Niche partitioning facilitates coexistence of closely related gut bacteria

Silvia Brochet[a], Andrew Quinn[a], Ruben A.T. Mars[b], Nicolas Neuschwander[a], Uwe Sauer[b], Philipp Engel[a]

[a]Department of Fundamental Microbiology, University of Lausanne, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

[b]Institute of Molecular Systems Biology, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

Correspondence:

Prof. Philipp Engel

Department of Fundamental Microbiology

University of Lausanne, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Tel.: +41 (0)21 692 56 12

e-mail: philipp.engel@unil.ch

Abstract

Ecological processes underlying bacterial coexistence in the gut are not well understood.

Here, we disentangled the effect of the host and the diet on the coexistence of four closely

related *Lactobacillus* species colonizing the honey bee gut. We serially passaged the four

species through gnotobiotic bees and in liquid cultures in the presence of either pollen

(bee diet) or simple sugars. Although the four species engaged in negative interactions,

they were able to stably coexist, both *in vivo* and *in vitro*. However, coexistence was only

possible in the presence of pollen, and not in simple sugars, independent of the

environment. Using metatranscriptomics and metabolomics, we found that the four

species utilize different pollen-derived carbohydrate substrates indicating resource

partitioning as the basis of coexistence. Our results show that despite longstanding host

association, gut bacterial interactions can be recapitulated *in vitro* providing insights

about bacterial coexistence when combined with *in vivo* experiments.

Introduction

Gut microbial communities are usually dominated by few bacterial phyla and families, but contain a high extent of species- and strain-level diversity[1,2]. According to the competition-relatedness hypothesis, the more closely two organisms are related the more likely it is that they will compete and exclude each other due to overlapping niches[3]. Therefore, it has remained unclear how closely related microbes can be maintained in the gut, or in any other natural microbial ecosystem.

The high concentration of nutrients and the structured environment of the gut may allow functionally redundant species or strains to coexist[4]. The host may even select for such redundancy, as it can increase the stability and resilience of the microbiota against environmental disturbance[4,5]. Phage predation can also contribute to the maintenance of diversity by imposing kill-the-winner dynamics and hindering the outgrowth of a single dominant strain[6]. Another possibility is that closely related species, and even strains of the same species, have functionally diverged from each other and occupy distinct ecological niches[7,8]. The genomic flexibility of bacteria facilitates adaptation to different nutrients, provided in the diet or by the host[9,10], or result from interactions with other bacteria[11], such as cross-feeding[12] or cooperative glycan breakdown[13].

Few experimental studies have investigated the coexistence of bacteria in host-associated microbial communities. The high diversity in these ecosystems and the resistance of many host-associated bacteria to experimental manipulations introduce considerable challenges for such approaches[14,15]. Moreover, community dynamics observed *in vivo* can be difficult to reproduce under laboratory conditions, as the host presents a highly specialized nutritional and spatial environment. Thus, there is a need

for *in vitro* models that can reproduce ecological interactions observed *in vivo*, from

simple co-culturing setups[16] to sophisticated 'organoids-on-a-chip' systems [17,18].

The gut microbiota of the Western honey bee (*Apis mellifera*) is composed of a few

deep-branching phylogenetic lineages (phylotypes) belonging to the Firmicutes,

Actinobacteria and Proteobacteria phyla[19,20]. Most of these lineages are composed of

several closely related sequence-discrete populations, hereafter referred to as species,

each of which contains further diversity at the strain-level[21–24]. Microbiota-depleted bees

can be generated and experimentally colonized with synthetic communities of different

strains. Moreover, most community members can be cultured in pollen, which is the

major dietary source of honey bees[25]. This experimental tractability offers an excellent

opportunity to probe the coexistence of bacteria in the gut of their native host and in

controlled laboratory cultures using similar nutritional conditions.

One of the most abundant and diverse phylotype of the honey bee gut microbiota

is *Lactobacillus* Firm5[22]. This phylotype consists of facultative anaerobes that ferment

sugars into organic acids and utilize various pollen-derived glycosylated plant

compounds, such as flavonoids[25]. *Lactobacillus* Firm5 is specific to social bees but has

diverged into many different species of which four are specifically associated with the

Western honey bee, *Apis mellifera*: *Lactobacillus apis* (Lapi), *Lactobacillus*

helsingborgensis (Lhel), *Lactobacillus melliventris* (Lmel) and *Lactobacillus kullabergensis*

(Lkul). The four species are consistently present in the gut of individual honey bees

suggesting that they can share the available niches and stably coexist despite their

phylogenetic relatedness. Genomic analysis has revealed that these species share <85%

pairwise average nucleotide identities (gANI) and exhibit high levels of genomic variation

in terms of carbohydrate metabolism[22,24]. However, whether the coexistence is facilitated

by adaptation to different nutritional niches, and to what extent the host environment,

the diet, or the interactions with other community members matter is currently

unknown.

Here, we tested under which conditions the four *Lactobacillus* Firm5 species can

coexist and investigated the underlying molecular mechanism. We serially passaged the

four species *in vivo* through gnotobiotic bees and *in vitro* in liquid cultures, and applied

RNA sequencing and metabolomics analysis. Our results show that the coexistence of the

four species is mediated by the partitioning of nutrients derived from the pollen diet of

bees and is largely independent from the presence of the host or other community

members.

Results

The coexistence of four related *Lactobacillus* species in the honey bee gut depends

on the host diet

All experiments in this study were conducted with four bacterial isolates

representing the four *Lactobacillus* Firm5 species (Lapi, Lhel, Lmel, and Lkul) associated

with the Western honey bee. We first tested if the four species can establish in the gut of

gnotobiotic bees under two different dietary conditions. To this end, we colonized

microbiota-depleted bees with each of the four species, alone or together, and fed bees

either sterilized sugar water (SW) or sterilized sugar water and pollen (SW+PG). Five

days post-colonization we assessed the bacterial loads in the gut by counting CFUs

(**Figure 1A, Supplementary Dataset 1**). When mono-colonized, the four species

established in the gut of microbiota-depleted bees independent of the dietary treatment

(**Figure 1A**). In the SW treatment, the colonization levels were generally lower than in

the SW+PG treatment (**Figure 1A**, ANOVA q-value < 0.01) confirming previous results

that pollen increases the total bacterial load in the gut[26]. There was no statistically

significant difference between the total bacterial loads of the mono-colonizations and the

co-colonizations in either dietary treatment, with the exception of the mono-colonization

with Lkul, which showed higher loads than the co-colonizations in SW (**Figure 1A**,

ANOVA q-value < 0.01). Consequently, the sum of the bacterial loads of the mono-

colonizations exceeded the total bacterial load of the co-colonizations in both dietary

treatments, suggesting that the species engage in negative interactions when colonizing

the honey bee gut together.

To test if the four species can stably coexist in the bee gut, we serially passaged

the community seven times in microbiota-depleted bees under both dietary conditions

(SW and SW+PG). After each passage (i.e. after 5 days of colonization), we used amplicon

sequencing of a discriminatory housekeeping gene fragment (see Materials and methods)

in combination with CFU counting to determine the absolute abundance of each species

in the community. We observed clear differences between the two dietary conditions in

the ability of the four species to coexist across the passages (**Figure 1B-C,**

Supplementary Dataset 2). In the SW treatment, all species were initially detectable in

most samples (P1, **Figure 1B**). However, three species (Lapi, Lmel and Lkul) steadily

decreased in abundance in the subsequent passages resulting in a rapid dominance of

Lhel (**Figure 1B**). Lmel and Lkul reached the detection limit and Lapi decreased to around

10^4 bacteria/gut by passage five (P5, **Figure 1B**). Only Lhel was stably maintained across

all seven passages and was present at around 1000x higher abundance than Lapi at the

end of the experiment ($\sim 10^7$ bacteria/gut, **Figure 1B**). In the contrary, in the SW+PG

treatment, all four species were detectable in all passages at around 10^6 to 10^8

bacteria/gut, and displayed a highly stable abundance profile over time (**Figure 1C**).

In summary, these findings show that the four species can stably coexist *in vivo*

when bees are fed pollen, but not when they are only fed sugar water. This is consistent

with the idea that pollen facilitates niche partitioning in the honey bee gut by offering

competing species different ecological niches facilitating their coexistence.

***In vitro* co-culture experiments recapitulate the nutrient-dependent coexistence of**

the four *Lactobacillus* species

We next tested if the four species can also coexist *in vitro*, outside of the host

environment, under different nutrient conditions. To this end, we cultured the species

alone or together in minimal medium supplemented with either glucose (G), pollen

extract (PE), or entire pollen grains (PG). All four species were able to grow when

cultured alone under the three nutrient conditions (**Supplementary Figure 1,**

Supplementary Dataset 1). Growth yields of Lhel, Lkul, and the co-culture were slightly

lower in PE and PG than in G, and Lmel showed lower growth yields than some of the

other species in PE and G (**Supplementary Figure 1,** ANOVA q-value < 0.01). As *in vivo*,

the total bacterial loads of the co-cultures were not consistently different from those of

the mono-cultures (**Supplementary Figure 1**), suggesting that the four species have

overlapping metabolic niches and engage in negative interactions with each other.

