Molecular evolutionary trends and biosynthesis pathways in the Oribatida revealed by the

genome of *Archegozetes longisetosus*

Adrian Brückner[1]*, Austen A. Barnett[2], Igor A. Antoshechkin[1] and Sheila A. Kitchen[1]

[1]Division of Biology and Biological Engineering, California Institute of Technology, 1200 East

California Boulevard, Pasadena, CA 91125, United States of America

[2]Department of Biology, DeSales University, 2755 Station Avenue, Center Valley, PA 18034,

United States of America

* corresponding author: Adrian Brückner - adrian.brueckner@gmail.com

Abstract

12   Oribatid mites are a specious order of microarthropods within the subphylum Chelicerata,

compromising about 11,000 described species. They are ubiquitously distributed across different

microhabitats in all terrestrial ecosystems around the world and were among the first animals

colonizing terrestrial habitats as decomposers and scavengers. Despite their species richness and

ecological importance genomic resources are lacking for oribatids. Here, we present a 190-Mb

genome assembly of the clonal, all-female oribatid mite species *Archegozetes longisetosus* Aoki,

a model species used by numerous laboratories for the past 30 years. Comparative genomic and

transcriptional analyses revealed patterns of reduced body segmentation and loss of segmental

identity gene *abd-A* within Acariformes, and unexpected expression of key eye development

genes in these eyeless mites across developmental stages. Consistent with their soil dwelling

lifestyle, investigation of the sensory genes revealed a species-specific expansion of gustatory

receptors, the largest chemoreceptor family in the genome used in olfaction, and evidence of

horizontally transferred enzymes used in cell wall degradation of plant and fungal matter, both

components of the *A. longisetosus* diet. Oribatid mites are also noted for their biosynthesis

capacities and biochemical diversity. Using biochemical and genomic data, we were able to

delineate the backbone biosynthesis of monoterpenes, an important class of compounds found in

the major exocrine gland system of Oribatida – the oil glands. Given the mite's strength as an

experimental model, the new high-quality resources provided here will serve as the foundation
for molecular research in Oribatida and will enable a broader understanding of chelicerate
evolution.

Keywords

soil animal, terpene synthesis, horizontal gene transfer, parthenogenesis, chemoreceptors,
Hox genes, model organism, RNAseq, MinION long-read sequencing, Sarcoptiformes

Introduction

In the past couple of years, the number of sequenced animal genomes has increased
dramatically, especially for arthropods about 500 genomes sequences are now available
(Childers 2020; Thomas et al. 2020). The majority of these genomes, however, belong to the
insects (e.g. flies, beetles, wasp, butterflies and bugs (Thomas et al. 2020)) which compromise
the most diverse, yet evolutionarily young and more derived taxa of arthropods (Giribet and
Edgecombe 2019; Regier et al. 2010). In strong contrast, genome assemblies, many of which are
incomplete or not well annotated, exist for the Chelicerata (Childers 2020) – the other major
subphylum of arthropods (Giribet and Edgecombe 2019; Regier et al. 2010). Chelicerates include
sea spiders, spiders, mites and scorpions among other organisms, as well as several extinct taxa
(Ballesteros and Sharma 2019; Dunlop and Selden 1998). Chelicerates originated as marine
animals about 500 million years ago (Dunlop and Selden 1998; Dunlop 2010). Molecular
analyses suggest that one particular group, the omnivorous and detritivores acariform mites, may
have been among the first arthropods that colonized terrestrial habitats and gave rise to ancient,
simple terrestrial food webs (Dunlop and Alberti 2008; Schaefer et al. 2010; Walter and Proctor
1999).

So far, the well-annotated genomic data of chelicerates is limited to animal parasites
(including human pathogens and ticks), plant parasites, and predatory mites used in pest control
(Cornman et al. 2010; Dong et al. 2017; Dong et al. 2018; Grbić et al. 2011; Gulia-Nuss et al.
2016; Hoy et al. 2016; Rider et al. 2015). Other than some lower-quality genome assemblies

(Bast et al. 2016), there are no resources available for free-living soil and litter inhabiting

species. Such data are, however, pivotal to understanding the evolution of parasitic lifestyles

from a free-living condition and to bridge the gap between early aquatic chelicerates such as

horseshoe crabs, and highly derived terrestrial pest species and parasites (Klimov and OConnor

2013; Shingate et al. 2020; Weinstein and Kuris 2016). Because the phylogeny of Chelicerata

remains unresolved, additional chelicerate genomes are urgently needed for comparative

analyses (Ballesteros and Sharma 2019; Dunlop 2010; Lozano-Fernandez et al. 2019). To help

address this deficit, we report here the genome assembly of the soil dwelling oribatid mite

Archegozetes longisetosus (Aoki, 1965; **Figure 1**) (Aoki 1965) and a comprehensive analysis in

the context of developmental genes, feeding biology, horizontal gene transfer and biochemical

pathway evolution of chelicerates.

Archegozetes longisetosus (hereafter referred to as *Archegozetes*) is a member of the

Oribatida (Acariformes, Sarcoptiformes), an order of chelicerates well-known for their

exceptional biosynthesis capacities, biochemical diversity, unusual mode of reproduction,

unusually high pulling strength, mechanical resistances and pivotal ecological importance

(Brückner et al. 2020; Brückner et al. 2017b; Heethoff and Koerner 2007; Heethoff et al. 2009;

Maraun et al. 2007; Maraun and Scheu 2000; Norton and Palmer 1991; Raspotnig 2009;

Schmelzle and Blüthgen 2019). *Archegozetes*, like all members of its family Trhypochthoniidae

(**Figure 1a**), reproduce via thelytoky (Heethoff et al. 2013). That means the all-female lineages

procreate *via* automictic parthenogenesis with an inverted meiosis of the holokinetic

chromosomes, resulting in clonal offspring (Bergmann et al. 2018; Heethoff et al. 2006; Palmer

and Norton 1992; Wrensch et al. 1994). While studying a parthenogenetic species is useful for

the development of genetic tools as stable germ-line modifications can be obtained from the

clonal progeny without laboratory crosses, one is confronted with the technical and philosophical

problems of species delineation, cryptic diversity and uncertain species distribution (Heethoff et

al. 2013; Oxley et al. 2014). Reviewing all available data, Norton (Norton 1994; 2007) and

Heethoff et al. (Heethoff et al. 2013) concluded that *Archegozetes* is found widely on continents

and islands throughout the tropical and partly subtropical regions of the world and that it is a

middle-derived oribatid mite closely related to the suborder Astigmata.

One major feature of most oribatid mites is a pair of opisthonotal oil-glands and

Archegozetes is no exception (Raspotnig 2009; Sakata and Norton 2001). These are a pair of

large exocrine glands, each composed of a single-cell layer invagination of the cuticle, which is

the simplest possible paradigm of an animal gland (Brückner and Parker 2020; Heethoff 2012).

The biological role of these glands was rather speculative for a long time; ideas ranged from a

lubricating and osmo- or thermoregulative function (Riha 1951; Smrž 1992; Zachvatkin 1941) to

roles in chemical communication (Heethoff et al. 2011a; Raspotnig 2006; Shimano et al. 2002).

So far about 150 different gland components have been identified from oribatid mites, including

mono- and sesquiterpenes, aldehydes, esters, aromatics, short-chained hydrocarbons, hydrogen

cyanide (HCN) and alkaloids (Brückner et al. 2017b; Brückner et al. 2015; Heethoff et al. 2018;

Raspotnig 2009; Saporito et al. 2007). While some chemicals appear to be alarm pheromones

(Raspotnig 2006; Shimano et al. 2002), most function as defensive allomones (Heethoff et al.

2011a). Interestingly, alkaloids produced by oribatids mites are the ultimate source of most

toxins sequestered by poison-frogs (Saporito et al. 2007; Saporito et al. 2009).

Terrestrial chelicerates predominately ingest fluid food. While phloem-feeding plant

pests like spider mites and ecotoparasites likes ticks adapted a sucking feeding mode, scorpions,

spiders and others use external, pre-oral digestion before ingestion by morphologically diverse

mouthparts (Bensoussan et al. 2016; Cohen 1995; Dunlop and Alberti 2008; Gulia-Nuss et al.

2016). Exceptions from this are Opiliones and sarcoptiform mites, i.e. oribatid and astigmatid

mites, all of which ingest solid food (Heethoff and Norton 2009; Norton 2007; Shultz 2007). In

general, oribatids feed on a wide range of different resources and show a low degree of dietary

specialization (Brückner et al. 2018b). The typical food spectrum of Oribatida, includes leaf-

litter, algae, fungi, lichens, nematodes, and small dead arthropods such as collembolans

(Heidemann et al. 2011; Riha 1951; Schneider and Maraun 2005; Schneider et al. 2004a;

Schneider et al. 2004b). In laboratory feeding trials, oribatid mites tend to prefer dark pigmented

fungi, but also fatty acid-rich plant-based food (Brückner et al. 2018b; Schneider and Maraun

2005). Additionally, stable-isotope analyses of ^{15}N and ^{13}C suggested that Oribatida are primary-

and secondary decomposers feeding on dead plant material and fungi, respectively (Maraun et al.

2011; Schneider et al. 2004a). The reasons for these preferences are still unknown, but they raise

the question of how oribatid mites are able to enzymatically digest the cell walls of plants and

fungi (Brückner et al. 2018a; Brückner et al. 2018b; Schneider et al. 2004b; Smrž and Čatská
2010).

Early studies on *Archegozetes* and other mites found evidence for cellulase, chitinase and
trehalase activity which was later attributed to symbiotic gut bacteria (Haq 1993; Luxton 1979;
Siepel and de Ruiter-Dijkman 1993; Smrž 2000; Smrž and Čatská 2010; Smrž and Norton 2004;
Zinkler 1971). While such bacterial symbionts are a possible explanation, genomic data of other
soil organisms and plant-feeding arthropods suggest a high frequency of horizontal transfer of
bacterial and fungal genes enabling the digestion of cell walls (Grbić et al. 2011; Mayer et al.
2011; McKenna et al. 2019; Wu et al. 2017; Wybouw et al. 2016; Wybouw et al. 2018). For
instance, an in-depth analysis of the spider mite *Tetranychus urticae* revealed a massive
incorporation of microbial genes into the mite's genome (Grbić et al. 2011; Wybouw et al.
2018). Horizontal gene transfer appears to be a common mechanism for soil organisms,
including mites, to acquire novel metabolic enzymes (Dong et al. 2018; Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva
et al. 2016; Grbić et al. 2011; Hoffmann et al. 1998; Mayer et al. 2011; Wu et al. 2017), and
hence seems very likely for *Archegozetes* and other oribatid mite species that feed on plant or
fungal matter.

Archegozetes has been established as a laboratory model organism for three decades,
having been used in studies, ranging from ecology, morphology, development and eco-
toxicology to physiology and biochemistry (Barnett and Thomas 2012; 2013a; 2013b; 2018;
Brückner et al. 2017a; Brückner et al. 2020; Heethoff et al. 2013). As such, *Archegozetes* is
among the few experimentally tractable soil organisms and by far the best-studied oribatid mite
species (Barnett and Thomas 2012; Heethoff et al. 2013; Thomas 2002). Since it meets the most
desirable requirements for model organisms (Thomas 2002), that is a rapid development under
laboratory conditions, a dedicated laboratory strain was named *Archegozetes longisetosus* **ran** in
reference to its founder **R**oy **A**. **N**orton (Heethoff et al. 2013, **Figure 1b-c**). Their large number
of offspring enables mass cultures of hundreds of thousands of individuals, and their cuticular
transparency during juvenile stages, and weak sclerotization as adults are general assets of an
amenable model system (Brückner et al. 2018c; Brückner et al. 2016; Heethoff et al. 2013;
Heethoff and Raspotnig 2012). In the past 10 years, *Archegozetes* also received attention as a
model system for chemical ecology (Brückner and Heethoff 2018; Brückner et al. 2020;

Brückner et al. 2016; Heethoff and Rall 2015; Heethoff and Raspotnig 2012; Raspotnig et al.

2011; Thiel et al. 2018). Some of these studies focusing on the *Archegozetes* gland revealed

basic insights into the chemical ecology and biochemical capabilities of arthropods (Brückner et

al. 2020; Heethoff and Rall 2015; Thiel et al. 2018). Hence, *Archegozetes* is poised to become a

genetically tractable model to study the molecular basis of gland and metabolic biology.

The aim and focus of the current study were three-fold – to provide well-annotated, high-

quality genomic and transcriptomic resources for *Archegozetes longisetosus* (**Figure 1**), to reveal

possible horizontal gene transfers that could further explain the feeding biology of oribatids, and

to present *Archegozetes* as a research model for biochemical pathway evolution. Through a

combination of comparative genomic and detailed computational analyses, we were able to

generate a comprehensive genome of *Archegozetes* and provide it as an open resource for

genomic, developmental and evolutionary research. We further identified candidate horizontal

gene transfer events from bacteria and fungi that are mainly related to carbohydrate metabolism

and cellulose digestion, features correlated with the mite feeding biology. We also used the

genomic data together with stable-isotope labeling experiments and mass spectrometric

investigation to delineate the biosynthesis pathway of monoterpenes in oribatid mites.

Results and Discussion

Archegozetes longisetosus genome assembly

Archegozetes longisetosus (**Figure 1**) has a diploid chromosome number (2n) of 18

(Heethoff et al. 2006), most likely comprising 9 autosomal pairs, the typical number of nearly all

studied oribatid mite species (Norton et al. 1993). There are no distinct sex chromosomes in

Archegozetes; this appears to be ancestral in the Acariformes and persisted in the Oribatida

(Heethoff et al. 2006; Norton et al. 1993; Wrensch et al. 1994). Even though some XX:XO and

XX:XY genetic systems have been described in the closely related Astigmata, the sex

determination mechanism in oribatids, including *Archegozetes,* remains unknown (Heethoff et al.

2013; Heethoff et al. 2006; Norton et al. 1993; Oliver Jr 1983; Wrensch et al. 1994). To provide

genetic resources, we sequenced and assembled the genome using both Illumina short-read and

Nanopore MinION long-read sequencing approaches (**Table 1**; see also "**Materials and**

Methods"). Analyses of the *k-mer* frequency distribution of short reads (**Table 1;**

Supplementary Figure S1) resulted in an estimated genome size range of 135-180 Mb, smaller

than the final assembled size of 190 Mb (**Table 1**; see also "**Materials and Methods**"). This

difference was suggestive of high repetitive content in the genome of *Archegozetes* and indeed,

repeat content was predicted to be 32 % of the genome (**see below**) (Alfsnes et al. 2017;

Simpson 2014). Compared to genome assemblies of other acariform mites, the assembled

genome size of *Archegozetes* is on the large end, but is smaller than that of mesostigmatid mites,

ticks and spiders (Bast et al. 2016; Dong et al. 2017; Dong et al. 2018; Grbić et al. 2011; Gulia-

Nuss et al. 2016; Hoy et al. 2016; Schwager et al. 2017). In the context of arthropods in general,

Archegozetes's genome (**Table 1**) is among the smaller ones and shares this feature with other

arthropod model species like the spider mite, *Drosophila*, clonal raider ant and red flour beetle

(Consortium 2008; dos Santos et al. 2015; Grbić et al. 2011; Oxley et al. 2014). Even though we

surface-washed the mites and only used specimens with empty alimentary tracts for sequencing,

we removed 438 contigs with high bacterial or fugal homology making up approximately 8.5 Mb

of contamination (**see supplementary Table S1**). The final filtered genome assembly was

composed of 1182 contigs with an N_{50} contiguity of 994.5 kb (**Table 1**).

<u>The official gene set and annotation of *Archegozetes*</u>

We generated the official gene set (OGS) for *Archegozetes* by an automated, multi-stage

process combining *ab inito* and evidenced-based (RNAseq reads, transcriptomic data and curated

protein sequences) gene prediction approaches (see "**Materials and Methods**") yielding 23,825

gene models. In comparison to other mites and ticks as well as insects, this is well within the

range of the numbers discovered in other Chelicerata so far (**Figure 2a**). Chelicerates with a

large OSG, however, usually possess larger genomes (1-7 Gb), which suggests that *Archegozetes*

may have a relatively dense distribution of protein-coding genes in its genome. On the other

hand, ticks can have giga-base sized genomes, but only a rather small number of gene models,

probably due to high repetitive content (Barrero et al. 2017; Gulia-Nuss et al. 2016; Palmer et al.

1994; Van Zee et al. 2007). Lacking more high-quality genomic resources of mites, it is thus not

clear whether the OGS of *Archegozetes* is the rule, or rather the exception within the Oribatida.

To compare if *Archegozetes'* OSG is similar to predicted genes of other oribatid mites as

well as Prostigmata and Astigmata, we first clustered genes by ortholog inference (OrthoFinder;

(Emms and Kelly 2015b)), removed species-specific genes and constructed a presence-absence

matrix of orthogroups to ordinate the data using non-metric multidimension scaling (NMDS,

Figure 2b). Ordination revealed that the OGS of *Archegozetes* is well nested with other oribatid

mites and clearly separated from their closest relative the astigmatid mites as well as

prostigmatid mites (**Figure 2b**). As a first step in annotating the OSG, we ran KOALA (KEGG

Orthology And Links Annotation) to functionally characterize the genes (Kanehisa et al. 2016).

In total, 10,456 (43.9%) of all genes received annotation and about two thirds of all genes were

assigned either as metabolic genes (36%) or genes related to genetic information processing

(34%), while the remaining genes fell into different KEGG categories (**Figure 2c**). To further

annotate the genome, we followed the general workflow of funannotate with some modifications

(Palmer and Stajich 2017, see "Materials and Methods").

Overall, we found 15,236 genes (64%) of the OGS with homology to previously

published sequences (**Figure 2d**). For about half of all genes (51%), we were able to assign a full

annotation, 4% of all genes only showed homology to bioinformatically predicted proteins of

other species, while 9% of all genes only showed homology to hypothetical proteins (**Figure 2d**).

As only a few high-quality, annotated mite genomes are available and the two-spotted spider

mite is the sole species with any experimentally confirmed gene models, it is not surprising that

we were only able to confidently annotate about 55% of all genes of the OGS (**Figure 2d**).

<u>Orthology and comparative genomics of chelicerates</u>

To further access the protein-coding genes of the mite, we compared the OGS to other

chelicerates. Both concatenated maximum likelihood and coalescent species-tree phylogenomic

approaches based on 1,121 orthologs placed *Archegozetes,* as expected, within the Nothrina

(Heethoff et al. 2013; Pachl et al. 2012) with strong support and recovered previously found

oribatid clade topologies (**Figure 3a**). Our analysis placed the Astigmata as a sister group of

Oribatida and not nested within oribatids as suggested based on life-history, chemical defensive

secretions, morphology and several molecular studies (Alberti and Michalik 2004; Dabert et al.

2010; Domes et al. 2007; Klimov et al. 2018; Koller et al. 2012; Li and Xue 2019; Liana and

Witaliński 2005; Maraun et al. 2004; Norton 1994; 1998; Pepato and Klimov 2015; Sakata and

Norton 2001). The relationship of Oribatida and Astigmata has been challenging to resolve for

the past decades and several studies using different set of genes, ultra-conserved elements or

transcriptomic data reconstructed discordant phylogenies, some of which are similar to ours

(Dabert et al. 2010; Domes et al. 2007; Klimov et al. 2018; Li and Xue 2019; Lozano-Fernandez

et al. 2019; Maraun et al. 2004; Pepato and Klimov 2015; Van Dam et al. 2019). Overall, the

Oribatid-Astigmatid relationship remains unresolved and a broader taxon sampling, especially of

more basal Astigmata, will be necessary (Domes et al. 2007; Klimov et al. 2018; Lozano-

Fernandez et al. 2019; Norton 1994; 1998; Van Dam et al. 2019). We recovered Trombidiformes

(Prostigmata and Sphaerolichida) as sister group of the Sarcoptiformes (Oribatida and

Astigmata) constituting the Acariformes (**Figure 3a**). Neither the maximum likelihood

phylogeny (**Figure 3a**), nor the coalescence-based phylogeny (**Supplementary Figure S2**)

reconstructed the Acari (i.e. Acariformes and Parasitiformes) as a monophyletic taxon. Even

though there is morphological, ultrastructural and molecular evidence for a biphyletic Acari,

aswe recovered here, this relationship and larger-scale chelicerate relationships remain unclear

(Alberti 1984; 1991; Dabert 2006; Dunlop and Alberti 2008; Jeyaprakash and Hoy 2009; Li and

Xue 2019; Lozano-Fernandez et al. 2019; Van Dam et al. 2019).

