found in snails (Supp. Fig. 5). The count of these ASVs ranged from 2 to 36,770 with a prevalence ranging from

1.19 to 73.81%. The Ba population showed most of the specific ASVs. Bg121, BgBRE, BgBS90 and BgNMRI

showed the lowest number of ASVs and Bg121, BgBRE, BgBS90 showed very low prevalence of these ASVs.

These snail specific ASVs suggest that they may be specifically adapted to their hosts.

We qualitatively compared our microbiome compositions to the main bacterial genus or family found in

other whole snail microbiome studies (Ducklow *et al.*, 1979, 1981; Allan *et al.*, 2018; Huot *et al.*, 2020). We

found bacteria from the *Pseudomonas*, *Acinetobacter*, *Aeromonas* genera and the Enterobacteriaceae family

identified in Caribbean field and laboratory populations (Ducklow *et al.*, 1979) in at least one individual of each

population, with the exception of *Acitenobacter,* which as absent from all BgNMRI snails. However, we did not

find bacteria from the *Vibrio*, *Pasteurella*, and *Moraxella* genera found in by Ducklow *et al.* (1979, 1981). We

also found bacteria from the *Gemmatimonas* genus in at least one individual snail from each population. This

genus was previously associated with BgBS90 snail genotypes showing resistance to schistosome infection (Allan

et al., 2018). We did not find the *Micavibrio*, *Parabacteroides* and *Halobacteriovorax* genus identified by Allan *et*

al. (2018). We found bacteria from the *Pseudomonas*, *Pirellula*, *Candidatus*, *Mesorhizobium* genus and the

Flavobacteriaceae family previously identified in *Biomphalaria* snails (Huot *et al*., 2020) but we did not find

bacteria from the *Mycoplasma*, *Planctomyces* and *Odyssella* genus found in the same study. These absence of

these bacterial taxa from our data set may reflect that these genera are in low concentration or truly absent

from the hemolymph, or that differences in the protocols (16S region amplified, primers, database, pipeline

used) may have precluded the identification from our current dataset.

Finally, the reproducibility of our protocol is again confirmed in this taxonomic analysis (Supp. Fig. 6). All

the replicated libraries clustered together, with the exception of one BgNMRI sample.

3) *Microbiome density*

We investigated the bacterial density by performing real time quantitative PCR on our samples, and corrected

the results to estimate the number of bacteria (Fig. 5A-B). We quantified an average of 4,490 16S rDNA copies

per µL of sample (range: 186 to 59,487). We found the highest average copy number in BgNMRI and the lowest

in BgBRE and water (Fig. 5A) (Kruskal-Wallis test: X^2=26.494, df=7, p=0.0004108 followed by post-hoc pairwise

comparison test).

Bacteria usually carry more than one 16S gene copy in their genome (Větrovský and Baldrian, 2013). We

corrected the raw density data based on 16S copy number using the estimation of 16S copy number per ASV

computed by PiCRUST2. This normalization gave an average of 2,784 ± 339 (mean ± s.e.) (range: 186 to 17,578)

estimated bacteria per µL in snail samples and 1,475 ± 382 in water samples (range: 169 to 5,014) (Fig. 5B). This

did not change drastically the trend already observed with the raw copy number quantification. However,

normalization narrowed the global and per population variation and removed any significant differences

between populations (Kruskal-Wallis test: X^2=16.22, df=7, p=0.023). When considering an average volume of 100

µL of hemolymph per adult snail (personal observation) and an average of 2,784 estimated bacteria per µL in

snail individuals, the snail hemolymph should be inhabited by an average of 278,400 bacteria (range: 18,600 to

1,757,800).

We examined the correlation between the estimated bacteria density and the observed microbial

richness diversity. We found no correlation (Kendall's τ=-0.076, p-value=0.3). This confirms that we can safely

estimate microbial diversity without taking in account bacterial density.

4)   *Functional inference of the hemolymph microbiome*

The microbiome in hemolymph could have a functional role in the snail physiology, just as the gut microbiome

does in humans (Valdes *et al.*, 2018). We investigated the presence of particular metabolic pathways in snails

and water samples based on 16S taxonomy using the PiCRUST2 pipeline. We identified 36 and 4 pathways

overrepresented in hemolymph and water samples respectively, which is supported by our two technical

replicates (Supp. Table 3). The 36 overrepresented pathways in hemolymph were involved in synthesis of

vitamins/electron transporters, in degradation of sugar, amines and aromatic compounds, in nucleotide

metabolism and in fermentation.

The pathways overrepresented in water samples were involved in synthesis of molecules related to cell

wall, DNA synthesis, and detoxification. At least two out of the four overrepresented pathways are found in

bacteria from the Actinobacteria phylum, the dominant phylum found in water (Fig. 4).

In both snail and water samples, other differentially represented pathways were found in only one of

the two technical replicates. This could be due to differences in taxa representation and abundance and

highlight the sensitivity of metabolic inference to this factor.

DISCUSSION

1. Snail hemolymph supports a diverse microbiome.

We have unambiguously shown the presence of diverse microbiomes in the snail hemolymph of one population

of *Biomphalaria alexandrina* and six populations of *B. glabrata.* The snail microbiome contains hemocytes that

protect against incoming microbes, so the existence of a flourishing microbiome in the hemolymph might seem

surprising to some. Three lines of argument suggest that the hemolymph microbiomes we have described are

real, rather than an artifact of our collection procedure:

i.   The shell cleaning step of our protocol efficiently removed any traces of bacteria on the shell, ensuring

no contamination from the outside environment during the heart puncture (see Supp. Fig. 1 and section

1 of Experimental procedures).

ii. The bacterial diversity of the snail microbiomes is distinctive from that of the water in the tanks. The

hemolymph and water microbiome showed dramatic differences in dominating phyla (Proteobacteria

(for all the Bg populations), Bacteroidetes (for the Ba population), and Actinobacteria phylum in the

water microbiomes). The hemolymph microbiomes were more diverse than the water microbiomes

using multiple different diversity metrics. Finally, different species or populations of snails show

characteristic bacterial composition in their hemolymph. The hemolymph, and to a lesser extent, the

water samples harbor uncharacterized taxa: a third of the ASVs identified did not have a taxonomic

assignment.

iii. Bacteria were abundant in the hemolymph. We observed an average of 2,784 bacteria per microliter of

snail hemolymph, with a maximum of 17,578 in the BgNMRI population. Assuming 100µL hemolymph

per snail this equates to 278,400 bacteria, or 1,757,800 for BgNMRI.

Our demonstration that the *Biomphalaria* hemolymph contains a rich microbiome is consistent with published

reports detailing the microbiome from other mollusks, crustaceans (Braquart-Varnier *et al.*, 2008; Desriac *et al.*,

2014; Wang and Wang, 2015; Vezzulli *et al.*, 2018; Table 1) and also from insects (Blow and Douglas, 2019). The

intimate relationship between these organisms and their water environment and their semi-open vascular

system may prevent them from having a sterile hemolymph. Instead, they may use a tolerance strategy as

observed in the human gut (Swiatczak and Cohen, 2015). In insects, the presence of both transient and obligate

bacteria in the hemolymph is now recognized (Blow and Douglas, 2019) but only few bacterial taxa can survive

in such an environment. In contrast, our results show that the hemolymph of *Biomphalaria* snails is inhabited by

a highly diverse microbiome, suggesting that the snail hemolymph environment is more permissive.