We then serially passaged the co-cultures 21 times under the three different

nutrient conditions by transferring an aliquot after 24 h of growth into fresh culture

medium (1:20). The absolute abundance of each strain was determined after every other

passage by combining amplicon sequencing with qPCR (see Materials and methods). As

for the *in vivo* experiment, we observed clear differences in the growth dynamics of the

four species, both over time and between the glucose and the pollen culture conditions

(**Figure 2, Supplementary Dataset 2**). In the presence of glucose, three of the four

species (Lhel, Lmel and Lkul) steadily decreased in abundance over time (**Figure 2A**),

with two of them reaching the limit of detection (<10^5 bacteria/ml) after about 11

passages (P11). In contrast, Lapi was stably maintained at high abundance (10^9

bacteria/ml) until the last passage (**Figure 2A**) and hence dominated the co-culture for

most of the transfer experiment. In the presence of PE or PG, the four species revealed

very different growth behaviors (**Figure 2B and 2C**). None of the species decreased over

time, and after 21 transfers all species still yielded between 10^6-10^9 bacteria/ml.

To look at changes in community composition over time, we measured the

community stability (temporal mean divided by temporal standard deviation of the

species abundances) in sliding windows of five passages. Little to no change in

community stability was observed for the two pollen conditions throughout the

experiment, whereas in glucose the community reached a stable state after ~11 transfers

(**Figure 2D**). To compare the growth yields of each species across the three nutrient

conditions, we only considered the passages after which community stability was

reached (P13-21). With the exception of Lapi all species reached higher yields in the

presence of pollen as compared to glucose (**Figure 2E**, ANOVA q-value < 0.01). Notably,

Lmel was the only species that showed improved growth in PG as compared to PE (**Figure**

2A-C).

In summary, these findings show that the nutrient-dependent coexistence of the

four *Lactobacillus* species observed *in vivo* can be recapitulated *in vitro* in a simple co-

culture experiment, suggesting that the partitioning of pollen-derived nutrients is

sufficient for enabling coexistence. Similar results were obtained for a second *in vitro*

experiment which included the same nutrient conditions, but was only conducted for ten

transfers (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

The four *Lactobacillus* species upregulate divergent carbohydrate transport and

metabolism functions in the presence of pollen during gut colonization

Given the impact of pollen on the coexistence of the four *Lactobacillus* species, we

tested if genes involved in nutrient acquisition and metabolism were differentially

expressed between the dietary treatments. To this end, we carried out RNA sequencing

of the four-species community in honey bees that were fed either sugar water (SW) or

sugar water and pollen grains (SW+PG) (**Figure 3A**). Multidimensional scaling (MDS) of

the normalized read counts mapped to each species revealed that most samples clustered

by treatment (SW+PG versus SW) (**Supplementary Figure 3**), indicating that all four

species exhibited dietary-specific transcriptional responses.

We found a total 687 genes (181 to 217 genes per species) to be differentially

expressed ($\log_2$FC ≥ |2| and p-value ≤ 0.01) between the two dietary treatments (**Figure**

3B). "Carbohydrate transport and metabolism" (Cluster of orthologous group category G,

COG G) was by far the most abundant functional category among the genes upregulated

in the SW+PG treatment relative to the SW treatment (**Figure 3C,** 17.1-37.6% of all

upregulated genes). In three of the four species (Lmel, Lhel, and Lkul), this category was

significantly enriched among the upregulated genes (Fisher's exact test, p<0.01,

Supplementary Dataset 4). The largest fraction of the upregulated COG G genes encoded

PTS transporters (**Figure 3D, Supplementary Dataset 3)**, followed by other sugar

transporters (e.g. ABC transporters), and enzymes involved in sugar cleavage and

conversion (**Figure 3D**). Among the downregulated genes, COG G genes were not

abundant (5.1-7.8%) (**Figure 3C**). Instead, the category "Amino acid metabolism and

transport" (COG E) was enriched in Lapi (Fisher's exact test, p < 0.01, **Supplementary**

Dataset 6), and genes encoding ABC-type amino acid transporters were present among

the downregulated genes in all species (**Supplementary Dataset 3)**.

We next clustered all genes by homology into gene families. While most of the

differentially expressed genes (89%) belonged to gene families with homologs in

multiple species, differential expression was typically observed for just one of the species

(**Figure 3E-F**). This suggests that the presence of pollen triggers distinct transcriptional

changes in the four species during gut colonization. Indeed, gene annotation analysis

allowed us to identify several species-specific metabolic functions among the

differentially regulated genes (**Figure 4, Supplementary Dataset 3**). For example, Lhel

specifically upregulated three PTS gene clusters for the uptake and metabolism of sugar

alcohols and one gene cluster for ribose utilization. In contrast, Lmel upregulated several

gene clusters involved in the cleavage of xylose, mannose, rhamnose, and arabinose from

polysaccharides or other glycosylated compounds. Lmel also upregulated a gene cluster

for the synthesis and the transport of bacteriocins in the presence of pollen. Lkul

upregulated a starch utilization gene cluster, which in part was also differentially

regulated in Lmel. In addition, this species upregulated an oligopeptide transporter gene

cluster that was present in some of the other strains but not differentially regulated. The

fourth species, Lapi, also differentially expressed genes belonging to COG 'G' (mainly PTS

transporters), but fewer ones, and with similar functional annotations as found in the

other three species. However, Lapi was the only species that upregulated two conserved

deoxycytidine kinase genes encoding enzymes involved in nucleoside salvage pathways.

Besides these species-specific transcriptional changes, a number of interesting

functions were differentially regulated in more than one species. For example, we found

evidence for citrate fermentation in Lhel and Lkul. Both species upregulated genes

encoding a citrate lyase for the conversion of citrate into oxaloacetate and acetate in the

presence of pollen (**Supplementary Dataset 3)**. Lhel, Lmel, and Lkul upregulated genes

for the uptake and metabolism of glycerol. Moreover, all four species upregulated gene

clusters encoding surface proteins with leucine-rich repeat (LRR) regions, LPXT cell-wall

anchoring motifs, and SLAP (S-layer associated protein) domains (**Figure 3G**).

Altogether, these results suggest that the four species utilize different

carbohydrate-related resources from pollen, which supports the niche partitioning

hypothesis as the basis for coexistence.

Transcriptional responses to pollen are similar *in vivo* and *in vitro*

In vivo gene expression differences between the two dietary conditions could be

influenced by the host or by bacteria-bacteria interactions. Therefore, we carried out an

additional transcriptomics analysis to disentangle the contribution of each of these

factors to transcriptional changes in the four *Lactobacillus* species. We grew the four

species *in vitro* in either co-culture or mono-culture, and with either pollen extract (PE)

or glucose as growth substrate (G) (**Figure 5A**). As for the *in vivo* RNA-Seq analysis, MDS

plots of the normalized read counts indicated that the four species exhibit treatment-

specific transcriptional responses (**Supplementary Figure 4**).

For each species, whether grown alone or in co-culture, we found between 159-

393 genes to be differentially regulated between the PE and the G treatment (**Figure 5B**,

$\log_2$FC $\geq$ |2| and p-value$\leq$0.01). As *in vivo*, Carbohydrate transport and metabolism (COG

'G') was the predominant functional category among the upregulated genes in the

presence of pollen (**Figure 5C**) and enriched in all eight comparisons (four species , each

alone or in co-culture, Fisher's exact test p-value < 0.01, **Supplementary Dataset 6**).

Moreover, 25.3%-36.9% of the genes upregulated *in vivo* were also upregulated *in vitro*

in the presence of pollen. In particular, the species-specific carbohydrate metabolism

functions described above (**Figure 4**) showed a similar transcriptional response to pollen

in vivo and *in vitro* (**Figure 5D**). In contrast, most of the putative adhesin genes

upregulated *in vivo* were not upregulated *in vitro* during growth in pollen or had

relatively low transcripts per million (TPM). This suggests that these genes are either

expressed in response to the host environment , or the presence of entire pollen grains

or sugar water, both of which were only included in the *in vivo* but not in the *in vitro*

experiment (**Supplementary Dataset 7**). It is also noteworthy that fewer genes were

downregulated than upregulated in pollen relative to glucose, and that the COG category

'G' was not enriched among the downregulated genes, which is concordant with our *in*

vivo transcriptome analysis. (**Supplementary Dataset 6**). Based on these results, we

conclude that each species upregulates specific operons for the transport and utilization

of different carbohydrates (e.g. sugar alcohols and glycans) in response to the presence

of pollen, independent of the host environment.

The presence of other community members has little impact on the transcriptional

profile of the four species

We found that a large fraction of the genes upregulated in PE relative to G in the

mono-cultures were also upregulated in the co-cultures (58.2-87.8%, **Figure 5E**). In

particular, the gene clusters identified to be regulated in a species-specific manner (see

above) showed highly concordant gene expression profiles *in vitro* independent of the

presence/absence of the other *Lactobacillus* species. This was confirmed by the direct

comparison of mono-culture and co-culture conditions. In comparison to the nutritional

treatments, fewer genes (9-149 genes) were differentially expressed between co-culture

and mono-culture treatments ($\log_2$FC $\geq$ |2| and p-value$\leq$0.01), (**Figure 5F**).