To further assess the quality and homology of both the genome assembly (**Table 1**) and

the OGS (**Figure 2**), we used the1066 arthropod Benchmarking Universal Single-Copy Ortholog

(BUSCO) genes data set (Simão et al. 2015). Nearly all BUSCO genes were present in the

Archegozetes assembly and OGS (96.2% and 97.3%, respectively; **Figure 3b**). Compared to

other genomes sequenced so far, the *Archegozetes* genome has the highest completeness among

oribatid mites and the OGS completeness is on par to the well curated genomes of other

chelicerate species and *Drosophila melanogaster* (**Figure 3b**). This result is not surprising

because the *Archegozetes* genome was assembled from long-read and short-read data, while all

other oribatid mite genomes were solely short reads sequenced on older Illumina platforms (Bast

et al. 2016). The fraction of duplicated BUSCO genes in *Archegozetes* (4%) was similar to that

of the spider mite and deer tick (Grbić et al. 2011; Gulia-Nuss et al. 2016), but very low

compared to the house spider (**Figure 3c**), whose genome underwent an ancient whole-genome

duplication (Schwager et al. 2017).

Overall, the high quality of both the genome assembly and OGS of *Archegozetes*

compared to those of other oribatid mites, strongly indicates the importance of this genomic

resource. We next categorized all protein models from the OGS by conversation level based on a

global clustering orthology analysis (OrthoFinder; Emms and Kelly 2015b) of 23 species

(**Figure 3c; supplementary Figure S3**) representing Acariformes, Parasitiformes, several other

chelicerates and the fly *Drosophila*. As for most other species (Siepel et al. 2005; Thomas et al.

2020), about a third of all orthogroups was highly conserved (**Figure 3c**) across the arthropods,

being either in all species (10%; **Figure 3d**) or is most (22%; **Figure 3d**). Only 1% of all

Archegozetes orthogroups did not show homology and were species specific (**Figure 3c and d**).

Only a low proportion (**Figure 3c**) of orthogroups was conserved across the higher taxonomic

levels (all <1% in *Archegozetes;* **Figure 3d**), which is in line with previous studies that included

prostigmatid and mesostigmatid mites (Dong et al. 2017; Dong et al. 2018; Hoy et al. 2016).

Interestingly, there was a large proportion of orthogroups conserved across all Oribatida (43% in

Archegozetes; **Figure 3d**) and also about 19% of orthogroups in *Archegozetes* were shared only

with other Nothrina (**Figure 3d**). A fairly large percentage of these orthogroups may contain

potentially novel genes that await experimental verification and functional analyses (Emms and

Kelly 2015b; Nagy et al. 2020; Thomas et al. 2020). Especially the lack of homology within the

Sarcoptiformes (2-3%; **Figure 3c**) may explain the controversial placement of Astigmata as a

sistergroup of Oribatida that we recovered (**Figure 3a**). This grouping is likely caused by a long-

branch attraction artifact and the sister relationship was incorrectly inferred (Dabert 2006; Dabert

et al. 2010; Domes et al. 2007; Klimov et al. 2018; Pepato and Klimov 2015), because

orthogroup clustering could not detect enough homology between oribatids and the Astigmata so

far sequenced , which are highly derived. Hence, a broad taxon sampling of basal astigmatid mite

genomes seems necessary to resolve Oribatida-Astigmata relationship (Li and Xue 2019; Norton

1994; 1998; Pepato and Klimov 2015; Van Dam et al. 2019).

Repeat content analysis and transposable elements (TEs)

For clonal species like *Archegozetes,* reproducing in the absence of recombination, it has

been hypothesized that a reduced efficacy of selection could results in an accumulation of

deleterious mutations and repeats in the genome (Arkhipova and Meselson 2000; Barton 2010;

Charlesworth 2012; Muller 1964; Nuzhdin and Petrov 2003; Schön et al. 2009). There is,

however, no evidence for such an accumulation in oribatids or other arthropods (Bast et al.

2016). Generally, we found that most of the repetitive content in *Archegozetes* could not be

classified (57%; **Figure 4a**). The high proportion of unknown repeats likely corresponds to novel

predicted repetitive content, because of limited repeat annotation of mites in common repeat

databases such as RepBase (Bast et al. 2016). Regarding the two major classes of repeat content,

DNA transposons made up about 32% of total repeats, while only 5% represented

retrotransposons (**Figure 4a**). About 6% of total repetitive content comprised simple and low

complexity repeats (**Figure 4a**). Overall, the total repetitive content (32%, **Figure 4b**) seems to

be within a normal range for chelicerates and arthropods.

The repeat content found in other oribatid mites was lower (Bast et al. 2016), but recent

studies suggest that sequencing technology, read depth and assembly quality are paramount to

the capacity of identifying repeat content and TEs (Bourque et al. 2018; Panfilio et al. 2019).

Hence, it is very likely the current genomic data for other Oribatida underestimates the actual

total repetitive content. More low-coverage, long-read sequencing could reduce the assembly

fragmentation and likely reveal a higher proportion of repeats, closer to the actual repetitiveness

of oribatid genomes (Panfilio et al. 2019).

Different classes of transposable elements (TEs) are characterized by the mechanism they

use to spread within genomes and are known to influence population dynamics differently

(Bourque et al. 2018; Crescente et al. 2018; Finnegan 1989). We therefore analyzed the

evolutionary history of TE activity in *Archegozetes* in more detail (**Figure 4c**). The main TE

superfamilies were DNA transposons (**Figure 4a and c**), which seems to be a common pattern of

oribatid mite genomes. For *Archegozetes,* they appear to have accumulated in the genome for a

long time (i.e. they are more divergent from the consensus; (Waterston et al. 2002)) with

Tc1/mariner – a superfamily of interspersed repeats DNA transposons (Bourque et al. 2018) –

being the most abundant one (**Figure 4c**). Interestingly, we found an increase in TE activity with

0-3% sequence divergence range, indicating a recent burst (**Figure 4c**). This burst contained an

enrichment of DNA Mavericks, which are the largest and most complex DNA transposons with

homology to viral proteins (Bourque et al. 2018), but also several of retrotransposons. Among

these, is the Long Terminal Repeat (LTR) gypsy retroelement (**Figure 4c**), which is closely

related to retroviruses (Bourque et al. 2018). Like retroviruses, it encodes genes equivalent to

gag, *pol* and *env*, but relatively little is known about how it inserts its DNA into the host genome

(Dej et al. 1998; Havecker et al. 2004). So far, it is unknown what these TEs do in *Archegozetes*,

but the recent burst in TE abundance might suggest that some changes in the genome might have

happened since the became a laboratory model nearly 30 years (Heethoff et al. 2013).

The *Archegozetes* Hox cluster

The Hox genes are a group of highly conserved transcription factor-encoding genes that

are used to pattern the antero-posterior axis in bilaterian metazoans (Holland and Hogan 1988;

Hrycaj and Wellik 2016). Ancestrally, arthropods likely had ten Hox genes arranged in a cluster

(Hughes and Kaufman 2002). During arthropod development, the Hox genes specify the

identities of the body segments, and mutations in Hox genes usually result in the transformation

of segmental identities (Hughes and Kaufman 2002). The importance of Hox genes in

development of metazoans makes knowledge of their duplication and disappearances important

for understanding their role in the evolution of body plans (Hughes and Kaufman 2002).

Mites largely lack overt, external signs of segmentation, other than the serially arranged

appendages of the prosoma (Dunlop and Lamsdell 2017). Signs of segmentation in the posterior

body tagma, the opisthosoma, do exist in adult members of Endeostigmata (van der Hammen

1970). However, these segmental boundaries are largely present only in the dorsal opisthosoma,

making it difficult to assess how these correspond to the ventral somites (Dunlop and Lamsdell

2017; van der Hammen 1970). Developmental genetic studies of the spider mite and

Archegozetes suggest that acariform mites only pattern two segments in the posterior body

region, the opisthosoma, during embryogenesis (Barnett and Thomas 2012; 2013b; 2018; Grbić

et al. 2011). This stands in stark contrast to other studied chelicerate embryos. For example,

during embryogenesis the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* patterns twelve opisthosomal

segments (Schwager et al. 2015) and the opilionid *Phalangium opilio* patterns seven (Sharma et

al. 2012). Furthermore, a member of Parasitiformes, the tick *Rhipicephalus microplus,* appears to

pattern eight opisthosomal segments during embryogenesis (Santos et al. 2013).

Parallel to the observation of segmental reduction in *T. urticae*, genomic evidence

suggests that this acariform mite has lost two of its Hox genes, *i.e., Hox3* and *abdominal-A (abd-*

A) (Grbić et al. 2011). Interestingly, orthologs of *abd-A* in other studied arthropods pattern the

posterior segments as well. A genomic comparison of arthropod Hox clusters has also shown a

correlation between independent losses of *abd-A* and a reduction in posterior segmentation (Pace

et al. 2016). To investigate whether the loss of segmentation in *Archegozetes* is also due to an

absence in *abd-A*, we annotated its Hox cluster, paying close attention to the region between the

Hox genes *Ultrabithorax* (*Ubx*) and *Abdominal-B* (*Abd-B*), which is usually where this gene

resides in other arthropods (Hughes and Kaufman 2002). Our results suggest that the

Archegozetes Hox genes are clustered in a contiguous sequence (tig00005200_pilon, total size

~7.5 Mbp) in the same order as suggested for the ancestral arthropod (Heethoff and Rall 2015).

Furthermore, we found no sequences suggestive of an *abd-A* ortholog in *Archegozetes* (**Figure**

5a). These data also support the findings of a previous PCR survey that retrieved no *abd-A*

ortholog in *Archegozetes* (Cook et al. 2001). Genomic evidence from the Parasitiformes *Ixodes*

scapularis and *Metaseiulus occidentalis* reveal that these taxa maintain orthologs of all ten Hox

genes, however in *M. occidentalis* these genes are not clustered as they are in *I. scapularis*

(Gulia-Nuss et al. 2016; Hoy et al. 2016).

Taken together, these observations suggest that the last common ancestor of acariform

mites likely lost its *abdominal-A* gene as well as experiencing a reduction in opisthosomal

segmentation (**Figure 5b**). Alternatively, these shared losses of *abd-A* may be due to

convergence due to similar selective pressures favoring a reduction in body size. The dorsal,

external segmentation of endeostigmatid mites does not necessarily contradict the hypothesis of a

loss of *abd-A* at the base of the acariform mites. As Hox genes are usually deployed after the

genetic establishment of segments in arthropods (Hughes and Kaufman 2002), the opisthosomal

segments in endeostigmatid mites may still develop in the absence of *abd-A*. However, this

hypothesis needs further testing with observations of segmental gene expression in

endeostigmatids as well as additional acariform species.

Life-stage specific RNA expression patterns

Developmental and gene expression data from *Archegozetes* embryos (**Figure 5 d** and **e**)

have elucidated many of the potential mechanisms driving the morphogenesis of

manydevelopmental peculiarities. These peculiarities include the suppression of the fourth pair

of walking legs during embryogenesis as well as the reduction of opisthosomal segmentation

(Barnett and Thomas 2012; 2013a; 2013b; 2018; Telford and Thomas 1998; Thomas 2002). In

typical acariform mites, embryogenesis ends with the first instar, the prelarva, which usually

remains within the egg chorion, as in *Archegozeetes*. Hatching releases the second instar, the

larva, which is followed by three nymphal instars (proto-, deutero- and tritonymph) and the

adult, for a total of six instars. (Heethoff et al. 2007). Thus far, methodological limitations have

made it difficult to examine how mite segmentation and limb development progress throughout

these instars.

To this end, we used RNAseq to calculate the transcripts per million (tpm) values of

genes known to be, or suspected to be, involved in limb development and segmentation

throughout the six different instars of *Archegozetes*. Prior to comparing these tpm values, gene

orthology was confirmed *via* phylogenetic analyses (**supplementary Figures S4-S11**; see **Table**

S2 for phylogenetic statistics and **Table S3** for tpm values). Regarding the total number of genes

expressed across the different life stages, we found that earlier instars generally expressed a

higher number of genes (**Figure 5c**). While most expressed genes were shared across all instars,

more transcripts were shared between the eggs and the larvae and among all five juvenile instars.

Additionally, we found that earlier instars expressed a larger number of stage-specific genes as

compared to later instars and adults (**Figure 5c**).

Gene expression, SEM and time-lapse data have revealed that the development of the

fourth pair of walking legs in *Archegozetes* is suppressed until after the larval instar (Barnett and

Thomas 2012; 2018; Telford and Thomas 1998). The resulting larva is thus hexapodal (see also

embryo in **Figure 5e**), which constitutes a putative synapomorphy of Acari, if they are

monophyletic (Dunlop and Alberti 2008). In arthropods, the development of the limbs is

generally accomplished via the activity of highly conserved regulatory genes, termed the "limb

gap genes." These genes are expressed along their proximo-distal axes to establish the specific

identities of the limb podomeres. The limb gap genes include *extradenticle* (*exd*) and

homothorax (*hth*), which act together to specify the proximal limb podomeres, *dachshund* (*dac*),

which specifies the medial podomeres, and *Distal-less* (*Dll*) which specifies the distal-most

podomeres. It was previously shown that the deployment of these genes in the anterior

appendages of *Archegozetes*, *i.e.*, the chelicerae, pedipalps and first three pairs of walking legs

(**Figure 5d** and **e**), is similar to that of other chelicerate taxa (Barnett and Thomas 2013a;

Schwager et al. 2015; Sharma et al. 2015). However, in the anlagen of the fourth pair of walking

legs, only the proximal-specifying genes, *exd* and *hth*, are expressed (Barnett and Thomas

2013a).

Whether the limb gap genes are re-deployed during the transition from the prelarval to

larval instars in order to activate the development of the fourth pair of walking legs remains an

open question. We therefore compared the average tpm values of verified limb gap genes (i.e.,

Al-*Dll*, Al-*Hth*, Al-*exd*, and Al-*dac* (Barnett and Thomas 2013a)) in embryos and at each instar

stage (**Figure 5f**). We also compared the tpm values of the *Archegozetes* orthologs of *Sp6-9* and

optomotor blind, genes shown to be involved in limb formation in spiders (Heingård et al. 2019;

Königsmann et al. 2017). We hypothesized that limb development genes would show high

expression in the larval stage leading to the development of the octopodal protonymph. We did

observe an increase in the tpm averages of Al-*hth* as well as Al-*optomotor-blind*, however the

aforementioned limb gap gene expression levels were similar between these instars (**Figure 5f**).

Taken together, these genes may not be up-regulated for the formation of the fourth pair of

walking legs between these two instars.

Chelicerate embryos segment their bodies through a "short/intermediate germ"

mechanism, whereby the anterior (prosomal) segments are specified asynchronously (Schwager

et al. 2015). This usually occurs well before the sequential addition of posterior segments from a

posterior growth zone. Based on neontological and paleontological data, chelicerate arthropods

may have ancestrally had an opisthosoma comprised of 12 or more segments (Dunlop and Selden

1998; Dunlop 2010; Dunlop and Lamsdell 2017). Embryonic expression data for the segment

polarity genes, those genes that delineate the boundaries of the final body segments, have shown

that in most studied chelicerate embryos opisthosomal segments are delineated during

embryogenesis (Dunlop and Lamsdell 2017; Schwager et al. 2015). However, as discussed

above, expression data in *Archegozetes* embryos suggest that only two opisthosomal segments

are patterned during embryogenesis (Barnett and Thomas 2012; 2018); this indicates that mites

have significantly reduced their number of opisthosomal segments either by loss or by fusion.

Further complicating this is the observation that many mites add segments as they progress

through the larval instars, a phenomenon known as anamorphic growth (Dunlop and Lamsdell

2017).

To determine by what genetic process *Archegozetes* may add segments during post-

embryonic ontogeny, we assessed the expression of known chelicerate and arthropod

segmentation genes in each instar transcriptome (**Figure 5f**) (Schwager et al. 2015). We

observed an up-regulation of the segmentation genes *hedgehog* and *engrailed* in the larvae, as
well as the slight up-regulation of *patched* and *pax3/7*. Furthermore, the segmentation gene
wingless was slightly up-regulated in the protonymph, as well as a slight up-regulation of
hedgehog in the tritonymph. Lastly, we found that transcripts of the genes *pax3/7* and *runt* were
up-regulated in adults. These results suggest that *Archegozetes* does pattern body segments
during the progression through the it's instars similar to other Chelicerata.

Another peculiarity of *Archegozetes* is that these mites lack eyes (see more details
below). Eye loss has been documented in other arachnid clades, including independently in other
members of Acari (Evans 1992; Walter and Proctor 1999), and it has been recently demonstrated
that a species of whip spider has reduced its eyes by reducing the expression of retinal
determination genes that are shared throughout arthropods (Gainett et al. 2020). We sought to
determine if eye loss in *Archegozetes* also is associated with the reduced expression of these
genes (see also analysis of photoreceptor genes below). The genes, which have been shown to be
expressed in the developing eyes of spiders and whip scorpions, include *Pax-6*, *six1/sine oculis*
(*so*), *eyes absent* (*eya*), *Eyegone*, *Six3/Optix*, and *atonal* (Gainett et al. 2020; Samadi et al. 2015;
Schomburg et al. 2015). We also followed the expression of Al-*orthodenticle*, a gene previously
shown to be expressed in the ocular segment of *Archegozetes* (Telford and Thomas 1998).
Surprisingly, all of these genes, excluding the *Pax-6* isoform A and *eyegone*, are indeed
expressed during embryogenesis (**Figure 5f**). Aside from the larval expression of the *Pax-6*
isoform A during the larval stage, these eye-development genes remain quiescent until the adult
stage, where all but *Pax-6* isoform A, *six3* and *atonal* are up-regulated (**Figure 5f**). These results
are exceedingly surprising, given the conserved role of genes in retinal patterning. They suggest
a novel role for these genes, or alternatively, these expression patterns could be the result of early
expression of a retinal determination pathway followed by negative regulation by other genes to
suppress eye development.

Photoreceptor and chemosensory system of *Archegozetes longisetosus*

Unlike insects and crustaceans, chelicerates do not have compounds eyes – with
horseshoe crab being an exception. Generally, mites are eyeless or possess one or two pairs of
simple ocelli (Alberti and Coons 1999; Alberti and Moreno-Twose 2012; Exner 1989; Harzsch et
al. 2006; Patten 1887). Ocelli are common in Prostigmata and Endeostigmata , among

Acariformes, as well Opilioacarida – the most likely sister group to the Parasitiformes – but are absent in most Oribatida, Astigmata, Mesostigmata and ticks (Norton and Franklin 2018; Norton and Fuangarworn 2015; Walter and Proctor 1998; Walter and Proctor 1999). This suggests that the presence of eyes might be an ancestral condition for both Acariformes and Parasitiformes, while more derived mites rely largely on chemical communication systems (Alberti and Coons 1999).

In oribatid mites, detailed morphological and ultrastructural investigations have suggested that setiform sensilla are the most obvious sensory structures (**Figure 6a**) (Alberti 1998; Alberti and Coons 1999; Walter and Proctor 1999). The trichobothria are very complex, highly modified (e.g. filiform, ciliate, pectinate, variously thickened or clubbed) no-pore setae which are anchored in a cup-like base and likely serve as mechanosensory structures. In contrast, the setal shafts of solenidia and eupathidia (**Figure 6a**) both possess pores (Alberti 1998; Alberti and Coons 1999; Walter and Proctor 1999). Solenidia have transverse rows of small pores visible under a light microscope and likely function in olfaction, while the eupathidia have one or several terminal pores and likely are used as contact/gustatory sensilla (**Figure 6a**) (Alberti 1998; Alberti and Coons 1999). Previous work demonstrated that oribatid mites indeed use olfactory signals in the context of chemical communication and food selection (Brückner et al. 2018a; Brückner et al. 2018b; Heethoff et al. 2011a; Heethoff and Raspotnig 2012; Raspotnig 2006; Shimano et al. 2002).

Interestingly, detailed morphological and ultrastructural studies showed that light-sensitive organs exist in some Palaeosomata and Enarthronota (probably true eyes) as well as in Brachypylina (the secondary lenticulus), representing lower and highly derived oribatid mites, respectively (Alberti and Coons 1999; Alberti and Moreno-Twose 2012; Norton and Franklin 2018; Norton and Fuangarworn 2015). *Archegozetes* and most other oribatids, however, are eyeless, yet there is scattered experimental and some anecdotal evidence that even these mites show some response to light and seem to avoid it ('negative phototropism' or 'negative phototaxis') (Madge 1965; Trägårdh 1933; Walter and Proctor 1999; Woodring 1966). Hence, we mined the genome of *Archegozetes* for potential photoreceptor genes and found two genes of the *all-trans retinal peropsin* class and one gene related to spider mite *rhodopsin-7-like* gene (**Figure 6b**). *Peropsin-like* genes are also present in other eyeless ticks. In jumping spiders it

encodes for nonvisual, photosensitive pigments, while *rhodopsin-7* may be involved in basic

insect circadian photoreception (Eriksson et al. 2013; Koyanagi et al. 2008; Nagata et al. 2010;

Senthilan et al. 2019; Senthilan and Helfrich-Förster 2016; Shen et al. 2011). Taken together, this

might suggest that eyeless species like *Archegozetes* use *peropsin-* and *rhodopsin-7-like* genes

for reproductive and diapause behaviors, or to maintain their circadian rhythm, as well as

negative phototaxis.

