Title: Patterns of microbiome variation among infrapopulations of permanent

bloodsucking parasites

Authors: Jorge Doña[1, 2]*, Stephany Virrueta Herrera[1], Tommi Nyman[3], Mervi Kunnasranta[4,5],

and Kevin P. Johnson[1]*

Author details:

[1]Illinois Natural History Survey, Prairie Research Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-

Champaign, 1816 S. Oak St., Champaign, Illinois 61820, USA.

[2]Departamento de Biología Animal, Universidad de Granada, Granada, 18001, Spain.

[3]Department of Ecosystems in the Barents Region, Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy

Research, Svanhovd 35, 9925 Svanvik, Norway.

[4]Department of Environmental and Biological Sciences, University of Eastern Finland,

Yliopistokatu 7, 80101 Joensuu, Finland.

[5]Natural Resources Institute Finland, Joensuu, Finland.

Email addresses: Jorge Doña: jorged@illinois.edu; Stephany Virrueta Herrera:

svirru2@illinois.edu; Tommi Nyman: tommi.nyman@nibio.no; Mervi Kunnasranta:

mervi.kunnasranta@uef.fi; Kevin P. Johnson: kdpjohnso@illinois.edu

*Correspondence to: jorged@illinois.edu, kpjohnso@illinois.edu.

Abstract:

While interspecific variation in microbiome composition can often be readily explained by factors

such as host species identity, there is still limited knowledge of how microbiomes vary at scales

lower than the species level (e.g., between individuals or populations). Here, we evaluated

variation in microbiome composition of individual parasites among infrapopulations (i.e.,

populations of parasites of the same species living on a single host individual). To address this

question, we used genome-resolved and shotgun metagenomic data of 17 infrapopulations

(balanced design) of the permanent, bloodsucking seal louse *Echinophthirius horridus* sampled

from individual Saimaa ringed seals *Pusa hispida saimensis*. Both genome-resolved metagenomic

and metagenomic classification approaches consistently show that parasite infrapopulation

identity is a significant factor that explains both qualitative and quantitative patterns of microbiome

variation at the intraspecific level. This study contributes to the general understanding of the

factors driving patterns of intraspecific variation in microbiome composition, especially of

bloodsucking parasites, and has implications for understanding how well-known processes

occurring at higher taxonomic levels, such as phylosymbiosis, might arise in these systems.

Keywords: *genome-resolved metagenomics, host-symbiont, intraspecific variation, lice, microbiota,*

shotgun metagenomics, symbiont.

Introduction

Patterns of inter- and intraspecific variation in microbiome composition of animals have received much attention because the microbiome may influence many biological processes that have considerable effects on the host (Clemente et al. 2012; Le Chatelier et al. 2013; Rothschild et al. 2018; Rudman et al. 2019; Velazquez et al. 2019). For instance, particular microbiome compositions have been found to drive genomic adaptation (Rudman et al. 2019) or to confer protection against pathogens (Velazquez et al. 2019).

In general, both stochastic (e.g., dispersal, or ecological drift) and deterministic (e.g., host immunological regulation, or microbe–microbe interactions) processes operate across multiple spatial scales to shape the composition of animal microbiomes (Adair and Douglas 2017; Kohl 2020). In particular, among the many determinants shaping microbiome composition, host species identity has been repeatedly identified as a key factor determining the composition of animal microbiomes (Brooks et al. 2016; Mazel et al. 2018; Nishida and Ochman 2018; Lutz et al. 2019; Knowles et al. 2019; Lim and Bordenstein 2020; Song et al. 2020). In other words, microbiomes of individuals of the same species tend to be more similar than to those of another species. This pattern is generally the result of filtering microbial taxa by the host (e.g., through host diet, habitat, or immune system, Adair and Douglas 2017) or result from host-microbe coevolution (Lim and Bordenstein 2020). When this process exhibits phylogenetic signal, the pattern is known as phylosymbiosis (i.e., microbial community relationships that recapitulate the phylogeny of their host, Brucker and Bordenstein 2013; Brooks et al. 2016; Lim and Bordenstein 2020). Nonetheless, several aspects of the variation of animal microbiomes are yet to be better understood (Lim and Bordenstein 2020). In particular, for non-human animals, there is still much to learn about how microbiomes vary at scales below the species level, such as between populations (Blekhman et al.

2015; Kohl et al. 2018; Rothschild et al. 2018; Campbell et al. 2020; Fountain-Jones et al. 2020)

or ecotypes (Agany et al. 2020).

An area of focus on understanding intraspecific variation in microbiome composition has been

bloodsucking parasites. In these parasites, previous studies have consistently found a major role

of the host species in shaping microbiome composition in the parasites (Osei-Poku et al. 2012;

Zhang et al. 2014; Swei and Kwan 2017; Zolnik et al. 2018; Landesman et al. 2019; Lee et al.

2019; Muturi et al. 2019). However, in ticks (*Ixodes scapularis*), host individual identity of the

blood meal was even more important than host species identity in explaining microbiome

composition (Landesman et al. 2019). These results suggested that individual host identity of the

blood meal might be an important factor that shapes parasite microbiomes at the intraspecific level

(Landesman et al. 2019). In theory, microbiomes of individual bloodsucking parasites could vary

due to: 1) the individual parasite immune system that may impose selection on different bacterial

taxa (Blekhman et al. 2015; Suzuki et al. 2019), 2) differences in the source of the blood meal that

may transfer or disperse particular bacterial taxa, or modulate bacteria by creating specific

conditions during digestion (Rothschild et al. 2018), 3) microbe–microbe interactions (Hassani et

al. 2018), and 4) stochastic processes (e.g., ecological drift) (Lankau et al. 2012). However, for

most species, and for bloodsucking parasites in particular, the nature of intraspecific variation in

microbiomes and the relative importance of factors shaping this variation remain understudied.

Sucking lice (Phthiraptera: Anoplura) are permanent blood-feeding ectoparasites that live in the

fur or hairs of mammals. The sucking lice of pinnipeds (seals, sea lions, and walrus) are of

particular interest because of their need to adapt to the aquatic lifestyle of their hosts (Durden and

Musser 1994; Leonardi et al. 2013). There is evidence that the sucking of lice of seals and sea

lions have codiversified with their hosts (Kim 1971, 1975, 1985; Leonardi et al. 2019). In addition,

the sucking lice of pinnipeds represent an interesting system in which to study the variation in

microbiome composition and the drivers of this variation at an intraspecific level because: 1) these

lice have well defined, isolated populations (infrapopulations) on individual seal hosts, due to an

expected low rate of horizontal dispersal among host individuals, which is only possible during

the seals' haul-out periods on land or ice (Kim 1985; Leonardi et al. 2013, 2019); and 2) these lice

feed only upon the blood of their host (Snodgrass 1944; Kim 1985), so that it can be assumed that

individuals from the same infrapopulation feed upon "exactly" the same resource (i.e., the blood

of the individual seal on which they occur).

Here, we used genome-resolved approaches (the construction of draft microbial genomes from

short-read shotgun sequencing data; Bowers et al. 2017; Uritskiy et al. 2018) and metagenomic

classification tools (taxonomic classification of individual sequencing reads; Menzel et al. 2016)

to infer patterns of microbiome variation among individuals of the sucking seal louse

Echinophthirius horridus (von Olfers, 1816) inhabiting individual Saimaa ringed seals *Pusa*

hispida saimensis (Nordquist, 1899). Our sampling design, involving analysis of two individual

lice from each of 17 seals, allowed us to evaluate the degree to which variation in microbiome

composition among individual lice is explained by the infrapopulation (the identity of the seal

host).

Materials and Methods

<u>Sampling, DNA extraction, and sequencing</u>

Thirty-four individual lice were sampled from 17 individual Saimaa ringed seals (*Pusa hispida*

saimensis), which is an endemic endangered landlocked subspecies of the ringed seal living in

freshwater Lake Saimaa in Finland (e.g., Nyman et al. 2014). Individual lice were collected from

seals found dead or from seals that were live-captured for telemetry studies (e.g., Niemi et al.