We could not find any consistent pattern across the four species in terms of COG

category enrichment (**Supplementary Dataset 6**). Moreover, only a few genes were

differentially expressed in more than one species (6.25-30%), or across both nutrient

conditions (1.86-5.33%). Citrate fermentation genes were upregulated in Lkul in co-

culture relative to mono-culture when grown in pollen, whereas in Lhel the opposite was

observed (**Figure 5G**). Also of note, the oligopeptide transporter system which was

upregulated *in vivo* in Lkul in the presence of pollen, was also upregulated *in vitro* in the

presence of pollen, but only when other species were present. These two specific

examples show that a few metabolic functions are differentially regulated in response to

other bacteria, but not always in the same direction across species, or only in a specific

nutrient condition. We thus conclude that the main factor driving changes in gene

expression in the four strains is the presence of pollen, rather than the presence of other

Lactobacillus species.

Metabolomics analysis reveals differences in flavonoid and sugar metabolism

across the four *Lactobacillus* species

Our transcriptome analyses suggest that differences in sugar metabolism may

enable the four species to coexist in the presence of pollen *in vitro* and *in vivo*. To assess

species-specific metabolic changes when grown in pollen, we profiled the metabolome of

the pollen extract medium before (t = 0h) and after bacterial growth (t = 16h) using Q-

TOF-based untargeted metabolomics[27]. We annotated a total of 657 ions of which 406

could be reliably categorized as pollen-derived ions, as opposed to ions originating from

the base medium (see methods, **Supplementary Dataset 8**, **Supplementary Figure 6**).

The metabolomics data clearly separated the four species indicating distinctive metabolic

changes and thus corroborating the transcriptome results (**Supplementary Figure 5**). A

total of 76 pollen-derived ions showed a significant decrease in abundance over-time

(log2FC ≤ -1 and p-value≤0.01, Student's t-Test, BH correction) (**Figure 6A,**

Supplementary Dataset 8). Of those, 24 ions decreased in abundance in all four species,

another 24 ions decreased in abundance in only a subset of the species, and the remaining

28 ions decreased in abundance in only a single species (**Figure 6A**). Ions annotated as

glycosylated flavonoids were among the top ions responsible for the separation of the

four species in the PCA (**Supplementary Figure 5**). Lmel depleted six different ions

annotated as flavonoids (isoorientin 2''-O-rhamnoside, quercetin-3-O-glucoside, vitexin,

rutin, luteolin-7-O-(6''-malonylglucoside), and quercetin-3-O-beta-D-glucosyl-(1->2)-

beta-D-glucoside), while Lapi depleted three ions annotated as flavonoids (isoorientin

2''-O-rhamnoside, quercetin-3-O-glucoside, vitexin) (**Figure 6A, Supplementary Figure**

7). In contrast, Lkul only depleted the flavonoid ion annotated as isoorientin 2''-O-

rhamnoside, and no flavonoid ion changes were identified for Lhel (**Figure 6A,**

Supplementary Figure 7).

To corroborate the species-specific utilization of flavonoids, we incubated each of

the four species in base culture medium supplemented with rutin. We observed the

formation of a yellow insoluble precipitate only in the wells incubated with Lmel (**Figure**

6B). Metabolomics analysis confirmed that rutin was depleted in these wells and that the

yellow precipitate corresponded to an accumulation of quercetin, the water-insoluble,

deglycosylated aglycone of rutin (**Figure 6C**). These findings are consistent with our

transcriptome results which show that Lmel is the only species that upregulated a

rhamnosidase gene known to cleave rhamnose residue from rutin[28] (**Figure 4**).

Other ions with species-specific abundance changes included a plant-derived

glycosylated compound belonging to the iridioids class (i.e. antirrhinoside, depleted in

the presence of Lapi), a component of the outer pollen wall (i.e. 9,10,18-

trihydroxystearate, accumulated in the presence of Lmel) and cyclic nucleotides

(depleted in the presence of Lhel, Lmel and Lkul) (**Figure 6A and Supplementary**

Figure 7). Lhel was the only species depleting an ion corresponding to sugar alcohols

(mannitol, D-sorbitol, or L-glucitol) (**Figure 6A and Supplementary Figure 7**)

consistent with the specific upregulation of sugar alcohol PTS transporters in this species

(**Figure 4**).

Based on the untargeted metabolomics analysis, we conclude that the four species

target different metabolites, in particular secondary plant metabolites present in pollen.

In order to assess differences in the utilization of simple sugars and acids in more detail,

we analyzed the supernatants of cultures of the four strains after 0, 8, 16 and 24 h of

growth using GC-MS. We used a semi-targeted approach, where we identified a subset of

metabolites by preparing analytical standards and the others by using a reference library

(see methods). We identified 113 metabolites of which 46 showed a significant change in

abundance in at least one strain between timepoint 0h and 24h ($\log_2$FC $\geq$ |2| and p-value

$\leq$ 0.01, Student's t-Test, BH correction) (**Supplementary Dataset 8**). All four species

showed mixed substrate utilization, i.e. they utilized several substrates simultaneously.

Moreover, most substrates were utilized by all four species, but often at different rates.

Many metabolites that we identified with the GC-MS had annotations comparable to the

ones found in the Q-TOF-based experiment. For example, we detected a compound

annotated as sugar alcohol, i.e. glucitol, that was consumed most efficiently by Lhel as

observed in the previous analysis (**Figure 6C**). Moreover, all four species consumed the

carboxylic acids citrate and malate (**Figure 6C** and **Supplementary Figure 8**), which

corresponded with the results of the Q-TOF-based experiment. Interestingly, Lkul and

Lhel consumed citrate at the fastest rate and they were also the two species that

upregulated gene clusters for citrate fermentation in the presence of pollen *in vivo* and *in*

vitro (**Figure 4**).

Lmel consumed several simple monosaccharides (such as glucose, fructose, allose

and mannose) at a slower rate than the other species, although having a similar growth

profile (**Figure 6C**, **Supplementary Figure 8** and **9**). This could indicate that Lmel has

specialized in the metabolism of pollen-derived glycosylated compounds (such as rutin,

Figure 6B-C) at the expense of fast consumption of generic substrates, which accords

with the upregulation of several gene clusters for the cleavage of such sugars from

polysaccharides or other glycosides (e.g. flavonoids) in presence of pollen (**Figure 4**).

In summary, our metabolomics results show that the four species specialize in the

utilization of different pollen-derived compounds, and that the observed metabolite

changes are to some extent consistent with the transcriptional changes observed in the

presence of pollen relative to the presence of simple sugars.

Discussion

Ecological processes governing the coexistence of microbes have been probed in the laboratory using microbial communities of different complexity[12,14,29–33]. However, few studies have examined the impact of the host on the coexistence of bacterial symbionts of animals[14,32]. In particular, little is known about the extent to which closely related species and strains can be stably maintained[8]. We capitalized on the experimental tractability of honey bees and their gut microbiota and used a bottom-up approach to study the coexistence of four closely related, naturally co-occurring *Lactobacillus* species. We disentangled the effect of the diet and the host on the interactions between the four species by serially passaging them through gnotobiotic bees or in culture tubes, under two nutrient conditions (pollen versus simple sugars). Our results show that the dynamics in the four-species community is governed by negative interactions, because the growth of each member was lower in co-culture than in mono-culture, independent of the environment (host or culture tube) and the nutrient condition (pollen or simple sugars). This is consistent with previous observations that negative interactions predominate in nutrient-rich environments[31,34–37]. Moreover, the four *Lactobacillus* species harbor relatively small genomes (1.5-2Mb) with a conserved and streamlined core metabolism and similar auxotrophies, suggesting overlapping nutritional requirements[38–40].

The coexistence of bacterial symbionts can be facilitated by the host, e.g. by providing a spatially structured environment that results in the physical separation of competing strains[41–44], or by secreting metabolites that support niche specialization[45,46]. However, in the case of the four *Lactobacillus* species, such host-related features seem not to be sufficient to support coexistence, because the four-species community was

rapidly dominated by a single species, when passaged through gnotobiotic bees that were

fed a simple sugar diet. In contrast, when providing a more diverse nutrition in the form

of pollen, we found that the four species were stably maintained both *in vivo* and *in vitro*.

We thus conclude that the coexistence of the four *Lactobacillus* species in the honey bee

gut primarily depends on the pollen diet of the host and not the host environment itself.

The challenges in replicating the native environment such that it is possible to

study relevant interactions of host-associated microbes *in vitro* are formidable. These

were highlighted in a recent study on the microbial community associated with the

freshwater polyp hydra that could not recapitulate the coexistence of the dominant

microbiota members *in vitro*[32]. Here, we aimed to approximate the nutritional conditions

in the honey bee gut by culturing the bacteria in pollen infused media, i.e. the natural diet

of bees. In both the *in vivo* and *in vitro* transfer experiment, we assessed the effect of

pollen on the dynamics of the community by comparing it to a simple sugar treatment.