However, the main sensory modality soil mites use is chemical communication via

olfaction (Alberti 1998; Alberti and Coons 1999; Brückner et al. 2018a; Brückner et al. 2018b;

Raspotnig 2006; Shen et al. 2011; Walter and Proctor 1999). In contrast to insects, but similar to

crustaceans and Myriapoda, mites do not have the full repertoire of chemosensory classes, they

are missing odorant receptors and odorant-binding proteins (**Table 2**) (Dong et al. 2017; Dong et

al. 2018; Hoy et al. 2016; Maraun et al. 2007; Raspotnig 2009; Sánchez-Gracia et al. 2009;

Sánchez-Gracia et al. 2011; Vieira and Rozas 2011). Although chemosensory protein (CSP)

encoding genes are absent in most mite genomes, we identified one gene encoding for such a

protein in *Archegozetes* and one CSP has been previously found in the deer tick (Table 2). Hence,

Archegozetes should primarily rely on gustatory receptors (GRs) and ionotropic receptors (IRs).

Both the number of GRs (68 genes; **Figure 6d**) and IRs (3 genes; **Figure 6c**) was very well within

the range of most mites and ticks and there was no evidence for any massive chemoreceptor

expansion like in the spider mite (**Table 2**) (Ngoc et al. 2016). This was surprising because

Archegozetes, like other acariform mites have many multiporous solenidia, present on all legs and

the palp, but appear to only have a limited number of chemoreceptors.

Canonical ionotropic glutamate receptors (iGluRs) are glutamate-gated ion channels with

no direct role in chemosensation, which come in two major subtypes: either NMDA iGluRs

which are sensitive to N-methyl-D-aspartic acid (NMDA) or non-NMDA iGluRs. The latter

group – at least in *Drosophila* – seems to have essential functions in synaptic transmission in the

nervous system and have been associated with sleep and vision (Benton et al. 2009; Croset et al.

2010; Ngoc et al. 2016; Sánchez-Gracia et al. 2009; Sánchez-Gracia et al. 2011). None of the IRs

we found in the *Archegozetes* genome belonged to the NMDA iGluRs and most were classified

as non-NMDA iGluRs (**Figure 6c**). Nothing is known about their functions in mites. It is,

however, likely that they perform similar tasks in synaptic transmission in the brain and

musculature. In *Drosophila* a specific set of chemosensory IRs, which do not bind glutamate, respond to acids and amines (*IR25a*), but also to temperature (*IR21a*, *IR93a*). For *Archegozetes* we found 3 IRs, like *IR21a* and *IR93a* of *Drosophila*, which fell into the antenna/1st leg IRs category (**Table 2**; **Figure 6c**) (Budelli et al. 2019; Knecht et al. 2016; Rytz et al. 2013). This is consistent with an assumed limited contribution of IRs to the perception of chemical cues. Furthermore, it is so far unclear whether these IRs are expressed in the first pair of legs (**Figure 6a** and **c**) in *Archegozetes*, but similar genes seem to be expressed in the legs of other mite species, which could suggest a similar function as in the fruit fly.

GRs are multifunctional proteins and at least in insects they are responsible for the perception of taste, heat or volatile molecules (Montell 2009). In *Archegozetes* we found 68 GRs, over half of which belonged to a species-specific expansion of the GR gene family (**Figure 6d**). Generally, it is unclear if GRs in *Archegozetes* and other mites have similar functions as in insects, but the GR gene family is heavily expanded in many acariform mites and also is present in ticks (**Table 2**), suggesting an important biological role (Barrero et al. 2017; Dong et al. 2017; Dong et al. 2018; Gulia-Nuss et al. 2016; Hoy et al. 2016; Ngoc et al. 2016). This is supported by experimental evidence which suggested that ticks and other mites, including *Archegozetes,* use chemical cues to find their host, communicate or discriminate food (Barrero et al. 2017; Brückner et al. 2018a; Brückner et al. 2018b; Bunnell et al. 2011; Gulia-Nuss et al. 2016; Kuwahara 2004; Raspotnig 2006; Yunker et al. 1992).

In general, not much is known about the nervous and sensory system of oribatid mites, or about sensory integration or the neuronal bases of their behavior (Alberti 1998; Alberti and Coons 1999; Norton 2007). Modern methods like Synchrotron X-ray microtomography (SRμCT) recently made it possible to investigate the organization and development of the nervous systems of oribatid mites (**Figure 6e;** (Hartmann et al. 2016)) and here we provide the first genomic resource for the investigation of the photo- and chemosensory systems of Oribatida (**Figure 6b-d**).

Horizontal gene transfer event sheds light on oribatid feeding biology

Horizontal gene transfer (HGT) is common among mites and other soil organisms (Dong et al. 2018; Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva et al. 2016; Grbić et al. 2011; Mayer et al. 2011; Wu et al. 2017; Wybouw et al. 2018). In some cases, genes that had been horizontally transferred now

have pivotal biological functions. For instance, terpene and carotenoid biosynthesis genes in

trombidiid and tetranychid mites, respectively, are found nowhere else in the animal kingdom

(Altincicek et al. 2012; Dong et al. 2018). Yet they show high homology with bacterial (terpene

synthase) or fungal (carotenoid cyclase/synthase/desaturase) genes, suggesting horizontal gene

transfer from microbial donors (Altincicek et al. 2012; Dong et al. 2018). At least the carotenoid

biosynthesis genes in spider mites still code for functional enzymes and equip these phytophages

with the ability to *de novo* synthesize carotenoids, which can induce diapause in these animals

(Altincicek et al. 2012).

Soil microarthropods like collembolans show numbers of horizontally transferred genes

that are among the highest found in Metazoan genomes, exceeded only by nematodes living in

decaying organic matter (Crisp et al. 2015; Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva et al. 2016; Wu et al. 2017).

Interestingly, many HGT genes found in collembolans are involved in carbohydrate metabolism

and were especially enriched for enzyme families like glycoside hydrolases, carbohydrate

esterases or glycosyltransferases (Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva et al. 2016; Wu et al. 2017). All three

enzyme families are involved in the degradation of plant and fungal cell walls (Gilbert 2010;

Latgé 2007). Hence, it has been hypothesized that cell-wall degrading enzymes acquired by HGT

are beneficial for soil organisms as it allowed such animals to access important food source in a

habitat that is highly biased towards polysaccharide-rich resources (Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva et al.

2016; Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva et al. 2017; Mitreva et al. 2009; Wu et al. 2017).

To assess the degree of HGT in *Archegozetes* we first used blobtools (v1.0) (Laetsch and

Blaxter 2017) to generate a GC proportion vs read coverage plot of our genome assembly, in

order to remove scaffolds of bacterial origin (**Figure 7a**; 438 contigs of ~ 8.5 Mb of

contamination). Of the remaining scaffolds, candidate HGTs were identified using the Alien

Index (Flot et al. 2013; Thorpe et al. 2018), where HGTs are those genes with blast homology

(bit score) closer to non-metazoan than metazoan sequences (**supplementary Table S4**). We

further filtered these HGT candidates to remove those that overlapped predicted repeats by ≥

50%, resulting in 617 genes. As HGT become integrated into the host genome, they begin to

mirror features of the host genome, including changes in GC content and introduction of introns

(Lawrence 1997). Comparing the GC content of the HGT candidates showed two distinct peaks,

one at 54.3% and the other at 35.2%, slightly higher than the remaining *Archegozetes* genes, GC

content of 31.5% (**Figure 7b**). Of the 407 HGT genes that shared similar GC content to the host genome, 73.5% had at least one intron (**Table S4**). In a final step, we used the gene expression data (RNAseq) to filter the list of all putative HGT genes and only retained candidates that were expressed in any life stage of *Archegozetes* (*n*= 298 HGT genes).

The majority of HGT candidates were of bacterial origin (75.2%), followed by genes likely acquired from fungi (13.4%), while transfer from Archaea, plants, virus and other sources was comparatively low (**Figure 7d**). This composition of HGT taxonomic origin is different from genes found in collembolans, which appear to have acquired more genes of fungal and protist origin (Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva et al. 2016; Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva et al. 2017; Wu et al. 2017). Subsequently, we performed an over-representation analysis of GO terms associated with these genes. We found an over-representation of genes with GO terms related to methyl transfer reactions and breaking glycosidic bonds (molecular function; **Figure 7c**) as well as carbohydrate metabolism, among others (biological process; **Figure 7c**) providing a first line of evidence that *Archegozetes* possess HGT related to plant- and fungal cell wall degradation similar to springtails.

As mentioned previously, oribatid mites are among the few Chelicerata that ingest solid food and are primary- and secondary decomposers feeding on dead plant material and fungi (Cohen 1995; Dunlop and Alberti 2008; Heethoff and Norton 2009; Maraun et al. 2011; Norton 2007; Shultz 2007). It was argued for decades that the enzymes necessary to break down these polysaccharide-rich resources originate from the mite's gut microbes (Siepel and de Ruiter-Dijkman 1993; Smrž 1992; Smrž 2000; Smrž and Čatská 2010; Smrž and Norton 2004; Stefaniak 1976; 1981). Microbes might be mixed with the food in the ventriculus and digest it while passing through the alimentary tract as food boli enclosed in a peritrophic membrane (see **Figure 7f** for an example) (Stefaniak 1976; 1981). However, screening the HGT candidate list for potential cell-wall degrading enzymes and mapping their overall and life-stage specific expression in *Archegozetes* using the RNAseq reads, revealed at least seven HGT genes related to polysaccharide breakdown (**Figure 7g**). We found that specifically members of the *glycoside hydrolases family 48* and *cellulose-binding domain* genes showed high expression in most life stages - the egg being an obvious exception (**Figure 7g**). Moreover, the majority of these genes

were flanked by a predicted metazoan gene, suggesting host transcriptional regulation (**Table**
S4).

In a last step we blasted the highly expressed HGT candidates (**Figure 7g**) against the
non-redundant protein sequence database, aligned the sequences with the highest alignment
score. Eventually, we performed a phylogenetic maximum likelihood analysis. For the highest
expressed HGT related to cell-wall-degrading enzymes (*glycoside hydrolases family 48 gene II*),
we recovered that the *Archegozetes* sequences was well nested within a clade of *GH 48*
sequences from herbivores beetles (McKenna et al. 2019), which appear to be related to similar
genes from various *Streptomyces* (**Figure 7e**) and we reconstructed similar phylogenies for other
highly expressed HGT candidates (**supplementary Figure S12**). All the sequences of beetle
glycoside hydrolases family 48 members (**Figure 7e**) were included in recent studies arguing for
a convergent horizontal transfer of bacterial and fungal genes that enabled the digestion of
lignocellulose from plant cell walls in herbivores beetles (McKenna et al. 2016; McKenna et al.
2019). They showed that phytophagous beetles likely acquired all genes of the *GH 48 family*
from Actinobacteria (including *Streptomyces*) (McKenna et al. 2019) and our phylogenetic
analysis (**Figure 7e**) revealed the same pattern as well as a highly similar tree topology (compare
to Fig 3B in (McKenna et al. 2019)).

Overall, our findings indicate that genes encoding for enzymes in *Archegozetes* capable
of degrading plant and fungal cell walls were likely horizontally transferred from bacteria (likely
Streptomyces). Bacterial symbionts and commensal living in the mites' gut are still likely to
contribute to the breakdown of food (**Figure 7f**). Yet, the high expression of genes encoding
cell-wall degrading enzymes (**Figure 7g**) as well as the evolutionary analyses of such genes
(**Figure 7e**) suggest that *Archegozetes* – and potentially many other oribatid mites – are able to
exploit polysaccharide-rich resources like dead plant material or chitinous fungi without
microbial aid. Enzymological and microscopical investigation of *Archegozetes* have suggested
that certain digestive enzymes (chitinase and cellulase) are only active when the mites consume a
particular type of food (e.g. algae, fungi or filter paper) (Smrž and Norton 2004). These results
were interpreted as evidence that these enzymes are directly derived from the consumed food
source (Smrž and Norton 2004). By contrast, we argue that this instead confirms our findings of
HGT: upon consumption of food containing either chitin or cellulose, gene expression of

polysaccharide-degrading enzymes starts, and proteins can readily be detected. Further

enzymological studies have placed oribatid mites in feeding guilds based on carbohydrase

activity and also found highly similar enzyme activity between samples of mites from different

times and locations (Luxton 1972; 1979; 1981; 1982; Siepel and de Ruiter-Dijkman 1993).

Future functional studies can disentangle the contribution of the host and microbes to cell wall

digestion and novel metabolic roles of the HGTs identified here.

Biosynthesis of monoterpenes – a common chemical defense compound class across oribatid

mite

Oribatid and astigmatid mites are characterized by a highly diverse spectrum of natural

compounds that are produced by and stored in so-called oil glands (for an example see **Figure**

8a) (Heethoff et al. 2016; Raspotnig 2009; Raspotnig et al. 2011). These paired glands are

located in the opisthosoma (i.e. the posterior part of chelicerate arthropods, analogous to the

abdomen of insects) and are composed of a single-cell layer invagination of the cuticle (**Figure**

8f). As previously mentioned, mites use chemicals produced by these glands to protect

themselves against environmental antagonists (predators or microbes) or use them as

pheromones (Brückner et al. 2015; Heethoff et al. 2011a; Heethoff and Rall 2015; Heethoff and

Raspotnig 2012; Raspotnig 2006; 2009; Shimano et al. 2002). The monoterpene aldehyde citral –

a stereoisomeric mixture of geranial ((E)-3,7-dimethylocta-2,6-dienal) and neral ((Z)-3,7-

dimethylocta-2,6-dienal) – and its derivatives are widely detected compounds in glandular

secretions of oribatids and astigmatids (Koller et al. 2012; Kuwahara 2004; Kuwahara et al.

2001; Raspotnig et al. 2004; Sakata 1997; Sakata and Norton 2001; Sakata and Norton 2003;

Sakata et al. 1995). These monoterpenes have been called "astigmatid compounds" (Sakata and

Norton 2001) as they characterize the biochemical evolutionary lineage of major oribatid mite

taxa (Mixonomata and Desmonomata) and almost all investigated astigmatid mites (Alberti

1984; Kuwahara 2004; Raspotnig 2009; Sakata 1997; Sakata and Norton 2001).

The chemical cocktail released by *Archegozetes* consists of a blend of 10 compounds

(**Figure 8a**) including two terpenes (approx. 45%)– neral and neryl formate – six hydrocarbons

(approx. 15%) and two aromatic compounds (approx. 40%) (Brückner and Heethoff 2017;

Sakata and Norton 2003). The hydrocarbons likely serve as solvents, while the terpenes and

aromatics are bioactive compounds used in chemical alarm and defense (Heethoff et al. 2011a;

Raspotnig 2006; Sakata and Norton 2003; Shimano et al. 2002). Recently, it was shown that

Archegozetes synthesizes the two aromatic compounds using a polyketide-like head-to-tail

condensation of (poly)-β-carbonyls *via* a horizontally acquired putative polyketide synthetase

(Brückner et al. 2020). Studies in Astigmata found that the monoterpenes of these mites appeared

to be made *de novo* from (poly)-*β*-carbonyls as well and one study identified a novel geraniol

dehydrogenases (GeDH), unrelated to those of bacteria, in *Carpoglyphus lactis* (Morita et al.

2004; Noge et al. 2005; Noge et al. 2008). To learn about the biosynthesis of astigmatid

compounds in *Archegozetes* and demonstrate the mite's applicability as research model for

biochemical pathway evolution, we used the novel genomic resources presented in this study.

First, we delineated the basic biochemical reactions likely to happen in the *Archegozetes*

gland through a stable-isotope labeling experiment. We supplemented the diet of the mite with

food containing 25% heavy $^{13}C_6$ D-glucose and 10% antibiotics (a combination of three different

antibiotics was fed, because this mixture is able to eliminate nearly all qPCR and FISH

detectable bacteria found on the food and in the alimentary tract (Brückner et al. 2020)). To

examine the incorporation of heavy $^{13}C_6$ D-glucose and its metabolic products into neral (**Figure**

8b) and neryl formate (**Figure 8c**), we compared selected fragment ions (M^+ and M^+-46,

respectively) using single ion mass spectrometry. Both neral and neryl formate showed

consistent enrichment in their M^+ to $[M+4]^+$ and $[M-46]^+$ to $[M-46+4]^+$-ion series, indicating that

Archegozetes used glycolysis breakdown products of $^{13}C_6$ D-glucose for the biosynthesis of their

monoterpenes. We then used the OGS mapped to KEGG metabolic pathways (Kanehisa et al.

2007) to reconstruct the backbone synthesis of terpenes in *Archegozetes* (**Figure 8d**). We found

mapped mite genes, which suggest that *Archegozetes* synthesizes geranyl pyrophosphate (GPP) –

the input substrate for further monoterpene synthesis – via the mevalonate pathway using the

Mevalonate-5P to Isopentenyl-PP route (**Figure 8d**). The Mevalonate-5P pathway is used in

most higher eukaryotes as compared to the Mevalonate-3P pathway in Archaea and the

MEP/DOXP pathway in bacteria, some plants and apicomplexan protists (Breitmaier 2006;

Degenhardt et al. 2009; Eisenreich et al. 2004; Miziorko 2011; Oldfield and Lin 2012; Trapp and

Croteau 2001). This likely excludes any horizontal gene transfer of mevalonate pathway genes as

Archegozetes uses enzymes similar to those of other animals.

The biosynthesis of monoterpenes not only depends on very widespread enzymes, but

also requires more specific enzymes downstream of GPP (Breitmaier 2006; Degenhardt et al.

2009; Trapp and Croteau 2001). For instance, *Carpoglyphus lactis* expresses a unique geraniol

dehydrogenase (GeDH) – catalyzing the oxidation of geraniol to geranial – different from all

previously characterized geraniol-related and alcohol dehydrogenases (ADHs) of animals and

plants (Noge et al. 2008). We used the functionally validated Carpoglyphus-GeDH (Noge et al.

2008), blasted its sequence against the *Archegozetes* OGS and found a homologous sequence.

We used both mite sequences in an alignment with plant, fungal and bacterial GeDHs and animal

ADHs and constructed a maximum likelihood phylogeny (**Figure 8e**). Similar to the previous

analysis including only Carpoglyphus-GeDH, we found that the *Al-GeDH* represent a new class

of geraniol dehydrogenases different from those in plants, fungi or bacteria and not nested within

animal ADHs (**Figure 8e**). This is why we hypothesize that *Al-GeDH* is a novel expansion of the

geraniol dehydrogenases gene family and has not been acquired by horizontal gene transfer, like

other biosynthesis and digestive enzymes in *Archegozetes* (**Figure 7**; (Brückner et al. 2020)).

Based on our mass spectrometry data of stable isotopes and genomic analysis, we

propose that the following biochemical pathway leading to monoterpenes is of oribatid mites

(**Figure 8f and g**): geraniol is likely to be synthesized from GPP – the universal precursor of all

monoterpenes – either enzymatically by a geraniol synthase (GES) or a diphosphate phosphatase

(DPP), but possibly also endogenously by dephosphorylation of GPP (Beran et al. 2019; Liu et

al. 2015; Oswald et al. 2007; Zhou et al. 2014). For *Archegozetes*, we could not find any *GES* or

specific *DPP* in the OGS, thus geraniol might be formed from GPP *via* endogenous

dephosphorylation, but further research is required to verify or falsify this hypothesis.

Subsequently, geraniol is oxidized to geranial by the pervious described *GeDH* (**Figure 8e**) and

readily isomerized to neral. Trace amounts of geranial have been found in *Archegozetes* and it is

common among other oribatid and astigmatid mites, supporting this idea (Koller et al. 2012;

Kuwahara 2004; Raspotnig et al. 2008; Raspotnig et al. 2004). Also, there is no evidence that

geraniol is converted into nerol, or that neral is formed directly via oxidation of nerol (Morita et

al. 2004; Noge et al. 2005; Noge et al. 2008). The most parsimonious explanation for neryl

formate synthesis would be an esterification of the corresponding terpene alcohol nerol. There is,

however, no evidence of nerol in the traces of any oribatid or astigmatid mite species (Kuwahara

2004; Raspotnig 2009; Raspotnig et al. 2011). Aliphatic non-terpene formats in Astigmata are

synthesized by dehomologation and generation of a one-carbon–shorter primary alcohol from an

aldehyde via hydrolysis of formate in a biological Baeyer–Villiger oxidation catalyzed by a

novel, uncharacterized enzyme (Shimizu et al. 2017). A similar reaction to synthesize terpene

formates is unlikely, as the terpenoid backbone would be shortened by one-carbon and this does

not happen in any possible scenario. The discovery of this Baeyer–Villiger oxidation mechanism,

however, highlights the probability that there are many very unusual reactions that remain to be

discovered in oribatid mites (Brückner et al. 2020).