2019), and placed in 2-ml screw-cap tubes with 99.5% ethanol. Lice from a single seal individual

were put in the same tube. Prior to DNA extraction, each louse individual was rinsed with 95 %

ethanol and placed alone in a new sterile vial; then, the remaining ethanol was evaporated at room

temperature.

Whole lice were ground up individually, and genomic DNA was extracted using the Qiagen

QIAamp DNA Micro Kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, U.S.A.). The standard protocol was modified

so that specimens were incubated in ATL buffer and proteinase K at 55 (insert degree) C for 48 h

instead of the recommended 1 – 3 h, as well as by substituting buffer AE with buffer EB (elution

buffer). This was done to ensure maximal yield (greater than 5 ng) of DNA from each louse. Each

DNA extract was quantified with a Qubit 2.0 Fluorometer (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, U.S.A.)

following the manufacturer's recommended protocols.

Shotgun genomic libraries were prepared from the extracts with Hyper Library construction kits

(Kapa Biosystems, Wilmington, MA, U.S.A.), and the libraries were quantitated by qPCR and 150

bp pair-end sequenced on one lane of a NovaSeq 6000 sequencer (Albany, New York). FASTQ

files from sequence data were generated and demultiplexed with bcl2fastq v.2.20. All library

preparations, sequencing, and FASTQ file generation were carried out at the W.M. Keck Center

(University of Illinois, Urbana, IL, U.S.A.). Raw reads were subsequently deposited to the NCBI

GenBank SRA database (Table S1).

Metagenomic analyses

For the genome-resolved metagenomic analyses, we used the metaWRAP v1.1.5 pipeline (Uritskiy

et al. 2018) along with all the recommended databases (i.e., Checkm_DB, NCBI_nt, and

NCBI_tax). We used the metaWRAP Read_qc module with default parameters to quality trim the

reads and to de-contaminate each sample from host reads. For decontamination, we ran a de-novo

genome assembly of an individual louse of the same species, not included in this study, and with

a high amount of sequencing data ("Echor52") in Abyss v2.0.1 (Jackman et al. 2017). Finally, we

filtered out all non-bacterial reads from the contig file using Blobtools v1.0.1 (Laetsch and Blaxter

2017) and used this file to decontaminate all the other samples with the metaWRAP Read_qc

module. Next, we co-assembled reads from all the samples with the metaWRAP Assembly

module (--usemetaspades option) (Nurk et al. 2017). For this assembly, and because of memory

limitations, we used BBNorm (sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap/) before assembly to reduce the

coverage of the concatenated FASTQ file to a maximum of 100X and to discard reads with

coverage under 3X. We binned reads with the metaWRAP Binning module (--maxbin2 --concoct

--metabat2 options) (Alneberg et al. 2014; Wu et al. 2016; Kang et al. 2019) and then consolidated

the resulting bins into a final bin set with both metaWRAP's Bin_refinement module (-c 50 -x 10

options) and the Reassemble_bins module. We quantified the bins resulting from the

Bin_refinement module with Salmon (Patro et al. 2017) using the Quant_bins module with default

parameters. Finally, we classified bins using the Classify_bins module. This module uses Taxator-

tk, which gives highly accurate but conservative classifications (Dröge et al. 2015). Accordingly,

we also uploaded our final metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs) to MiGA for a

complementary analysis to determine the most likely taxonomic classification and novelty rank of

the bin (Rodriguez-R et al. 2018). We used the NCBI Genome database (Prokaryotes; February

26, 2020 version) for this analysis.

For the metagenomic classification of reads, we used the metagenomic classifier Kaiju (Menzel et

al. 2016) with Reference database: nr (Bacteria and Archaea; Database date: 2017-05-16). We

used the default parameters for these analyses – SEG low complexity filter: yes; Run mode:

greedy; Minimum match length: 11; Minimum match score: 75; Allowed mismatches: 5. We then

converted Kaiju's output files into a summary table at the genus and species level and filtered out

taxa with low abundances (<0.1 % of the total reads). We also removed poorly identified taxa

because they would artificially increase the similarity between our samples. Specifically, the

following taxa were excluded: "NA", "Viruses", "archaeon", "uncultured bacterium", "uncultured

Gammaproteobacteria bacterium" (Table S2 and S3).

Lastly, we used Decontam v1.2.1 to filter out bacterial taxa exhibiting known statistical properties

of contaminants (Davis et al. 2018). We used the frequency method (*isContaminant* function)

which is based on the inverse relationship between the relative abundance of contaminants and

sample DNA concentration, and also has been found suitable for samples dominated by host DNA

(Willner et al. 2012; Lusk 2014; Salter et al. 2014; Jervis-Bardy et al. 2015; Hooper et al. 2019;

McArdle and Kaforou 2020). As input for Decontam analyses, we used the aforementioned total

DNA concentration values. Then, as recommended, we explored the distribution of scores

assigned by Decontam to assign the threshold according to bimodality between very low and high

scores (Davis et al. 2018). For the MAGs matrix, no bimodality was found, and thus we used the

0.1 default value (Fig S1a). None of the MAGs were classified as contaminants, according to

Decontam. For Kaiju matrices, a 0.3 threshold value was selected for the species matrix (Fig S1b)

and 0.31 for the genus matrix (Fig S1c). Decontam filtered out a single species (*Clostridia*

bacterium k32) from the species matrix and two genera (*Cupriavidus* and *Massilia*) from the genus

matrix.

 Statistical analyses

To visualize similarities of microbiome composition among louse individuals from the same or

different individual seal hosts, we constructed non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS)

ordinations based on Bray–Curtis and Jaccard (binary = T) dissimilarities using the phyloseq

v1.26-1 R package (McMurdie and Holmes 2013).   For the genome-resolved metagenomic

analyses, we used the normalized MAGs compositional matrices resulting from Salmon.

Specifically, these MAG counts are standardized to the individual sample size (MAG copies per

million reads) and thus allow between-sample comparisons. For the Kaiju analyses, we used the

rarefy_even_depth function of phyloseq (without replacement as in the hypergeometric model) to

rarefy samples to the smallest number of classified sequences per individual observed (85,513, and

71,267 reads in genus and species matrices, respectively) (Weiss et al. 2017).   To assess the

influence of individual host identity on the microbiome composition of louse individuals, we

conducted a permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) (Anderson and

Walsh 2013; Anderson 2014). PERMANOVA analyses were done using the *adonis2* function in

vegan v2.5–4 (Oksanen et al. 2019), based on Bray–Curtis and Jaccard distance matrices with 100

iterations. In PERMANOVA analyses, for the individual host identity factor, our within-group

sample size (n=2) was smaller than both the total number of groups (n=17) and the total sample

size (n=34). Thus, to account for a potential deviation in F-statistics and R^2 values (Kelly et al.

2015), we wrote an R simulation that randomly subsampled the infrapopulations from which the

louse came (5 infrapopulations per iteration). We ran 10 iterations and ran a PERMANOVA

analysis for each iteration. Note that, for a few iterations, subsampled samples were too similar

and PERMANOVA could not be done. In addition, we ran PERMANOVA analyses to explore

additional factors (louse sex: male, female; sequencing lane: 1, 2; and host status: dead, alive) that

may explain variance in microbiome composition. Furthermore, we included significant factors

as the first factors of the host identity PERMANOVA models (i.e., to obtain the variance explained

by host identity after accounting for the variance explained by that factor). We also restricted the

groups in which permutations could be done to only those with the same value of that vector using

the strata argument (e.g., for a sample collected from a dead host, and for the host-status factor,

permutations could only be done among other dead hosts). Lastly, we ran a Mantel test using the

mantel function in vegan (method=spearman, permutations=9999) to explore if host locality (i.e.,

the coordinates in which each host was sampled) correlated with the microbiome composition of

louse individuals. For this analysis, we ran 10 iterations of an R simulation in which we randomly

subsampled one louse sample for each individual host and ran a Mantel test for each iteration. The

following packages were used to produce the plots: ggplot2 v3.1.0.9 (Wickham 2016), grid v3.5.3

(R Core Team 2019), gridExtra v.2.3 (Auguie 2016), ggrepel v0.8.0 (Slowikowski et al. 2019),

ggpubr v.0.2.5 (Kassambara 2018), and ggsci v2.9 (Xiao 2018).