Although not identical, the nutritional conditions *in vitro* were sufficiently similar as to

recapitulate the overall community dynamics observed *in vivo*: pollen nutrients

supported the stable coexistence of the four species, while the simple sugars led to the

dominance of a single species. As the bee and members of the bee gut microbiota pre-

digest pollen and sugars upstream of the rectum, it is difficult to exactly replicate the

metabolic environment of the rectum. For example, sucrose is largely absorbed via the

midgut epithelium and cleaved into glucose and fructose by host enzymes, while

fermentative bacteria such as *Gilliamella apicola* degrade and modify a diverse range of

carbohydrates in the ileum[25,47]. These metabolic alterations may explain some of the

differences observed between the *in vivo* and *in vitro* experiments, such as the dominance

of different species in the simple sugar conditions (sucrose and glucose respectively). We

therefore suspect that different species would dominate *in vitro* or *in vivo* with an

alternative simple sugar composition.

Our findings are consistent with the consumer-resource model, which predicts

that the number of species that can coexist depends on the number of available

resources[48]. Correspondingly, in the presence of a single substrate, such as in the case of

glucose *in vitro*, competition for the same nutrient results in the competitive exclusion of

all but one species. However, depending on the nutrient availability, the dietary transit

time, the crosstalk with the host, or the spatial structure of the gut, the ecological

processes governing bacterial coexistence may differ across host-associated

microbiomes. For example, the *Lactobacillus* species of the honey bee gut microbiota

primarily colonize the luminal space of the rectum, where partially digested pollen

accumulates. In contrast, some of the Proteobacteria of the bee gut microbiota adhere to

the epithelial surface of the ileum[49]. We expect that in the latter case interactions with

the host play a more important role for microbial coexistence than in the case of the

Lactobacilli in the rectum.

Although ecological interactions in bacterial communities have been investigated

across a wide range of experimental systems, few studies have tackled the molecular

mechanisms underlying coexistence. In some cases, cross-feeding of metabolic by-

products facilitates the maintenance of diversity in bacterial communities, such as after

passaging leaf and soil samples in single carbon sources[12]. However, cross-feeding does

not seem to play an important role in maintaining coexistence of the four *Lactobacillus*

species in this study. Unlike the above example, feeding a single carbon source led to the

extinction of all but one species. Our metabolomics analysis also did not reveal any major

metabolites that could potentially be cross-fed, i.e. were produced by one species and

utilized by another. Finally, we identified no transcriptional changes that would suggest

cross-feeding activities when comparing mono-cultures and co-cultures of the four

Lactobacillus species.

Instead, our combined transcriptomics and metabolomics analyses suggest that

coexistence is facilitated by specialization towards distinct pollen-derived nutrients. We

found that all four species upregulated carbohydrate transport and metabolism functions

dedicated to the utilization of different carbon sources in the presence of pollen when

colonizing the bee gut, and these changes were reproducible *in vitro*. Our metabolomics

analysis identified a number of pollen-derived glycosides that were utilized in a species-

specific manner. In particular, Lmel specialized in the utilization of flavonoids at the

expense of simple sugars, which may explain why this species rapidly went extinct in

presence of only simple sugars during the transfer experiments. While the importance of

pollen-derived flavonoids in niche partitioning needs to be validated, the species-specific

deglycosylation of these secondary plant compounds illustrates that the four species have

different hydrolytic capabilities that may also be involved in the cleavage of other

carbohydrates. The metabolic specialization on plant glycans may be a common

phenomenon in animal gut communities, as similar transcriptional changes have been

described in other gut symbionts when the host diet was supplemented with specific

plant glycans[50,51].

In contrast to the species specific metabolism of glycosides, we observed few

differences in the utilization of simple saccharides among the four species in our time-

resolved GC-MS analysis. While this may seem surprising, theoretical work has

established that resource preference for at least one substrate is sufficient to explain

coexistence[52]. Moreover, it is plausible that the four species utilize the same sugars, but

extract them from different pollen-derived glycans, such as starch, hemicellulose,

flavonoids, or other glycosylated secondary plant metabolites.

While this work focused on niche partitioning based on degradation of complex

carbohydrates, it is noteworthy that all four *Lactobacillus* species engaged to a variable

extent in co-fermentation of the carboxylic acids citrate and malate present in pollen. The

two species, Lkul and Lhel, that upregulated citrate fermentation pathways in the

presence of pollen also consumed citrate at the fastest rate. Citrate co-fermentation has

been linked to competitive advantages in lactic acid bacteria, though whether the varying

levels of co-fermentation contribute to colonization stability in this system remains an

outstanding question[53–55].

Previous work suggested that the large diversity of carbohydrate transport and

metabolism functions in the accessory gene pool of *Lactobacillus* Firm5 is an adaptation

to the pollen-based diet of the host and a consequence of the nutrient competition with

closely related species[22,38]. Our findings support this hypothesis and provide the first

experimental evidence for a link between the coexistence of the four *Lactobacillus*

species, the large diversity of carbohydrate metabolism functions in their genomes, and

the pollen diet of the host. Moreover, these results suggest that dietary differences

between host species or natural variation in pollen diversity influence the diversity of

Lactobacillus Firm5 and could, e.g., explain why the Asian honey bee, *Apis cerana,* harbors

only one species of this phylotype in its gut[56].

However, we have only tested a single strain of each of the four species. Therefore,

given the extensive genomic diversity within these species[22], more work is needed to

determine if the identified patterns of coexistence reflect stable ecological niches

occupied by the four species or are rather the result of the specific strains selected for

our experiments. In a recent study on pitcher plant microbiomes it was shown that even

strains that differ by only a few base pairs can have different ecological trajectories in

communities and coexist over extended period of time[8]. Expanding our approach to

strains within species presents an exciting next step to understand at which level discrete

ecological niches are defined in the bee gut and how diversity can be maintained in such

ecosystems.

Materials and methods

Key Resources Table			
Reagent type (species) or resource	**Designation**	**Source or reference**	**Identifiers**
Strain, strain background (*Lactobacillus apis*)	Lapi	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2003467	Genome ID: 2684622912
Strain, strain background (*Lactobacillus helsingborgensis*)	Lhel	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2003467	Genome ID: 2684622914
Strain, strain background (*Lactobacillus melliventris*)	Lmel	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2003467	Genome ID: 2684622913
Strain, strain background (*Lactobacillus kullabergensis*)	Lkul	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2003467	Genome ID: 2684622911
Commercial assay or kit	QIAquick Gel Extraction Kit	Qiagen	#Cat 28706X4
Commercial assay or kit	Nucleospin RNA clean-up kit	Macherey-Nagel	#Cat 740903
Commercial assay or kit	Zymo-Seq RiboFree Total RNA Library kit	Zymo Research	#Cat R3000
Software, algorithm	R Studio software	R Studio (https://www.rstudio.com)	RRID:SCR_000432
Software, algorithm	Integrative Genomics Viewer	Integrative Genomics Viewer (https://software.broadinstitute.org/software/igv/)	RRID:SCR_011793

Culturing of bacterial strains

We used the following four bacterial strains of Lhel, Lmel, Lapi, and Lkul for our

experiments: ESL0183, ESL0184, ESL0185, and ESL0186 (Kešnerová et al., 2017). All

strains were precultured on solid De Man – Rogosa – Sharpe agar (MRSA) (supplemented

with 2% w/v fructose and 0.2% w/v L-cysteine-HCl) from glycerol stocks stored at -80°C.

MRSA plates were incubated for three days in anaerobic conditions at 34°C to obtain

single colonies. Single colonies were inoculated into a liquid carbohydrate-free MRS

medium (cfMRS[57]) supplemented with 4% glucose (w/v), 4% fructose (w/v) and 1% L-

cysteine-HCl (w/v) and incubated at 34°C in anaerobic conditions without shaking.

***In vivo* transfer experiments**

Bacterial colonization stocks were prepared from overnight cultures by washing

the bacteria in 1xPBS, diluting them to an OD_{600} = 1, and storing them in 25% glycerol at

-80°C until further use. For colonization stocks containing all four species, cultures

adjusted to an OD_{600} = 1 were mixed at equal proportions. Microbiota-depleted bees were

obtained from colonies of *Apis mellifera carnica* located at the University of Lausanne

following the procedure described in Kešnerová et al. (2017). Colonization stocks were

diluted ten times in a 1:1 mixture of 1xPBS and sugar water (50% sucrose solution, w/v)

and 5 µL were fed to each bee using a pipette. Five days post-colonization, ten rectums

were dissected and homogenized in 1xPBS. An aliquot of each homogenized gut was used

for CFU plating to enumerate the total bacterial load and for amplicon sequencing to

obtain the relative abundance of each community member (see below). To serial passage

the community through microbiota-depleted bees, the ten homogenized gut samples

from the same treatment were pooled together and stored in 25% glycerol at -80°C until

a new batch of microbiota-depleted bees was available. At the day of colonization, a

frozen aliquot of the pooled gut homogenate was thawed, diluted ten times in a 1:1

mixture of 1xPBS and sugar water (50% sucrose solution, w/v), and fed to newly

emerged microbiota-depleted bee as described above. This was repeated for a total of six

serial passages. Throughout the experiments all bees were kept on either a sugar water

or a sugar water/pollen diet according to the two dietary treatment. Food was provided

ad libitum.

