Within-host environmental heterogeneity is associated with phenotypic but not genomic diversity in *Wolbachia* endosymbionts

Romain Pigeault[1*], Yann Dussert[1], Raphaël Jorge[2,3], Marie Panza[1], Maryline Raimond[1], Carine Delaunay[1], David Ogereau[4], Bouziane Moumen[1], Jean Peccoud[1], Richard Cordaux[4]

[1] Université de Poitiers, CNRS, EBI, UMR 7267, Poitiers, France

[2] Université Lyon 1, CNRS, VetAgroSup, Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Evolutive, UMR 5558, Villeurbanne, France

[3] INSA Lyon, INRAE, Biologie fonctionnelle, insectes et interactions, UMR203, Villeurbanne, France

[4] Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, IRD, UMR Évolution Génomes Comportement Écologie, 91190 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

ORCID :

Romain Pigeault: 0000-0002-8011-4600

Yann Dussert: 0000-0003-1900-7715

David Ogereau : 0000-0002-4496-3007

Bouziane Moumen: 0000-0002-1789-6160

Jean Peccoud: 0000-0002-3356-7869

Richard Cordaux: 0000-0003-4997-735X

*Corresponding author: **Romain Pigeault - romain.pigeault@univ-poitiers.fr**

Abstract

The mechanisms underlying within-host diversification in parasite populations are still poorly understood. Yet, diversification in parasite phenotype and genotype may have important clinical and epidemiological consequences. Our aim was to determine if the constraints associated with the infection of different host tissues lead to the emergence and co-existence of multiple parasite sub-populations with different phenotypes. We tested this hypothesis by injecting the most widespread bacterial endosymbiont, *Wolbachia*, isolated from three tissues of the common pill-bug *Armadillidium vulgare* into uninfected individuals, and by monitoring the growth rate and virulence of each bacterial sub-population in the new hosts. Our results highlighted that within-host environmental heterogeneity led to diverse phenotypes in *Wolbachia*. This variability did not appear to result from genomic variation, but from phenotypic plasticity. Indeed, we did not find recurrent tissue-specific genomic variation among infected individuals. Whole genome resequencing of the *Wolbachia* sub-populations and pedigree data from the animals used in this study demonstrated however the coexistence of two *Wolbachia* variants within our host lineage for almost 20 years. Our results further supported the stability of the *Wolbachia* genome with respect to small-scale genomic variation, in agreement with reports on other symbiotic systems.

Keywords: adaptation, acclimation, feminizing *Wolbachia*, infection dynamics, subpopulation, tissue tropism, variant calling, within-host evolution.

1. Introduction

Among the many factors that influence species richness and community structure, environmental heterogeneity is generally considered to be a particularly important driver [1,2]. Since heterogeneous environments offer a variety of ecological niches and refuges from adverse conditions, species richness and persistence should increase with greater spatial heterogeneity [1,3–5]. Environmental heterogeneity also promotes genetic and phenotypic diversity within species through diversifying selection [6–9], which may underpin local adaptations [10–13]. However, most studies that investigated relationships between environmental heterogeneity and diversity have focused on free-living species (e.g.,[2,14]). The relationship between environmental heterogeneity and both endoparasites species diversity and phenotypic variability remains underexplored.

For endoparasites, environmental heterogeneity is found both within and between hosts. Host population heterogeneity is known to shape parasite evolutionary trajectories [15–17], leading to rapid parasite diversification [15,18]. However, a single host is treated by most theoretical and empirical studies on endoparasite evolution as a homogeneous environment – a single population of target cells without any structure – neglecting heterogeneities in cell type, immune response, nutrient supply or microbiota composition. Yet, several parasites exploit a heterogeneous environment composed of different biological tissues and fluids which form a spatially structured fitness landscape for the parasite. Successful colonization of different microenvironments, with their contrasted constraints, may involve the expression or selection of different parasitic phenotypes leading to within-host differentiation into several sub-populations [19]. This phenotypic variability can reflect

phenotypic plasticity (e.g., expression plasticity, [20]), selection of genetic variants initially

present in the inoculum [21] or of new variants arising from spontaneous mutations [22].