Results

From the genome-resolved metagenomics pipeline, 13 high-quality bacterial metagenome-

assembled genomes (MAGs) were obtained (Table 1; Fig 1). According to MiGA analyses, 10 of

them (77%) likely belong to a species not represented in the NCBI Genome database.

Kaiju analyses recovered a higher diversity of microorganisms than did the genome-resolved

approach. These differences are likely because of the quality-filtering parameters used in the

genome-resolved metagenomics pipeline (i.e., these taxa may have been discarded because the

completeness values of their bins were lower than 50% and/or their contamination values were

higher than 10%). Nevertheless, bacterial taxa found in the genome-resolved metagenomic

approach were generally found also in Kaiju and with similar relative abundances (Fig 2), and a

similar pattern was found also at the species level (Fig S2).

Ordination and PERMANOVA analyses show a major role of infrapopulation identity in

explaining microbiome composition for both presence–absence and quantitative data. In the

genome-resolved metagenomic dissimilarity matrices, most (>84% in all cases) of the variance

was explained by infrapopulation identity (PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, R^2= 0.857, F=6.419,

P=0.001, Fig 3a; Jaccard, R^2= 0.842, F= 5.671, P=0.001; Fig S3a). Results from the simulations

were in line with the results of the regular model, and thus support that our results were not biased

by the sampling design [PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, R^2 (min= 0.65, max= 0.98, mean= 0.78); P

(min= 0.001, max= 0.019, n<0.05= 10/10); Jaccard, R^2 (min= 0.66, max= 1, mean= 0.86), P (min=

0.001, max= 0.106, n<0.05= 5/7)]. From all the additional factors examined, only host status (i.e.,

dead, alive) explained a significant amount of variance [PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, Host status:

R^2= 0.28, F= 12.72, P= 0.001, Louse sex: R^2= 0.08, F= 0.9, P= 0.554, Sequencing lane: R^2= 0.01,

F= 0.38, P= 0.878; Jaccard, Host status: R^2= 0.13, F= 4.93, P= 0.002, Louse sex: R^2= 0.03, F=

0.28, P= 0.867, Sequencing lane: R^2= 0, F= -0.01, P= 1; Mantel test, locality, Bray-Curtis: ρ (min=

-0.09, max= -0.09, mean= -0.09), P (min= 0.8749, max= 0.8867, n<0.05= 0/10); Jaccard: ρ (min=

-0.29, max= -0.29, mean= -0.29), P (min= 0.97742, max= 0.9777, n<0.05= 0/10)]. Including host

status in PERMANOVA analyses did not alter the results on the major influence of host identity

in explaining microbiome composition (PERMANOVA: Host identity, Bray-Curtis, R^2= 0.57, F=

4.58, P= 0.001; Jaccard, R^2= 0.71, F= 5.09, P= 0.002).

Similarly, in Kaiju matrices collapsed at the species level, most (>80% in all cases) of the variance

was also explained by infrapopulation identity (PERMANOVA: Bray–Curtis, R^2=0.804, F=4.346,

P=0.001, Fig 3b; Jaccard, R^2=0.803, F=4.319, P=0.001; Fig S3b). Again, results from simulations

were similar [PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, R^2 (min= 0.62, max= 0.88, mean= 0.75); P (min=

0.003, max= 0.058, n<0.05= 9/10); Jaccard, R^2 (min= 0.63, max= 0.95, mean= 0.76), P (min=

0.002, max= 0.09, n<0.05= 9/10)]. Of all the others factors examined, only host status explained

a significant amount of variance [PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, Host-status: R^2= 0.22, F= 9.03, P=

0.001, Louse sex: R^2= 0.08, F= 0.81, P= 0.564, Sequencing lane: R^2= 0.01, F= 0.35, P= 0.859;

Jaccard, Host-status: R^2= 0.21, F= 8.73, P= 0.001, Louse sex: R^2= 0.08, F= 0.88, P= 0.497,

Sequencing lane: R^2= 0.01, F= 0.4, P= 0.825; Mantel test, locality, Bray-Curtis: ρ (min= 0.04,

max= 0.04, mean= 0.04), P (min= 0.5637, max= 0.5785, n<0.05= 0/10); Jaccard: ρ (min= -0.03,

max= -0.03, mean= -0.03), P (min= 0.5337, max= 0.5488, n<0.05= 0/10)]. PERMANOVA

analysis accounting for host status did not alter the significance of host identity (PERMANOVA:

Bray-Curtis, R^2= 0.52, F= 1.78, P= 0.007; Jaccard, R^2= 0.59, F= 3.37, P= 0.001).

Furthermore, results were consistent when using matrices collapsed at the genus level (>77% of

variance explained in all cases) (PERMANOVA: Bray–Curtis, R^2= 0.865, F= 6.804, P= 0.001, Fig

S4a; Jaccard, R^2= 0.774, F= 3.634, P= 0.001; Fig S4b). Once again, results from simulations were

similar [PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, R^2 (min= 0.68, max= 0.96, mean= 0.8); P (min= 0.002,

max= 0.073, n<0.05= 9/10); Jaccard, R^2 (min= 0.54, max= 0.86, mean= 0.73), P (min= 0.003,

max= 0.061, n<0.05= 9/10)]. Additionally, of all the others factors examined, only host status

explained a significant amount of variance [PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, Host-status: R^2= 0.3, F=

14, P= 0.001, Louse sex: R^2= 0.05, F= 0.51, P= 0.851, Sequencing lane: R^2= 0.01, F= 0.39, P=

0.753; Jaccard, Host-status: R^2= 0.18, F= 7.19, P= 0.002, Louse sex: R^2= 0.07, F= 0.75, P= 0.53,

Sequencing lane: R^2= 0.01, F= 0.40, P= 0.75; Mantel test, locality, Bray-Curtis: ρ (min= 0.09,

max= 0.09, mean= 0.09), P (min= 0.7198, max= 0.7344, n<0.05= 0/10); Jaccard: ρ (min= 0.02,

max= 0.02, mean= 0.02), P (min= 0.4043, max= 0.4246, n<0.05= 0/10)]. Likewise,

PERMANOVA analysis accounting for host status did not alter the significance of host identity

(PERMANOVA: Bray-Curtis, R^2= 0.56, F= 4.73, P= 0.001; Jaccard, R^2= 0.59, F= 2.96, P= 0.001).

Discussion

Two different metagenomic approaches support a major role of infrapopulation identity (ringed

seal host individual) in explaining microbiome variation among individuals of the seal louse. In

addition, highly similar results were found for approaches using either presence-absence or

quantitative matrices, suggesting that not only is bacterial composition, but also bacterial

abundance explained by infrapopulation identity. Our analyses were done on whole louse

individuals and, thus, we cannot confidently differentiate between bacterial taxa inhabiting the lice

(e.g., *Wolbachia* or *Hodgkinia*) from transient taxa present in the host blood meal (e.g.,

Chlamydia). Nevertheless, in line with current evidence on the determinants of microbiome

composition of bloodsucking parasites, the louse blood meal from individual seals is the most

likely candidate in explaining the patterns of microbiome variation across the louse

infrapopulations found here. Indeed, many of the taxa found in our analyses have already been

found in other bloodsucking parasites, thus supporting the influence of blood in shaping the

composition of parasite microbiomes studied here (Jiménez-Cortés et al. 2018).