2. Do genetics or the environment drive microbiome differences?

Differences in microbial diversity between hemolymph samples reflected their species or populations of origin.

At the species level, *B. glabrata* and *B. alexandrina* always clustered apart based on both qualitative and

quantitative β diversity analysis. This was driven by the differences in bacterial taxa and their abundance

between the two species despite that all these snails were exposed to the same food and the same water source

at the time of the tank setup. Therefore, the differences in the microbial composition are likely to be genetically

controlled, reflecting the evolutionary distance between the two species. At the population level, we could

discriminate *B. glabrata* populations based on rare taxa (qualitative β diversity analysis). Interestingly, the

distance between population clusters was consistent with geographical origins: Brazilian populations (BgBRE,

BgBS90) clustered apart from the Caribbean population (BgNMRI), while inbred subpopulations from a cross

between snails of Caribbean and Brazilian origin (Bonner *et al.*, 2012) tended to cluster with the Caribbean

population (Bg26) or the Brazilian population (Bg36, Bg121). If genetics is the main driver, this would suggest

that microbiome selection at the population level is different from selection at the species level. However, a

strong influence of the environment could also explain this result: we sampled snails of each population from

single tanks. The rare taxa distinguishing microbiomes from different snail populations could also be a signature

of the tank microbiome.

An association between snail genetics and the composition of whole snail microbiome has been

observed previously (Allan *et al.*, 2018). In this particular case, specific genotypes at a locus involved in snail

compatibility with schistosome infection were linked to changes in two particular taxa (*Gemmatimonas*

aurantiaca and *Micavibrio aeruginosavorus*). This locus likely contains immune genes that could specifically

shape the whole snail microbiome. In addition, a recent analysis of whole snail microbiomes that included

several *Biomphalaria* species and *B. glabrata* populations is consistent with our observation regarding species

differentiation based on microbiome but failed to support *B. glabrata* population differentiation (Huot *et al.*,

2020). Three factors from the Huot *et al.* (Huot *et al.*, 2020) study could explain this difference: (i) the shell was

removed prior to DNA extraction: this may have resulted in significant loss of hemolymph, reducing the

contribution of hemolymph to the results, or (ii) their analysis focused on the core microbiome: excluding rare

taxa may have limited their ability to detect population differentiation, or (iii) the composite microbiome from

whole snails (including microbiomes from multiple different organs) was analyzed.

Previous studies on whole snail microbiomes using older, culture-based methodology showed a strong

influence of the environment: translocating *B. glabrata* from one river to another had a dramatic impact on

abundance of cultivable bacteria (Ducklow *et al.*, 1981). This change in microbiome could be due to uptake of

new bacteria from this new environment or could result from the stress of the translocation leading to the

modification of the immune system and consequently of the microbiome composition. To better understand the

relative role of genes and environment in controlling microbiome composition, classical genetic crosses, and

common garden rearing experiments will be needed.

3.   Origin of the hemolymph microbiome

Microorganisms can be acquired directly from the environment or transmitted vertically from the parents. We

observed shared bacterial taxa between snail hemolymph and water suggesting that exchanges between the

environment and the snail is likely to occur. Exchange could take place at two main sites: the mantle cavity and

the gut. The mantle cavity is likely involved in gas exchange between the hemolymph and the water (Jurberg *et*

al., 1997). Pinocytosis at the mantle epithelium and loose vascular connective under it (Sullivan and Cheng,

1974) could promote active or passive acquisition of microorganisms. The microsporidium *Capsaspora*

owczarzaki was found in the mantle and pericardial explants strongly suggesting that microorganisms can pass

through the mantle cavity (Stibbs et al., 1979; Hertel et al., 2002). The gut and its surrounding hepatopancreas

where active phagocytosis happens (Van Weel, 1961) could be another site of microorganism acquisition.

Amoebae (Richards, 1968) and microsporidia (Richards and Sheffield, 1970) can infect the gut and

hepatopancreas suggesting that the complex gut microbiome (Van Horn et al., 2012) could colonize the

hemolymph through this route. This could be validated by comparing gut and hemolymph microbiome.

A second route of microbiome acquisition is a vertical transmission from parents to offspring.

Microorganisms could be selectively added to the egg yolk or the egg mass fluid (i.e. fluid surrounding the eggs

inside the egg mass) and could be integrated into the developing organism. Antimicrobial proteins have been

identified in both egg yolk (Baron *et al.*, 2013) and egg mass fluid (Hathaway *et al.*, 2010) which, in addition to

protecting the eggs from outside pathogens, could control the development of the transmitted microbiome.

Vertical transmission of microorganisms via the egg cytoplasm (Werren *et al.*, 2008) or after spreading them on

the egg surface (Abe *et al.*, 1995; Prado *et al.*, 2006) is common in invertebrates.

4.   *Microbiome functionality: transient passengers or co-evolved relationship*

The primary role of the hemolymph is to distribute nutrients to organs and defend the snail against infections.

The presence of a microbiome could result from a tolerance strategy to mitigate the high costs of maintaining a

sterile hemolymph and could be comprised of commensal microorganisms only. However, snails could have

evolved in order to take advantage of the presence of this microbiome. Hemolymph microbiomes could be

involved in providing nutrients to their snail host. Pathway inference analysis from our microbiome data showed

that hemolymph microbiome is enriched in pathways related to vitamin production. Vitamins are known to be

essential in egg production: snails raised in axenic conditions were not able to lay eggs except with a supplement

of vitamin E (Vieira, 1967). We did not find pathways involved in the production of this particular vitamin but for

others (B6, B12, K12) which may also have a role in snail physiology. The vitamins B6 (pyridoxine), B12

(cobalamin), and K12 (menaquinol) are essential to animals and could be released into the hemolymph by the

bacteria and absorbed by the snail tissues. We have also shown enrichment for other pathways like sugar and

polyamine metabolism which could serve only bacteria but could also be beneficial to snail hosts. Sugar

degradation is likely involved in energy generation for the bacteria. Polyamines are linked to bacterial growth

and survival by reducing oxidative stress (Murray Stewart *et al.*, 2018) which could be generated by the

presence of the hemocytes (Castillo *et al.*, 2020). Production of critical metabolites by the hemolymph

microbiome could support sustainable production of these metabolites. While pathway inference using 16S data

can give good indication of the pathways present and differentially represented between samples, a more

robust approach using metagenomics is required to confirm these inferences.

This microbiome could also be involved in snail defense either directly by controlling pathogens or

indirectly by stimulating the snail immune system or competing with pathogens. Snails are susceptible to

pathogens ranging from bacteria (Duval *et al.*, 2015) to multicellular parasites (Laidemitt *et al.*, 2017) such as

schistosomes causing damages to the snail organs.