Conclusion

The integrated genomic and transcriptomic resources presented here for *Archegozetes*

longisetosus allowed a number of insights into the molecular evolution and basic biology of

decomposer soil mites. Our analysis of an oribatid mite genome also provides the foundation for

experimental studies building on the long history of *Archegozetes'* as a chelicerate model

organism, which now enters the molecular genetics era (Aoki 1965; Heethoff et al. 2013; Norton

et al. 1993; Palmer and Norton 1992). This includes the study of biochemical pathways,

biochemistry, neuroethological bases of food searching behavior, and environmental impacts on

genomes of complex, clonal organisms.

Our evolutionary comparisons across the Chelicerata revealed interesting patterns of

genome evolution and how horizontal gene transfer might have shaped the feeding mode of soil

mites. We also showed how oribatid glandular biology and chemical ecology are reflected in the

genome. The community of researchers studying the fundamental biology of oribatid and other

free-living, non-parasitic mites is growing. We think that providing these genomic and

transcriptomic resources can foster a community effort to eventually transform basic research on

these mites into a modern, molecular discipline.

Key priorities for a future community research effort include i) sequencing organ-specific

transcriptomic data, ii) developing tools for genetic interrogation (RNAi or CRISPR/CAS9), iii)

establishing reporter linages with germ-line stable modifications (e.g. GAL4/UAS misexpression

systems), iv) constructing an whole-animal single-cell RNAseq expression atlas, and v)

gathering more genomic data to improve the genome assembly. Please do not hesitate to contact

the corresponding author, if you want to start your own culture of *Archegozetes*. He will be

happy to provide you with starter specimens and share rearing protocols with you.

Materials and Methods

Mite husbandry

776   The lineage 'ran' (Heethoff et al. 2013) of the pantropical, parthenogenetic oribatid mite

777 *Archegozetes longisetosus* was used in this study. Stock cultures were established in 2015 from

778 an already existing line and fed with wheat grass (*Triticum* sp.) powder from Naturya. Cultures

779 were maintained at 20-24°C and 90% relative humidity. Sterilized water and 3-5 mg wheat grass

780 were provided three times each week.

DNA extraction and Illumina sequencing

For the short-read library, DNA was extracted from ~200 mites that were taken from the

stock culture, starved for 24 h to avoid possible contamination from food in the gut, subsequently

washed with 1% SDS for 10 sec. For extraction of living specimens, we used the Quick-DNA

Miniprep Plus Kit (Zymo Research) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Amounts and

quality of DNA were accessed with Qubit dsDNA HS Kit (ThermoFisher) and with NanoDrop

One (ThermoFisher) with target OD 260/280 and OD 260/230 ratios of 1.8 and 2.0-2.2,

respectively. Extracted DNA was shipped to Omega Bioservices (Norcross, GA, USA) on dry

ice for library preparation and sequencing. DNA library preparation followed the KAPA

HyperPrep Kit (Roche) protocol (150 bp insert size) and 200 million reads were sequenced as

150bp paired-end on a HighSeq4000 (Illumina) platform.

High-molecular weight DNA isolation and Nanopore sequencing

Genomic DNA was isolated from ~300-500 mites starved for 24 h using QIAGEN Blood

& Cell Culture DNA Mini Kit. Briefly, mites were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and

homogenized with a pestle in 1 ml of buffer G2 supplemented with RNase A and Proteinase K at

final concentrations of 200 ng/µl and 1 µg/µl, respectively. Lysates were incubated at 50°C for 2

h, cleared by centrifugation at 5 krpm for 5 min at room temperature and applied to Genomic tip

G/20 equilibrated with buffer QBT. Columns were washed with 4 ml of buffer QC and genomic

DNA was eluted with 2 ml of buffer QF. DNA was precipitated with isopropanol, washed with

70% EtOH and resuspended in 50 µl of buffer EB. DNA was quantified with Qubit dsDNA HS

Kit (ThermoFisher) and the absence of contaminants was confirmed with NanoDrop One

(ThermoFisher) with target OD 260/280 and OD 260/230 ratios of 1.8 and 2.0-2.2, respectively.

DNA integrity was assessed using Genomic DNA ScreenTape kit for TapeStation (Agilent

Technologies).

Libraries for nanopore sequencing were prepared from 1 µg of genomic DNA using 1D

Genomic DNA by Ligation Kit (Oxford Nanopore) following manufacturer's instructions.

Briefly, unfragmented DNA was repaired and dA tailed with a combination of NEBNext FFPE

Repair Mix (New England Biolabs) and NEBNext End repair/dA-tailing Module (New England

Biolabs). DNA fragments were purified with Agencourt AMPure XP beads (Beckman Coulter)

and Oxford Nanopore sequencing adapters were ligated using NEBNext Quick T4 DNA Ligase

(New England Biolabs). Following AMPure XP bead cleanup, ~500 ng of the library was

combined with 37.5 µL of SQB sequencing buffer and 25.5 µl of loading beads in the final

volume of 75 µl and loaded on a MinION Spot-ON Flow Cell version R9.4 (Oxford Nanopore).

Two flow cells were run on MinION device controlled by MinKNOW software version 3.1.13

for 48 hours each with local basecalling turned off generating 9.7 and 5.1 GB of sequence data.

Post run basecalling was performed with Guppy Basecalling Software, version 3.4.5 (Oxford

Nanopore). After filtering low quality reads (Q<7), the combined output of the two runs was

13.69 GB and 4.7 million reads.

Genome assembly and contamination filtering

Read quality was assessed using FastQC v0.11.8 (Andrews 2010). Illumina adapters,

low-quality nucleotide bases (phred score below 15) from the 3' and 5' ends and reads shorter

than 50 bp were removed using cutadapt v1.18 (Martin 2011). From the filtered reads, *in silico*

genome size estimates were calculated using *k-mer* based tools kmergenie v.1.7048 (Chikhi and

Medvedev 2014), GenomeScope v1.0 (Vurture et al. 2017), and findGSE v0.1.0 R package (Sun

et al. 2018). The latter two required a *k-mer* histogram computed by jellyfish v2.2.10 (Marçais

and Kingsford 2011) with *k-mer* size of 21. The genome was assembled using 4.7 million long

reads from two MinION runs (60x coverage) using Canu v1.8 with default settings and setting

the expected genome size to 200 Mb (Koren et al. 2017). To improve assembly quality, paired

end Illumina reads were mapped to the genome with BWA aligner (Li and Durbin 2009) using

BWA-MEM algorithm and polished with Pilon v. 1.23 with '—changes' and '--fix all' options

(Walker et al. 2014). Assembled contigs identified as bacterial and fungal contaminants based on

divergent GC content from most *Archegozetes* contigs, high coverage and blast homology to the

nt database (downloaded February 2019, Evalue $1e^{-25}$) were removed using Blobtools v1.0

(Laetsch and Blaxter 2017).

<u>Identification, classification and masking of repetitive element</u>

Repetitive elements in the genome *Archegozetes* were identified using a species-specific

library generated with RepeatModeler v 1.0.11 (Bao et al. 2015; Smit and Hubley 2008) and

MITE tracker (Crescente et al. 2018) and annotated by RepeatClassifier, a utility of the

RepeatModeler software that uses the RepBase database (version Dfam_Consensus-20181026).

Unclassified repeat families from both programs were run through CENSOR v 4.2.29 (Kohany et

al. 2006) executable *censor.ncbi* against the invertebrate library v 19.03 to provide further

annotation. Predicted repeats were removed if they had significant blast homology (E-value $1e^{-5}$)

to genuine proteins in the NCBI nr database and/or a local database of arthropod genomes

(*Drosophila melanogaster, Tribolium castaneum, Tetranychus urticae, Leptotrombidium*

deliense, Dinothrombium tinctorium, Sarcoptes scabiei, Euroglyphus maynei, Galendromus

occidentalis, Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus). Unclassified repeats with blast homology to

known TEs were retained whereas those with no blast homology were removed (Petersen et al.

2019). The remaining repeat families were combined with the Arthropoda sequences in RepBase

and clustered using vsearch v 2.7.1 (--iddef 1 --id 0.8 --strand both; (Rognes et al. 2016)). The

filtered repeat library was used to soft mask the *A. longisetosus* using RepeatMasker v 4.07 (Smit

et al. 1996-2010).A summary of the masked repeat content was generated using the

"buildSummary.pl" script, the Kimura sequence divergence calculated using the

"calcDivergenceFromAlign.pl" script and the repeat landscape visualized using the

"createRepeatLandscape.pl" script, all utilities of RepeatMasker.

<u>Gene prediction and annotation</u>

Both *ab inito* and reference-based tools were used for gene prediction using modified

steps of the funannotate pipeline (Palmer and Stajich 2017). The *ab inito* tool GeneMark-ES

v4.33 (Ter-Hovhannisyan et al. 2008) was used along with reference based tools BRAKER

v2.1.2 (Bruna et al. 2020) using RNAseq reads discussed below and PASA v 2.3.3 (Haas et al.

2008) using genome-guided transcriptome assembly from Trinity described below. Lastly,

Tetranychus urticae gene models from the NCBI database (GCF_000239435.1) were aligned to

the contigs using GeMoMa (Keilwagen et al. 2019). All gene predictions were combined in

EvidenceModeler (Haas et al. 2008) with the following weights: GeMoMa =1, PASA = 10, other

BRAKER = 1, and GeneMark = 1. Predicted tRNAs using tRNAscan-SE v 2.0.3 (Chan and

Lowe 2019) were combined with the gene predictions in the final gene feature format (GFF) file

and filtered for overlap using bedtools (Quinlan and Hall 2010) *intersect* tool (Quinlan and Hall

2010).

The predicted genes were searched against the NCBI nr (February 2019) (Pruitt et al.

2005), SwissProt (February 2019) (Bairoch and Apweiler 2000), a custom-made Chelicerata

database including genomes of *Tetranychus urticae, Leptotrombidium deliense, Dinothrombium*

tinctorium, Sarcoptes scabiei, Euroglyphus maynei, Galendromus occidentalis, Metaseiulus

occidentalis, Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus, Trichonephila clavipes, Stegodyphus

mimosarum, Centruroides sculpturatus, Ixodes scapularis and *Parasteatoda tepidariorum* (all

downloaded Feb 2019), PFAM (v 32, August 2018) (Bateman et al. 2004), merops (v 12,

October 2017) (Rawlings et al. 2010) and CAZY (v 7, August 2018) (Cantarel et al. 2009)

databases. The results of the hmm-based (Eddy 2011) PFAM and CAZY searches were filtered

using cath-tools v 0.16.2 (https://cath-tools.readthedocs.io/en/; E-value $1e^{-5}$) and the blast-based

searches were filtered by the top hit (E-value $1e^{-5}$ threshold). Predicted genes were also assigned

to orthologous groups using eggNOG-mapper (Huerta-Cepas et al. 2017). Gene annotation was

prioritized by the SwissProt hit if the E-value $< 1e^{-10}$ followed by NCBI annotation, the custom

Chelicerata database and if no homology was recovered, then the gene was annotated as,

"hypothetical protein". Final annotation was added to the GFF file using GAG (Geib et al. 2018).

Analysis of the official gene set (OGS)

To allow the OGS to be used as resources for functional studies, we assigned functional

categories based on Gene Ontology (GO) and the Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes

(KEGG) (Consortium 2004; Kanehisa and Goto 2000). GO terms for the respective genes

models of the OGS were assigned based on the gene id with highest homology from the

SwissProt database or NCBI nr database (Bairoch and Apweiler 2000; Pruitt et al. 2005). A

custom database of GO terms was created with makeOrgPackage function in the R package

AnnotationForge v1.26.0 (Carlson and Pagès 2019). Over-representation analysis of GO terms

was tested using the enrichGO function in the R package clusterProfiler v3.12.0 (Yu et al. 2012)

with a hypergeometric distribution and a Fisher's Exact test. P-values were adjusted for multiple

comparisons using false discovery rate correction (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995). Resulting

enriched GO terms were processed with GO slim (Consortium 2019) and the final list of over

represented GO terms was used to plot the number of genes in a respective category.

KEGG orthology terms were assigned from single-directional best hit BLAST searches

of each gene model on the KEGG Automatic Annotation Server (Moriya et al. 2007).

Additionally, we ran GhostKOALA (Kanehisa et al. 2016) (GHOSTX searches for KEGG

Orthology And Links Annotation) to obtain KEGG orthology terms. Compared to conventional

BLAST searches, GhostKOALA is about 100 times more efficient than BLAST to remote

homologs by using suffix arrays (Suzuki et al. 2014).

Orthology and phylogenomic analyses

Orthologs of *A. longisetosus*, other species within Acari, Chelicerata and the fruit fly

Drosophila were identified using OrthoFinder v 2.3.3 (-M msa –A mafft –T fasttree; (Emms and

Kelly 2015a)). Prior to running OrthoFinder, isoform variants were removed from the gene

predictions using CD-Hit (Fu et al. 2012). Trees of orthogroups with at least 80% of taxa present

(n= 4,553) were constructed using fasttree v 2.1.10 (Price et al. 2010), trimmed with TrimAl v

1.4.1 (-keepheader -fasta –gappyout; (Capella-Gutiérrez et al. 2009)) and paralogs pruned using

phylotreepruner v 1.0 (min_number_of_taxa =18, bootstrap_cutoff= 0.7, longest sequence for a

given orthogroup=u; (Kocot et al. 2013)). Alignments shorter than 100 amino acids were

removed, leaving 1,121 orthogroups.

For the maximum likelihood analysis, the trimmed and pruned alignments were

concatenated into a supermatrix using FasConCat v1.04 (Kück and Meusemann 2010) composed

of 377,532 amino acids and the best substitution models determined using PartitionFinder v 2.1.1

(Lanfear et al. 2016). The maximum likelihood consensus phylogeny from the supermatrix and

partition scheme was constructed using IQ-tree and 1,000 ultrafast bootstrap replicates (Nguyen

et al. 2015). For the coalescence species tree reconstruction, gene trees were generated using IQ-

tree v 1.6.12 on the trimmed alignments of the 1,121 filtered orthogroups and processed using

ASTRAL v 5.6.3 (Zhang et al. 2018). Branch lengths are presented in coalescent units

(differences in the 1,121 gene trees) and the node values reflect the local posterior probabilities.

RNA sequencing and transcriptome assembly

For RNA extraction, about 200 mites of all life stages were taken from stock culture and

subsequently washed with 1% SDS for 10 s. RNA was extracted from living specimens using the

Quick-RNA MiniPrep Kit (Zymo Research) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Quantity

and quality of RNA were accessed using a Qubit fluorometer and NanoDrop One (Thermo

Fisher Scientific), respectively.

Extracted RNA was shipped to Omega Bioservices (Norcross, GA, USA) on dry ice for

library preparation and sequencing. Whole animal RNA was used for poly-A selection, cDNA

synthesis and library preparation following the Illumina TruSeq mRNA Stranded Kit protocol.

The library was sequenced with 100 million 150 bp paired-end on a HighSeq4000 platform. For

the genome-guided assembly of the transcriptome a bam-file was created from the genome using

STAR (Dobin et al. 2013). RNAseq reads were *in silico* normalized and subsequently used

together with the bam-file to assemble the transcripts using Trinity v2.8.4 (Grabherr et al. 2011;

Haas et al. 2013), yielding an assembly with a total length of 162.8 Mbp, an N50= 2994 bp and a

BUSCO score (Simão et al. 2015) of C:96.3% [S:36.5%,D:59.8%], F:1.3%, M:2.4%.

Life-stage specific RNAseq

For life-stage specific RNAseq, we collected 15 specimens per life stage from the stock

culture that were split into three replicates of five individuals. Whole animals (for all stages but

eggs) were flash frozen in 50 μl TRIzol using a mixture of dry ice and ethanol (100%) and stored

at −80°. RNA was extracted using a combination of the TRIzol RNA isolation protocol (Life

Technologies) and RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen) (Kitchen et al. 2015). The TRIzol protocol was

used for initial steps up to and including the chloroform extraction. Following tissue

homogenization, an additional centrifugation step was performed at $12,000 \times g$ for 10 min to

remove tissue debris. After the chloroform extraction, the aqueous layer was combined with an

equal volume of ethanol and the RNeasy Mini Kit was used to perform washes following the

manufacturer's protocol. Eggs were crushed using pipette tips and directly stored in a mixture of

cell lysis buffer and murine RNase Inhibitor (New England Biolab).

We used the NEBNext® Single Cell/Low Input RNA Library Prep Kit for Illumina®

together with NEBNext® Multiplex Oligos for Illumina® (New England Biolab) for library

preparation, including reverse transcription of poly(A) RNA, amplification full-length cDNA,

fragmentation, ligation and final library amplification according to the manufacturer's protocol.

We performed cDNA amplification for 16 (18 for egg samples) PCR cycles and final library

amplification 8 PCR cycles. In total, we constructed 18 libraries (three for each life stage). The

quality and concentration of the resulting libraries were assessed using the Qubit High

Sensitivity dsDNA kit (Thermo Scientific) and Agilent Bioanalyzer High Sensitivity DNA assay.

Libraries were sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq2500 platform (single-end with read lengths of 50

bp) with ~18 million reads per library.

Illumina sequencing reads were pseudoaligned to the bulk transcriptome and quantified

(100 bootstrap samples) with kallisto 0.46.0 (Bray et al. 2016) using default options for single-

end reads. Fragment length sizes were extracted from the Agilent Bioanalyzer runs. For life-

stage specific differential expression analysis, kallisto quantified RNAseq data was processes

with sleuth 0.30.0 (Pimentel et al. 2017) using Likelihood Ratio tests in R 3.6.1 (R_Core_Team

2019). The average transcripts per million (tpm) values for each target transcript were extracted

from the sleuth object (see R script) and used with the Heatmapper tool (Babicki et al. 2016) to

produce an unclustered heatmap showing relative expression levels. UpSetR (Conway et al.

2017) was used to compare the number of unique and shared expressed genes across life stages.

<u>Horizontal gene transfer events identification</u>

To detect HGTs, we used the published tool "./Lateral_gene_transfer_predictor.py"

(Thorpe et al. 2018) to calculate the Alien Index described by (Gladyshev et al. 2008) and (Flot

et al. 2013). All predicted genes were compared to the NCBI nr database as previously described

(Thorpe et al. 2018). Results to Arthropoda (tax id 6656) were ignored in the downstream

calculations. The HGT candidates were filtered for contamination identified by both Blobtools

(Laetsch and Blaxter 2017) and the Alien Index (AI > 30 and >70% percent identity to a non-

metazon sequence). The candidates were further filtered for > 50% overlap with predicted

repeats using the bedtools intersect tool with the RepeatMasker gff file and expression from any

developmental stage. Introns were scored manually from visualization in IGV genome browser

(Robinson et al. 2011) and GC content for all predicted genes was calculated using the bedtools

nuc tool.

<u>Analysis of chemosensory and photoreceptor gene families</u>

The search and analysis chemosensory genes largely followed the procedure outlined by

Dong et al. (Dong et al. 2018) with slight modifications. First, the *Archegozetes* official gene set

(OGS) was searched using BLASTP (E-value, $<1 \times 10^{-3}$) against the following queries for the

different chemosensory gene families. The OGS was queried against i) *D. melanogaster*, *D.*

mojavensis, *Anopheles gambiae*, *Bombyx mori*, *T. castaneum*, *Apis mellifera*, *Pediculus humanus*

humanus, and *Acyrthosiphon pisum* odorant binding proteins (OBPs) (Vieira and Rozas 2011);

ii) *D. melanogaster*, *D. mojavensis*, *A. gambiae*, *B. mori*, *T. castaneum*, *A. mellifera*, *P.*

humanus humanus, *A. pisum, I. scapularis*, and *Daphnia pulex* small chemosensory proteins

(CSP) (Niimura and Nei 2005; Robertson and Wanner 2006; Vieira and Rozas 2011); iii) *D.*

melanogaster and *A. mellifera* odorant receptors (Niimura and Nei 2005; Robertson and Wanner

2006); iv) *D. melanogaster*, *A. mellifera*, *I. scapularis*, *T. urticae*, *T. mercedesae*, and *M.*

occidentalis gustatory receptors (GRs) (Dong et al. 2017; Gulia-Nuss et al. 2016; Hoy et al.

2016; Ngoc et al. 2016; Robertson and Wanner 2006; Robertson et al. 2003); v) a comprehensive

list of iGluRs and IRs across vertebrates and invertebrates (Croset et al. 2010), as well as those

identified in the *T. mercedesae, D. tinctorium* and *L. deliense* genome projects (Dong et al. 2017;

Dong et al. 2018). Second, all candidate *Archegozetes* sequences were reciprocally blasted

(BLASTP, E-value $<1 \times 10^{-3}$) against the NCBI database (Pruitt et al. 2005) and all sequences

that did not hit one of the respective receptors or transmembrane proteins were removed from the

list. Third, for phylogenetic analysis of IRs and GRs from *Archegozetes* were aligned with IRs

from *D. melanogaster*, *T. urticae, D. tinctorium* and *L. deliense* and GRs from iv) *D.*

melanogaster, T. mercedesae, I. scapularis, and *M. occidentalis*, respectively, using MAFFT (v

7.012b) with default settings (Katoh and Standley 2013). Poorly aligned and variable terminal

regions, as well as several internal regions of highly variable sequences were excluded from the

phylogenetic analysis. Fourth, maximum likelihood trees were constructed with the IQ-TREE

pipeline (v 1.6.12) with automated model selection using 1,000 ultrafast bootstrap runs (Nguyen

et al. 2015).