However, other factors in addition to blood may have contributed to the similarity of microbiomes

between individual lice from the same seal host individual. Some similarity may have arisen from

shared environmental bacteria, those on the surface of the louse from a shared environment (skin

and fur of the host), or contamination between louse individuals in screw-cap tubes, and not filtered

by our decontamination procedures. There may also be insect-specific bacterial taxa, independent

from the host blood, that are shared horizontally between individual lice from the same

infrapopulation. Finally, louse infrapopulations are known to typically be highly inbred, with a

high level of relatedness between individuals (Koop et al. 2014, DiBlasi et al 2018, Virrueta

Herrera et al., in prep.). It may be that there are louse genetic factors that interact with the

microbiome to produce a specific composition (Blekhman et al. 2015; Dobson et al. 2015; Suzuki

et al. 2019).

Our results are congruent with previous findings on the influence of host blood on microbiomes

of bloodsucking parasites. Specifically, several studies have found a major role of the specific

host species from which a blood meal is taken in shaping microbiomes of other bloodsucking

organisms, such as ticks (*Ixodes scapularis, Ixodes pacificus*) and mosquitoes (*Aedes aegypti*)

(Swei and Kwan 2017; Landesman et al. 2019; Muturi et al. 2019). Furthermore, Landesman et

al. (2019) showed that microbiomes of deer tick (*Ixodes scapularis*) nymphs were largely

explained by the individual hosts of the tick, a result similar to the one obtained here. Interestingly,

in that study, the percentage of variation explained was considerably lower (45%) than that found

here (>77%). It may be that differences in parasite ecology, such as the whether the parasite is a

permanent or a recurrent feeder (as are both the case in sucking lice) may modulate the extent to

which host blood shapes parasite microbiomes. The differences in the proportion of variance

explained by infrapopulation identity between the two studies could also be due to differences in

experimental design, such as the number of sampled infrapopulations (3 in ticks, and 17 in the seal

lice here) and whether the sample design is balanced (i.e., the same number of individual parasites

sampled per infrapopulation).

The knowledge that blood from the same individual seal host may influence the similarity of the

microbiome of blood-feeding lice from that host can potentially provide new insights into the

influence of host blood on such parasites. There are least two not necessarily mutually exclusive

processes may explain the influence of a host individual's blood on louse microbiomes. First, the

blood from a particular host individual may contain a specific composition of bacterial loads that

enter the louse on consumption of blood. Indeed, anopluran lice might have a higher likelihood

of being colonized by bacteria from host blood because they do not possess a peritrophic

membrane, an extracellular layer in the midgut that is composed of chitin, proteoglycans, and

proteins, which in most other insects surrounds the ingested food bolus and separates the gut

content, including bacteria, from the epithelium (Terra 2001; Waniek 2009). Indeed, the idea that

a lack of a peritrophic membrane may facilitate colonization of blood-feeding parasites by bacteria

present in the host blood has potentially also been supported by work on mouse fleas

(*Rhadinopsylla dahurica*), which also lack this membrane (Li et al. 2018). In this case, there was

evidence of homogenization (i.e., similar bacterial communities) between the host blood and the

parasite (whole flea individuals). The lack of a peritrophic membrane is often associated with

permanent parasites, such as blood-feeding lice, for which the continual availability of food means

that there is less selection for efficiency of digestion. Therefore, the presence versus absence of a

peritrophic membrane may explain the differences between lice and ticks (of which the latter

possess a peritrophic membrane) with regards to the influence of host blood on the composition of

the parasite microbiome.

A second possibility that could explain why host blood may influence louse microbiome

composition is that the conditions during blood digestion may alter bacterial taxa that were already

present in the louse. The specifics of blood digestion may have an individual host-specific

signature. Specifically, catabolism of blood meal leads to the generation of reactive oxygen

species that are known to alter the midgut bacterial composition and diversity of bloodsucking

parasites (Souza et al. 1997; Wang et al. 2011; Muturi et al. 2019). Also, the blood meals of

different host species are also known to differ in composition (e.g., total protein, hemoglobin, and

hematocrit content), and these differences may lead to a differential proliferation of microbial taxa

during digestion by the parasite (Souza et al. 1997; Wang et al. 2011; Muturi et al. 2019). It may

be the case that differences in blood composition among individuals even within the same host

species may be shaping the bacterial composition of lice in a manner that is specific to host

individuals.

Bloodsucking organisms, and anopluran lice in particular, are well known to rely on mutualistic

endosymbionts to complement deficiencies in their diet (Perotti et al. 2008; Boyd and Reed 2012;

Boyd et al. 2017; Jiménez-Cortés et al. 2018). Notwithstanding that several of the bacterial taxa

we found may not be stable inhabitants of lice, we did find evidence for the presence of several

louse-specific bacterial taxa. These include the obligate intracellular arthropod bacteria *Wolbachia*

(Werren 1997) and *Hodgkinia* (for which only endosymbionts of *Cicadas* are known; McCutcheon

et al. 2009). Accordingly, we explored our MAGs for genome characteristics typical of

endosymbionts. In particular, because endosymbiont genomes typically are small and have an AT

bias, we explored the relative position of the observed MAGs in a "Genome size ~ GC content"

correlation plot (Wernegreen 2015; Figure 4). Bin 1 appears to be the best candidate to be a

mutualistic endosymbiont, according to its relative position in the correlation plot. This MAG was

100% complete (according to CheckM; Parks et al. 2015), detected in most samples (prevalence =

71%), and classified with confidence as Flavobacteriaceae. MiGA analyses suggest it may even

belong to *Chryseobacterium* (p-value 0.585). Endosymbionts belonging to *Chryseobacterium* are

known in other arthropods (e.g., termites, mosquitoes, cockroaches, and ticks; Eutick et al. 1978;

Dugas et al. 2001; Campbell et al. 2004; Montasser 2005; Burešová et al. 2006). Additionally, we

conducted a preliminary investigation of the metabolic capabilities of this bacterium by

investigating the completeness of metabolic pathways using GhostKOALA (Kanehisa et al. 2016)

and KEGG-Decoder (Graham et al. 2018). This MAG has complete routes for synthesis of vitamin

B (riboflavin), an essential amino acid (lysine), and several non-essential amino acids (e.g., serine;

see Table S4), as well as many fully or partially missing routes that may be redundant or potentially

shared (or synthesized along) with the louse (Table S4).

Overall, these results are congruent with what has been found for endosymbionts of bloodsucking

parasites (Moriyama et al. 2015; Boyd et al. 2016; Santos-Garcia et al. 2017; Duron et al. 2018).

Another anopluran pinniped louse (*Proechinophthirus fluctus*) has been found to have a *Sodalis*

endosymbiont (Boyd et al. 2016), but we found no evidence of *Sodalis* in *Echinophthirius*

horridus. Other species of Anoplura have yet other endosymbionts (Boyd et al. 2017, Ríhová et

al. 2017), suggesting that endosymbiont replacement is an ongoing and relatively common process

within the order. Further research, including phylogenomic studies improving the phylogenetic

placement of this potentially mutualistic bacterium and studies using fluorescence in situ

hybridization (FISH) to ascertain the location of this bacterium in louse individuals, is needed to

get deeper insight into the interaction of this bacterium with *E. horridus*.

Finally, at a broader scale, our results are congruent with previous studies that have found a major

role of different levels of subdivision in shaping microbiomes in a wide range of systems. For

instance, population identity has been found to largely explain microbiome composition of great

apes (Campbell et al. 2020), American pikas (*Ochotona princeps*) (Kohl et al. 2018), and humans

(Rothschild et al. 2018). Similar results have also been found across subdivision levels other than

populations, such as ecotypes (human lice *Pediculus humanus*; Agany et al. 2020), or by spatial

proximity (North American moose *Alces alces*; Fountain-Jones et al. 2020). On the other hand,

while the influence of subdivision on microbiome composition is widely supported, much less is

known about whether signs of phylosymbiosis can be found at these levels. Kohl et al. (2018)

found that populations largely explained microbiome variation in American pikas along with a

phylosymbiotic pattern (i.e., closely related hosts had similar microbial communities).