***In vitro* transfer experiment**

Each of the four strains was cultured in liquid medium overnight for about 16 h as

described above. The cultures were re-inoculated at an OD_{600} = 0.3 in fresh medium and

let grow for another 4 h at 34°C with shaking (700 rpm). Bacterial cells were then washed

with 1xPBS, mixed in equal proportions, and inoculated at an OD_{600} = 0.05 in triplicates

in 96-deep well plates (SIGMA) containing cfMRS medium supplemented with either 2%

glucose (w/v), 10% pollen extract (v/v), or 10% pollen grains (v/v) in a final volume of

500 µL per well. Detailed information about pollen extract preparation can be found in

the Supporting methods section of Kešnerová et al. (2017). Pollen grain solutions were

prepared by adding 1.250 ml of ddH_2O to 80 mg of pollen grains crushed with the bottom

of a 15 mL falcon tube. The plates were incubated for 24 h at 34°C under anaerobic

conditions without shaking (300 rpm). After 24 h of incubation, an aliquot of each sample

was subjected to CFU plating to enumerate the total bacterial load. Then, 1% of each

culture (i.e. 5 µL) was transferred to a plate with fresh medium supplemented with the

appropriate carbon sources and incubated again. These transfers were repeated 10,

respectively, 20 times for the two independent experiments. After each transfer, cultures

were washed once with 1xPBS and stored at -20°C for amplicon sequencing analysis.

CFUs were counted after 24 h and at the final transfer.

Amplicon sequencing

The relative abundance of the four strains across all transfer experiments was

obtained using amplicon sequencing of a 199-bp long fragment of a housekeeping gene

encoding a DNA formamidopyrimidine-glycosylase which allows to discriminate the four

strains from each other[58].

For the *in vitro* transfer experiments, the PCR fragment was amplified from crude

cell lysates. They were generated by mixing 5 µL of culture with 50 µL of lysis solution,

containing 45 µL of lysis buffer (10 mM Tris- HCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.1% Triton, pH 8), 2.5 µL

of lysozyme (20 mg/ml, Fluka) and 2.5 µL of Proteinase K solution (10 mg/ml, Roth). The

samples were incubated for 10 min at 37°C, for 20 min at 55°C, and for 10 min at 95°C,

followed by a short spin before preparing the PCR (1 min, 1500 rpm). For the *in vivo*

transfer experiment, DNA was isolated from the homogenized gut samples using the hot

phenol protocol used in Kešnerová et al. (2017).

To amplify the gene fragment and to add the Illumina barcodes and adapters, the

two-step PCR strategy published in Ellegaard et al (2019) was used. For the first PCR, 5

µL of DNA or 5 µL of cell lysate were mixed with 12.5 µL of GoTaq Colorless Master Mix

(Promega), 1 µL of forward and reverse primer (5 µM, see **Supplementary Table 1**) and

5.5 µL of Nuclease-free Water (Promega). The PCR I was performed as follows: initial

denaturation (95°C – 3 min), 30 times denaturation-annealing-extension (95°C – 30 sec,

64°C – 30 sec, 72°C – 30 sec), final extension (72°C – 5 min). To purify the amplicons, 15

µL of PCR product were mixed with 5 µL of a 5X Exo-SAP solution (15% Shrimp Alkaline

Phosphatase – 1000U/ ml – NEB, 10% Exonuclease I – 20000 U/ ml – NEB, 45% glycerol

80% and 30% dH2O). and incubated for 30 min at 37°C and for 15 min at 80°C. For the

second PCR reaction, 5 µL of purified PCR products were mixed with the same reagents

as before. The PCR program was the same as above with the exception that the annealing

temperature was set to 60°C and the denaturation-annealing-extension steps were

repeated for only 8 times. The barcoded primers are listed in Supplementary Table 1. The

amplicons of the second PCR were purified using the Exo-SAP program as described

above.

To prepare the sequencing of the amplicons, DNA concentrations were measured

using Quant-iT™ PicoGreen® for dsDNA (Invitrogen). Each sample was adjusted to a DNA

concentration of 0.5 ng/µL and 5 µL of each sample were pooled together. The pooled

sample was loaded on a 0.9% agarose gel and gel-purified using the QIAquick Gel

Extraction Kit (Qiagen) following the manufacturer's instructions. The purified DNA was

prepared for sequencing following the Illumina MiniSeq System Guide for "denaturate

and dilute libraries" and then loaded on a Illumina MiniSeq Mid Output Reagent Cartridge

using the correspondent MiniSeq flow cell. Illumina reads were demultiplexed by

retrieving the unique barcodes of the different samples and quality-filtered using

Trimmomatic (Trimmomatic-0.35) (LEADING:28 TRAILING: 29 SLIDING WINDOW:4:15

MINLEN:90). Each forward and reverse read pair was assembled using PEAR (-m 290 -n

284 -j 4 -q 26 -v 10 -b 33)[59], and the assembled reads were assigned to the different

strains based on base pair positions with discriminatory SNP. See details in

Supplementary material.

To obtain absolute abundance data for each strain, we combined the relative

abundance data from the amplicon sequencing with CFU counts obtained from plating

homogenized bee guts in the case of the *in vivo* experiments (see above) or by carrying

out qPCR with *Lactobacillus* specific primers as described in Kešnerová et al. (2017) in

the case of the *in vitro* co-culture experiments (**Supplementary Table 1**,

Supplementary Dataset 2). For the *in vitro* transfer the stability of the four-species

community over time was calculated using the codyn R package[60].

RNA extraction and sequencing

For the *in vivo* RNA sequencing, microbiota-depleted bees were colonized with the four species community as described above and fed with either sugar water and pollen grains or with sugar water only. After 5 days of colonization, the rectums of five bees per treatment (all kept in the same cage) were dissected and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen in separate tubes containing glass beads (0.1 mm dia. Zirconia/Silica beads; Carl Roth). For RNA extraction, the tissue samples were suspended in 1 mL of TE buffer and homogenized using a bead beater (45 m/s, 6 seconds). Then, 200 µL of an ice-cold STOP solution (95% v/v ethanol, 5% v/v Aqua phenol (Roth)) was added to 1 ml of homogenate and snap-frozen again in liquid nitrogen. Tubes were then thawed on ice and a previously developed hot phenol RNA extraction protocol was followed[61]. For the *in vitro* RNA sequencing, bacterial strains were cultured in triplicates in cfMRS supplemented with either 1% w/v glucose or 1% w/v pollen extract. After 16 h of growth, 200 µL of STOP solution was added to 1 mL of culture followed by the same steps as described above.

After the precipitation step, samples were treated with DNaseI (NEB) to degrade DNA. RNA samples were purified using Nucleospin RNA clean-up kit (Macherey-Nagel) following the manufacturer's instructions. RNA was eluted in RNase free-water and stored at -80℃ until further use. RNA concentration and quality were assessed using Nanodrop (ThermoFisher Scientific), Qubit (ThermoFisher Scientific, RNA – High Sensitivity reagents and settings) and Bioanalyzer (Agilent). High-quality RNA samples were selected to prepare RNA libraries. For the *in vivo* RNA sequencing, libraries were prepared using the Zymo-Seq RiboFree Total RNA Library kit (Zymo Research). The libraries were sequenced by the GTF facility of the University of Lausanne using HiSeq 4000 SR150 sequencing (150 bp reads) (Illumina). For the *in vitro* RNA sequencing,

libraries were prepared following the protocol developed by Avraham et al. [62]. Libraries

were then prepared for sequencing following the Illumina MiniSeq System guide for

denaturate and dilute libraries. Libraries were sequenced using the Illumina MiniSeq

technology using High Output Reagent Cartridges (150 bp reads) and MiniSeq flow cells.

RNA sequencing analysis

For the *in vitro* samples, raw reads were demultiplexed using a script provided by

Dr. Jelle Slager (Personal communication) For the *in vivo* samples, the reads were already

demultiplexed by the sequencing facility. For both experiments, the reads were trimmed

with Trimmomatic (Trimmomatic-0.35) (LEADING:30 TRAILING: 3 SLIDING

WINDOW:4:15 MINLEN:20). The quality of the reads was checked using FASTQC

(http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/). For the *in vivo* samples,

trimmed reads were sorted with sortmerna-4.2.0 to select only the non-rRNA reads for

the downstream analysis. Reads were mapped onto the genomes of the selected strains[63]

(Lapi, Lhel, Lmel and Lkul) using Bowtie (bowtie2-2.3.2). Gene annotations for the four

genomes were retrieved from IMG/mer[64]. Mapped reads were quality filtered for the

alignment length (CIGAR > 100 bp) and for the allowed mismatches in the sequence (NM

= 0-1). Quality filtered reads were then quantified using HTseq (Version 0.7.2).