The co-occurrence of polymorphic sub-populations of parasites in different tissues or

cell types has been described in several biological models. RNA viruses (e.g., plum pox virus,

influenza, SARS-CoV-2, poliovirus) may display genetic diversity within single infected hosts,

and co-existing viral variants may evolve differently in distinct cell types [23–25]. The ability

of some RNA viruses to adapt to tissue-specific innate immune microenvironments may

actually be critical for establishing robust infections [25]. Gastric biopsies from multiple

stomach regions of *Helicobacter pylori*-infected hosts showed location-specific evolution of

the bacteria, suggesting the existence of structured niches with distinct selective pressures

within the stomach [22]. In other cases, such as *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* or *Mycobacterium*

tuberculosis chronic infections, the emergence of polymorphic sub-populations seems to be

driven by tissue-specific adaptation [26,27]. Some within-host parasite sub-population may

constitute a reservoir from which new virulent variants can emerge [28], and which can delay

clearance of parasite infection by the host immune system or drugs [29–31]. Understanding

the evolutionary forces and mechanisms at the origin of within-host parasite diversity is

essential, yet it is rarely studied. Descriptive studies (e.g., long-term ambulatory monitoring

of chronically infected patients) cannot trace the divergence of variants found within a host

and cannot identify the drivers of their diversification without controlling or assessing the

composition of the infectious inoculum and ensuring the absence of subsequent infections.

For this purpose, vertically transmitted parasites are particularly useful, as their transmission

mode ensures the common origin of all within-host parasite sub-populations.

Among the most widespread vertically transmitted endosymbionts in animals is

Wolbachia pipientis. This primarily maternally transmitted intracellular alpha-

proteobacterium is widely distributed among arthropods and has been extensively studied

with respect to its peculiar effects on its hosts [32,33]. *Wolbachia* not only manipulates host

reproduction, it may also negatively or positively affect host life history traits (e.g., immunity,

senescence) and the evolution of host genomes [34,35]. The diversity of effects of *Wolbachia*

on its hosts certainly relates to its wide distribution within infected individuals [35]. In addition

to colonizing the female germline, ensuring vertical transmission, *Wolbachia* has indeed been

observed in all major tissues (e.g., nerve chord, immune and digestive compartments) of many

arthropod species. The presence of vertically transmitted endosymbionts in somatic tissues

may seem paradoxical, especially considering that systemic infection can decrease host

fitness. Given the disadvantages of reducing the fitness of their host (i.e., fitness alignment),

these extensive somatic localizations must somehow benefit the parasite. Localization of

Wolbachia in somatic tissues could influence host biology in such a way that favours its vertical

and, possibly, horizontal transmission. The ability of the bacteria to colonize and establish in

different tissular microenvironments could involve the expression or selection of different

phenotypes.

To investigate this hypothesis, we assessed the relationship between environmental

heterogeneity and phenotype variability in the *w*VulC *Wolbachia* strain, which infects the

common pill-bug *Armadillidium vulgare* [36]. In this study, we focused on three naturally

infected tissues, which we selected for their physiological characteristics and the benefits that

Wolbachia could gain by colonizing them: (i) gonads, which are a prime target for vertical

transmission, (ii) haemocytes, as these circulating immune cells could contribute to spread

Wolbachia to different host tissues and may facilitate its horizontal transmission [37], and (iii)

the nerve chain, as the localization of *Wolbachia* in the brain and nerve chord could induce

adaptive modifications of host behaviour [38,39]. We hypothesized that the main phenotypic

variation between bacteria sub-populations colonizing these tissues pertained to their

replication rate. A high replication rate in vital tissues, such as the nerve chain, could disrupt

tissue structure and reduce host lifespan [40,41]. Thus, we expected *Wolbachia* populations

from the host's nerve system to show lower replication rates than those from the other

tissues. We tested this hypothesis by injecting *Wolbachia* extracted from the three tissue

types into uninfected *A. vulgare* individuals, and by monitoring their growth rates in their new

hosts. We then tested whether *Wolbachia* sub-populations were adapted and not merely

acclimated to their tissue types. In this case, we expected to find recurrent tissue-specific

genomic variation among infected individuals. We verified this prediction by sequencing the

whole genomes of focal bacterial sub-populations.

126 2. Materials and Methods

127 2.1 Biological models

All *A. vulgare* individuals used in this experiment were reared as previously described [42].