Interestingly, while we did not investigate the presence of phylosymbiosis here, our results suggest

that a phylosymbiotic pattern is not always found at an intraspecific level. For instance, this may

be the case of subdivided systems in which the food source (which allows the dispersal of microbes

from one organism to another) constitutes the main determinant of microbiome composition, and

populations are not necessarily composed of closely related organisms. However, phylosymbiotic

patterns across species have been found in relatively similar systems. Therefore, bacterial

dispersal, ecological drift, diversification, or microbe-microbe interactions may be the main factors

explaining phylosymbiosis in these systems. More studies on the origin and prevalence of

phylosymbiotic patterns within and across species are clearly needed.

Acknowledgments: We thank seal researchers and students for collecting the lice analyzed in

this study.

Author contributions: J.D., S.V.H, and K.P.J. conceived the study. T.N. and M.K. obtained

samples. S.V.H. and K.P.J. collected the data. J.D. analyzed the data. T.N., M.V., and K.P.J.

obtained financial support for the project. J.D. wrote the manuscript and all authors contributed

to editing the manuscript.

Funding: This study was supported by the US National Science Foundation (DEB-1239788 and

DEB-1342604 to K.P.J). Sequencing costs were supported by grants from the Oskar Öflund

Foundation, the Betty Väänänen Foundation, Societas Pro Fauna et Flora Fennica, and the

Nestori Foundation.

Availability of data and material: Raw sequence reads for all samples are available under

(NCBI) project *ACCESSION CODE*. Metagenomic assemblies are available at Figshare (doi:

10.6084/m9.figshare.12366575 —private link for review:

https://figshare.com/s/171207f7fb73f7d290a6). Metagenomic assemblies are also available from

NCBI Genome (*ACCESION CODES*).

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Telemetry studies have been approved by the local

environmental authority Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment

(permit numbers: ESAELY/433/ 07.01/2012 and ESA-2008-L-519-254) and the Animal

Experiment Board in Finland (permit numbers: ESAVI/ 8269/04.10.07/2013 and ESAVI-2010-

08380/Ym-23).

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References:

Adair, K. L., and A. E. Douglas. (2017). Making a microbiome: the many determinants of host-associated microbial community composition. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*, 35, 23–29.

Agany, D. D. M., R. Potts, J. L. Gonzalez Hernandez, E. Z. Gnimpieba, and J. E. Pietri. (2020). Microbiome Differences between Human Head and Body Lice Ecotypes Revealed by 16S rRNA Gene Amplicon Sequencing. *Journal of Parasitology*, 106, 14.

Alneberg, J., B. S. Bjarnason, I. de Bruijn, M. Schirmer, J. Quick, U. Z. Ijaz, L. Lahti, N. J. Loman, A. F. Andersson, and C. Quince. (2014). Binning metagenomic contigs by coverage and composition. *Nature Methods*, 11, 1144–1146.

Anderson, M. J. (2014). Permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA). *Wiley statsref: statistics reference online*, 1–15.

Anderson, M. J., and D. C. Walsh. (2013). PERMANOVA, ANOSIM, and the Mantel test in the face of heterogeneous dispersions: what null hypothesis are you testing? *Ecological Monographs*, 83, 557–574.

Auguie, B. (2016). gridExtra: Miscellaneous functions for "Grid" graphics. R package version 2.3. URL https://CRAN. R-project. org/package= gridExtra.

Blekhman, R., J. K. Goodrich, K. Huang, Q. Sun, R. Bukowski, J. T. Bell, T. D. Spector, A. Keinan, R. E. Ley, D. Gevers, and A. G. Clark. (2015). Host genetic variation impacts microbiome composition across human body sites. *Genome Biology*, 16, 191.

Bowers, R. M., N. C. Kyrpides, R. Stepanauskas, M. Harmon-Smith, D. Doud, T. B. K. Reddy, F. Schulz, J. Jarett, A. R. Rivers, E. A. Eloe-Fadrosh, S. G. Tringe, N. N. Ivanova, A. Copeland, A. Clum, E. D. Becraft, R. R. Malmstrom, B. Birren, M. Podar, P. Bork, G. M. Weinstock, G. M. Garrity, J. A. Dodsworth, S. Yooseph, G. Sutton, F. O. Glöckner, J. A. Gilbert, W. C. Nelson, S. J. Hallam, S. P. Jungbluth, T. J. G. Ettema, S. Tighe, K. T. Konstantinidis, W.-T. Liu, B. J. Baker, T. Rattei, J. A. Eisen, B. Hedlund, K. D. McMahon, N. Fierer, R. Knight, R. Finn, G. Cochrane, I. Karsch-Mizrachi, G. W. Tyson, C. Rinke, A. Lapidus, F. Meyer, P. Yilmaz, D. H. Parks, A. M. Eren, L. Schriml, J. F. Banfield, P. Hugenholtz, and T. Woyke. (2017). Minimum information about a single amplified genome (MISAG) and a metagenome-assembled genome (MIMAG) of bacteria and archaea. *Nature Biotechnology*, 35, 725–731.

Boyd, B. M., J. M. Allen, R. Koga, T. Fukatsu, A. D. Sweet, K. P. Johnson, and D. L. Reed. (2016). Two Bacterial Genera, Sodalis and Rickettsia, Associated with the Seal Louse Proechinophthirus fluctus (Phthiraptera: Anoplura). *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 82, 3185–3197.

Boyd, B. M., J. M. Allen, N.-P. Nguyen, P. Vachaspati, Z. S. Quicksall, T. Warnow, L. Mugisha, K. P. Johnson, and D. L. Reed. (2017). Primates, Lice and Bacteria: Speciation and Genome Evolution in the Symbionts of Hominid Lice. *Molecular Biology and Evolution,* 34, 1743–1757.

Boyd, B. M., and D. L. Reed. (2012). Taxonomy of lice and their endosymbiotic bacteria in the post-genomic era. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 18, 324–331.

Brooks, A. W., K. D. Kohl, R. M. Brucker, E. J. van Opstal, and S. R. Bordenstein. (2016). Phylosymbiosis: Relationships and Functional Effects of Microbial Communities across Host Evolutionary History. *PLoS Biology*, 14, e2000225.

Brucker, R. M., and S. R. Bordenstein. (2013). The Hologenomic Basis of Speciation: Gut

Bacteria Cause Hybrid Lethality in the Genus Nasonia. *Science*, 341, 667–669.

Burešová, V., Z. Franta, and P. Kopáček. (2006). A comparison of Chryseobacterium
indologenes pathogenicity to the soft tick Ornithodoros moubata and hard tick Ixodes
ricinus. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology*, 93, 96–104.

Campbell, C. L., D. L. Mummey, E. T. Schmidtmann, and W. C. Wilson. (2004). Culture-
independent analysis of midgut microbiota in the arbovirus vector Culicoides sonorensis
(Diptera: Ceratopogonidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 41, 340–348.

Campbell, T. P., X. Sun, V. H. Patel, C. Sanz, D. Morgan, and G. Dantas. (2020). The
microbiome and resistome of chimpanzees, gorillas, and humans across host lifestyle and
geography. *ISME Journal*, 1–16.

Clemente, J. C., L. K. Ursell, L. W. Parfrey, and R. Knight. (2012). The impact of the gut
microbiota on human health: an integrative view. *Cell*, 148, 1258–1270.

Davis, N. M., D. M. Proctor, S. P. Holmes, D. A. Relman, and B. J. Callahan. (2018). Simple
statistical identification and removal of contaminant sequences in marker-gene and
metagenomics data. *Microbiome*, 6, 226.