5.   Role of the hemolymph microbiome in the snail-schistosome interactions

We hypothesize that hemolymph microbiome could be a third player in the interaction between the snail and its

schistosome parasite. Such tripartite interactions are increasingly recognized to modulate infection outcome

and could play a major role in evolution of host-parasite systems (Dheilly, 2014; Ford *et al.*, 2017). The

hemolymph is known to be involved in snail defense against schistosomes by the action of hemocytes and

humoral factors (Castillo *et al.*, 2020). Snail genetics has also been shown to be a major determinant of snail

resistance (Tennessen *et al.*, 2015). However, the microbiome could enhance or reduce snail resistance.

Enhancing resistance could occur by direct interaction with the parasite (through competition or parasite

infection) or by stimulation of the immune system. The microsporidia *C. owczarzaki* showed direct interaction

with *S. mansoni* sporocysts leading to their death while leaving the snail unharmed (Stibbs *et al.*, 1979; Hertel *et*

al., 2002). These microsporidia were found in higher density in resistant snail populations (Stibbs *et al.*, 1979).

This could result from resistant snails actively selecting this particular microorganism. Furthermore, the

abundance of bacteria from the *Gemmatimonas* genus in whole snails has been associated with snail genotypes

linked to schistosome resistance (Allan *et al.*, 2018), genus which is also present in the hemolymph of our snail

populations. While it is unknown if the bacteria associated with the resistant genotype are actually involved in

resistance, this showed that genetic control of microbial composition occurs in snails and could influence

interactions between snails and schistosomes.

Beyond the snail hemolymph microbiome, we may also have to consider the influence of a potential

schistosome microbiome. Role of parasite microbiomes in host-parasite interactions is still poorly understood

but could be critical as stated by the Parasite Microbiome Project (Dheilly *et al.*, 2017). Non-human infecting

trematodes are known to harbor *Neorickettsia* endosymbionts (Jenkins *et al.*, 2019) and these might also be

present in schistosomes (Buddenborg *et al.*, 2017). In addition, schistosome larvae could acquire

microorganisms during their free living stages (miracidium and cercariae) or during their development into the

snail which could influence the outcome of the infection in snail and mammalian hosts. For instance, the

entomopathogenic nematodes *Heterorhabditis* and *Steinernema* rely on their gut bacteria to kill and consume

their insect host (Jenkins *et al.*, 2019). The schistosome microbiome, if present, could facilitate the development

of developing schistosome larvae inside the snail by disturbing the hemolymph microbiome or by interacting

with the snail immune system.

In addition to the fact that *Biomphalaria spp.* snails are intermediate hosts of *S. mansoni*, these snails

have several attractive features that make them a promising model system for studying invertebrate-

microbiome interactions. Namely (i) they are easy to grow in large numbers in aquaria or plastic trays and

experimentally tractable, (ii) they are relatively large and hemolymph can be easily sampled, (iii) as these snails

are hermaphrodite, inbred snail lines are easily generated by serial inbreeding to minimize host genetic effects

(Bonner *et al.*, 2012), (iv) improving genomic resources and tools for gene silencing are available (Knight *et al.*,

2011; Allan *et al.*, 2017). We anticipate that *Biomphalaria spp.* may join the list of non-traditional model

invertebrate species (Douglas, 2019) that are now being exploited for asking both pure and applied questions

about microbiome biology.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

1) Biomphalaria spp. *hemolymph collection*

Biomphalaria spp. freshwater snails are the intermediate host for schistosome trematode parasites. In this study, we sampled only hemolymph (i.e. blood) from schistosome uninfected snails. All our *Biomphalaria spp.* snails were reared in 10-gallon aquaria containing aerated freshwater at 26-28°C on a 12 hour light – 12 hour dark photocycle and fed *ad libitum* on green leaf lettuce. An advantage of *Biomphalaria* snails is their large size and their flat shell. This allows easy access to the heart and makes collection of ~80-100 µL of hemolymph possible. All snails used in this study had a shell diameter between 10-15 mm.

For each individual snail, we disinfected the shell 3 times with 70% ethanol. We validated the effectiveness of the disinfection method on an independent set of snails. We swabbed shells before and after the 70% ethanol cleaning using sterile polyester tipped swabs (Puritan), extracted DNA and amplified 16S rDNA as described in the next section. This showed no detectable rDNA and confirmed that collected hemolymph was not contaminated with shell microbiome (Supp. Fig. 1). After shell cleaning, we collected the hemolymph by heart puncture using a sterile 1 mL syringe and a sterile 22 gauge needle. The hemolymph collected was immediately placed in a sterile 1.5 mL pre-cooled microtube on ice.

We collected hemolymph from 5 individual snails from each of 7 different populations of *Biomphalaria spp.* (Table 2, Figure 1). We also sampled water from the aquaria where each *Biomphalaria spp.* populations were raised as a control, to characterize the microbiome from the snails' environment. Immediately after collection, samples were snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C until processing. All the samples were collected by a single experimenter, in a 2h window.

2) *16S rDNA library preparation and sequencing*

We extracted DNA from the snail hemolymph and water samples using the Blood and Tissue kit (Qiagen),

following the manufacturer's protocol, with minor modifications. All the DNA extractions were processed the

same day, using a single Blood and Tissue kit (Qiagen) kit, by a single experimenter. We also added blank

controls starting at the DNA extraction step to check for potential contaminant coming from the DNA extraction

kit and PCR reaction kit. To verify the reproducibility of our process for DNA extraction, library preparation and

sequencing, we split each hemolymph or water sample in two aliquots and processed them independently. For

each replicate sample, we extracted total DNA using 40 µL of the hemolymph or water samples. We incubated

each replicate for 45 minutes at 56°C in a water bath. We recovered final gDNA in 50 µL of elution buffer

(Qiagen).

We prepared the 16S rDNA libraries under a biosafety cabinet to avoid contamination, and in triplicate to

avoid biases potentially introduced during PCR reaction step. We amplified 250 bp of the 16S rDNA V4 region

from bacteria and archaea, using specific primers (515f and 806rB) designed by the Earth Microbiome Project

(Apprill *et al.*, 2015). Each of the 515f forward primers were barcoded to allow sample identification. The 16S

rDNA V4 reaction mixture consisted of 4 µL of 1X 5 Prime Hot Master Mix (QuantaBio), 2 µL of sterile water, 1 µL

of 2 µM 515f barcoded primer, 1 µL of 2 µM 806rB primer (Supp. Table 4), and 2 µL of total gDNA template.