Differential gene expression between samples cultured in pollen extract and samples

cultured in glucose, and between mono-cultures and co-cultures, was calculated using the

R package EdgeR[65]. Counts per million were calculated and only genes with at least 1

count per million were used for the analysis. EdgeR fits negative binomial models to the

data. The counts were normalized for RNA composition by adjusting the $\log_2$FC according

to the library size, and the quantile-adjusted conditional maximum likelihood (qCML)

method was used to estimate the common dispersion and the tag-wise dispersion.

Finally, the differential gene expression was determined using the exact test with a false

discovery rate (FDR) <5%. COG annotations were obtained from IMG/mer, and the

enrichment analysis for COG categories tested using the Fisher's exact test. Transcripts

per million (TPM) were visualized using the Integrated Genome Browser software[66].

Untargeted metabolomics

Metabolites were extracted from liquid cultures supplemented with 10% (w/v)

pollen extract at the inoculation time and after 16 h of incubation at 34°C. For each liquid

culture sample, 300 µL was collected and centrifuged (20'000 g, 4°C, 30 min), then 200

µL supernatant was transferred to a new tube and stored at -80°C. After collection of all

samples, they were prepared for metabolomics analysis. The samples were thawed on ice

and centrifuged again (20'000 g, 4°C, 5 min), then diluted 10 times with ddH$_2$O. For

metabolomics analysis, 25 µL of each diluted sample was sent in a 96-well plate on dry

ice to the laboratory of Prof. Uwe Sauer for analysis (ETH Zürich, Switzerland). Three

replicates of a pollen-extract dilution series (10 serial 2x dilutions) as well as undiluted

pollen-extracts and water used for performing the dilution series were included in the

metabolomics analysis. Because of the insolubility of flavonoid aglycones in a water

matrix, metabolites from liquid cultures supplemented with rutin were extracted using a

methanol-extraction protocol at the time of inoculation and after 16 h of growth by

adding 200 µL of methanol pre-cooled to -20°C to 100 µL of culture. Tubes were vortexed

thoroughly and incubated for 5 min (4°C, shaking 14'000 rpm). Samples where then

incubated at -20°C for 1 h and centrifuged (20'000 g, 5 min). 200 µL of the supernatant

was transferred to a new tube and diluted 10 times in 70% methanol and 25 µL of each

diluted sample was sent to Zürich in Eppendorf tubes sealed with parafilm on dry ice. For

untargeted metabolomics analysis, each sample was injected twice (technical replicate)

into an Agilent 6550 time-of-flight mass spectrometer (ESI-iFunnel Q-TOF, Agilent

Technologies) as detailed in Kešnerová et al. (2017)[25]. In brief, m/z features (ions) were

annotated by matching their accurate mass-to-sum formulas of compounds in the KEGG

database accounting for deprotonation (-H^+). Alternative annotation can be found in

Supplementary dataset 8. When available, metabolites categories were assigned to ions

based on KEGG ontology.

Metabolomics data analysis was carried out using R version 3.6.3. Variation of raw

ion intensities obtained from untargeted metabolomics analysis for the two technical

replicates was determined by assessing the correlation between ion intensities of the

respective technical replicates. Then, mean ion intensities of technical replicates were

calculated. Time point comparisons (T = 0 h vs T = 16 h) were performed using t-tests

with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) correction for multiple testing. $\log_2$FC values between the

two time-points were calculated with respect to the mean intensity in the T0 time point.

To identify pollen-derived ions, and distinguish them from background originating from

culture medium and experimental noise, the ion intensities of the pollen dilution series

were plotted for each ion and the R^2 of the obtained linear fit was extracted. In addition,

we calculated the $\log_2$FC difference between undiluted pollen and water. The R^2 values

were then plotted against the $\log_2$FC values, and stringent thresholds ($R_2 > 0.75$ and

$\log_2$FC > 2) were chosen to discriminate ions that are likely pollen-derived

(**Supplementary Figure 7**). All ions were included for downstream analysis (e.g. PCA)

and then they were discriminated between pollen-derived and non-pollen-derived.

Semi-targeted Metabolomics via GC-MS

Soluble metabolites were extracted from liquid cultures supplemented with 10%

pollen extract (w/v) at the inoculation time and after 8, 16 and 24 h of incubation. For

each liquid culture sample, 300 µL was collected and centrifuged (15'000 g, 4°C, 15 min).

Then, 200 µL was transferred to a new tube, snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at

-80°C. Once that all the samples were collected, soluble metabolites were extracted. To

extract soluble metabolites, tubes were thawed on ice, and 75 µL of sample was combined

with 5 uL of 20 mM internal standard (norleucine and norvaline, (Sigma-Aldrich) and U-

$^{13}C_6$ glucose (Cambridge Isotope laboratories)). A volume of 825 µL of cold

methanol:water:chloroform (5:2:2) solution was added to the sample and vortexed for

30 sec. The tubes were incubated at -20°C for 90 min and vortexed 2x for 30 sec during

the incubation. Tubes were centrifuged for 5 min at 10'000g at 4°C. The supernatant was

removed and extraction was repeated using 400 µL of ice cold chloroform:methanol

(1:1), tubes were vortexed and left on ice for 30 min. Tubes were centrifuged 5 min at

8'000 rpm at 4°C and the liquid phase was transferred to the previous extracted aqueous

phase. 200 µL of water was added and tubes were centrifuged 5 min at 8000 rpm. The

aqueous phase was transferred to a 2 mL microcentrifuge tube. The aqueous extract was

dried using a vacuum concentrator at ambient temperature overnight (Univapo 150 ECH

vacuum concentrator centrifuge). Once dried, the samples were dissolved in 50 µL of 20

mg/ml methoxyamine hydrochloride in pyridine for 1.5 h at 33°C followed by

derivatization with N-Methyl-N-(trymethylsolyl)trifluoroacetamide (MSTFA, Sigma

Aldrich) for 2 h at 35°C.

Aliquots (1 µL) were injected on an Agilent 8890/5977B GC-MSD. The samples

were injected in split mode (20:1) with an inlet temperature of 250 °C. The VF-5ms (30

m x 250 µm x 0.25 µm) column was held initially at 125 °C for 2 mins, ramped at 5 °C / min

to 250 °C, ramped at 15 °C to 300 °C, and held for 5 min. The MS was run in full scan mode

(50-500 m/z) at a speed of 5 Hz. Peaks from the total ion chromatogram (TIC) were

identified by matching retention times and spectra to an in-house library that was built

by comparing selected T=0h and T=24h samples against the NIST library, as well as our

library of analytical standards. Compounds are noted as either confirmed with our own

standards, or the best match and associated matching factor against the NIST library are

reported (**Supplementary Dataset 8**). Peaks were picked and integrated using the

Agilent MassHunter Quantitative Analysis software. Peak areas were normalized to the

internal standards. The data were processed using R version 3.6.3 and mean intensities

and $\log_2$FC between time-points were calculated as described above for the untargeted

metabolomics analysis.

Analysis-code and data availability

The complete custom code for all the analyses is available on GitHub:

(https://github.com/silviabrochet). The amplicon sequencing data and the RNA

sequencing data are available under the NCBI Bioproject PRJNA700984 and the GEO

record GSE166724. All differential expression analysis results of this study are included

in **Supplementary Dataset 9**.

Acknowledgments

We thank Kirsten Ellegaard for the critical reading of the manuscript and discussions on the experimental design. We also thank Sara Mitri for providing feedback on the manuscript. We are grateful to Simon Maréchal for his help with the transfer experiments. This project was funded by the ERC-StG "MicroBeeOme" (grant 714804), the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant 31003A_160345 and 31003A_179487), the Human Frontier Science Program Young Investigator (grant RGY0077/2016) and the NCCR Microbiomes.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Ley, R. E. *et al.* Evolution of mammals and their gut microbes. *Science (80-.).* **320**, 1647–1651 (2008).

2. Dethlefsen, L., McFall-Ngai, M. & Relman, D. A. An ecological and evolutionary perspective on humang-microbe mutualism and disease. *Nature* **449**, 811–818 (2007).

3. Elton, C. Competition and the Structure of Ecological Communities. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **15**, 54–68 (2016).

4. Ley, R. E., Peterson, D. A. & Gordon, J. I. Ecological and evolutionary forces shaping microbial diversity in the human intestine. *Cell* **124**, 837–848 (2006).

5. Foster, K. R., Schluter, J., Coyte, K. Z. & Rakoff-Nahoum, S. The evolution of the host microbiome as an ecosystem on a leash. *Nature* **548**, 43–51 (2017).

6. Koskella, B. & Brockhurst, M. A. Bacteria-phage coevolution as a driver of ecological and evolutionary processes in microbial communities. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* **38**, 916–931 (2014).

7. Chesson, P. Mechanisms of Maintainance of Species Diversity. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **31**, 343–66 (2000).