Díaz-Sánchez, S., A. Estrada-Peña, A. Cabezas-Cruz, and J. de la Fuente. (2019). Evolutionary
Insights into the Tick Hologenome. *Trends in Parasitology*, 35, 725–737.

Dobson, A. J., J. M. Chaston, P. D. Newell, L. Donahue, S. L. Hermann, D. R. Sannino, S.
Westmiller, A. C.-N. Wong, A. G. Clark, and B. P. Lazzaro. (2015). Host genetic
determinants of microbiota-dependent nutrition revealed by genome-wide analysis of
Drosophila melanogaster. *Nature Communications*, 6, 1–9.

Dröge, J., I. Gregor, and A. C. McHardy. (2015). Taxator-tk: precise taxonomic assignment of
metagenomes by fast approximation of evolutionary neighborhoods. *Bioinformatics,* 31,
817–824.

Dugas, J. E., L. Zurek, B. J. Paster, B. A. Keddie, and E. R. Leadbetter. (2001). Isolation and
characterization of a Chryseobacterium strain from the gut of the American cockroach,
Periplaneta americana. *Archives of Microbiology*, 175, 259–262.

Durden, L. A., and G. G. Musser. (1994). The mammalian hosts of the sucking lice (Anoplura)
of the world: a host-parasite list. *Journal of Vector Ecology*, 19, 130–168.

Duron, O., O. Morel, V. Noël, M. Buysse, F. Binetruy, R. Lancelot, E. Loire, C. Ménard, O.
Bouchez, F. Vavre, and L. Vial. (2018). Tick-Bacteria Mutualism Depends on B Vitamin
Synthesis Pathways. *Current Biology*, 28, 1896-1902.e5.

Eutick, M. L., R. W. O'brien, and M. Slaytor. (1978). Bacteria from the gut of Australian
termites. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 35, 823–828.

Fountain-Jones, N. M., N. J. Clark, A. C. Kinsley, M. Carstensen, J. Forester, T. J. Johnson, E.
A. Miller, S. Moore, T. M. Wolf, and M. E. Craft. (2020). Microbial associations and
spatial proximity predict North American moose (Alces alces) gastrointestinal
community composition. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 89, 817–828.

Graham, E. D., J. F. Heidelberg, and B. J. Tully. (2018). Potential for primary productivity in a
globally-distributed bacterial phototroph. ISME Journal, 12, 1861–1866.

Hassani, M. A., P. Durán, and S. Hacquard. (2018). Microbial interactions within the plant
holobiont. *Microbiome*, 6, 58.

Hooper, R., J. C. Brealey, T. van der Valk, A. Alberdi, J. W. Durban, H. Fearnbach, K. M.
Robertson, R. W. Baird, M. B. Hanson, P. Wade, M. T. P. Gilbert, P. A. Morin, J. B. W.
Wolf, A. D. Foote, and K. Guschanski. (2019). Host-derived population genomics data
provides insights into bacterial and diatom composition of the killer whale skin.

Molecular Ecology, 28, 484–502.
Jackman, S. D., B. P. Vandervalk, H. Mohamadi, J. Chu, S. Yeo, S. A. Hammond, G. Jahesh, H.
Khan, L. Coombe, R. L. Warren, and I. Birol. (2017). ABySS 2.0: resource-efficient
assembly of large genomes using a Bloom filter. *Genome Research*, 27, 768–777.
Jervis-Bardy, J., L. E. Leong, S. Marri, R. J. Smith, J. M. Choo, H. C. Smith-Vaughan, E.
Nosworthy, P. S. Morris, S. O'Leary, and G. B. Rogers. (2015). Deriving accurate
microbiota profiles from human samples with low bacterial content through post-
sequencing processing of Illumina MiSeq data. *Microbiome*, 3, 19. Springer.
Jiménez-Cortés, J. G., R. García-Contreras, M. I. Bucio-Torres, M. Cabrera-Bravo, A. Córdoba-
Aguilar, G. Benelli, and P. M. Salazar-Schettino. (2018). Bacterial symbionts in human
blood-feeding arthropods: Patterns, general mechanisms and effects of global ecological
changes. *Acta Tropica*, 186, 69–101.
Kanehisa, M., Y. Sato, and K. Morishima. (2016). BlastKOALA and GhostKOALA: KEGG
tools for functional characterization of genome and metagenome sequences. *Journal of
Molecular Biology*, 428, 726–731.
Kang, D. D., F. Li, E. Kirton, A. Thomas, R. Egan, H. An, and Z. Wang. (2019). MetaBAT 2: an
adaptive binning algorithm for robust and efficient genome reconstruction from
metagenome assemblies. *PeerJ*, 7:e7359.
Kassambara, A. (2018). Package 'ggpubr':'ggplot2'based publication ready plots. Version 0.2.
See https://rpkgs. datanovia. com/ggpubr/index. html.
Kelly, B. J., Gross, R., Bittinger, K., Sherrill-Mix, S., Lewis, J. D., Collman, R. G., ... & Li, H.
(2015). Power and sample-size estimation for microbiome studies using pairwise
distances and PERMANOVA. *Bioinformatics*, 31, 2461-2468.
Kim, K. C. (1985). Coevolution of Parasitic Arthropods and Mammals. Wiley.
Kim, K. C. (1975). Specific antiquity of the sucking lice and evolution of otariid seals. *Rapports
et procès-verbaux des réunions*, 169, 544–549.
Kim, K. C. (1971). The Sucking Lice (Anoplura: Echinophthiriidae) of the Northern Fur Seal;
Descriptions and Morphological Adaptation. *Annals of the Entomological Society of
America*, 64, 280–292
Knowles, S. C. L., Eccles, R. M., & Baltrūnaitė, L. (2019). Species identity dominates over
environment in shaping the microbiota of small mammals. *Ecology Letters*, 22, 826-837.
Kohl, K. D. (2020). Ecological and evolutionary mechanisms underlying patterns of
phylosymbiosis in host-associated microbial communities. *Philosophical Transactions of
the Royal Society of London B Biological Sciences*, 375, 20190251.
Kohl, K. D., J. Varner, J. L. Wilkening, and M. D. Dearing. (2018). Gut microbial communities
of American pikas (*Ochotona princeps*): Evidence for phylosymbiosis and adaptations to
novel diets. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 87, 323–330.
Laetsch, D. R., and M. L. Blaxter. (2017). BlobTools: Interrogation of genome assemblies.
F1000Research, 6, 1287.
Landesman, W. J., K. Mulder, B. F. Allan, L. A. Bashor, F. Keesing, K. LoGiudice, and R. S.
Ostfeld. (2019). Potential effects of blood meal host on bacterial community composition
in Ixodes scapularis nymphs. *Ticks and Tick-Borne Diseases*, 10, 523–527.
Lankau, E. W., P.-Y. Hong, and R. I. Mackie. (2012). Ecological drift and local exposures drive
enteric bacterial community differences within species of Galapagos iguanas. *Molecular
Ecology*, 21, 1779–1788.
Le Chatelier, E., T. Nielsen, J. Qin, E. Prifti, F. Hildebrand, G. Falony, M. Almeida, M.