Given that the *Wolbachia* strain used in this study is feminizing, all the individuals used were

females. As *Wolbachia* is not cultivable, phenotyping sub-populations requires trans-infection

of an uninfected host with bacterial isolates from naturally infected animals. For this purpose,

we used a common pill-bug source line (WXw) naturally infected by the *w*VulC *Wolbachia*

strain (source individuals) and a naturally uninfected recipient line (WXa, recipient individuals)

into which we injected bacteria. The two laboratory lines came from the same original

population sampled in Helsingør (Denmark) in 1991.

136 2.2 Experimental infection

To characterize the phenotype of the different *Wolbachia* sub-populations associated with

three different tissues of their native host, five batches of trans-infection were carried out.

Three batches were used to monitor early infection dynamics within the recipient host (day 0

to day 60 post-infection), and two batches were used to estimate bacterial persistence in

tissues (day 200 post-infection). For each batch, one tissue suspension was prepared from

each of the following tissues: haemolymph, ovaries and nerve chain. Tissues were collected

from five source females from the WXw line (infection status previously validated by

quantitative PCR, see section 2.4). For each suspension, tissues were crushed in 1 mL of Ringer

solution (1.4 mM CaCl2, 2.4 mM HNaCO3, 2 mM KCl, 0.4 M NaCl) for haemolymph and 2 mL

for ovaries and nerve chain. The resulting suspension was filtered through a 1.2 µm pore

membrane to remove cell debris and host cell nuclei. As the number of bacteria differed

between the three focal tissues (see **Figure S1** in appendix 1), the solutions were further

diluted in Ringer solution to adjust the final concentration of bacteria at 2500 ± 300 cells/µL

for the trans-infection batches used to describe *Wolbachia* infection dynamics, and at 1282 ±

205 cells/µL for the two batches made to investigate bacterial persistence 200 days after

injection. One µL of each filtrate was injected using a thin glass needle into the general cavity

of each recipient individual through a small hole pierced at its posterior part. Twenty-one

recipient females of the WXa line were injected with each tissue filtrate from each of the three

trans-infection batches used to describe *Wolbachia* infection dynamics (i.e., 63 females per

tissue filtrate). Then, on days 20, 40 and 60 post-injection, 6-7 recipient females were

randomly selected to quantify *Wolbachia* in the focal tissues (see section 2.4). To study

bacterial persistence in recipient host tissues, 10 females were injected with each tissue

filtrate for each of the two trans-infection batches. Two hundred days post-injection, all

surviving females were dissected to quantify *Wolbachia* in the three focal tissues (see section

2.4). For each trans-infection batch, control groups were created using the same protocol, but

with female sources originating from the WXa line.

2.3 Mortality monitoring

The effect of *Wolbachia* injection on pill-bug mortality was monitored every 10 days as part

of the study of the influence of *Wolbachia* tissue origin on the dynamics of early infection

within the recipient host, and every 15-25 days as part of the study of *Wolbachia* tissue origin

on the persistence of the bacterium in tissues. When individuals were harvested during the

experiment to quantify *Wolbachia*, they were censored for the survival analysis (see section

2.9).

2.4 Quantification of *Wolbachia* in recipient host's tissues

Total DNA was extracted from the haemolymph, nerve chain and ovaries of recipient females

using standard protocols (Qiagen DNeasy 96 Blood & Tissue kit). For each sample, the purity

of the extracted DNA (OD 260/280 nm and 260/230 nm ratios) was measured using a

Nanodrop 1000 spectrophotometer (Thermofisher). To quantify *Wolbachia* load, we

developed a fluorescent probe-based quantitative PCR (qPCR) approach amplifying a

Wolbachia locus and a reference host nuclear locus in the same reaction. We used primers

wsp208f (5'- TGG-TGC-AGC-ATT-TAC-TCC-AG-3') and wsp413r (5'-TCG-CTT-GAT-AAG-CAA-

AAC-CA-3') targeting the *Wolbachia* protein surface gene (*wsp*, [40]) and we designed primers

amplifying a portion of the single-copy nuclear gene encoding the mitochondrial leucine-tRNA

ligase of *A. vulgare*: TLeuF (5'- TGT-ACA-CAT-CGA-GCA-GCA-AG-3') and TLeuR (5'- AAA-GAG-

GAG-CGG-AGA-GTT-TCA-G-3') [43]. The *Wolbachia wsp* double-dye probe (5'-TTG-CAG-ACA-