Libraries were amplified using the GeneAmp PCR system 9700 (Applied Biosystems) as follows: 95°C for 3

minutes, then 35 cycles of 95°C for 45 seconds, 50°C for 1 minute, 72°C for 90 seconds, then 72°C for 10

minutes. We electrophoresed 2 µL of each PCR product on agarose gel (2%) to check amplicon size, and absence

of contamination in the controls (Supp. File 7). We pooled the triplicate PCR products and the 24 µL of final

volume were purified by adding 44 µL of AMPure XP beads (Beckman Coulter), mixing with pipette followed by a

5 minute incubation. We separated the beads on a 96 well-plate magnetic device (5 minutes), discarded the

cleared solution from each well, and washed beads twice in 200 µL of freshly-prepared 70% ethanol (1 minute),

while maintaining the plate on the magnetic device. After drying beads (3 minutes), we eluted each library by

adding 20 µL of nuclease-free sterile water, mixing the beads and water by pipetting followed by a 2 minute

incubation. Then we separated the beads on the magnetic device (3 minutes) and placed the purified 16S rDNA

V4 barcoded libraries in a fresh 96 well-plate. All incubations were done at room temperature. We quantified

these libraries using the Picogreen quantification assay (Invitrogen) following the manufacturer's instructions.

Finally, we made an equimass pool of all the libraries using 15 ng of each library. We quantified the final pool

fragment size using the 4200 TapeStation (DNA screen tape, Agilent Technology) and molarity using the Kappa

library quantification kit for the Illumina sequencing platform (following the manufacturer's recommendations).

We sequenced the pool on an Illumina MiSeq sequencer at Texas Biomedical Research Institute (San Antonio,

Texas). Raw sequencing data are accessible from the NCBI Sequence Read Archive under BioProject accession

number PRJNA613098.

3) Sequence processing

Commands and scripts used for the sequence processing and downstream analysis are available in a Jupyter

notebook on Zenodo (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4020011).

We demultiplexed the raw sequencing data obtained from the MiSeq using bcl2fastq (v2.17.1.14,

Illumina) with the default parameters. We used the fastq files generated as input for Qiime2 (v2019.4) (Bolyen

et al., 2019). We checked the read quality from the results of the demux module. We then denoised and

clustered the sequences into amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) using the denoise-paired command from the

dada2 module with a max expected error of 5. We determined the taxonomy of the ASVs using the SILVA

database and the classify-consensus-vsearch command of the feature-classifier module using a 97% identity

threshold. ASVs with unassigned taxonomy were blasted against the NCBI nt database using megablast from

blast+ (v2.7.1) to identify eukaryotic contaminants for removal in downstream analysis. We used a relatively

lenient e-value threshold (1e-2) to increase our power of detection. To build a phylogenetic tree, we aligned the

ASVs and masked the highly variable positions using the mafft and mask commands from the alignment module.

Finally, we built and rooted a tree from the alignment using the fasttree and midpoint-root commands from the

phylogeny module.

4)   ***Functional inference of the microbiome***

We inferred the microbiome's function using PiCRUST2 software (v2.1.4b). We used the Qiime2 processed data

and exported the ASV representative sequences of the taxonomy analysis and the abundance table. We placed

the sequences into the reference tree, performed hidden-state prediction of gene families and generated

metagenome prediction. We performed pathway-level inference and finally add functional description to the

generated files. Finally, we performed a differential pathway abundance using the ALDEx2 R package (v1.16.0)

(Fernandes *et al.*, 2014) on the unstratified pathway prediction.

5)   ***Estimation of bacterial abundance by quantitative PCR***

We performed real time quantitative PCR (qPCR) reactions to estimate the number of bacterial 16S rDNA in each

hemolymph and water replicated sample. Reactions were performed in duplicate using the QuantStudio 5

(Applied Biosystems) as follows: 95°C for 10 minutes, then 40 cycles of 95°C for 15 seconds and 60°C for 1

minute. Duplicate reactions showing a difference in C_T greater than one were rerun. The reaction mixture

consisted of 5 µL of SYBR Green MasterMix (Applied Biosystems), 0.3 µL of 10 µM forward primer (515f without

barcode: GTGYCAGCMGCCGCGGTAA) and 10 µM reverse primer (806rB: GGACTACNVGGGTWTCTAAT)

amplifying 250 bp of the 16S rDNA V4 region, 3.4 µL of sterile water and 1 µL of total DNA template. We plotted

standard curves using seven dilutions of a purified 16S V4 rDNA amplicon (copies.µL^{-1}: $1.34×10^1$, $1.34×10^2$,

$1.34×10^3$, $1.34×10^4$, $1.34×10^5$, $1.34×10^6$, $1.34×10^7$). We produced the purified 16S V4 rDNA by amplification of

the V4 region of *Escherichia coli* XL 10-gold (Agilent) using TaKaRa Taq R001 AM kit (Clonetech) following the

manufacturer's protocol (PCR cycles: 95°C for 10 min, [95°C for 15 s, 50°C for 30 s, 60°C for 60 s] × 35 cycles,

60°C for 10 min). We purified the PCR product using AMPure XP beads (Beckman Coulter) following the

manufacturer's protocol, and quantified it using Qubit dsDNA BR Assay kit (Invitrogen). We determined the

number of copies in the PCR product as follows: PCR product length × (average molecular mass of nucleotides

(330 g.mol^{-1}) × 2 strands) × Avogadro constant. The number of 16S V4 rDNA V4 copies in each sample was

estimated according to the standard curve (QuantStudio Design and Analysis Software). The primer pair

(515f/806rB) was chosen to allow direct comparison of qPCR values with Illumina MiSeq sequenced amplicons of

the same locus. We used the following equation to normalize the qPCR data:

$$q_{bacteria} = \left(q_{16S} \times \frac{50}{40} \right) \times \frac{1}{n_{ASV} \times n_{16S\ ASV}}$$

Where the the 16S copy number from the qPCR (q_{16S}) was first corrected with the dilution factor between

hemolymph and elution volume (40 and 50 µL, respectively) and this value was then normalized using the

estimated 16S copy per bacteria from PiCRUST2 ($n_{16S\ ASV}$) and the abundance of each bacteria from Qiime2 (n_{ASV})

(see previous section).

6) Statistical analysis

All statistical analyzes and graphs were performed using R software (v3.5.1). We used several packages to

compute diversity statistics from the Qiime data: phyloseq (v1.26.1) (McMurdie and Holmes, 2013), microbiome

(v1.8.0), and picante (v1.8.1) (Kembel *et al.*, 2010). We compared α-diversity results using a pairwise Wilcoxon

test. We used the vegan (v2.5.4) and the pairwiseAdonis (v0.0.1) packages to perform β-dispersion and

Permanova tests, respectively. We used the DESeq2 package (v1.22.2) (Love *et al.*, 2014) to identify the

differentially represented phyla. We computed centroid distances from the different populations or species

using the usedist package (v0.4.0) and tested for significant differences using a t-test or a Wilcoxon test when

data did not follow a normal distribution (Shapiro test, p < 0.05).