Arumugam, J.-M. Batto, S. Kennedy, P. Leonard, J. Li, K. Burgdorf, N. Grarup, T.
Jørgensen, I. Brandslund, H. B. Nielsen, A. S. Juncker, M. Bertalan, F. Levenez, N. Pons,
S. Rasmussen, S. Sunagawa, J. Tap, S. Tims, E. G. Zoetendal, S. Brunak, K. Clément, J.
Doré, M. Kleerebezem, K. Kristiansen, P. Renault, T. Sicheritz-Ponten, W. M. de Vos, J.-
D. Zucker, J. Raes, T. Hansen, P. Bork, J. Wang, S. D. Ehrlich, and O. Pedersen. (2013).
Richness of human gut microbiome correlates with metabolic markers. *Nature*, 500, 541–
546.
Lee, S., J. Y. Kim, M. Yi, I.-Y. Lee, R. Fyumagwa, and T.-S. Yong. (2019). Comparative
microbiomes of ticks collected from a black rhino and its surrounding environment.
International Journal of Parasitology Parasites and Wildlife, 9, 239–243.
Leonardi, M. S., E. A. Crespo, J. A. Raga, and F. J. Aznar. (2013). Lousy mums: patterns of
vertical transmission of an amphibious louse. *Parasitology Research*, 112, 3315–3323.
Springer.
Leonardi, M. S., S. V. Herrera, A. Sweet, J. Negrete, and K. P. Johnson. (2019). Phylogenomic
analysis of seal lice reveals codivergence with their hosts. *Systematic Entomology*, 44,
699–708.
Li, H., T. Li, and J. Qu. (2018). Stochastic processes govern bacterial communities from the
blood of pikas and from their arthropod vectors. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology,* 94.
Lim, S. J., and S. R. Bordenstein. (2020). An introduction to phylosymbiosis. *Proceedings of the*
Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 287, 20192900.
Lusk, R. W. (2014). Diverse and widespread contamination evident in the unmapped depths of
high throughput sequencing data. *PLoS One,* 9.
Lutz, H. L., E. W. Jackson, P. W. Webala, W. S. Babyesiza, J. C. Kerbis Peterhans, T. C.
Demos, B. D. Patterson, and J. A. Gilbert. (2019). Ecology and Host Identity Outweigh
Evolutionary History in Shaping the Bat Microbiome. *mSystems,* 4.
Mazel, F., K. M. Davis, A. Loudon, W. K. Kwong, M. Groussin, and L. W. Parfrey. (2018). Is
Host Filtering the Main Driver of Phylosymbiosis across the Tree of Life? *mSystems,* 3.
McArdle, A. J., and M. Kaforou. (2020). Sensitivity of shotgun metagenomics to host DNA:
abundance estimates depend on bioinformatic tools and contamination is the main issue.
Access Microbiology, doi: 10.1099/acmi.0.000104.
McCutcheon, J. P., B. R. McDonald, and N. A. Moran. *2009*. Origin of an Alternative Genetic
Code in the Extremely Small and GC–Rich Genome of a Bacterial Symbiont. *PLoS*
Genetics, 5, e1000565.
McMurdie, P. J., and S. Holmes. (2013). phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive
analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. *PLoS One,* 8.
Menzel, P., K. L. Ng, and A. Krogh. (2016). Fast and sensitive taxonomic classification for
metagenomics with Kaiju. *Nature Communications*, 7, 1–9.
Montasser, A. A. (2005). Gram-negative bacteria from the camel tick Hyalomma dromedarii
(Ixodidae) and the chicken tick Argas persicus (Argasidae) and their antibiotic
sensitivities. *Journal of the Egyptian Society of Parasitology*, 35, 95–106.
Moriyama, M., N. Nikoh, T. Hosokawa, and T. Fukatsu. (2015). Riboflavin Provisioning
Underlies Wolbachia's Fitness Contribution to Its Insect Host. *mBio,* 6.
Muturi, E. J., C. Dunlap, J. L. Ramirez, A. P. Rooney, and C.-H. Kim. (2019). Host blood-meal
source has a strong impact on gut microbiota of Aedes aegypti. *FEMS Microbiology*
Ecology, 95.

Niemi, M., Liukkonen, L., Koivuniemi, M., Auttila, M., Rautio, A., & Kunnasranta, M. (2019).
Winter behavior of Saimaa ringed seals: Non-overlapping core areas as indicators of
avoidance in breeding females. *PloS one*, 14, 1.
Nishida, A. H., and H. Ochman. (2018). Rates of gut microbiome divergence in mammals.
Molecular Ecology, 27, 1884–1897.
Nurk, S., D. Meleshko, A. Korobeynikov, and P. A. Pevzner. (2017). metaSPAdes: a new
versatile metagenomic assembler. *Genome Research*, 27, 824–834.
Nyman, T., Valtonen, M., Aspi, J., Ruokonen, M., Kunnasranta, M. & Palo, J. U. (2014).
Demographic histories and genetic diversities of Fennoscandian marine and landlocked
ringed seal subspecies. *Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 3420-3434.
Oksanen, J., F. G. Blanchet, R. Kindt, P. Legendre, R. B. O'hara, G. L. Simpson, P. Solymos, M.
H. H. Stevens, and H. Wagner. (2019). Vegan: community ecology package. R package
version 2.5-4.
Osei-Poku, J., C. M. Mbogo, W. J. Palmer, and F. M. Jiggins. (2012). Deep sequencing reveals
extensive variation in the gut microbiota of wild mosquitoes from Kenya. *Molecular
Ecology*, 21, 5138–5150.
Parks, D. H., M. Imelfort, C. T. Skennerton, P. Hugenholtz, and G. W. Tyson. (2015). CheckM:
assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and
metagenomes. *Genome Research*, 25, 1043–1055.
Patro, R., G. Duggal, M. I. Love, R. A. Irizarry, and C. Kingsford. (2017). Salmon provides fast
and bias-aware quantification of transcript expression. *Nature Methods*, 14, 417.
Perotti, M. A., E. F. Kirkness, D. L. Reed, and H. R. Braig. (2008). Endosymbionts of lice. Pp.
223–238 *in* Insect Symbiosis, Volume 3. CRC Press.
R Core Team. (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
Rodriguez-R, L. M., S. Gunturu, W. T. Harvey, R. Rosselló-Mora, J. M. Tiedje, J. R. Cole, and
K. T. Konstantinidis. (2018). The Microbial Genomes Atlas (MiGA) webserver:
taxonomic and gene diversity analysis of Archaea and Bacteria at the whole genome
level. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 46, W282–W288.
Rothschild, D., O. Weissbrod, E. Barkan, A. Kurilshikov, T. Korem, D. Zeevi, P. I. Costea, A.
Godneva, I. N. Kalka, N. Bar, S. Shilo, D. Lador, A. V. Vila, N. Zmora, M. Pevsner-
Fischer, D. Israeli, N. Kosower, G. Malka, B. C. Wolf, T. Avnit-Sagi, M. Lotan-Pompan,
A. Weinberger, Z. Halpern, S. Carmi, J. Fu, C. Wijmenga, A. Zhernakova, E. Elinav, and
E. Segal. (2018) Environment dominates over host genetics in shaping human gut
microbiota. *Nature*, 555, 210–215.
Rudman, S. M., S. Greenblum, R. C. Hughes, S. Rajpurohit, O. Kiratli, D. B. Lowder, S. G.
Lemmon, D. A. Petrov, J. M. Chaston, and P. Schmidt. (2019). Microbiome composition
shapes rapid genomic adaptation of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the
National Academy of Sciences USA*, 116, 20025–20032.
Salter, S. J., M. J. Cox, E. M. Turek, S. T. Calus, W. O. Cookson, M. F. Moffatt, P. Turner, J.
Parkhill, N. J. Loman, and A. W. Walker. (2014). Reagent and laboratory contamination
can critically impact sequence-based microbiome analyses. *BMC Biology*, 12, 87.
Springer.
Santos-Garcia, D., F. J. Silva, S. Morin, K. Dettner, and S. M. Kuechler. (2017). The All-
Rounder Sodalis: A New Bacteriome-Associated Endosymbiont of the Lygaeoid Bug
Henestaris halophilus (Heteroptera: Henestarinae) and a Critical Examination of Its
Evolution. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 9, 2893–2910.

Slowikowski, K., A. Schep, S. Hughes, S. Lukauskas, J. O. Irisson, and Z. N. Kamvar. (2019). ggrepel: automatically position non-overlapping text labels with 'ggplot2'2018. URL https://CRAN. R-project. org/package= ggrepel. R package version 0.8. 0.

Snodgrass, R. E. (1944). The feeding apparatus of biting and sucking insects affecting man and animals. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections.