8. Leonora S. Bittleston, Matti Gralka, Gabriel E. Leventhal, Itzhak Mizrahi, O. X. C. Context-dependent dynamics lead to the assembly of functionally distinct pitcher-plant microbiomes. *Nat Commun* **3**, 1–31 (2019).

9. Berasategui, A. *et al.* Gut microbiota of the pine weevil degrades conifer diterpenes and increases insect fitness. *Mol. Ecol.* **26**, 4099–4110 (2017).

10. Martens, E. C., Chiang, H. C. & Gordon, J. I. Mucosal Glycan Foraging Enhances Fitness and Transmission of a Saccharolytic Human Gut Bacterial Symbiont. *Cell Host Microbe* **4**, 447–457 (2008).

11. Madi, N., Vos, M., Murall, C. L., Legendre, P. & Shapiro, B. J. Does diversity beget diversity in microbiomes? *bioRxiv* 1–26 (2020). doi:10.1101/612739

12. Goldford, J. E. *et al.* Emergent simplicity in microbial community assembly. *Science (80-.).* **361**, 469–474 (2018).

13. Rakoff-Nahoum, S., Foster, K. R. & Comstock, L. E. The evolution of cooperation within the gut microbiota. *Nature* **533**, 255–259 (2016).

14. Lopez, A. O., Vega, N. M. & Gore, J. Interspecies bacterial competition determines

community assembly in the C. elegans intestine. *ISME J.* (2021).

doi:10.1101/535633

15. Venturelli, O. S. *et al.* Deciphering microbial interactions in synthetic human gut

microbiome communities. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **14**, 1–19 (2018).

16. Li, L. *et al.* An in vitro model maintaining taxon-specific functional activities of the

gut microbiome. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, (2019).

17. Jalili-Firoozinezhad, S. *et al.* A complex human gut microbiome cultured in an

anaerobic intestine-on-a-chip. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* **3**, 520–531 (2019).

18. Nikolaev, M. *et al.* Homeostatic mini-intestines through scaffold-guided organoid

morphogenesis. *Nature* **585**, 574–578 (2020).

19. Martinson, V. G. *et al.* A simple and distinctive microbiota associated with honey

bees and bumble bees. *Mol. Ecol.* **20**, 619–628 (2011).

20. Kwong, W. K. & Moran, N. A. Gut microbial communities of social bees. *Nat. Rev.*

Microbiol. **14**, 374–384 (2016).

21. Ellegaard, K. M. & Engel, P. Beyond 16S rRNA community profiling: Intra-species

diversity in the gut microbiota. *Front. Microbiol.* **7**, 1–16 (2016).

22. Ellegaard, K. M., Engel, P. Genomic diversity landscape of the honey bee gut

microbiota. *Nat. Commun.* **10.1**, 1–13 (2019).

23. Engel, P., Martinson, V. G. & Moran, N. a. Functional diversity within the simple gut

microbiota of the honey bee. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, 11002–11007

(2012).

24. Ellegaard, K. M. *et al.* Extensive intra-phylotype diversity in lactobacilli and

bifidobacteria from the honeybee gut. *BMC Genomics* **16**, 1–22 (2015).

25. Kešnerová, L., Mars, R. A. T., Ellegaard, K. M., Sauer, U. & Engel, P. Disentangling

metabolic functions of bacteria in the honey bee gut. *PLoS Biol.* 1–28 (2017).

26. Kešnerová, L. *et al.* Gut microbiota structure differs between honeybees in winter

and summer. *ISME J.* **14**, 801–814 (2020).

27. Fuhrer, T., Heer, D., Begemann, B. & Zamboni, N. High-throughput, accurate mass

metabolome profiling of cellular extracts by flow injection-time-of-flight mass

spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **83**, 7074–7080 (2011).

28. Beekwilder, J. *et al.* Characterization of Rhamnosidases from Lactobacillus

plantarum and Lactobacillus acidophilus. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **75**, 3447–3454

(2009).

29. Wright, Erik S., and K. H. V. Inhibitory interactions promote frequent bistability
among competing bacteria. *Nat Commun* **7**, 11274 (2016).

30. Friedman, J., Higgins, L. M. & Gore, J. Community structure follows simple
assembly rules in microbial microcosms. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 1–7 (2017).

31. Piccardi, P., Vessman, B. & Mitri, S. Toxicity drives facilitation between 4 bacterial
species. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 15979–15984 (2019).

32. Deines, P., Hammerschmidt, K. & Bosch, T. C. G. Microbial species coexistence
depends on the host environment. *MBio* **11**, 1–13 (2020).

33. Logan M. Higgins, J. F. H. S. & J. G. Co-occurring soil bacteria exhibit a robust
competitive hierarchy and lack of non-transitive interactions. *bioRxiv* 1–16
(2017).

34. Foster, K. R. & Bell, T. Competition, not cooperation, dominates interactions
among culturable microbial species. *Curr. Biol.* **22**, 1845–1850 (2012).

35. Berry, D. & Widder, S. Deciphering microbial interactions and detecting keystone
species with co-occurrence networks. *Front. Microbiol.* **5**, 1–14 (2014).

36. Coyte, K. Z., Schluter, J. & Foster, K. R. The ecology of the microbiome: Networks,
competition, and stability. *Science (80-.).* **350**, 663–666 (2015).

37. Ghoul, M. & Mitri, S. The Ecology and Evolution of Microbial Competition. *Trends
Microbiol.* **24**, 833–845 (2016).

38. Ellegaard, K., Brochet, S., Emery, O., Glover, N. & Hadadi, N. Genomic changes
underlying host specialization in the bee gut symbiont Lactobacillus Firm5. *Mol.
Ecol.* **28**, 2224–2237 (2019).

39. Ellegaard, K. M. *et al.* Extensive intra-phylotype diversity in lactobacilli and
bifidobacteria from the honeybee gut. *BMC Genomics* **16**, 1–22 (2015).

40. Kwong, W. K. & Moran, N. A. Gut microbial communities of social bees. *Nat. Rev.
Microbiol.* **14**, 374–384 (2016).

41. Gude, S. *et al.* Bacterial coexistence driven by motility and spatial competition.
Nature **578**, 588–592 (2020).

42. Kim, H. J., Boedicker, J. Q., Choi, J. W. & Ismagilov, R. F. Defined spatial structure
stabilizes a synthetic multispecies bacterial community. *PNAS* **105**, 18188–18193
(2008).

43. Mitri, S., Clarke, E. & Foster, K. R. Resource limitation drives spatial organization
in microbial groups. *ISME J.* **10**, 1471–1482 (2016).

44.   Hallatschek, O., Hersen, P., Ramanathan, S. & Nelson, D. R. Genetic drift at
858   expanding frontiers promotes gene segregation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **104**,
859   19926–19930 (2007).

860   45.   Schluter, J. & Foster, K. R. The Evolution of Mutualism in Gut Microbiota Via Host
861   Epithelial Selection. *PLoS Biol.* **10**, (2012).

862   46.   McLoughlin, K., Schluter, J., Rakoff-Nahoum, S., Smith, A. L. & Foster, K. R. Host
863   Selection of Microbiota via Differential Adhesion. *Cell Host Microbe* **19**, 550–559
864   (2016).

865   47.   Crailsheim, K. Intestinal transport of sugars in the honeybee (Apis mellifera L.). *J.*
866   *Insect Physiol.* **34**, 839–845 (1988).

867   48.   Tilman, D. A consumer-resource approach to community structure. *Integr. Comp.*
868   *Biol.* **26**, 5–22 (1986).

869   49.   Zheng, H., Steele, M. I., Leonard, S. P., Motta, E. V. S. & Moran, N. A. Honey bees as
870   models for gut microbiota research. *Lab Anim. (NY).* **47**, 317–325 (2018).

871   50.   Sonnenburg, J. L. *et al.* Glycan foraging in vivo by an intestine-adapted bacterial
872   symbiont. *Science (80-.).* **307**, 1955–1959 (2005).

873   51.   Zheng, H. *et al.* Division of labor in honey bee gut microbiota for plant
874   polysaccharide digestion. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 25909–25916 (2019).

875   52.   Meszéna, G., Gyllenberg, M., Pásztor, L. & Metz, J. A. J. Competitive exclusion and
876   limiting similarity: A unified theory. *Theor. Popul. Biol.* **69**, 68–87 (2006).

877   53.   Laëtitia, G., Pascal, D. & Yann, D. The Citrate Metabolism in Homo- and
878   Heterofermentative LAB: A Selective Means of Becoming Dominant over Other
879   Microorganisms in Complex Ecosystems. *Food Nutr. Sci.* **05**, 953–969 (2014).

880   54.   Magni, C., De Mendoza, D., Konings, W. N. & Lolkema, J. S. Mechanism of citrate
881   metabolism in Lactococcus lactis: Resistance against lactate toxicity at low pH. *J.*
882   *Bacteriol.* **181**, 1451–1457 (1999).

883   55.   Jimeno, J., Lazaro, M. J. & Sollberger, H. Antagonistic interactions between
884   propionic acid bacteria and non-starter lactic acid bacteria. *Lait* **75**, 401–413
885   (1995).