We compared the microbial density between populations using a Kruskal-Wallis test (data not following

normal distribution; Shapiro test, p < 0.05) followed by pairwise comparison post-hoc test. We used Kendall's

tau coefficient to test the correlation between the estimated bacteria density and the observed microbial

richness. The confidence interval of significance was set to 95% and p-values less than 0.05 were considered as

significant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Michael S. Blouin from Oregon State University for providing all the inbred *Biomphalaria glabrata* snail lines (Bg26, Bg36 and Bg121) , Guillaume Mitta and Benjamin Gourbal (University of Perpignan, France) for providing the BgBRE snails, Philip LoVerde (UT Health, San Antonio) and the Biomedical Research Institute (NIAID Schistosomiasis Resource Center, Rockville, MD) for providing the BgNMRI and BgBS90 snails through NIH-NIAID Contract HHSN272201700014I, and the Theodor Bilharz Research Institute (Giza, Egypt) for providing *B. alexandrina* snails. We thank Shelley Cole and Vanessa Ayala (Texas Biomedical Research Institute) for help with MiSeq sequencing. This research was supported by a Forum grant (14-04491 (FC, WL), a Cowles fellowship (WL) from Texas Biomedical Research Institute and NIH grants (NIH R01AI133749 and R01AI123434 (TJCA)), and was conducted in facilities constructed with support from Research Facilities Improvement Program grant C06 RR013556 from the National Center for Research Resources.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Abe, Y., Mishiro, K., and Takanashi, M. (1995) Symbiont of brown-winged green bug, *Plautia stali* SCOTT.
Japanese journal of applied entomology and zoology **39**: 109–115.
Allan, E.R.O., Tennessen, J.A., Bollmann, S.R., Hanington, P.C., Bayne, C.J., and Blouin, M.S. (2017) Schistosome
infectivity in the snail, *Biomphalaria glabrata*, is partially dependent on the expression of Grctm6, a
Guadeloupe Resistance Complex protein. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases* **11**: e0005362.
Allan, E.R.O., Tennessen, J.A., Sharpton, T.J., and Blouin, M.S. (2018) Allelic variation in a single genomic region
alters the microbiome of the snail *Biomphalaria glabrata*. *The Journal of heredity* **109**: 604–609.
Antunes, F., Hinzmann, M., Lopes-Lima, M., Machado, J., and Martins da Costa, P. (2010) Association between
environmental microbiota and indigenous bacteria found in hemolymph, extrapallial fluid and mucus of
Anodonta cygnea (Linnaeus, 1758). *Microbial ecology* **60**: 304–309.
Apprill, A., McNally, S., Parsons, R., and Weber, L. (2015) Minor revision to V4 region SSU rRNA 806R gene
primer greatly increases detection of SAR11 bacterioplankton. *Aquat Microb Ecol* **75**: 129–137.
Auguste, M., Lasa, A., Pallavicini, A., Gualdi, S., Vezzulli, L., and Canesi, L. (2019a) Exposure to TiO$_2$ nanoparticles
induces shifts in the microbiota composition of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* hemolymph. *The Science of the*
total environment **670**: 129–137.
Auguste, M., Lasa, A., Pallavicini, A., Gualdi, S., Vezzulli, L., and Canesi, L. (2019b) Exposure to TiO$_2$ nanoparticles
induces shifts in the microbiota composition of *Mytilus galloprovincialis* hemolymph. *The Science of the*
total environment **670**: 129–137.
Baron, O.L., van West, P., Industri, B., Ponchet, M., Dubreuil, G., Gourbal, B., et al. (2013) Parental transfer of the
antimicrobial protein LBP/BPI protects *Biomphalaria glabrata* eggs against oomycete infections. *PLoS*
pathogens **9**: e1003792.
Blow, F. and Douglas, A.E. (2019) The hemolymph microbiome of insects. *Journal of insect physiology* **115**: 33–
39.
Bolyen, E., Rideout, J.R., Dillon, M.R., Bokulich, N.A., Abnet, C.C., Al-Ghalith, G.A., et al. (2019) Reproducible,
interactive, scalable and extensible microbiome data science using QIIME 2. *Nature biotechnology* **37**:
852–857.
Bonner, K.M., Bayne, C.J., Larson, M.K., and Blouin, M.S. (2012) Effects of Cu/Zn superoxide dismutase (sod1)
genotype and genetic background on growth, reproduction and defense in *Biomphalaria glabrata*. *PLoS*
NeglTrop Dis **6**: e1701.
Braquart-Varnier, C., Lachat, M., Herbinière, J., Johnson, M., Caubet, Y., Bouchon, D., and Sicard, M. (2008)
Wolbachia mediate variation of host immunocompetence. *PloS one* **3**: e3286.
Brune, A. (2014) Symbiotic digestion of lignocellulose in termite guts. *Nature reviews Microbiology* **12**: 168–180.
Buddenborg, S.K., Bu, L., Zhang, S.-M., Schilkey, F.D., Mkoji, G.M., and Loker, E.S. (2017) Transcriptomic
responses of Biomphalaria pfeifferi to Schistosoma mansoni: Investigation of a neglected African snail
that supports more S. mansoni transmission than any other snail species. *PLoS neglected tropical*
diseases **11**: e0005984.
Castillo, M.G., Humphries, J.E., Mourão, M.M., Marquez, J., Gonzalez, A., and Montelongo, C.E. (2020)
Biomphalaria glabrata immunity: Post-genome advances. *Developmental and comparative immunology*
104: 103557.
Colley, D.G., Bustinduy, A.L., Secor, W.E., and King, C.H. (2014) Human schistosomiasis. *Lancet* **383**: 2253–2264.
Desriac, F., Le Chevalier, P., Brillet, B., Leguerinel, I., Thuillier, B., Paillard, C., and Fleury, Y. (2014) Exploring the
hologenome concept in marine bivalvia: haemolymph microbiota as a pertinent source of probiotics for
aquaculture. *FEMS microbiology letters* **350**: 107–116.
Dheilly, N.M. (2014) Holobiont-Holobiont interactions: redefining host-parasite interactions. *PLoS pathogens* **10**:
e1004093.