Reference opsin genes and opsin-like sequences were obtained from Dong et al. (Dong et

al. 2018) and used to query the *Archegozetes* OGS using BLASTP (E-value, $<1 \times 10^{-5}$).

Subsequently, candidates sequenced were reciprocally blasted against NCBI using the same

settings and only retained if they hit an opsin or opsin-like gene. The *Archegozetes* candidates

were aligned with the query sequence list using MAFFT (v 7.012b) with default settings (Katoh

and Standley 2013). This opsin gene alignment phylogenetically analyzed using the IQ-TREE

pipeline (v 1.6.12) with automated model selection and 1,000 ultrafast bootstrap runs (Nguyen et

al. 2015).

<u>Gene family phylogenies</u>

We used the following workflow to analyses genes related to Figure 5 (hox and

developmental genes), Figure 7 (cell wall-degrading enzyme encoding genes) and Figure 8

(alcohol and geraniol dehydrogenases genes). Generally, protein orthologs were retrieved from

NCBI (Pruitt et al. 2005), and aligned using MUSCLE (Edgar 2004) or MAFFT (v 7.012b)

(Katoh and Standley 2013) and ends were manually inspected and trimmed. The resulting final

protein sequence alignments used to construct a maximum likelihood (ML) phylogenetic tree

with either i) PhyML with Smart Model Selection (Guindon et al. 2010; Lefort et al. 2017) or ii)

the IQ-TREE pipeline with automated model selection (Nguyen et al. 2015). The ML trees were

constructed using either 1,000 ultrafast bootstrap runs (IQ-TREE) or approximate-likelihood

ratio test (PhyML) was used to assess node support.

<u>Feeding experiments with labelled precursors and chemical analysis (GC/MS)</u>

Stable isotope incorporation experiments were carried out as previously described

(Brückner et al. 2020). Briefly, mites were fed with wheat grass containing a 10% (w/w) mixture

of three antibiotics (amoxicillin, streptomycin and tetracycline) and additionally, we added 25%

(w/w) of the stable isotope-labelled precursors [$^{13}C_6$] D-glucose (Cambridge Isotope

Laboratories, Inc.) as well as a control with untreated wheat grass. Cultures were maintained for

one generation and glands of adult specimens were extracted one week after eclosion by

submersing groups of 15 individuals in 50 µl hexane for 5 min, which is a well-established

method to obtain oil gland compounds from mites (Brückner and Heethoff 2016; 2017; Brückner

et al. 2017b; Raspotnig et al. 2008).

Crude hexane extracts (2-5 µl) were analysed with a GCMS-QP2020 gas chromatography

– mass spectrometry (GCMS) system from Shimadzu equipped with a ZB-5MS capillary column

(0.25 mm x 30m, 0.25 µm film thickness) from Phenomenex. Helium was used a carrier gas with

a flow rate of 2.14 ml/min, with splitless injection and a temperature ramp was set to increase

from 50°C (5 min) to 210°C at a rate of 6°C/min, followed by 35°C/min up to 320°C (for 5 min).

Electron ionization mass spectra were recorded at 70 eV and characteristic fragment ions were

monitored in single ion mode.

1042

Acknowledgment

We thank Joe Parker for making his laboratory space and resources available to us.

Michael Heethoff, Sebastian Schemlzle, Benjamin Weiss and Martin Kaltenpoth graciously

allowed us to use some of their unpublished images. Roy A. Norton provided invaluable

comments to the manuscript and collected the first specimens of *Archegozetes longisetosus*

giving rise to the current laboratory strain. This work was supported by a grant from the Caltech

Center for Environmental Microbial Interactions (CEMI) to AB. AB is Simons Fellow of the

Life Sciences Research Foundation (LSRF).

Ethics statement

There are no legal restrictions on working with mites.

Authors contributions

AB had the initial idea for the study; AB, AAB and SAK design research; IAA performed

long-read sequencing and assembled the genome; AB performed all other experimental work;

AAB analyzed hox and life-stage specific expression data; AB analyzed chemical data; SAK and

AB performed bioinformatic analyses; AB wrote the first draft of the manuscript with input from

AAB and SAK; SAK revised the manuscript. All authors gave final approval for publication.

Data availability

Genomic and transcriptomic data generated for his project can be found on NCBI under

the accession numbers PRJNA683935 and PRJNA683999. All other data related to this

manuscript can be found at https://doi.org/10.22002/D1.1876 under a cc-by-nc-4.0 license

(Brückner 2021).

1064

Figure 1 The mite, *Archegozetes longisetosus*, in its phylogenetic and natural environment. **a**:

Species tree of selected oribatid mites of the family Trhypochthoniidae based on phylogenetic

analyses and divergence time estimates by (Heethoff et al. 2011b). **b**: Two adults and one

tritonymph of *Archegozetes* on a piece of leaf litter. The algae growing on the leaf serves as a

food source for the mites. **c**: Habitus of an adult mite based on a surface rendering of a μCT-scan

reconstruction. Image courtesy of Sebastian Schmelzle.

1071

1072

Figure 2 Comparisons and annotations of the official gene set (OGS) of *Archegozetes longisetosus.* **a**: Number of gene models of the mites compared to other mites, chelicerates and the fruit fly (Cao et al. 2013; dos Santos et al. 2015; Grbić et al. 2011; Gulia-Nuss et al. 2016; Schwager et al. 2017). **b**: Non-linear multidimensional scaling plot (NMDS) of clustered orthogroups based on the OGS or predicted proteins of several mite species. *Archegozetes longisetosus* is marked a square, nested within Oribatida. Prostigmata are depicted in blue, Astigmata in yellow and Oribatida in green. **c**: Pie chart showing the percentage composition of genes of the *Archegozetes* annotated to different broad biological categories by GhostKOALA. **d**: Pie chart describing the overall annotation of the OGS of the mite.

Figure 3 Orthology comparison and phylogenetic placement of *Archegozetes longisetosus* among other chelicerates. **a**: Maximum likelihood phylogeny based on concatenation of 1,121 orthologs showing the mites phylogenetic environment within the Oribatida (all nodes have 100% support; branch length unit is substitutions per site). For the fully expanded tree see supplementary Figure S2. **b**: BUSCO-assessment of the *Archegozetes* genome assembly and protein set for both ortholog presence and copy number compared to other oribatid mites and selected model species, respectively. **c**: Comparisons of protein-coding genes in seven oribatid mite species (for a full comparison of all species see supplementary Figure S3) with *Archegozetes* highlighted in red. The bar charts show the proportion of orthrogroup conservation with each species (see insert legend) based on OrthoFinder clustering. **d**: Detailed pie chart depicting the conservation levels of orthogroup in *Archegozetes*.

1095

Figure 4 Comparison of repeat content estimations and transposable element (TE) landscape of *Archegozetes longisetosus*. **a:** Repetitive element categories of *Archegozetes* based on the results from RepeatModeler and MITE Tracker. LINE= long interspersed nuclear element, LTR= long terminal repeat. **b:** Comparison of total repetitive content among *Archegozetes*, other model chelicerates and the fly. All values are from the respective genome paper of the species, except for the fly. **c:** Repeat divergence plot showing TE activity through time for the major TE superfamilies of *Archegozetes*. Transposable elements with a low divergence from the consensus were recently active, while TEs diverging from the consensus depicted older activities (x-axis).

1104

Figure 5 The genomic organization of the Hox genes and life-stage specific expression patters of

developmental genes in *Archegozetes longisetosus*. **a:** Schematic of the genomic region

enclosing the *Archegozetes* Hox cluster. The genomic organization of the Hox cluster is

collinear, as it is in many arthropod taxa, however an abdominal-A ortholog is absent. Arrowed

boxes denote the direction of transcription. The scale bar represents 50,000 base pairs. **b:** A

comparison of the Hox cluster organization of reported members of Acari with the fruit fly

Drosophila melanogaster as the outgroup. The last common ancestor of the parasitiform mites *M.*

occidentalis and *I. scapularis* likely had an intact Hox cluster (green branches and labels),

whereas abdominal-A was likely lost in the last common ancestor of acariform mites, as represented by *Archegozetes* and *T. urticae* (red branches and labels). Boxes with white borders represent duplicated Hox genes. Lines through the boxes indicate an intact Hox cluster. See text for further details. **c:** Number of transcripts shared across the different life stages of *Archegozetes*. The barplot panel on the left shows the numbers of transcripts in each stage. Exemplars of (**d**) early and (**e**) mid- germ-band embryos. Ch= chelicera; L1-3= walking legs 1-3; Pp= pedipalp. Embryos are stained with the nuclear dye DAPI and oriented with the anterior to the left of the page. **f:** Non-clustered heatmap showing the relative expression (row z-score based on tpm) patterns of putative limb, eye, and body segmentation genes throughout the embryonic, larval instars, and adult stages of *Archegozetes*. See **supplementary Table S3** for average tpm values. Life stages (for **c** and **f**): EGG= egg; LAR= larva; PRO= protonymph; DEU= deutonymph; TRI= tritonymph; ADU= adult.

1127

Figure 6 The sensory systems of *Archegozetes longisetosus* and phylogenetic analysis of selected photoreceptor and chemosensory genes. **a**: Scanning electron micrograph (SEM) showing the end of tarsus on *Archegozetes*' first leg. Images shows normal setae, but also modified chemosensory setae, namely eupathidia, both paired (p) and single (s), as well as an omega-3 solenidium. SEM picture courtesy of Michael Heethoff. **b**: Phylogeny and classification of opsin genes across the Metazoa, including those of several Chelicerata. The tree was constructed using a maximum likelihood approach and rooted with a jelly fish opsin. *Archegozetes* sequences are depicted in red, Drosophila in turquoise; branch length unit is substitutions per site. **c**: Maximum likelihood phylogeny of ionotropic receptors and ionotropic glutamate receptors of *Archegozetes* (Along), *Dinothrombium* (Dt), *Leptothrombidium* (Ld), *Tetranychus* (Tu) and *Drosophila* (Dmel). IR25a/IR8a and antenna/1st leg IRs contain genes with known chemosensory function in *Drosophila*. The tree was rooted to the middle point; *Archegozetes* sequences are depicted in red, *Drosophila* in turquoise; branch length unit is

substitutions per site. Bootstrap values can be found in the supplementary Figure S13. **d**:

Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree of gustatory receptors of *Archegozetes* (Along), *Ixodes*

(Is), *Tropilaelaps* (Tm), *Metaseiulus* (Mocc) and *Drosophila* (Dmel). The tree was rooted to the

middle point; *Archegozetes* sequences are depicted in red, *Drosophila* in turquoise; branch length

unit is substitutions per site. Bootstrap values can be found in the supplementary Figure S14. **e**:

Combined image of volume rendering (grey) and reconstructed nervous system of *Archegozetes*

in dorsal view. Color-code corresponds to different parts of the nervous system, as depicted in

the legend. The blue structure in the middle of the synganglion is the part of the esophagus which

penetrates the synganglion. Scale bar: 200 μm. Image courtesy of Sebastian Schmelzle based on

data in (Hartmann et al. 2016).

1152

Figure 7 Horizontal gene transfer (HGT) and implications for the feeding biology of

Archegozetes longisetosus. **a:** Blob-plot of the long-read genome assembly contigs plotting the

read coverage against GC proportion [%]. Contigs are colored according to the taxonomic order

of their best Megablast hit to the NCBI nucleotide database. Size of circle corresponds to the

nucleotides per contigs. **b:** Comparison of the GC content of HGT and non-HGT genes. HGT

genes shifted towards the host genome GC content indicate integration within the host genome

while the higher GC content HGT genes might be the product of relatively recent HGT events. **c:**

Enrichment of functional categories (GO terms) describing the molecular functions and

biological processes related to the HGT candidate genes. **d:** Taxonomic origin of HGT. The

category "others" includes mostly protozoan donor genes among other Eukaryotes. **e:** Unrooted

maximum-likelihood tree of glycoside hydrolase family 48 members (GH_48) from

Streptomyces bacteria and HGT genes from other arthropods as well as *Archegozetes* (GH_48

II). Bootstrap values and the full tree can be found in the supplementary Figure S15. The scale

bar denotes substitutions per site. **f:** Fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH) micrograph of a

food bolus in the mites' alimentary tract. The food material (wheat grass power) is enclosed in a

peritrophic membrane and there is a high bacterial prevalence in the food bolus. Image courtesy

of Benjamin Weiss and Martin Kaltenpoth. **g:** RNAseq support of HGT candidates related to cell

wall degrading enzymes. The first block (single column) shows the overall RNA expression

(tpm) of the HGT in all life stages; red denotes high total expression, while blue depicts low total

expression. The second block (six columns) shows the expression (row z-score based on tpm) of

the same HGT candidates across the different life stages of *Archegozetes*. Abbreviations:

GH_48= glycoside hydrolase family 48, GH_44= glycoside hydrolase family 44, cbd= cellulose-

binding domain, cbp= cellulose-binding protein, chiA/celA = chitinase/cellulase, GH_75=

glycoside hydrolase family 75.

1177

1178

Figure 8 Reconstruction of the biosynthetic pathway leading to monoterpenes in *Archegozetes*

longisetosus. **a**: Representative gas chromatogram of the mite' gland content; in order of

retention time: 2-hydroxy-6-methyl-benzaldehyde (2,6-HMBD), neral ((*Z*)-3,7-dimethylocta-2,6-

dienal) neryl formate ((*Z*)-3,7-dimethyl-2,6-octadienyl formate), tridecane, 3-hydroxybenzene-1,2-dicarbaldehyde (γ-acaridial). Further alkanes/alkenes (pentadec-7-ene, pentadecane, heptadeca-6,9-diene, heptadec-8-ene, heptadecane) are not shown. Monoterpenes are marked in red. **b and c**: Representative mass spectra of neral (**b**) and neryl formate (**c**) extracted from defensive glands of mites fed with unlabeled wheatgrass powder (control), or wheatgrass infused with $^{13}C_6$-labelled glucose recorded in single-ion mode. The mass spectra for neral (**b**) shows the M+-ion series, while the spectra for neryl formate (**c**) show the diagnostic ion series at $[M-46]^+$. Mites fed with the $^{13}C_6$ glucose infused wheatgrass showed enriched ions. **d:** KEGG reference pathway map for terpenoid backbone biosynthesis. Mapping genes from the *Archegozetes* genome encoding for pathway enzymes (labeled in red) revealed that the mite can produce geranyl pyrophosphate (GPP) *via* the mevalonate pathway from precursors provided by glycolysis. Enzymes names correspond to EC numbers: 2.3.1.9= acetyl-CoA C-acetyltransferase; 2.3.3.10= hydroxymethylglutaryl-CoA synthase; 1.1.1.34= hydroxymethylglutaryl-CoA reductase; 2.7.1.36= mevalonate kinase; 2.7.4.2= phosphomevalonate kinase; 4.1.1.33= diphosphomevalonate decarboxylase; 5.3.3.2= isopentenyl-diphosphate delta-isomerase; 2.5.1.1= farnesyl diphosphate synthase. **e:** Maximum-likelihood tree based on an alignment of plant, fungal and bacterial geraniol dehydrogenases, animal alcohol dehydrogenase and two mite (*Carpoglyphus lactis* and *Archegozetes*) geraniol dehydrogenases (GeDH). Bootstrap values (based on 1000 replicates) are indicated along branches and the scale bar denotes substitutions per site. The tree was rooted by the outgroup cinnamyl dehydrogenase from sweet basil. **f:** Ultrastructure of the gland-tissue of *Archegozetes*, as observed by transmission electron microscopy (TEM). Red error shows the border between the gland cell and the glandular lumen. TEM picture courtesy of Michael Heethoff. **g:** Proposed biochemical pathway scenario leading to neral and neryl formate in *Archegozetes* starting with GGP from the terpenoid backbone biosynthesis.

1207 **Table 1** *Archegozetes longisetosus* genome metrics

1208

Feature	Value
Estimated genome size	135-180 Mb
Assembly size	190 Mb
Coverage based on assembly (short/long)	200x (short), ~60x (long)
# contigs	1182
N50 (contigs)	994.5 kb
Median contig length	50.3 kb
GC content	30.9%
# gene models	23,825

1209 **Table 2** Comparison of chemosensory receptor repertoires between *Archegozetes longisetosus*

1210 and other arthropods. GR= gustatory receptor, OR= odorant receptor, IR= ionotropic receptor,

1211 OBP= odorant binding protein, CSP= chemosensory protein.

	Chemosensory receptors				
	GR	**OR**	**IR**	**OBP**	**CSP**
A. longesitosus	68	0	3	0	1
spider mite	689	0	4	0	0
deer tick	60	0	22	0	1
house spider	634	0	108	4	0
fruit fly	73	62	66	51	4

1212

1213

Supplementary Figures

Figure S1 Results of *in silico* genome size estimations based on jellyfish *k-mer* counting using **a:** GenomeScope v1.0 and **b** and **c**: the findGSE v0.1.0 R package (Sun et al. 2018).

Figure S2 Phylogenetic placement of *Archegozetes longisetosus* among other chelicerates. **a**: Maximum likelihood phylogeny based on concatenation of 1,121 orthologs Branch lengths unit is substitutions per site and the node values reflect bootstrap supports. **b**: Coalescence species tree reconstruction of the 1,121 filtered orthogroups. Branch lengths are presented in coalescent units (differences in the 1,121 gene trees) and the node values reflect the local posterior probabilities.

Figure S3 Comparisons of protein-coding genes of 23 arthropod species, including *Archegozetes*. The bar charts show the proportion of orthrogroup conservation with each species (see insert legend) based on OrthoFinder clustering.

Figure S4 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Paired protein orthologs. **(a)** Maximum likelihood tree showing the relationship of the Eyegone, Pax-3/7, and Pax-6 clades as collapsed subtrees. **(b)** The un-collapsed clade in **A** showing the phylogenetic relationships of selected Eyegone proteins and the putative *A. longisetosus* Eyegone ortholog. **(c)** The un-collapsed clade in **A** showing the phylogenetic relationships of selected Pax-3/7 proteins and the putative *A. longisetosus* Pax-3/7 orthologs. **(d)** The un-collapsed clade in **A** showing the phylogenetic relationships of selected Pax-6 proteins and the putative *A. longisetosus* Pax-6 ortholog. All *A. longisetosus* orthologs are in red, and the *D. melanogaster* orthologs are in blue. Node support was calculated using the approximate likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is represented by the color of each node. All taxa are represented by their species names, gene names if given, and their NCBI accession numbers.

Figure S5 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Eyes absent (Eya) protein ortholog and selected metazoan Eya proteins. The *A. longisetosus* ortholog is in red, and the *D. melanogaster* orthologs are in blue. Node support was calculated using the approximate likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is represented by the color of each node. All taxa are represented by their species names, gene names if given, and their NCBI accession numbers.

Figure S6 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Hairy protein

ortholog and selected metazoan Hairy proteins. Hairy/E(spl) proteins were used as an outgroup.

The *A. longisetosus* ortholog is in red, and the *D. melanogaster* orthologs are in blue. Node

support was calculated using the approximate likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is represented

by the color of each node. All taxa are represented by their species names, gene names if given,

and their NCBI accession numbers.

Figure S7 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Omb, T-box H15,

and TBX1 protein orthologs and selected metazoan T-box proteins. All *A. longisetosus* orthologs

are in red, and the *D. melanogaster* orthologs are in blue. Node support was calculated using the

approximate likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is represented by the color of each node. All

taxa are represented by their species names, gene names if given, and their NCBI accession

numbers.

Figure S8 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Runt protein

ortholog and selected arthropod Runt proteins. The *A. longisetosus* ortholog is in red, and the *D.*

melanogaster orthologs are in blue. Node support was calculated using the approximate

likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is represented by the color of each node. All taxa are

represented by their species names, gene names if given, and their NCBI accession numbers. See

Figure S9 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Six family protein

orthologs and selected metazoan Six family proteins. All *A. longisetosus* orthologs are in red,

and the *D. melanogaster* orthologs are in blue. Node support was calculated using the

approximate likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is represented by the color of each node. All

taxa are represented by their species names, gene names if given, and their NCBI accession

numbers.

Figure S10 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Sp-family protein

orthologs and selected metazoan Sp-family proteins. All *A. longisetosus* orthologs are in red, and

the *D. melanogaster* orthologs are in blue. Node support was calculated using the approximate

likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is represented by the color of each node. All taxa are

represented by their species names, gene names if given, and their NCBI accession numbers.

Figure S11 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analyses of the *A. longisetosus* Wnt-family

protein orthologs and selected metazoan Wnt proteins. The tree is organized as a cladogram for

easier viewing. All *A. longisetosus* orthologs are in red, and the *D. melanogaster* orthologs are in

blue. Node support was calculated using the approximate likelihood ratio (aLRT) method and is

represented by the color of each node. All taxa are represented by their species names, gene

names if given, and their NCBI accession numbers.