Song, S. J., J. G. Sanders, F. Delsuc, J. Metcalf, K. Amato, M. W. Taylor, F. Mazel, H. L. Lutz, K. Winker, G. R. Graves, G. Humphrey, J. A. Gilbert, S. J. Hackett, K. P. White, H. R. Skeen, S. M. Kurtis, J. Withrow, T. Braile, M. Miller, K. G. McCracken, J. M. Maley, V. O. Ezenwa, A. Williams, J. M. Blanton, V. J. McKenzie, and R. Knight. (2020). Comparative Analyses of Vertebrate Gut Microbiomes Reveal Convergence between Birds and Bats. *mBio*, 11.

Souza, A. V. G., J. H. Petretski, M. Demasi, E. J. H. Bechara, and P. L. Oliveira. (1997). Urate protects a blood-sucking insect against hemin-induced oxidative stress. *Free Radical Biology & Medicine*, 22, 209–214.

Suzuki, T. A., M. Phifer-Rixey, K. L. Mack, M. J. Sheehan, D. Lin, K. Bi, and M. W. Nachman. (2019). Host genetic determinants of the gut microbiota of wild mice. *Molecular Ecology*, 28, 3197–3207.

Swei, A., and J. Y. Kwan. (2017). Tick microbiome and pathogen acquisition altered by host blood meal. *ISME Journal*, 11, 813–816.

Terra, W. R. (2001). The origin and functions of the insect peritrophic membrane and peritrophic gel. *Archives of Insect Biochemistry and Physiology*, 47, 47–61.

Uritskiy, G. V., J. DiRuggiero, and J. Taylor. (2018). MetaWRAP—a flexible pipeline for genome-resolved metagenomic data analysis. *Microbiome,* 6, 158.

Velazquez, E. M., H. Nguyen, K. T. Heasley, C. H. Saechao, L. M. Gil, A. W. L. Rogers, B. M. Miller, M. R. Rolston, C. A. Lopez, Y. Litvak, M. J. Liou, F. Faber, D. N. Bronner, C. R. Tiffany, M. X. Byndloss, A. J. Byndloss, and A. J. Bäumler. (2019). Endogenous Enterobacteriaceae underlie variation in susceptibility to Salmonella infection. *Nature Microbiology*, 4, 1057–1064.

Wang, Y., T. M. G. Iii, P. Kukutla, G. Yan, and J. Xu. (2011). Dynamic Gut Microbiome across Life History of the Malaria Mosquito Anopheles gambiae in Kenya. *PloS One*, 6, e24767.

Waniek, P. J. (2009). The digestive system of human lice: current advances and potential applications. *Physiological Entomology*, 34, 203–210.

Weiss, S., Z. Z. Xu, S. Peddada, A. Amir, K. Bittinger, A. Gonzalez, C. Lozupone, J. R. Zaneveld, Y. Vázquez-Baeza, A. Birmingham, E. R. Hyde, and R. Knight. (2017). Normalization and microbial differential abundance strategies depend upon data characteristics. *Microbiome*, 5, 27.

Wernegreen, J. J. (2015). Endosymbiont evolution: Predictions from theory and surprises from genomes. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1360, 16–35.

Werren, J. H. (1997). Biology of wolbachia. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 42, 587–609.

Wickham, H. (2016). ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer.

Willner, D., J. Daly, D. Whiley, K. Grimwood, C. E. Wainwright, and P. Hugenholtz. (2012). Comparison of DNA extraction methods for microbial community profiling with an application to pediatric bronchoalveolar lavage samples. *PloS One*, 7.

Wu, Y.-W., B. A. Simmons, and S. W. Singer. (2016). MaxBin 2.0: an automated binning algorithm to recover genomes from multiple metagenomic datasets. *Bioinformatics,* 32, 605–607.

Xiao, N. (2018). ggsci: scientific journal and sci-fi themed color palettes for 'ggplot2'. R
package version 2.9.
Zhang, X.-C., Z.-N. Yang, B. Lu, X.-F. Ma, C.-X. Zhang, and H.-J. Xu. (2014). The composition
and transmission of microbiome in hard tick, Ixodes persulcatus, during blood meal.
Ticks and Tick-Borne Diseases, 5, 864–870.
Zolnik, C. P., R. C. Falco, T. J. Daniels, and S.-O. Kolokotronis. (2018). Transient influence of
blood meal and natural environment on blacklegged tick bacterial communities. *Ticks*
and Tick-Borne Diseases, 9, 563–572.
698

 Figure and table legend:

Table 1. Statistics of the MAGs assembled. MAG name indicates the name given to that bin for
this study (e.g., in Figure 1). The highest taxonomic rank with p-value ≤ 0.5 is shown in MiGA
ID. RPD ID is the result of the identification analysis using rRNA genes (16S) implemented in
MiGA; % indicates confidence in identification. Taxonomic novelty is a MiGA analysis that
indicates the taxonomic rank at which the MAG represents a novel taxon with respect to the NCBI
Genome database; highest taxonomic rank with p-value ≤ 0.01 are shown.

MAG name	Completeness (%)	Contamination (%)	N50 (bp)	Size (bp)	Taxator tk ID	MiGA ID	RPD ID	Taxonomic novelty
bin.1	100	1.07	57370	1869975	Flavobacteriaceae	Flavobacteriaceae*	NA	Species****
bin.4	99.26	0.24	81315	2500734	Flavobacteriaceae	Chryseobacterium*	Chryseobacterium (100.0%)	Species****
bin.2	98.51	0.42	36844	3101576	Deinococcus	Deinococcus grandis*	Deinococcus (100.0%)	Subspecies****
bin.7	97.75	0	16123	2650064	Moraxellaceae	Psychrobacter sp. PRwf-1*	NA	Subspecies****
bin.3	97.41	1.33	32961	4014303	Neisseriales	Pseudogulbenkiania*	NA	Species****
bin.11	95.65	0.92	69243	2786419	Moraxellaceae	Psychrobacter*	NA	Species****
bin.10	95.12	0	13409	2459723	Deinococcaceae	Deinococcus*	NA	Species****
bin.12	93.14	0.85	24793	2851493	Deinococcaceae	Deinococcus*	NA	Species****
bin.6	88.74	1.45	7283	1988194	Micrococcales	Arthrobacter*	NA	Species****
bin.13	77.11	0.64	3045	2627969	Deinococcaceae	Deinococcus*	NA	Species****
bin.5	74.13	0.61	24837	1635952	Moraxellaceae	unclassified Moraxellaceae*	Alkanindiges (99 %)	Species****
bin.8	67.76	0	10934	2837743	Deinococcaceae	Deinococcus*	NA	Species****

| bin.9 | 61.13 | 0.30 | 2210 | 2110411 | Janthinobacterium | Janthinobacterium sp. SNU WT3*** | NA | Subspecies**** |

Significance at p-value below: *0.5, **0.1, ***0.05, ****0.01

Figure 1. Genome-resolved metagenomic data. a) Stacked bar plot showing the relative
abundances of MAGs in each louse sample. Note that samples are ordered according to host
(i.e., samples from the same host are next to each other). b) Boxplot summarizing the relative
abundance of each MAG across the louse samples.
/

Figure 2. Kaiju data. a) Stacked bar plot showing bacterial relative abundances in each seal
louse sample. Note that samples are sorted according to host individual (i.e., samples from the
same host are next to each other). b) Boxplot summarizing the relative abundance of each taxon
across all louse samples.

a)

b)

718 /
719

720 **Figure 3.** NMDS ordinations of seal louse microbiomes base on Bray–Curtis dissimilarity
721 matrices. a) MAG matrix, and b) Kaiju matrix (species level). Lice originating from the same
722 seal individual are colored similarly and connected by a line.
723 /

a)   b)

725 **Figure 4.** Scatter plot showing the relationship between genome size (Mb) and GC content (i.e.,
726 proportion of G and C sites) for sequenced MAGs.

727 /
728