Dheilly, N.M., Bolnick, D., Bordenstein, S., Brindley, P.J., Figuères, C., Holmes, E.C., et al. (2017) Parasite
microbiome project: Systematic investigation of microbiome dynamics within and across parasite-host
interactions. *mSystems* **2**:.
Douglas, A.E. (2019) Simple animal models for microbiome research. *Nature reviews Microbiology* **17**: 764–775.
Ducklow, H.W., Boyle, P.J., Maugel, P.W., Strong, C., and Mitchell, R. (1979) Bacterial flora of the schistosome
vector snail *Biomphalaria glabrata*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **38**: 667–672.
Ducklow, H.W., Clausen, K., and Mitchell, R. (1981) Ecology of bacterial communities in the schistosomiasis
vector snail *Biomphalaria glabrata*. *Microb Ecol* **7**: 253–274.
Duval, D., Galinier, R., Mouahid, G., Toulza, E., Allienne, J.F., Portela, J., et al. (2015) A novel bacterial pathogen
of *Biomphalaria glabrata*: a potential weapon for schistosomiasis control? *PLoS neglected tropical*
diseases **9**: e0003489.
Fernandes, A.D., Reid, J.N., Macklaim, J.M., McMurrough, T.A., Edgell, D.R., and Gloor, G.B. (2014) Unifying the
analysis of high-throughput sequencing datasets: characterizing RNA-seq, 16S rRNA gene sequencing
and selective growth experiments by compositional data analysis. *Microbiome* **2**: 15.
Files, V.S. and Cram, E.B. (1949) A study on the comparative susceptibility of snail vectors to strains of
Schistosoma mansoni. *The Journal of Parasitology* **35**: 555–560.
Flintoft, L. (2013) Evolution: Speciation meets microbiomes. *Nature reviews Genetics* **14**: 598.
Ford, S.A., Williams, D., Paterson, S., and King, K.C. (2017) Co-evolutionary dynamics between a defensive
microbe and a pathogen driven by fluctuating selection. *Molecular ecology* **26**: 1778–1789.
Hathaway, J.J.M., Adema, C.M., Stout, B.A., Mobarak, C.D., and Loker, E.S. (2010) Identification of protein
components of egg masses indicates parental investment in immunoprotection of offspring by
Biomphalaria glabrata (gastropoda, mollusca). *Dev Comp Immunol* **34**: 425–435.
Hertel, L.A., Bayne, C.J., and Loker, E.S. (2002) The symbiont *Capsaspora owczarzaki*, nov. gen. nov. sp., isolated
from three strains of the pulmonate snail *Biomphalaria glabrata* is related to members of the
Mesomycetozoea. *Int J Parasitol* **32**: 1183–1191.
Hosokawa, T., Koga, R., Kikuchi, Y., Meng, X.-Y., and Fukatsu, T. (2010) Wolbachia as a bacteriocyte-associated
nutritional mutualist. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
107: 769–774.
Huot, C., Clerissi, C., Gourbal, B., Galinier, R., Duval, D., and Toulza, E. (2020) Schistosomiasis vector snails and
their microbiota display a phylosymbiosis pattern. *Frontiers in microbiology* **10**: 3092.
Jenkins, T.P., Brindley, P.J., Gasser, R.B., and Cantacessi, C. (2019) Helminth microbiomes - a hidden treasure
trove? *Trends in parasitology* **35**: 13–22.
Jurberg, P., Cunha, R.A., and Rodrigues, M.L. (1997) Behavior of Biomphalaria glabrata Say, 1818 (Gastropoda:
Planorbidae) - 1. Morphophysiology of the mantle cavity. *Memorias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz* **92**: 287–
295.
Kembel, S.W., Cowan, P.D., Helmus, M.R., Cornwell, W.K., Morlon, H., Ackerly, D.D., et al. (2010) Picante: R tools
for integrating phylogenies and ecology. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **26**: 1463–1464.
Kinross, J.M., Darzi, A.W., and Nicholson, J.K. (2011) Gut microbiome-host interactions in health and disease.
Genome medicine **3**: 14.
Knight, M., Miller, A., Liu, Y., Scaria, P., Woodle, M., and Ittiprasert, W. (2011) Polyethyleneimine (PEI) mediated
siRNA gene silencing in the *Schistosoma mansoni* snail host, *Biomphalaria glabrata*. *PLoS neglected*
tropical diseases **5**: e1212.
Laidemitt, M.R., Zawadzki, E.T., Brant, S.V., Mutuku, M.W., Mkoji, G.M., and Loker, E.S. (2017) Loads of
trematodes: discovering hidden diversity of paramphistomoids in Kenyan ruminants. *Parasitology* **144**:
131–147.
Lee, W.-J. and Hase, K. (2014) Gut microbiota-generated metabolites in animal health and disease. *Nature*
chemical biology **10**: 416–424.

Leite, L., Jude-Lemeilleur, F., Raymond, N., Henriques, I., Garabetian, F., and Alves, A. (2017) Phylogenetic
diversity and functional characterization of the Manila clam microbiota: a culture-based approach.
Environmental science and pollution research international **24**: 21721–21732.

Lewis, F.A., Stirewalt, M.A., Souza, C.P., and Gazzinelli, G. (1986) Large-scale laboratory maintenance of
Schistosoma mansoni, with observations on three schistosome/snail host combinations. *J Parasitol* **72**:
813–829.

Lokmer, A. and Mathias Wegner, K. (2015) Hemolymph microbiome of Pacific oysters in response to
temperature, temperature stress and infection. *The ISME journal* **9**: 670–682.

Love, M.I., Huber, W., and Anders, S. (2014) Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq
data with DESeq2. *Genome biology* **15**: 550.

McMurdie, P.J. and Holmes, S. (2013) phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis and graphics
of microbiome census data. *PloS one* **8**: e61217.

Murray Stewart, T., Dunston, T.T., Woster, P.M., and Casero, R.A. (2018) Polyamine catabolism and oxidative
damage. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **293**: 18736–18745.

Musella, M., Wathsala, R., Tavella, T., Rampelli, S., Barone, M., Palladino, G., et al. (2020) Tissue-scale microbiota
of the Mediterranean mussel (Mytilus galloprovincialis) and its relationship with the environment. *The*
Science of the total environment **717**: 137209.

Offret, C., Jégou, C., Mounier, J., Fleury, Y., and Le Chevalier, P. (2019) New insights into the haemo- and coelo-
microbiota with antimicrobial activities from Echinodermata and Mollusca. *Journal of applied*
microbiology **126**: 1023–1031.

Oliver, K.M., Degnan, P.H., Burke, G.R., and Moran, N.A. (2010) Facultative symbionts in aphids and the
horizontal transfer of ecologically important traits. *Annual review of entomology* **55**: 247–266.

Ooi, M.C., Goulden, E.F., Smith, G.G., and Bridle, A.R. (2019) Haemolymph microbiome of the cultured spiny
lobster Panulirus ornatus at different temperatures. *Scientific reports* **9**: 1677.

Paraense, W.L. and Correa, L.R. (1963) Variation in susceptibility of populations of Australorbis glabratus to a
strain of Schistosoma mansoni. *Rev Inst Med Trop Sao Paulo* **5**: 15–22.

Pathirana, E., McPherson, A., Whittington, R., and Hick, P. (2019) The role of tissue type, sampling and nucleic
acid purification methodology on the inferred composition of Pacific oyster (Crassostrea gigas)
microbiome. *Journal of applied microbiology* **127**: 429–444.

Prado, S.S., Rubinoff, D., and Almeida, R.P.P. (2006) Vertical transmission of a pentatomid caeca-associated
symbiont. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* **99**: 577–585.

Sant'Anna, M.R.V., Diaz-Albiter, H., Aguiar-Martins, K., Al Salem, W.S., Cavalcante, R.R., Dillon, V.M., et al. (2014)
Colonisation resistance in the sand fly gut: *Leishmania* protects *Lutzomyia longipalpis* from bacterial
infection. *Parasites & vectors* **7**: 329.

Slatko, B.E., Luck, A.N., Dobson, S.L., and Foster, J.M. (2014) *Wolbachia* endosymbionts and human disease
control. *Molecular and biochemical parasitology* **195**: 88–95.

Stathopoulos, S., Neafsey, D.E., Lawniczak, M.K.N., Muskavitch, M.A.T., and Christophides, G.K. (2014) Genetic
dissection of Anopheles gambiae gut epithelial responses to Serratia marcescens. *PLoS pathogens* **10**:
e1003897.