886   56.   Ellegaard, K. M., Suenami, S., Miyazaki, R. & Engel, P. Vast Differences in Strain-
887   Level Diversity in the Gut Microbiota of Two Closely Related Honey Bee Species.
888   *Curr. Biol.* **30**, 2520-2531.e7 (2020).

889   57.   Donnell, M. M. O., Forde, B. M., Neville, B., Ross, P. R. & Toole, P. W. O.

890   Carbohydrate catabolic flexibility in the mammalian intestinal commensal

891   Lactobacillus ruminis revealed by fermentation studies aligned to genome

892   annotations. *Microb. Cell Fact.* **10**, 1–11 (2011).

893 58. Ellegaard, K. M. *et al.* Genomic changes underlying host specialization in the bee

894   gut symbiont Lactobacillus Firm5. *Mol. Ecol.* **28**, 2224–2237 (2019).

895 59. Zhang, J., Kobert, K., Flouri, T. & Stamatakis, A. PEAR: A fast and accurate Illumina

896   Paired-End reAd mergeR. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 614–620 (2014).

897 60. Hallett L, Avolio M, Carroll I, Jones S, MacDonald A, Flynn D, Slaughter P,

898   Ripplinger J, Collins S, Gries C, J. M. (2020). codyn: Community Dynamics Metrics.

899   doi: 10.5063/F1N877Z6, R package version 2.0.5,

900   https://github.com/NCEAS/codynHallett L, Avoli,

901   https://github.com/NCEAS/codyn.

902 61. Sharma, C. M. *et al.* The primary transcriptome of the major human pathogen

903   Helicobacter pylori. *Nature* **464**, 250–255 (2010).

904 62. Avraham, R. *et al.* A highly multiplexed and sensitive RNA-seq protocol for

905   simultaneous analysis of host and pathogen transcriptomes. *Nat. Protoc.* **11**,

906   1477–1491 (2016).

907 63. Ellegaard, K. M. & Engel, P. New Reference Genome Sequences for 17 Bacterial

908   Strains of. *Microbiol. Resour. Announc.* **7**, 4–6 (2018).

909 64. Chen, I. M. A. *et al.* The IMG/M data management and analysis system v.6.0: New

910   tools and advanced capabilities. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **49**, D751–D763 (2021).

911 65. Robinson, M. D., McCarthy, D. J. & Smyth, G. K. edgeR: A Bioconductor package for

912   differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics* **26**,

913   139–140 (2009).

914 66. Nowlan H. Freese, David C. Norris, and A. E. L. Integrated Genome Browser:

915   Visual analytics platform for genomics. *Bioinformatics* (2016).

Figure 1. The presence of dietary pollen facilitates the stable coexistence of the four _Lactobacillus_ species in
the honey bee gut. (A) Bacterial abundance (CFUs) in the gut of gnotobiotic bees (n= 7-10) colonized with the four
species separately or together under two different dietary conditions. Bees were sampled five days after colonization.
Statistical differences (ANOVA with Tuckey post-hoc test and BH correction) are depicted by different letters. (**B, C**)
Changes in the absolute abundance of each member of the four-species community across the seven serial passages
(P1-P7) through the gut of gnotobiotic bees. The absolute abundance of each species was determined by multiplying
the total number of CFUs with the relative abundance of each species in the community. Grey areas represent the limit
of detection which can vary depending on the sequencing depth of each replicate (see methods). Therefore, the average
limit of detection and the 95% confidence intervals are shown.

Figure 2. The stable coexistence of the four *Lactobacillus* species can be recapitulated *in vitro* in the presence of pollen. (A-C) Changes in total abundance of the four species when serial passaged in co-culture for 21 times in minimal medium supplemented with **(A)** 2% (w/v) glucose, **(B)** 10% (v/v) pollen extract, and **(C)** 10% (v/v) pollen grains. The absolute abundance of each species was determined by multiplying the total number of CFUs with the proportion of each strain in a given sample as based on amplicon sequencing (see methods). Grey areas indicate the limit of detection as explained in the methods. **(D)** Community stability of each replicate calculated based on the species abundances for a sliding window of five passages with a step size of 1. **(E)** Absolute abundance of each species across the three treatments considering the replicates of passages 13-21, which is when the community reached stability. Statistical differences (ANOVA with Tuckey post-hoc test and BH correction) are depicted by different letters.

Figure 3: Transcriptome analysis of the four *Lactobacillus* species during co-colonization of gnotobiotic bees.
(A) Schematic outline of the RNA-Seq experiment. **(B)** Number of differentially regulated genes ($\log_2 FC \geq |2|$ and p-
value ≤ 0.01) in each species during co-colonization of gnotobiotic bees fed either pollen and sugar water (PG+SW) or
sugar water only (SW). Up- and down-regulated genes are shown in different grey tones. **(C)** COG categories of genes
up- or down-regulated by the four species in SW+PG if compared to SW. For COG definitions, see Supplementary Table
2 **(D)** Functional sub-categories of COG 'G' genes upregulated in SW+PG if compared to SW. **(E)** Barplot displaying
numbers of gene families differentially regulated in one species, two species, three species, or four species. Gene
families differentially regulated in only one species are split into those that have homologs in the other species or that
are species-specific.**(F)** Venn diagram showing overlap of gene families (based on gene homology) differentially
regulated in the four species. **(G)** Transcripts per million (TPM) for two representative samples of the SW+PG and the
SW treatments over a genomic region of Lkul encoding *Lactobacillus*-specific surface proteins. The genomic region of
Lkul is compared to a similar region identified in Lmel which is also differentially regulated across the two treatments
(expression profile not shown). Similarity between genes is shown by vertical lines. Grey tones indicate level of
similarity. Surface protein-encoding genes are show in grey with the different domains and motifs shown according to
the color legend.

Figure 4. The four *Lactobacillus* species upregulate different carbohydrate metabolism functions during gut
colonization of gnotobiotic bees. (A) Lhel, **(B)** Lmel, **(C)** Lkul, **(D)** Lapi. Only enzymes and transporters that are
upregulated in a species-specific manner in the pollen treatment versus the sugar water treatment are shown. The
figure is not exhaustive, but highlights the main differences that could be identified based on gene annotations among
all differentially regulated genes (**Supplementary Dataset 4**). Glycosidases belonging to different CAZyme families are
represented by different colors. ABC: ABC transporters, PTS: phosphotransferase system transporters. Numbers
indicate EC numbers of upregulated enzymatic steps.

Figure 5: Transcriptome analysis of the four *Lactobacillus* species grown *in vitro* in pollen extract or in glucose.
(A) Scheme of the 2x2 experimental design. Species were grown alone or together, in either glucose (G) or pollen
extract (PE). **(B)** Number of differentially regulated genes in each of the four species in the presence of PE if compared
to G**.** Mono, mono-culture, Co, co-culture. Up- and down-regulated genes are shown in different gray tones. **(C)** COG
categories of genes up-regulated by the four species in the presence of PE if compared to G. The colors are the same as
in Figure 3C. For COG definitions, see Supplementary Table 2. **D)** Heatmap displaying normalized counts of selected
genes differentially regulated across the *in vivo* and *in vitro* RNA-Seq experiments. We selected metabolic genes and
gene clusters that were identified in the in vivo experiment to be differentially regulated across the two treatments and
which could be assigned a putative function based on annotation. Counts were normalized for each gene and dataset
separately, i.e*. in vivo*, co-cultures, and mono-cultures. **(E)** Venn diagrams displaying the overlap of the genes
differentially regulated between the PE and G treatment when the four species were grown in co-culture (Co) and
mono-culture (Mono). **(F)** Number of differentially regulated genes in each of the four species in co-culture relative to
mono-culture**.** Up- and down-regulated genes are shown in different gray tones. **(G)** Transcripts per million (TPM) over
a genomic region of Lkul and Lmel encoding genes for citrate fermentation (i.e. citrate operon) for a representative
sample of the co-culture and the mono-culture treatment when grown in PE.

Figure 6. Metabolomics analysis shows differences in the utilization of pollen-derived glycosides across the four *Lactobacillus* species. (A) Volcano plots displaying ions with significant fold changes (FC) for each of the four species after 16 h of growth in pollen extract versus glucose. Each dot corresponds to an ion in the untargeted metabolomics dataset. Different colors represent ions that significantly change over time in one, two, three, or four species. Dashed black lines represent the significance thresholds: p-value < 0.01 and log2FC < -1 or > 1. **(B)** Culture wells of the four species grown in cfMRS + 0.05% rutin after 16 h of incubation. The yellow precipitate is only visible for Lmel. **(C)** Rutin and quercetin detection in spent medium of Lmel and Lkul grown in cfMRS + 0.05% rutin after 16 h of incubation (n=5). **(D)** Changes in key metabolites during growth measured by GC-MS (n=5). Log₂FC relative to time point 0 is plotted. Time is reported in hours. * Indicates metabolites whose identity was confirmed using analytical standards. For m/z values see **Supplementary Dataset 8**.

991