Figure S12 Unrooted maximum-likelihood phylogenetic trees of cell-wall degrading enzymes

based on the alignment of amino acid sequences. Branch lengths unit is substitutions per site and

the node values reflect bootstrap supports. *Archegozetes* sequences are highlighted in red.

Figure S13 Maximum likelihood phylogeny of ionotropic receptors and ionotropic glutamate

receptors of *Archegozetes* (Along), *Dinothrombium* (Dt), *Leptothrombidium* (Ld), *Tetranychus*

(Tu) and *Drosophila* (Dmel). The tree was rooted to the middle point. Branch lengths unit is

substitutions per site and the node values reflect bootstrap supports.

Figure S14 Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree of gustatory receptors of *Archegozetes*

(Along), *Ixodes* (Is), *Tropilaelaps* (Tm), *Metaseiulus* (Mocc) and *Drosophila* (Dmel). The tree

was rooted to the middle point. Branch lengths unit is substitutions per site and the node values

reflect bootstrap supports.

Figure S15 Unrooted maximum-likelihood tree of glycoside hydrolase family 48 members

(GH_48) from Streptomyces bacteria and HGT genes from other arthropods as well as

Archegozetes (GH_48 II)*.* Branch lengths unit is substitutions per site and the node values reflect

bootstrap supports.

1292

Supplementary Table

Table S1 Contamination contigs identified from Blobtools.

Table S2 Phylogenetic statistics of the PhyML constructed trees as well as the matrices selected
by the SMS model selection tool.

Table S3 The average transcript per million (tpm) values for the transcripts highlighted in the
heatmap (**Figure 5f**) for each instar stage.

Table S4 Candidate HGTs identified from the *Archegozetes* genome. The genes were filtered
first if they were predicted to be contamination from Blobtools and the Alien Index report,
second if they overlapped predicted repeats by ≥ 50%, and third if they were not expressed in
any developmental stage. Annotation is provided from similarity searches against the NCBI nr
database, other oribatid mite and eggNOG database. The taxonomy of the sequences upstream
and downstream of each candidate HGT was determine using the eggNOG predicted taxonomic
group.

1306

References

Alberti G. 1984. The contribution of comparative spermatology to problems of acarine systematics. *Acarology VI*.479-490.

Alberti G. 1991. Spermatology in the Acari: systematic and functional implications. In: Schuster R, Murphy PW, editors. The Acari - Reproduction, Development and Life-History Strategies. London: Chapman & Hall. p. 77-105.

Alberti G. 1998. Fine structure of receptor organs in oribatid mites (Acari). In: Ebermann E, editor. Arthropod biology: Contributions to morphology, ecology and systematics. Wien: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press p. 27-77.

Alberti G, Coons LB. 1999. Acari-Mites. New York: Wiley.

Alberti G, Michalik P. 2004. Feinstrukturelle Aspekte der Fortpflanzungssysteme von Spinnentieren (Arachnida). *Denisia*. 12(14):1-62.

Alberti G, Moreno-Twose AI. 2012. Fine structure of the primary eyes in *Heterochthonius gibbus* (Oribatida, Heterochthoniidae) with some general remarks on photosensitive structures in oribatid and other actinotrichid mites. *Soil Org*. 84(2):391-408.

Alfsnes K, Leinaas HP, Hessen DO. 2017. Genome size in arthropods; different roles of phylogeny, habitat and life history in insects and crustaceans. *Ecol Evol*. 7(15):5939-5947.

Altincicek B, Kovacs JL, Gerardo NM. 2012. Horizontally transferred fungal carotenoid genes in the two-spotted spider mite Tetranychus urticae. *Biol Lett*. 8(2):253-257.

Andrews S. 2010. FastQC: A quality control tool for high throughput sequence data. *Ref Source*.https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/.

Aoki J. 1965. Oribatiden (Acarina) Thailands. I. *Nat Life Southeast Asia*. 4:129-193.

Arkhipova I, Meselson M. 2000. Transposable elements in sexual and ancient asexual taxa. *PNAS*. 97(26):14473-14477.

Babicki S, Arndt D, Marcu A, Liang Y, Grant JR, Maciejewski A, Wishart DS. 2016. Heatmapper: web-enabled heat mapping for all. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 44(W1):W147-W153.

Bairoch A, Apweiler R. 2000. The SWISS-PROT protein sequence database and its supplement TrEMBL in 2000. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 28(1):45-48.

Ballesteros JA, Sharma PP. 2019. A critical appraisal of the placement of *Xiphosura*
(Chelicerata) with account of known sources of phylogenetic error. *Syst Biol*. 68(6):896-
917.

Bao W, Kojima KK, Kohany O. 2015. Repbase Update, a database of repetitive elements in
eukaryotic genomes. *Mobile DNA*. 6(1):11.

Barnett AA, Thomas RH. 2012. The delineation of the fourth walking leg segment is temporally
linked to posterior segmentation in the mite *Archegozetes longisetosus* (Acari: Oribatida,
Trhypochthoniidae). *Evol Dev*. 14(4):383-392.

Barnett AA, Thomas RH. 2013a. The expression of limb gap genes in the mite *Archegozetes*
longisetosus reveals differential patterning mechanisms in chelicerates. *Evol Dev*.
15(4):280-292.

Barnett AA, Thomas RH. 2013b. Posterior Hox gene reduction in an arthropod: Ultrabithorax
and Abdominal-B are expressed in a single segment in the mite *Archegozetes*
longisetosus. *EvoDevo*. 4(1):23.

Barnett AA, Thomas RH. 2018. Early segmentation in the mite *Archegozetes longisetosus*
reveals conserved and derived aspects of chelicerate development. *Dev Genes Evol*.
228(5):213-217.

Barrero RA, Guerrero FD, Black M, McCooke J, Chapman B, Schilkey F, de Leon AAP, Miller
RJ, Bruns S, Dobry J. 2017. Gene-enriched draft genome of the cattle tick *Rhipicephalus*
microplus: assembly by the hybrid Pacific Biosciences/Illumina approach enabled
analysis of the highly repetitive genome. *Int J Parasitol*. 47(9):569-583.

Barton NH. 2010. Mutation and the evolution of recombination. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol*
Sci. 365(1544):1281-1294.

Bast J, Schaefer I, Schwander T, Maraun M, Scheu S, Kraaijeveld K. 2016. No accumulation of
transposable elements in asexual arthropods. *Mol Biol Evol*. 33(3):697-706.

Bateman A, Coin L, Durbin R, Finn RD, Hollich V, Griffiths-Jones S, Khanna A, Marshall M,
Moxon S, Sonnhammer EL. 2004. The Pfam protein families database. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. 32(suppl_1):D138-D141.

Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the False Discovery Rate - a Practical and
Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc Series B*. 57(1):289-300.

Bensoussan N, Santamaria ME, Zhurov V, Diaz I, Grbić M, Grbić V. 2016. Plant-herbivore
interaction: dissection of the cellular pattern of *Tetranychus urticae* feeding on the host
plant. *Front Plant Sci*. 7:1105.

Benton R, Vannice KS, Gomez-Diaz C, Vosshall LB. 2009. Variant ionotropic glutamate
receptors as chemosensory receptors in *Drosophila*. *Cell*. 136(1):149-162.

Beran F, Köllner TG, Gershenzon J, Tholl D. 2019. Chemical convergence between plants and
insects: biosynthetic origins and functions of common secondary metabolites. *New*
Phytol.

Bergmann P, Laumann M, Norton RA, Heethoff M. 2018. Cytological evidence for automictic
thelytoky in parthenogenetic oribatid mites (Acari, Oribatida): Synaptonemal complexes
confirm meiosis in *Archegozetes longisetosus*. *Acarologia*. 58(2):342-356.

Bourque G, Burns KH, Gehring M, Gorbunova V, Seluanov A, Hammell M, Imbeault M, Izsvák
Z, Levin HL, Macfarlan TS. 2018. Ten things you should know about transposable
elements. *Genome Biol*. 19(1):1-12.

Bray NL, Pimentel H, Melsted P, Pachter L. 2016. Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq
quantification. *Nat Biotech*. 34(5):525-527.

Breitmaier E. 2006. Terpenes: flavors, fragrances, pharmaca, pheromones. Weinheim: John
Wiley & Sons.

Brückner A. 2021. Data related to "The *Archegozetes longisetosus* genome project" 1.0 ed.
Pasadena: CaltechDATA https://doi.org/10.22002/D1.1876

Brückner A, Heethoff M. 2016. Scent of a mite: origin and chemical characterization of the
lemon-like flavor of mite-ripened cheeses. *Exp Appl Acarol*. 69(3):249-261.

Brückner A, Heethoff M. 2017. The ontogeny of oil gland chemistry in the oribatid mite
Archegozetes longisetosus Aoki (Oribatida, Trhypochthoniidae). *Int J Acarol*. 43(5):337-
342.

Brückner A, Heethoff M. 2018. Nutritional effects on chemical defense alter predator–prey
dynamics. *Chemoecology*. 28(1):1-9.

Brückner A, Hilpert A, Heethoff M. 2017a. Biomarker function and nutritional stoichiometry of
neutral lipid fatty acids and amino acids in oribatid mites. *Soil Biol Biochem*. 115:35-43.

Brückner A, Kaltenpoth M, Heethoff M. 2020. De novo biosynthesis of simple aromatic compounds by an arthropod (*Archegozetes longisetosus*). *Proc R Soc Lond Biol*. 287(1934):20201429.

Brückner A, Parker J. 2020. Molecular evolution of gland cell types and chemical interactions in animals. *J Exp Biol*. 223(Suppl 1).

Brückner A, Raspotnig G, Wehner K, Meusinger R, Norton RA, Heethoff M. 2017b. Storage and release of hydrogen cyanide in a chelicerate (*Oribatula tibialis*). *PNAS*. 114(13):3469-3472.

Brückner A, Schuster R, Smit T, Heethoff M. 2018a. Imprinted or innated food preferences in the model mite *Archegozetes longisetosus* (Actinotrichida, Oribatida, Trhypochthoniidae). *Soil Org*. 90(1):23-26.

Brückner A, Schuster R, Smit T, Pollierer MM, Schäffler I, Heethoff M. 2018b. Track the snack – Olfactory cues shape foraging behaviour of decomposing soil mites (Oribatida). *Pedobiologia*. 66(74-80).

Brückner A, Schuster R, Wehner K, Heethoff M. 2018c. Effects of nutritional quality on the reproductive biology of *Archegozetes longisetosus* (Actinotrichida, Oribatida, Trhypochthoniidae) *Soil Org*. 90(1):1-12.

Brückner A, Stabentheiner E, Leis HJ, Raspotnig G. 2015. Chemical basis of unwettability in Liacaridae (Acari, Oribatida): specific variations of a cuticular acid/ester-based system. *Exp Appl Acarol*. 66(3):313-335.

Brückner A, Wehner K, Neis M, Heethoff M. 2016. Attack and defense in a gamasid-oribatid mite predator-prey experiment - sclerotization outperforms chemical repellency. *Acarologia*. 56(4):451-461.

Bruna T, Hoff K, Stanke M, Lomsadze A, Borodovsky M. 2020. BRAKER2: Automatic Eukaryotic Genome Annotation with GeneMark-EP+ and AUGUSTUS Supported by a Protein Database. *bioRxiv*.

Budelli G, Ni L, Berciu C, van Giesen L, Knecht ZA, Chang EC, Kaminski B, Silbering AF, Samuel A, Klein M. 2019. Ionotropic receptors specify the morphogenesis of phasic sensors controlling rapid thermal preference in *Drosophila*. *Neuron*. 101(4):738-747. e733.

Bunnell T, Hanisch K, Hardege JD, Breithaupt T. 2011. The fecal odor of sick hedgehogs

(*Erinaceus europaeus*) mediates olfactory attraction of the tick *Ixodes hexagonus*. *J*

Chem Ecol. 37(4):340.

Cantarel BL, Coutinho PM, Rancurel C, Bernard T, Lombard V, Henrissat B. 2009. The

Carbohydrate-Active EnZymes database (CAZy): an expert resource for glycogenomics.

Nucleic Acids Res. 37(suppl_1):D233-D238.

Cao Z, Yu Y, Wu Y, Hao P, Di Z, He Y, Chen Z, Yang W, Shen Z, He X. 2013. The genome of

Mesobuthus martensii reveals a unique adaptation model of arthropods. *Nature*

communications. 4(1):1-10.

Capella-Gutiérrez S, Silla-Martínez JM, Gabaldón T. 2009. trimAl: a tool for automated

alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. *Bioinformatics*. 25(15):1972-

1973.

Carlson M, Pagès H. 2019. AnnotationForge: Tools for building SQLite-Based Annotation Data

Packages. *R package version*. 1(0).

Chan PP, Lowe TM. 2019. tRNAscan-SE: searching for tRNA genes in genomic sequences.

Gene Prediction. Springer. p. 1-14.

Charlesworth B. 2012. The effects of deleterious mutations on evolution at linked sites. *Genetics*.

190(1):5-22.

Chikhi R, Medvedev P. 2014. Informed and automated k-mer size selection for genome

assembly. *Bioinformatics*. 30(1):31-37.

Sequenced Arthropod Genomes. 2020. Manhattan, KS: i5k initiative; [accessed 10/27/2020].

Cohen AC. 1995. Extra-oral digestion in predaceous terrestrial Arthropoda. *Annual Rev Entomo*.

40(1):85-103.

Consortium GO. 2004. The Gene Ontology (GO) database and informatics resource. *Nucleic*

Acids Res. 32(suppl_1):D258-D261.

Consortium GO. 2019. The gene ontology resource: 20 years and still GOing strong. *Nucleic*

Acids Res. 47(D1):D330-D338.

Consortium TGS. 2008. The genome of the model beetle and pest *Tribolium castaneum*. *Nature*.

452(7190):949.

Conway JR, Lex A, Gehlenborg N. 2017. UpSetR: an R package for the visualization of

intersecting sets and their properties. *Bioinformatics*. 33(18):2938-2940.

Cook CE, Smith ML, Telford MJ, Bastianello A, Akam M. 2001. Hox genes and the phylogeny
of the arthropods. *Curr Biol*. 11(10):759-763.

Cornman RS, Schatz MC, Johnston JS, Chen Y-P, Pettis J, Hunt G, Bourgeois L, Elsik C,
Anderson D, Grozinger CM. 2010. Genomic survey of the ectoparasitic mite Varroa
destructor, a major pest of the honey bee *Apis mellifera*. *BMC Genomics*. 11(1):602.

Crescente JM, Zavallo D, Helguera M, Vanzetti LS. 2018. MITE Tracker: an accurate approach
to identify miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements in large genomes. *BMC
Bioinf*. 19(1):348.

Crisp A, Boschetti C, Perry M, Tunnacliffe A, Micklem G. 2015. Expression of multiple
horizontally acquired genes is a hallmark of both vertebrate and invertebrate genomes.
Genome Biol. 16(1):1-13.

Croset V, Rytz R, Cummins SF, Budd A, Brawand D, Kaessmann H, Gibson TJ, Benton R.
2010. Ancient protostome origin of chemosensory ionotropic glutamate receptors and the
evolution of insect taste and olfaction. *PLoS genetics*. 6(8):e1001064.

Dabert M. 2006. DNA markers in the phylogenetics of the Acari. *Biological Lett*. 43(2):97-107.

Dabert M, Witalinski W, Kazmierski A, Olszanowski Z, Dabert J. 2010. Molecular phylogeny of
acariform mites (Acari, Arachnida): Strong conflict between phylogenetic signal and
long-branch attraction artifacts. *Mol Phylogenet Evol*. 56:222-241.

Degenhardt J, Köllner TG, Gershenzon J. 2009. Monoterpene and sesquiterpene synthases and
the origin of terpene skeletal diversity in plants. *Phytochem*. 70(15-16):1621-1637.

Dej KJ, Gerasimova T, Corces VG, Boeke JD. 1998. A hotspot for the *Drosophila* gypsy
retroelement in the ovo locus. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 26(17):4019-4024.

Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, Batut P, Chaisson M, Gingeras
TR. 2013. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics*. 29(1):15-21.

Domes K, Althammer M, Norton RA, Scheu S, Maraun M. 2007. The phylogenetic relationship
between Astigmata and Oribatida (Acari) as indicated by molecular markers. *Exp Appl
Acarol*. 42(3):159-171.

Dong X, Armstrong SD, Xia D, Makepeace BL, Darby AC, Kadowaki T. 2017. Draft genome of
the honey bee ectoparasitic mite, *Tropilaelaps mercedesae*, is shaped by the parasitic life
history. *GigaScience*. 6(3):gix008.

Dong X, Chaisiri K, Xia D, Armstrong SD, Fang Y, Donnelly MJ, Kadowaki T, McGarry JW,
Darby AC, Makepeace BL. 2018. Genomes of trombidid mites reveal novel predicted
allergens and laterally transferred genes associated with secondary metabolism.
GigaScience. 7(12):giy127.

dos Santos G, Schroeder AJ, Goodman JL, Strelets VB, Crosby MA, Thurmond J, Emmert DB,
Gelbart WM, Consortium F. 2015. FlyBase: introduction of the *Drosophila melanogaster*
Release 6 reference genome assembly and large-scale migration of genome annotations.
Nucleic Acids Res. 43(D1):D690-D697.

Dunlop J, Alberti G. 2008. The affinities of mites and ticks: a review. *J Zool Syst Evol Res*.
46(1):1-18.

Dunlop J, Selden P. 1998. The early history and phylogeny of the chelicerates. In: Fortey RA,
Thomas RH, editors. Arthropod Relationships The Systematics Association Special
Volume Series. Dordrecht: Springer. p. 221-235.

Dunlop JA. 2010. Geological history and phylogeny of Chelicerata. *Arthropod Struct Dev*. 39(2-
3):124-142.

Dunlop JA, Lamsdell JC. 2017. Segmentation and tagmosis in Chelicerata. *Arthropod Struct*
Dev. 46(3):395-418.

Eddy SR. 2011. Accelerated profile HMM searches. *PLoS Comp Biol*. 7(10):e1002195.

Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high
throughput. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 32(5):1792-1797.

Eisenreich W, Bacher A, Arigoni D, Rohdich F. 2004. Biosynthesis of isoprenoids via the non-
mevalonate pathway. *Cellular and molecular life sciences : CMLS*. 61(12):1401-1426.

Emms DM, Kelly S. 2015a. OrthoFinder: solving fundamental biases in whole genome
comparisons dramatically improves orthogroup inference accuracy. *Genome biology*.
16(1):157.

Emms DM, Kelly S. 2015b. OrthoFinder: solving fundamental biases in whole genome
comparisons dramatically improves orthogroup inference accuracy. *Genome Biol*.
16(1):157.

Eriksson BJ, Fredman D, Steiner G, Schmid A. 2013. Characterisation and localisation of the
opsin protein repertoire in the brain and retinas of a spider and an onychophoran. *BMC*
Evol Biol. 13(1):186.

Evans GO. 1992. Principles of Acarology. Wallingford: CAB International.

Exner S. 1989. The physiology of the compound eyes of insects and crustaceans. Berlin,

Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag GmbH & Co. KG.

Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva A, Derks MF, Anvar SY, Agamennone V, Suring W, Smit S, van

Straalen NM, Roelofs D. 2016. Gene family evolution reflects adaptation to soil

environmental stressors in the genome of the collembolan *Orchesella cincta*. *Genome*

Biol Evol. 8(7):2106-2117.

Faddeeva-Vakhrusheva A, Kraaijeveld K, Derks MF, Anvar SY, Agamennone V, Suring W,

Kampfraath AA, Ellers J, Le Ngoc G, van Gestel CA. 2017. Coping with living in the

soil: the genome of the parthenogenetic springtail *Folsomia candida*. *BMC Genomics*.

18(1):493.

Finnegan DJ. 1989. Eukaryotic transposable elements and genome evolution. *Trends Genet*.

5:103-107.

Flot J-F, Hespeels B, Li X, Noel B, Arkhipova I, Danchin EG, Hejnol A, Henrissat B, Koszul R,

Aury J-M. 2013. Genomic evidence for ameiotic evolution in the bdelloid rotifer Adineta

vaga. *Nature*. 500(7463):453-457.

Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z, Wu S, Li W. 2012. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-generation

sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*. 28(23):3150-3152.

Gainett G, Ballesteros JA, Kanzler CR, Zehms JT, Zern JM, Aharon S, Gavish-Regev E, Sharma

PP. 2020. Systemic paralogy and function of retinal determination network homologs in

arachnids. *BMC Genomics*. 21:811.

Geib SM, Hall B, Derego T, Bremer FT, Cannoles K, Sim SB. 2018. Genome Annotation

Generator: a simple tool for generating and correcting WGS annotation tables for NCBI

submission. *GigaScience*. 7(4):giy018.

Gilbert HJ. 2010. The biochemistry and structural biology of plant cell wall deconstruction.

Plant Physiol 153(2):444-455.