Stibbs, H.H., Owczarzak, A., Bayne, C.J., and DeWan, P. (1979) Schistosome sporocyst-killing amoebae isolated
from *Biomphalaria glabrata*. *Journal of invertebrate pathology* **33**: 159–170.

Sullivan, J.T. and Cheng, T.C. (1974) Structure and function of the mantle cavity of Biomphalaria glabrata
(Mollusca: Pulmonata). *Transactions of the American Microscopical Society* **93**: 416–420.

Swiatczak, B. and Cohen, I.R. (2015) Gut feelings of safety: tolerance to the microbiota mediated by innate
immune receptors. *Microbiology and immunology* **59**: 573–585.

Tennessen, J.A., Bonner, K.M., Bollmann, S.R., Johnstun, J.A., Yeh, J.-Y., Marine, M., et al. (2015) Genome-Wide
Scan and Test of Candidate Genes in the Snail Biomphalaria glabrata Reveal New Locus Influencing
Resistance to Schistosoma mansoni. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **9**: e0004077.

Theron, A., Rognon, A., Gourbal, B., and Mitta, G. (2014) Multi-parasite host susceptibility and multi-host
parasite infectivity: A new approach of the *Biomphalaria glabrata/Schistosoma mansoni* compatibility
polymorphism. *Infect Genet Evol* **26**: 80–88.
Valdes, A.M., Walter, J., Segal, E., and Spector, T.D. (2018) Role of the gut microbiota in nutrition and health.
BMJ (Clinical research ed) **361**: k2179.
Van Weel, P. (1961) The comparative physiology of digestion in molluscs. *American Zoologist* 245–252.
Větrovský, T. and Baldrian, P. (2013) The variability of the 16S rRNA gene in bacterial genomes and its
consequences for bacterial community analyses. *PloS one* **8**: e57923.
Vezzulli, L., Colwell, R.R., and Pruzzo, C. (2013) Ocean warming and spread of pathogenic vibrios in the aquatic
environment. *Microbial ecology* **65**: 817–825.
Vezzulli, L., Stagnaro, L., Grande, C., Tassistro, G., Canesi, L., and Pruzzo, C. (2018) Comparative 16SrDNA gene-
based microbiota profiles of the pacific oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*) and the mediterranean mussel
(*Mytilus galloprovincialis*) from a shellfish farm (ligurian sea, italy). *Microbial ecology* **75**: 495–504.
Vieira, E.C. (1967) Influence of vitamin E on reproduction of Biomphalaria glabrata under axenic conditions. *Am J
Trop Med Hyg* **16**: 792–796.
Wang, X.-W. and Wang, J.-X. (2015) Crustacean hemolymph microbiota: Endemic, tightly controlled, and
utilization expectable. *Molecular immunology* **68**: 404–411.
Wang, X.-W., Xu, J.-D., Zhao, X.-F., Vasta, G.R., and Wang, J.-X. (2014) A shrimp C-type lectin inhibits proliferation
of the hemolymph microbiota by maintaining the expression of antimicrobial peptides. *The Journal of
biological chemistry* **289**: 11779–11790.
van der Werf, M.J., de Vlas, S.J., Brooker, S., Looman, C.W.N., Nagelkerke, N.J.D., Habbema, J.D.F., and Engels, D.
(2003) Quantification of clinical morbidity associated with schistosome infection in sub-Saharan Africa.
Acta Trop **86**: 125–139.
Werren, J.H., Baldo, L., and Clark, M.E. (2008) Wolbachia: master manipulators of invertebrate biology. *Nature
reviews Microbiology* **6**: 741–751.
WHO World Health Organization. Schistosomiasis.
Zhang, Xinxu, Sun, Z., Zhang, Xusheng, Zhang, M., and Li, S. (2018) Hemolymph microbiomes of three aquatic
invertebrates as revealed by a new cell extraction method. *Applied and environmental microbiology* **84**:.
708

709 **TABLES**

710 **Table 1 – Aquatic organisms with known hemolymph microbiome.**

Organism (vernacular name) / phylum	Biotope	Hemolymph microbiome characterization	References
Crassostrea gigas (Pacific oyster) /Mollusk	Sea water	16S rRNA gene amplicon (V1-V2) pyrosequencing	Lokmer and Mathias Wegner, 2015
		16S rRNA gene amplicon HiSeq sequencing	Vezzulli *et al.*, 2018
		16S rRNA gene amplicon (V1-V3) sequencing	Pathirana *et al.*, 2019
		Bacterial culture / CFU* counting	Desriac *et al.*, 2014
Crassostrea angulate (Portuguese oyster) / Mollusk	Sea water	16S rRNA gene amplicon (V3-V4) HiSeq sequencing/bacterial culture	Zhang *et al.*, 2018[1]
Mytilus galloprovincialis (Mediterranean mussel) / Mollusk	Sea water	16S rRNA gene amplicon (V4) Ion Torrent sequencing	Auguste *et al.*, 2019b
		16S rRNA gene amplicon HiSeq sequencing	Musella *et al.*, 2020
Mytilus edulis *(Blue mussel)* / Mollusk	Sea water	Bacterial culture / CFU* counting	Desriac *et al.*, 2014
		16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing	Offret *et al.*, 2019
Anodonta cygnea (Swan mussel) / Mollusk	Fresh water	Bacterial culture / CFU* counting	Antunes *et al.*, 2010
Pecten maximus (Great scallop) / Mollusk	Sea water	Bacterial culture / CFU* counting	Desriac *et al.*, 2014

Tapes rhomboides (Clam) / Mollusk	Sea water	Bacterial culture/ CFU* counting	Desriac *et al.*, 2014
Ruditapes philippinarum (Manila clam) / Mollusk	Sea water	Bacterial culture/16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing	Leite *et al.*, 2017
Haliotis tuberculata (Abalone) /Mollusk	Sea water	16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing	Offret *et al.*, 2019
Scylla paramamosain (Mud crab) / Arthropoda	Sea water	16S rRNA gene amplicon (V3-V4) HiSeq sequencing/bacterial culture	Zhang *et al.*, 2018[1]
Litopenaeus vannamei (Whiteleg shrimp) / Arthropoda	Sea water	16S rRNA gene amplicon (V3-V4) HiSeq sequencing/bacterial culture	Zhang *et al.*, 2018[1]
Marsupenaeus japonicas (Kuruma shrimp) / Arthropoda	Sea water	Bacterial culture/ CFU* counting	Wang *et al.*, 2014
Panulirus ornatus (Spiny lobster) / Arthropoda	Sea water	16S rRNA gene amplicon (V1-V3) pyrosequencing	Ooi *et al.*, 2019

711   [1]For additional references on hemolymph microbiome related studies, see **Table 1** from Zhang *et al.*, 2018.

712   *CFU: Colony Forming Unit

719   **Table 2 – Snail laboratory populations used in this study and their characteristics.**

Biomphalaria species	*Biomphalaria laboratory* population	Origin (Country, town, snail cross)	Albinism	Inbreeding	References
B. alexandrina	Ba	Egypt	No	No	Theodor Bilharz Research Institute, Egypt
B. glabrata	BgBS90	Brazil	No	No	Paraense and Correa, 1963
	BgBRE	Brazil (Recife)	Yes	No	Theron *et al.*, 2014
	BgNMRI	Puerto Rico	Yes	No	Lewis *et al.*, 1986
	Bg26	BgM line derived (cross between a Brazilian and a Puerto Rican snail)	Yes	Yes	Bonner *et al.*, 2012
	Bg36		Yes	Yes	
	Bg121		Yes	Yes	

722   **Table 3 – Description of α diversity indices used.**

Index	Description
Observed richness	Raw number of ASVs
Chao1 richness	Estimation of the true richness by adjusting the raw number of ASVs for rare taxa
Faith's Phylogenetic diversity index	Richness index based on phylogenetic distance between ASVs
Shannon index	Measure of heterogeneity in taxa representation (evenness × richness)
Simpson evenness index	Measure of true evenness of taxa within a sample independently of taxa richness. A value close to 0 means that the taxa are unevenly distributed in a sample.
Simpson dominance index	Measure of taxa diversity within a sample. This index is weighted towards the most abundant taxa and influenced by taxa richness. A value close to 0 means that the sample is dominated by few taxa.

 FIGURES

Fig. 1 – Site of hemolymph sampling and workflow of the library preparation and the analysis. A. Snail

hemolymph was sampled directly by heart puncture using a syringe. Left panel shows the position of the heart

(arrow) on an albino snail. Right panel shows a schematic representation of the puncture. **B.** Work flow of the

sample preparation and data processing.

Fig. 2 – α diversity indices. Six different alpha diversity indices were computed (see Table 2 for index

description) revealing that snail hemolymph harbors bacteria communities and those communities are richer

and more diverse that those of the water. Variation in diversity exists between snail populations. All these

bacterial communities are dominated by characteristic bacterial species. Each box plot represents the median

and the interquartile ranges of the distribution. Groups (i.e. snail populations or tank water) not connected by

the same letter are significantly different (post-hoc test).

Fig. 3 – β diversity indices. For each index (A. Jaccard, B. Unweighted unifrac, C. Bray, D. Weighted unifrac), the

first two axes of the principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) are represented. The two first indices represent a

qualitative measure (absence or presence of bacterial taxa) while the two last are quantitative (adjusted with

taxa abundance). The matrices on the right side of each index showed the significance level of the Permanova

test (differences between populations) and the β dispersion test (homogeneity of variance between

populations). All four indices showed that water microbiome was different from snail hemolymph microbiomes,

that the two species of snail (*B. glabrata* and *B. alexandrina*) can be differentiated on a quantitative and

qualitative approaches, and that *B. glabrata* populations were differentiated based on rare taxa (qualitative

aspect) and this differentiation could be linked to their geographic origin. The ellipse represents the multivariate

normal distribution.

Fig. 4 – Taxonomic diversity in each sample and populations. **A.** Dendrogram representing the distance

between samples based on their microbiome composition. Number under each node represents bootstrap

values from 1,000 iterations. Samples from the same population cluster together and links between populations

reflects results obtained from the beta-diversity analysis. **B and C**. Relative abundance of the different phyla

present in each samples from the dendrogram (B) and in each corresponding populations (C). Water microbiome

showed dramatic differences when compared to snail hemolymph microbiomes. Snail microbiomes showed also

specificities between populations.

Fig. 5 – Comparison of microbial density and diversity. **A.** Raw 16S copy number per microliter of hemolymph

and water sample quantified using qPCR. **B.** Estimation of bacteria per microliter after adjusting 16S copy

number using PiCRUST2 input. **C.** Correlation between observed number of ASVs and estimated bacteria

number. The number of bacteria present in a sample does not correlate with the number of ASVs observed. The

dot colors are consistent with the population colors in the above panels. The different letters on panel A and B

indicate significant differences in density means. Groups (i.e. snail populations or tank water) not connected by

the same letter are significantly different (pairwise comparison post-hoc test, $p < 0.05$).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supp. Fig. 1 – Shell cleaning effectiveness. We swabbed snail shells before and after ethanol cleaning and

amplified 16S rDNA to test the effectiveness of the cleaning methods. This was done on a snail of each

population. L corresponds to the 100 bp ladder; 1 and 2 correspond to swab samples before and after 70%

ethanol shell cleaning, respectively; + and - correspond to positive (*E. coli* DNA) and negative (water only) PCR

controls.

Supp. Fig. 2 – Library rarefaction curve for each snail population. Curves represent the number of bacterial

species identified while subsampling a defined number of 16S V4 sequences. Each curve reached a plateau

phase indicating that sampling more sequences did not reveal new bacterial species and therefore that the

sequencing was sufficient to capture all the diversity present in the hemolymph sample.

Supp. Fig. 3 – Correlation of α diversity indices between replicates. For the six different alpha diversity indices,

we performed a correlation analysis between the two replicates and showed that they are highly correlated

confirming the reproducibility of our methods. *R* refers to the Pearson's correlation coefficient (ranging from 0

for no correlation, to 1 for perfect correlation) and *p* refers to the p-value associated.

Supp. Fig. 4 – Principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) of β diversity indices. For each index (Jaccard, Unweighted

unifrac, Bray, Weighted unifrac), the first three axes of the PCoA are represented in pairwise. The two first

indices represent a qualitative measure (absence or presence of bacterial taxa) while the two last are

quantitative (adjusted with taxa abundance). A and B refer to replicate 1 and 2, respectively.

Supp. Fig. 5 – Heatmap of the 94 specific ASVs to snail hemolymph or water microbiomes. ASVs found in either

snails but not water, or in water only, on in specific population of snails.

Supp. Fig. 6 – Taxonomic diversity in each replicated sample. This figure is similar to Fig. 4 with the addition of

the replicated libraries. Each replicated library clustered together showing the reproducibility of the protocol.

Supp. Fig. 7 - 16S library preparation gels. Each library was prepared in triplicate in separated plates. Failed

amplifications were run again (plate 4). Gels showed absence of amplification in the negative control (sterile

water treated alongside samples).

Supp. Table 1 – Library statistics.

Supp. Table 2 – Differentially represented phyla.

Supp. Table 3 – Differentially represented metabolic pathways in snails and water samples.

Supp. Table 4 – Earth Microbiome Project primers used for generating each library.

A

2.5 mm

B

Hemolymph from each **snail**
(40 µL/sample - 2 replicates)

Water from each **tank**
(40 µL/sample - 2 replicates)

Quantitative analysis

gDNA extraction
(Qiagen Blood & tissue kit)

qPCR
16S V4 region

Qualitative analysis

PCR (triplicates)
16S V4 region

Checking amplicons (Presence and size)
Agarose 2% gel

Pooling the 3 PCRs products for each sample

PCR product purification
(AMPure magnetic beads)

DNA quantification
(Picrogreen assay)

Equimass pool
(15 ng/ sample)

MiSeq sequencing

Data analysis – QIIME2 / R

Diversity analysis | **Functional inference** | **Microbiome density**