Giribet G, Edgecombe GD. 2019. The phylogeny and evolutionary history of arthropods. *Curr*

Biol. 29(12):R592-R602.

Gladyshev EA, Meselson M, Arkhipova IR. 2008. Massive horizontal gene transfer in bdelloid

rotifers. *Science*. 320(5880):1210-1213.

Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M, Levin JZ, Thompson DA, Amit I, Adiconis X, Fan L,
Raychowdhury R, Zeng Q. 2011. Trinity: reconstructing a full-length transcriptome
without a genome from RNA-Seq data. *Nat Biotech*. 29(7):644.

Grbić M, Van Leeuwen T, Clark RM, Rombauts S, Rouzé P, Grbić V, Osborne EJ, Dermauw W,
Ngoc PCT, Ortego F. 2011. The genome of *Tetranychus urticae* reveals herbivorous pest
adaptations. *Nature*. 479(7374):487-492.

Guindon S, Dufayard J-F, Lefort V, Anisimova M, Hordijk W, Gascuel O. 2010. New
algorithms and methods to estimate maximum-likelihood phylogenies: assessing the
performance of PhyML 3.0. *Syst Biol*. 59(3):307-321.

Gulia-Nuss M, Nuss AB, Meyer JM, Sonenshine DE, Roe RM, Waterhouse RM, Sattelle DB, De
La Fuente J, Ribeiro JM, Megy K. 2016. Genomic insights into the *Ixodes scapularis* tick
vector of Lyme disease. *Nature communications*. 7(1):1-13.

Haas BJ, Papanicolaou A, Yassour M, Grabherr M, Blood PD, Bowden J, Couger MB, Eccles D,
Li B, Lieber M. 2013. De novo transcript sequence reconstruction from RNA-seq using
the Trinity platform for reference generation and analysis. *Nat Protoc*. 8(8):1494-1512.

Haas BJ, Salzberg SL, Zhu W, Pertea M, Allen JE, Orvis J, White O, Buell CR, Wortman JR.
2008. Automated eukaryotic gene structure annotation using EVidenceModeler and the
Program to Assemble Spliced Alignments. *Genome Biol*. 9(1):R7.

Haq MA. 1993. Symbiotic association of mites and microbes in cellulose degradation. *Soil Org*
Sustain. 4:81-85.

Hartmann K, Laumann M, Bergmann P, Heethoff M, Schmelzle S. 2016. Development of the
synganglion and morphology of the adult nervous system in the mite *Archegozetes*
longisetosus Aoki (Chelicerata, Actinotrichida, Oribatida). *J Morphol*. 277(4):537-548.

Harzsch S, Vilpoux K, Blackburn DC, Platchetzki D, Brown NL, Melzer R, Kempler KE,
Battelle BA. 2006. Evolution of arthropod visual systems: development of the eyes and
central visual pathways in the horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus* Linnaeus, 1758
(Chelicerata, Xiphosura). *Dev Dyn*. 235(10):2641-2655.

Havecker ER, Gao X, Voytas DF. 2004. The diversity of LTR retrotransposons. *Genome Biol*.
5(6):1-6.

Heethoff M. 2012. Regeneration of complex oil-gland secretions and its importance for chemical
defense in an oribatid mite. *J Chem Ecol*. 38(9):1116-1123.

Heethoff M, Bergmann P, Laumann M, Norton RA. 2013. The 20th anniversary of a model mite:
A review of current knowledge about *Archegozetes longisetosus* (Acari, Oribatida).
Acarologia. 53(4):353-368.

Heethoff M, Bergmann P, Norton RA. 2006. Karyology and sex determination of oribatid mites.
Acarologia. 46(1-2):127-131.

Heethoff M, Brückner A, Schmelzle S, Schubert M, Bräuer M, Meusinger R, Dötterl S, Norton
RA, Raspotnig G. 2018. Life as a fortress–structure, function, and adaptive values of
morphological and chemical defense in the oribatid mite *Euphthiracarus reticulatus*
(Actinotrichida). *BMC Zoology*. 3(1):7.

Heethoff M, Koerner L. 2007. Small but powerful: the oribatid mite *Archegozetes longisetosus*
Aoki (Acari, Oribatida) produces disproportionately high forces. *J Exp Biol*.
210(17):3036-3042.

Heethoff M, Koerner L, Norton RA, Raspotnig G. 2011a. Tasty but protected-first evidence of
chemical defense in oribatid mites. *J Chem Ecol*. 37:1037-1043.

Heethoff M, Laumann M, Bergmann P. 2007. Adding to the reproductive biology of the
parthenogenetic oribatid mite, *Archegozetes longisetosus* (Acari, Oribatida,
Trhypochthoniidae). *Turk J Zool*. 31:151-159.

Heethoff M, Laumann M, Weigmann G, Raspotnig G. 2011b. Integrative taxonomy: Combining
morphological, molecular and chemical data for species delineation in the
parthenogenetic *Trhypochthonius tectorum* complex (Acari, Oribatida,
Trhypochthoniidae). *Front Zool*. 8:2.

Heethoff M, Norton RA. 2009. A new use for synchrotron X-ray microtomography: three-
dimensional biomechanical modeling of chelicerate mouthparts and calculation of
theoretical bite forces. *Inver Biol*. 128(4):332-339.

Heethoff M, Norton RA, Raspotnig G. 2016. Once Again: Oribatid Mites and Skin Alkaloids in
Poison Frogs. *J Chem Ecol*. 42(8):841-844.

Heethoff M, Norton RA, Scheu S, Maraun M. 2009. Parthenogenesis in Oribatid Mites (Acari,
Oribatida): Evolution Without Sex. In: Schön I, Martens K, van Dijk P, editors. Lost Sex:
The Evolutionary Biology of Parthenogenesis. Dordrecht: Springer. p. 241-257.

Heethoff M, Rall BC. 2015. Reducible defence: chemical protection alters the dynamics of
predator–prey interactions. *Chemoecology*. 25(2):53-61.

Heethoff M, Raspotnig G. 2012. Expanding the 'enemy-free space' for oribatid mites: evidence for chemical defense of juvenile *Archegozetes longisetosus* against the rove beetle *Stenus juno*. *Exp Appl Acarol*. 56:93-97.

Heidemann K, Scheu S, Ruess L, Maraun M. 2011. Molecular detection of nematode predation and scavenging in oribatid mites: Laboratory and field experiments. *Soil Biol Biochem*. 43:229-236.

Heingård M, Turetzek N, Prpic N-M, Janssen R. 2019. FoxB, a new and highly conserved key factor in arthropod dorsal–ventral (DV) limb patterning. *EvoDevo*. 10(1):1-16.

Hoffmann A, Thimm T, Dröge M, Moore ER, Munch JC, Tebbe CC. 1998. Intergeneric transfer of conjugative and mobilizable plasmids harbored by *Escherichia coli* in the gut of the soil microarthropod *Folsomia candida* (Collembola). *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 64(7):2652-2659.

Holland P, Hogan B. 1988. Expression of homeo box genes during mouse development: a review. *Gene Devol*. 2(7):773-782.

Hoy MA, Waterhouse RM, Wu K, Estep AS, Ioannidis P, Palmer WJ, Pomerantz AF, Simao FA, Thomas J, Jiggins FM. 2016. Genome sequencing of the phytoseiid predatory mite *Metaseiulus occidentalis* reveals completely atomized Hox genes and superdynamic intron evolution. *Genome Biol Evol*. 8(6):1762-1775.

Hrycaj SM, Wellik DM. 2016. Hox genes and evolution. *F1000Research*. 5.

Huerta-Cepas J, Forslund K, Coelho LP, Szklarczyk D, Jensen LJ, Von Mering C, Bork P. 2017. Fast genome-wide functional annotation through orthology assignment by eggNOG-mapper. *Mol Biol Evol*. 34(8):2115-2122.

Hughes CL, Kaufman TC. 2002. Hox genes and the evolution of the arthropod body plan. *Evol Dev*. 4(6):459-499.

Jeyaprakash A, Hoy MA. 2009. First divergence time estimate of spiders, scorpions, mites and ticks (subphylum: Chelicerata) inferred from mitochondrial phylogeny. *Exp Appl Acarol*. 47(1):1-18.

Kanehisa M, Araki M, Goto S, Hattori M, Hirakawa M, Itoh M, Katayama T, Kawashima S, Okuda S, Tokimatsu T. 2007. KEGG for linking genomes to life and the environment. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 36(suppl_1):D480-D484.

Kanehisa M, Goto S. 2000. KEGG: kyoto encyclopedia of genes and genomes. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. 28(1):27-30.

Kanehisa M, Sato Y, Morishima K. 2016. BlastKOALA and GhostKOALA: KEGG tools for
functional characterization of genome and metagenome sequences. *J Mol Biol*.
428(4):726-731.

Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
improvements in performance and usability. *Mol Biol Evol*. 30(4):772-780.

Keilwagen J, Hartung F, Grau J. 2019. GeMoMa: Homology-based gene prediction utilizing
intron position conservation and RNA-seq data. Gene Prediction. Amsterdam: Springer.
p. 161-177.

Kitchen SA, Crowder CM, Poole AZ, Weis VM, Meyer E. 2015. De novo assembly and
characterization of four anthozoan (Cnidaria) transcriptomes. *G3*. 5(11):2441-2452.

Klimov PB, OConnor B. 2013. Is permanent parasitism reversible?—Critical evidence from
early evolution of house dust mites. *Syst Biol*. 62(3):411-423.

Klimov PB, OConnor BM, Chetverikov PE, Bolton SJ, Pepato AR, Mortazavi AL, Tolstikov
AV, Bauchan GR, Ochoa R. 2018. Comprehensive phylogeny of acariform mites
(Acariformes) provides insights on the origin of the four-legged mites (Eriophyoidea), a
long branch. *Mol Phylogenet Evol*. 119:105-117.

Knecht ZA, Silbering AF, Ni L, Klein M, Budelli G, Bell R, Abuin L, Ferrer AJ, Samuel AD,
Benton R. 2016. Distinct combinations of variant ionotropic glutamate receptors mediate
thermosensation and hygrosensation in *Drosophila*. *eLife*. 5:e17879.

Kocot KM, Citarella MR, Moroz LL, Halanych KM. 2013. PhyloTreePruner: a phylogenetic
tree-based approach for selection of orthologous sequences for phylogenomics. *Evol*
Bioinform Online. 9:429-435.

Kohany O, Gentles AJ, Hankus L, Jurka J. 2006. Annotation, submission and screening of
repetitive elements in Repbase: RepbaseSubmitter and Censor. *BMC Bioinformatics*.
7(1):1-7.

Koller LM, Wirth S, Raspotnig G. 2012. Geranial-rich oil gland secretions: a common
phenomenon in the Histiostomatidae (Acari, Astigmata)? *Int J Acarol*. 38(5):420-426.

Königsmann T, Turetzek N, Pechmann M, Prpic N-M. 2017. Expression and function of the zinc
finger transcription factor Sp6–9 in the spider *Parasteatoda tepidariorum*. *Dev Genes*
Evol. 227(6):389-400.

Koren S, Walenz BP, Berlin K, Miller JR, Bergman NH, Phillippy AM. 2017. Canu: scalable
and accurate long-read assembly via adaptive k-mer weighting and repeat separation.
Genome Res. 27(5):722-736.

Koyanagi M, Nagata T, Katoh K, Yamashita S, Tokunaga F. 2008. Molecular evolution of
arthropod color vision deduced from multiple opsin genes of jumping spiders. *J Mol*
Evol. 66(2):130-137.

Kück P, Meusemann K. 2010. FASconCAT: Convenient handling of data matrices. *Mol*
Phylogenet Evol. 56(3):1115-1118.

Kuwahara Y. 2004. Chemical ecology of astigmatid mites. In: Cardé RT, Millar JG, editors.
Advances in Insect Chemical Ecology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 76-
109.

Kuwahara Y, Ibi T, Nakatani Y, Ryouno A, Mori N, Sakata T, Okabe K, Tagami K, Kurosa K.
2001. Chemical ecology of astigmatid mites LIX. Neral, the alarm pheromone of
Schwiebea elongata (Banks)(Acari: Acaridae). *J Acarol Soc Japan*. 10:19-25.

Laetsch DR, Blaxter ML. 2017. BlobTools: Interrogation of genome assemblies.
F1000Research. 6(1287):1287.

Lanfear R, Frandsen PB, Wright AM, Senfeld T, Calcott B. 2016. PartitionFinder 2: new
methods for selecting partitioned models of evolution for molecular and morphological
phylogenetic analyses. *Mol Biol Evol*. 34(3):772-773.

Latgé JP. 2007. The cell wall: a carbohydrate armour for the fungal cell. *Mol Microbiol*.
66(2):279-290.

Lawrence JG. 1997. Selfish operons and speciation by gene transfer. *Trends Microbiol*. 5(9):355-
359.

Lefort V, Longueville J-E, Gascuel O. 2017. SMS: smart model selection in PhyML. *Mol Biol*
Evol. 34(9):2422-2424.

Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler transform.
Bioinformatics. 25(14):1754-1760.

Li W-N, Xue X-F. 2019. Mitochondrial genome reorganization provides insights into the

relationship between oribatid mites and astigmatid mites (Acari: Sarcoptiformes:

Oribatida). *Zoolo J Lin Soc*. 187(3):585-598.

Liana M, Witaliński W. 2005. Sperm structure and phylogeny of Astigmata. *J Morphol*.

265(3):318-324.

Liu W, Zhang R, Tian N, Xu X, Cao Y, Xian M, Liu H. 2015. Utilization of alkaline phosphatase

PhoA in the bioproduction of geraniol by metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli*.

Bioengineered. 6(5):288-293.

Lozano-Fernandez J, Tanner AR, Giacomelli M, Carton R, Vinther J, Edgecombe GD, Pisani D.

2019. Increasing species sampling in chelicerate genomic-scale datasets provides support

for monophyly of Acari and Arachnida. *Nature Comm*. 10(1):1-8.

Luxton M. 1972. Studies on oribatid mites of a Danish beech wood soil .1. Nutritional Biology.

Pedobiologia. 12(6):434-463.

Luxton M. 1979. Food and energy processing by oribatid mites. *Rev Ecol Biol Sol*. 16:103-111.

Luxton M. 1981. Studies on the oribatid mites of a Danish beech wood soil .7. Energy Budgets.

Pedobiologia. 22(2):77-111.

Luxton M. 1982. The bology of mites from beech woodland soil. *Pedobiologia*. 23(1):1-8.

Madge D. 1965. Further studies on the behaviour of *Belba geniculosa* Oudms. in relation to

various environmental stimuli. *Acarologia*. 7(4):744-757.

Maraun M, Erdmann G, Fischer BM, Pollierer MM, Norton RA, Schneider K, Scheu S. 2011.

Stable isotopes revisited: Their use and limits for oribatid mite trophic ecology. *Soil Biol

Biochem*. 43(5):877-882.

Maraun M, Heethoff M, Schneider K, Scheu S, Weigmann G, Cianciolo J, Thomas RH, Norton

RA. 2004. Molecular phylogeny of oribatid mites (Oribatida, Acari): evidence for

multiple radiations of parthenogenetic lineages. *Exp Appl Acarol*. 33(3):183-201.

Maraun M, Schatz H, Scheu S. 2007. Awesome or ordinary? Global diversity patterns of oribatid

mites. *Ecography*. 30(2):209-216.

Maraun M, Scheu S. 2000. The structure of oribatid mite communities (Acari, Oribatida):

Patterns, mechanisms and implications for future research. *Ecography*. 23(3):374-383.

Marçais G, Kingsford C. 2011. A fast, lock-free approach for efficient parallel counting of

occurrences of k-mers. *Bioinformatics*. 27(6):764-770.

Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.
EMBnet J. 17(1):10-12.

Mayer WE, Schuster LN, Bartelmes G, Dieterich C, Sommer RJ. 2011. Horizontal gene transfer
of microbial cellulases into nematode genomes is associated with functional assimilation
and gene turnover. *BMC Evol Biol.* 11(1):1-10.

McKenna DD, Scully ED, Pauchet Y, Hoover K, Kirsch R, Geib SM, Mitchell RF, Waterhouse
RM, Ahn S-J, Arsala D. 2016. Genome of the Asian longhorned beetle (*Anoplophora*
glabripennis), a globally significant invasive species, reveals key functional and
evolutionary innovations at the beetle–plant interface. *Genome Biol.* 17(1):1-18.

McKenna DD, Shin S, Ahrens D, Balke M, Beza-Beza C, Clarke DJ, Donath A, Escalona HE,
Friedrich F, Letsch H. 2019. The evolution and genomic basis of beetle diversity.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 116(49):24729-24737.

Mitreva M, Smant G, Helder J. 2009. Role of horizontal gene transfer in the evolution of plant
parasitism among nematodes. Horizontal Gene Transfer. Amsterdam: Springer. p. 517-
535.

Miziorko HM. 2011. Enzymes of the mevalonate pathway of isoprenoid biosynthesis. *Arch*
Biochem Biophys. 505(2):131-143.

Montell C. 2009. A taste of the *Drosophila* gustatory receptors. *Curr Opin Neurobiol.* 19(4):345-
353.

Morita A, Mori N, Nishida R, Hirai N, Kuwahara Y. 2004. Neral biosynthesis via the
mevalonate pathway, evidenced by D-glucose-1-13C feeding in *Carpoglyphus lactis* and
13C incorporation into other opisthonotal gland exudates. *J Pest Sci.* 29:27-32.

Moriya Y, Itoh M, Okuda S, Yoshizawa AC, Kanehisa M. 2007. KAAS: an automatic genome
annotation and pathway reconstruction server. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 35(suppl_2):W182-
W185.

Muller HJ. 1964. The relation of recombination to mutaional advance. *Mutation Res* 106:2-9.

Nagata T, Koyanagi M, Tsukamoto H, Terakita A. 2010. Identification and characterization of a
protostome homologue of peropsin from a jumping spider. *J Comp Physiol A.* 196(1):51.

Nagy LG, Merényi Z, Hegedüs B, Bálint B. 2020. Novel phylogenetic methods are needed for
understanding gene function in the era of mega-scale genome sequencing. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. 48(5):2209-2219.

Ngoc PCT, Greenhalgh R, Dermauw W, Rombauts S, Bajda S, Zhurov V, Grbić M, Van de Peer
Y, Van Leeuwen T, Rouze P. 2016. Complex evolutionary dynamics of massively
expanded chemosensory receptor families in an extreme generalist chelicerate herbivore.
Genome Biol Evol. 8(11):3323-3339.

Nguyen L-T, Schmidt HA, Von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2015. IQ-TREE: a fast and effective
stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies. *Mol Biol Evol*.
32(1):268-274.

Niimura Y, Nei M. 2005. Evolutionary dynamics of olfactory receptor genes in fishes and
tetrapods. *PNAS*. 102(17):6039-6044.

Noge K, Kato M, Iguchi T, Mori N, Nishida R, Kuwahara Y. 2005. Biosynthesis of neral in
Carpoglyphus lactis (Acari: Carpoglyphidae) and detection of its key enzyme, geraniol
dehydrogenase, by electrophoresis. *J Acarol Soc Japan*. 14:75-81.

Noge K, Kato M, Mori N, Kataoka M, Tanaka C, Yamasue Y, Nishida R, Kuwahara Y. 2008.
Geraniol dehydrogenase, the key enzyme in biosynthesis of the alarm pheromone, from
the astigmatid mite *Carpoglyphus lactis* (Acari: Carpoglyphidae). *The FEBS journal*.
275(11):2807-2817.

Norton RA. 1994. Evolutionary aspects of oribatid mite life histories and consequences for the
origin of the Astigmata. In: Houck MA, editor. Mites: Ecological and Evolutionary
Analyses of Life-History Patterns. Chapman & Hall ed. New York: Chapman & Hall. p.
99-135.

Norton RA. 1998. Morphological evidence for the evolutionary origin of Astigmata (Acari :
Acariformes). *Exp Appl Acarol*. 22(10):559-594.

Morales-Malacara JB, Behan-Pelletier V, Ueckermann E, Perez TM, Estrada-Venegas EG, Badii
M, editors. Holistic acarology and ultimate causes: examples from the oribatid mites.
Acarology XI: Proceedings of the International Congress; 2007; Mexico. Sociedad
Latinoamericana de Acarologia.

Norton RA, Franklin E. 2018. *Paraquanothrus* n. gen. from freshwater rock pools in the USA,
with new diagnoses of Aquanothrus, Aquanothrinae, and Ameronothridae (Acari,
Oribatida). *Acarologia*. 58(3):557-627.

Norton RA, Fuangarworn M. 2015. Nanohystricidae n. fam., an unusual, plesiomorphic
enarthronote mite family endemic to New Zealand (Acari, Oribatida). *Zootaxa*.
4027(2):151-204.

Norton RA, Kethley JB, Johnston DE, O'Connor BM. 1993. Phylogenetic perspectives on
genetic systems and reproductive modes of mites. In: Wrensch D, Ebbert M, editors.
Evolution and Diversity of Sex Ratio in Insects and Mites. London: Chapman & Hall. p.
8-99.

Norton RA, Palmer SC. 1991. The distribution, mechanisms and evolutionary significance of
parthenogenesis in oribatid mites. In: Schuster R, Murphy PW, editors. The Acari -
Reproduction, Development and Life-History Strategies. London: Chapman & Hall. p.
107-136.

Nuzhdin SV, Petrov DA. 2003. Transposable elements in clonal lineages: lethal hangover from
sex. *Biol J Lin Soc*. 79(1):33-41.

Oldfield E, Lin FY. 2012. Terpene biosynthesis: modularity rules. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl*.
51(5):1124-1137.

Oliver Jr JH. 1983. Chromosomes, genetic variance and reproductive strategies among mites and
ticks. *Bull Entomol Soc Am*. 29(2):8-17.

Oswald M, Fischer M, Dirninger N, Karst F. 2007. Monoterpenoid biosynthesis in
Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *FEMS Yeast Res* 7(3):413-421.

Oxley PR, Ji L, Fetter-Pruneda I, McKenzie SK, Li C, Hu H, Zhang G, Kronauer DJ. 2014. The
genome of the clonal raider ant *Cerapachys biroi*. *Curr Biol*. 24(4):451-458.

Pace RM, Grbić M, Nagy LM. 2016. Composition and genomic organization of arthropod Hox
clusters. *EvoDevo*. 7(1):11.

Pachl P, Domes K, Schulz G, Norton RA, Scheu S, Schaefer I, Maraun M. 2012. Convergent
evolution of defense mechanisms in oribatid mites (Acari, Oribatida) shows no "ghosts of
predation past". *Mol Phylogenet Evol*. 65(2):412-420.

Palmer J, Stajich J. 2017. Funannotate: eukaryotic genome annotation pipeline.
https://funannotate.readthedocs.io/en/latest/.

Palmer M, Bantle J, Guo X, Fargoxy1 WS. 1994. Genome size and organization in the ixodid
tick *Amblyomma americanum* (L.). *Insect Mol Biol*. 3(1):57-62.

1819 Palmer SC, Norton RA. 1992. Genetic diversity in thelytokous oribatid mites (Acari;
1820   Acariformes: Desmonomata). *Biochem Syst Ecol*. 20(3):219-231.

1821 Panfilio KA, Jentzsch IMV, Benoit JB, Erezyilmaz D, Suzuki Y, Colella S, Robertson HM,
1822   Poelchau MF, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P. 2019. Molecular evolutionary trends and
1823   feeding ecology diversification in the Hemiptera, anchored by the milkweed bug genome.
1824   *Genome Biol*. 20(1):64.

1825 Patten W. 1887. Eyes of molluscs and arthropods. *J Morphol*. 1(1):67-92.

1826 Pepato A, Klimov P. 2015. Origin and higher-level diversification of acariform mites–evidence
1827   from nuclear ribosomal genes, extensive taxon sampling, and secondary structure
1828   alignment. *BMC Evol Biol*. 15(1):178.

1829 Petersen M, Armisén D, Gibbs RA, Hering L, Khila A, Mayer G, Richards S, Niehuis O, Misof
1830   B. 2019. Diversity and evolution of the transposable element repertoire in arthropods
1831   with particular reference to insects. *BMC Evol Biol*. 19(1):11.

1832 Pimentel H, Bray NL, Puente S, Melsted P, Pachter L. 2017. Differential analysis of RNA-seq
1833   incorporating quantification uncertainty. *Nature Meth* 14(7):687.

1834 Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. 2010. FastTree 2 – approximately Maximum-Likelihood trees
1835   for large alignments. *PLoS One*. 5(3):e9490.

1836 Pruitt KD, Tatusova T, Maglott DR. 2005. NCBI Reference Sequence (RefSeq): a curated non-
1837   redundant sequence database of genomes, transcripts and proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res*.
1838   33(suppl_1):D501-D504.

1839 Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
1840   features. *Bioinformatics*. 26(6):841-842.

1841 R_Core_Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
1842   for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2019.

1843 Raspotnig G. 2006. Chemical alarm and defence in the oribatid mite *Collohmannia gigantea*
1844   (Acari: Oribatida). *Exp Appl Acarol*. 39(3):177-194.

1845 Sabelis MW, Bruin J, editors. Oil gland secretions in Oribatida (Acari). Trends in Acarology;
1846   2009; Dordrecht. Springer.

1847 Raspotnig G, Kaiser R, Stabentheiner E, Leis HJ. 2008. Chrysomelidial in the Opisthonotal
1848   Glands of the Oribatid Mite, *Oribotritia berlesei*. *J Chem Ecol*. 34(8):1081-1088.

Raspotnig G, Norton RA, Heethoff M. 2011. Oribatid mites and skin alkaloids in poison frogs.
Biol Lett. 7:555-556.

Raspotnig G, Schuster R, Krisper G. 2004. Citral in oil gland secretions of Oribatida (Acari): a
key component for phylogenetic analyses. *Abh Ber Naturkundemus Görlitz*. 76:43-50.

Rawlings ND, Barrett AJ, Bateman A. 2010. MEROPS: the peptidase database. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. 38(suppl_1):D227-D233.

Regier JC, Shultz JW, Zwick A, Hussey A, Ball B, Wetzer R, Martin JW, Cunningham CW.
2010. Arthropod relationships revealed by phylogenomic analysis of nuclear protein-
coding sequences. *Nature*. 463(7284):1079-1083.

Rider SD, Morgan MS, Arlian LG. 2015. Draft genome of the scabies mite. *Parasite Vectors*.
8(1):1-14.

Riha G. 1951. Zur Ökologie der Oribatiden in Kalksteinböden. *Zoolo Jahrb*. 80:407-450.

Robertson HM, Wanner KW. 2006. The chemoreceptor superfamily in the honey bee, *Apis*
mellifera: expansion of the odorant, but not gustatory, receptor family. *Genome Res*.
16(11):1395-1403.

Robertson HM, Warr CG, Carlson JR. 2003. Molecular evolution of the insect chemoreceptor
gene superfamily in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PNAS*. 100(suppl 2):14537-14542.

Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Winckler W, Guttman M, Lander ES, Getz G, Mesirov JP.
2011. Integrative genomics viewer. *Nat Biotechnol*. 29(1):24-26.

Rognes T, Flouri T, Nichols B, Quince C, Mahé F. 2016. VSEARCH: a versatile open source
tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ*. 4:e2584.

Rytz R, Croset V, Benton R. 2013. Ionotropic receptors (IRs): chemosensory ionotropic
glutamate receptors in *Drosophila* and beyond. *Insect Biochem Mol Biol*. 43(9):888-897.

Sakata T. 1997. Natural Chemistry of Mite Secretions. [Kyoto, Japan]: Kyoto University.

Sakata T, Norton RA. 2001. Opisthonotal gland chemistry of early-derivative oribatid mites
(Acari) and its relevance to systematic relationships of Astigmata. *Int J Acarol*.
27(4):281-292.

Sakata T, Norton RA. 2003. Opisthonotal gland chemistry of a middle-derivative oribatid mite,
Archegozetes longisetosus (Acari : Trhypochthoniidae). *Int J Acarol*. 29(4):345-350.

Sakata T, Tagami K, Kuwahara Y. 1995. Chemical ecology of oribatid mites. I. Oil gland
components of *Hydronothrus crispus* Aoki. *J Acarol Soc Japan*. 4(2):69-75.

Samadi L, Schmid A, Eriksson BJ. 2015. Differential expression of retinal determination genes in the principal and secondary eyes of *Cupiennius salei* Keyserling (1877). *EvoDevo*. 6(1):16.

Sánchez-Gracia A, Vieira F, Rozas J. 2009. Molecular evolution of the major chemosensory gene families in insects. *Heredity*. 103(3):208-216.

Sánchez-Gracia A, Vieira FG, Almeida FC, Rozas J. 2011. Comparative genomics of the major chemosensory gene families in Arthropods. *eLS*.https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470015902.a9780470022848.

Santos VT, Ribeiro L, Fraga A, de Barros CM, Campos E, Moraes J, Fontenele MR, Araujo HM, Feitosa NM, Logullo C. 2013. The embryogenesis of the tick *Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus*: the establishment of a new chelicerate model system. *Genesis*. 51(12):803-818.

Saporito RA, Donnelly MA, Norton RA, Garraffo HM, Spande TF, Daly JW. 2007. Oribatid mites as a major dietary source for alkaloids in poison frogs. *PNAS*. 104(21):8885-8890.

Saporito RA, Spande TF, Garraffo HM, Donnelly MA. 2009. Arthropod alkaloids in poison frogs: A review of the dietary hypothesis. *Heterocycles*. 79:277-297.

Schaefer I, Norton RA, Scheu S, Maraun M. 2010. Arthropod colonization of land - Linking molecules and fossils in oribatid mites (Acari, Oribatida). *Mol Phylogenet Evol*. 57:113-121.

Schmelzle S, Blüthgen N. 2019. Under pressure: force resistance measurements in box mites (Actinotrichida, Oribatida). *Front Zool*. 16(1):24.

Schneider K, Maraun M. 2005. Feeding preferences among dark pigmented fungal taxa ("Dematiacea") indicate limited trophic niche differentiation of oribatid mites (Oribatida, Acari). *Pedobiologia*. 49(1):61-67.

Schneider K, Migge S, Norton RA, Scheu S, Langel R, Reineking A, Maraun M. 2004a. Trophic niche differentiation in soil microarthropods (Oribatida, Acari): evidence from stable isotope ratios (N-15/N-14). *Soil Biol Biochem*. 36(11):1769-1774.

Schneider K, Renker C, Scheu S, Maraun M. 2004b. Feeding biology of oribatid mites: a minireview. *Phytophaga*. 14:247-256.

Schomburg C, Turetzek N, Schacht MI, Schneider J, Kirfel P, Prpic N-M, Posnien N. 2015.

Molecular characterization and embryonic origin of the eyes in the common house spider

Parasteatoda tepidariorum. *EvoDevo*. 6(1):1-14.

Schön I, Martens K, van Dijk P. 2009. Lost Sex - The Evolutionary Biology of Parthenogenesis.

Dordrecht: Springer.

Schwager EE, Schönauer A, Leite DJ, Sharma PP, McGregor AP. 2015. Chelicerata.

Amsterdam: Springer.

Schwager EE, Sharma PP, Clarke T, Leite DJ, Wierschin T, Pechmann M, Akiyama-Oda Y,

Esposito L, Bechsgaard J, Bilde T. 2017. The house spider genome reveals an ancient

whole-genome duplication during arachnid evolution. *BMC Biology*. 15(1):1-27.

Senthilan PR, Grebler R, Reinhard N, Rieger D, Helfrich-Förster C. 2019. Role of rhodopsins as

circadian photoreceptors in the *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Biology*. 8(1):6.

Senthilan PR, Helfrich-Förster C. 2016. Rhodopsin 7–the unusual rhodopsin in *Drosophila*.

PeerJ. 4:e2427.

Sharma PP, Schwager EE, Extavour CG, Giribet G. 2012. Hox gene expression in the

harvestman *Phalangium opilio* reveals divergent patterning of the chelicerate

opisthosoma. *Evol Dev*. 14(5):450-463.

Sharma PP, Tarazona OA, Lopez DH, Schwager EE, Cohn MJ, Wheeler WC, Extavour CG.

2015. A conserved genetic mechanism specifies deutocerebral appendage identity in

insects and arachnids. *Proc R Soc Lond Biol*. 282(1808):20150698.

Shen WL, Kwon Y, Adegbola AA, Luo J, Chess A, Montell C. 2011. Function of rhodopsin in

temperature discrimination in *Drosophila*. *Science*. 331(6022):1333-1336.

Shimano S, Sakata T, Mizutani Y, Kuwahara Y, Aoki J-i. 2002. Geranial: the alarm pheromone

in the nymphal stage of the oribatid mite, *Nothrus palustris*. *J Chem Ecol*. 28(9):1831-

1837.

Shimizu N, Sakata D, Schmelz EA, Mori N, Kuwahara Y. 2017. Biosynthetic pathway of

aliphatic formates via a Baeyer-Villiger oxidation in mechanism present in astigmatid

mites. *PNAS*. 114(10):2616-2621.

Shingate P, Ravi V, Prasad A, Tay B-H, Garg KM, Chattopadhyay B, Yap L-M, Rheindt FE,

Venkatesh B. 2020. Chromosome-level assembly of the horseshoe crab genome provides

insights into its genome evolution. *Nature Comm*. 11(1):1-13.

Shultz JW. 2007. A phylogenetic analysis of the arachnid orders based on morphological
characters. *Zoolo J Lin Soc*. 150(2):221-265.

Siepel A, Bejerano G, Pedersen JS, Hinrichs AS, Hou M, Rosenbloom K, Clawson H, Spieth J,
Hillier LW, Richards S. 2005. Evolutionarily conserved elements in vertebrate, insect,
worm, and yeast genomes. *Genome Res* 15(8):1034-1050.

Siepel H, de Ruiter-Dijkman EM. 1993. Feeding guilds of oribatid mites based on their
carbohydrase activities. *Soil Biol Biochem*. 25(11):1491-1497.

Simão FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, Kriventseva EV, Zdobnov EM. 2015. BUSCO:
assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs.
Bioinformatics. 31(19):3210-3212.

Simpson JT. 2014. Exploring genome characteristics and sequence quality without a reference.
Bioinformatics. 30(9):1228-1235.

RepeatMasker Open-3.0. 1996-2010. [accessed]. http://www.repeatmasker.org.

Smit AF, Hubley R. 2008. RepeatModeler Open-1.0.

Smrž J. 1992. Some adaptive features in the microanatomy of moss-dwelling oribatid mites
(Acari: Oribatida) with respect to their ontogenetical development. *Pedobiologia*.
36(5):306-320.

Smrž J. 2000. A modified test for chitinase and cellulase activity in soil mites. *Pedobiologia*.
44(2):186-189.

Smrž J, Čatská V. 2010. Mycophagous mites and their internal associated bacteria cooperate to
digest chitin in soil. *Symbiosis*. 52(1):33-40.

Smrž J, Norton RA. 2004. Food selection and internal processing in *Archegozetes longisetosus*
(Acari : Oribatida). *Pedobiologia*. 48(2):111-120.

Stefaniak O. 1976. The microflora of the alimentary canal of *Achiptera coleoptrata* (Acarina,
Oribatei). *Pedobiologia*. 16(185-194).

Stefaniak O. 1981. The effect of fungal diet on the development of *Oppia nitens* (Acari, Oribatei)
and on the microflora of its alimentary tract. *Pedobiologia*. 21:202-210.

Sun H, Ding J, Piednoël M, Schneeberger K. 2018. findGSE: estimating genome size variation
within human and Arabidopsis using k-mer frequencies. *Bioinformatics*. 34(4):550-557.

Suzuki S, Kakuta M, Ishida T, Akiyama Y. 2014. GHOSTX: an improved sequence homology search algorithm using a query suffix array and a database suffix array. *PloS One*. 9(8):e103833.

Telford MJ, Thomas RH. 1998. Expression of homeobox genes shows chelicerate arthropods retain their deutocerebral segment. *PNAS*. 95(18):10671-10675.

Ter-Hovhannisyan V, Lomsadze A, Chernoff YO, Borodovsky M. 2008. Gene prediction in novel fungal genomes using an ab initio algorithm with unsupervised training. *Genome Res*. 18(12):1979-1990.

Thiel T, Brechtel A, Brückner A, Heethoff M, Drossel B. 2018. The effect of reservoir-based chemical defense on predator-prey dynamics. *Theo Ecol*. 12(3):365-378.

Thomas GW, Dohmen E, Hughes DS, Murali SC, Poelchau M, Glastad K, Anstead CA, Ayoub NA, Batterham P, Bellair M. 2020. Gene content evolution in the arthropods. *Genome Biol* 21(1):1-14.

Bernini F, Nannelli R, Nuzzaci G, de Lillo E, editors. Mites as models in development and genetics. Acarid Phylogeny and Evolution: Adaptation in Mites and Ticks: Proceedings of the IV Symposium of the European Association of Acarologists; 2002; Dordrecht. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Thorpe P, Escudero-Martinez CM, Cock PJ, Eves-van den Akker S, Bos JI. 2018. Shared transcriptional control and disparate gain and loss of aphid parasitism genes. *Genome Biol Evol*. 10(10):2716-2733.

Trägårdh I. 1933. Methods of automatic collecting for studying the fauna of the soil. *Bull Entomol Res*. 24(2):203-214.

Trapp SC, Croteau RB. 2001. Genomic organization of plant terpene synthases and molecular evolutionary implications. *Genetics*. 158(2):811-832.

Van Dam MH, Trautwein M, Spicer GS, Esposito L. 2019. Advancing mite phylogenomics: Designing ultraconserved elements for Acari phylogeny. *Mol Ecol Res*. 19(2):465-475.

van der Hammen L. 1970. La segmentation primitive des Acariens. *Acarologia*. 12(1):3-10.

Van Zee JP, Geraci N, Guerrero F, Wikel S, Stuart J, Nene V, Hill C. 2007. Tick genomics: the Ixodes genome project and beyond. *Int J Parasitol*. 37(12):1297-1305.

Vieira FG, Rozas J. 2011. Comparative genomics of the odorant-binding and chemosensory
protein gene families across the Arthropoda: origin and evolutionary history of the
chemosensory system. *Genome Biol Evol*. 3:476-490.

Vurture GW, Sedlazeck FJ, Nattestad M, Underwood CJ, Fang H, Gurtowski J, Schatz MC.
2017. GenomeScope: fast reference-free genome profiling from short reads.
Bioinformatics. 33(14):2202-2204.

Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, Cuomo CA, Zeng Q,
Wortman J, Young SK. 2014. Pilon: an integrated tool for comprehensive microbial
variant detection and genome assembly improvement. *PloS One*. 9(11):e112963.

Walter DE, Proctor HC. 1998. Feeding behaviour and phylogeny: observations on early
derivative Acari. *Exp Appl Acarol*. 22(1):39-50.

Walter DE, Proctor HC. 1999. Mites: ecology, evolution, and behaviour. Amsterdam: Springer
Netherlands.

Waterston RH, Lindblad-Toh K, Birney E, Rogers J, Abril JF, Agarwal P, Agarwala R,
Ainscough R, Alexandersson M, An P. 2002. Initial sequencing and comparative analysis
of the mouse genome. *Nature*. 420(6915):520-562.

Weinstein SB, Kuris AM. 2016. Independent origins of parasitism in Animalia. *Biol Lett*.
12(7):20160324.

Woodring J. 1966. Color phototactic responses of an eyeless oribatid mite. *Acarologia*. 8(2):382-
388.

Wrensch DL, Kethley JB, Norton RA. 1994. Cytogenetics of holokinetic chromosomes and
inverted meiosis: keys to the evolutionary success of mites, with generalizations on
eukaryotes. In: Houck MA, editor. Mites: Ecological and Evolutionary Analyses of Life-
History Patterns. New York: Chapman & Hall. p. 282-343.

Wu C, Jordan MD, Newcomb RD, Gemmell NJ, Bank S, Meusemann K, Dearden PK, Duncan
EJ, Grosser S, Rutherford K. 2017. Analysis of the genome of the New Zealand giant
collembolan (*Holacanthella duospinosa*) sheds light on hexapod evolution. *BMC*
Genomics. 18(1):795.

Wybouw N, Pauchet Y, Heckel DG, Van Leeuwen T. 2016. Horizontal gene transfer contributes
to the evolution of arthropod herbivory. *Genome Biol Evol*. 8(6):1785-1801.

Wybouw N, Van Leeuwen T, Dermauw W. 2018. A massive incorporation of microbial genes into the genome of *Tetranychus urticae*, a polyphagous arthropod herbivore. *Insect Mol Biol*. 27(3):333-351.

Yu G, Wang L-G, Han Y, He Q-Y. 2012. clusterProfiler: an R package for comparing biological themes among gene clusters. *Omics* 16(5):284-287.

Yunker C, Peter T, Norval R, Sonenshine D, Burridge M, Butler J. 1992. Olfactory responses of adult *Amblyomma hebraeum* and *A. variegatum* (Acari: Ixodiae) to attractant chemicals in laboratory tests. *Exp Appl Acarol*. 13(4):295-301.

Zachvatkin AA. 1941. Tyroglyphoidae (Acari). Moscow: Zoological Institute of the Acaemy of Science of the U.S.S.R.

Zhang C, Rabiee M, Sayyari E, Mirarab S. 2018. ASTRAL-III: polynomial time species tree reconstruction from partially resolved gene trees. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 19(6):153.

Zhou J, Wang C, Yoon S-H, Jang H-J, Choi E-S, Kim S-W. 2014. Engineering *Escherichia coli* for selective geraniol production with minimized endogenous dehydrogenation. *J Biotech*. 169:42-50.

Zinkler D. 1971. Vergleichende Untersuchungen zum Wirkungsspektrum der Carbohydrasen laubstreubewohnender Oribatiden. *Zool Ges Verh*.149-153.