GTG-TGA-CAG-CGT-T-3') was labelled with Hexachlorofluorescein (HEX) as a reporter at the 5'

end and Black Hole Quencher 1 (BHQ-1) at the 3' end. *A. vulgare* TLeu probe (5'-ACG-AAG-

TTC-GCC-CTG-TTC-TGG-A-3') was labelled with 6-carboxy-fluorescein (FAM) as a reporter and

BHQ-1 as a quencher. The qPCR reactions were performed using Roche LIGHTCYCLER 480 with

the following program: 2 min at 50°C, 10 min at 95°C and 45 cycles, 15 s at 95°C, and 1 min at

60°C. For each sample, two independent technical replicates were carried out and the mean

cycle-threshold value was calculated. *Wolbachia* load was then calculated relative to the

reference gene (TLeu) using the delate CP method: $2^{-(CP(wsp) - CP(TLeu))}$.

2.5 Genome assembly of *Wolbachia* *w*VulC

To study the within-host genetic diversity of *Wolbachia*, we first assembled the genome of the

*w*VulC *Wolbachia* strain from the WXw line. Three female individuals were used for Oxford

Nanopore Technologies (ONT) long-read sequencing and one for Illumina short-read

sequencing. Total DNA from haemolymph, nerve chain and ovaries of each female was

extracted using standard protocols (DNA used for ONT sequencing: Macherey-Nagel

NucleoBond HMW DNA kit, DNA used for Illumina sequencing: Qiagen DNeasy 96 Blood &

Tissue kit). The long-read sequencing library was prepared using the SQK-LSK109 Ligation

Sequencing Kit (ONT) and sequenced with an R9.4.1 flow cell on a MinION Mk1B (ONT). Reads

were basecalled with Guppy 6.3.8 (RRID:SCR_023196) using the SUP model. The short-read

library was prepared using the TruSeq Nano DNA Library Prep kit (Illumina) and sequenced on

a HiSeq X (Illumina, paired-end 2 × 150 pb).

ONT adapters were first trimmed with porechop 0.2.4

(https://github.com/rrwick/Porechop), and reads were filtered using NanoFilt 2.7.1 (minimum

average quality: 7, minimum length: 1000 bp) implemented in NanoPack [44]. Reads were

then assembled with Flye 2.8.3 [45] using default parameters. The entire assembly was first

polished with the ONT reads using medaka 1.7 (https://github.com/nanoporetech/medaka)

(r941_min_fast_g507 model, 2 rounds). For assembly polishing using short reads, Illumina

reads were mapped onto the assembly with bwa-mem2 2.2.1 [46] and used for further

polishing with Polypolish 0.4.3 [47]. This step was carried out twice. The largest assembled

contig was reported detected as circular by the Flye assembler and had the expected length

(~1.6 Mb) of the *w*VulC *Wolbachia* genome. We aligned this contig against a previous version

of the genome (GenBank accession: ALWU00000000.1) with nucmer in MUMmer 4.0.0rc1

[48], confirming that the contig corresponded to the *w*VulC strain. After mapping the short

reads for a third time onto this contig, short variants were called with Freebayes 1.3.1 [49].

Variants were then visually reviewed using the IGV genome browser (version 2.14.0) [50].

Eight of them, corresponding to errors, were kept. We corrected the genome sequence with

these eight variants using the consensus command in BCFtools 1.17 [51]. Following the

recommendations of Ioannidis [52], the genome sequence was rotated to start at the *hemE*

gene using the fixstart command of Circlator 1.5.5 [53] . The genome was annotated with the

NCBI Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline (PGAP) 2022-12-13.build6494 [54–56]. A

search of Insertion Sequence (IS) elements was carried out with digIS v1.2 [57]. Additionally,

bacteriophage-derived regions were detected using PHASTEST [58]. Results of these

annotations were plotted with Circos v0.69-9 [59]. The completeness of the genome and the

gene annotation was assessed using BUSCO 5.3.2 [60] using the rickettsiales_odb10 dataset.

2.6 Whole-genome resequencing and variant calling

Three *A. vulgare* females from the WXw line were used to study the genetic diversity of the

different *Wolbachia* sub-populations associated with the nerve chain, ovaries and

haemolymph. Two of these females were sisters (names: F1_2015 & F2_2015). The matriline

of the third one (F_1999) diverged from the matriline of the sisters 18 years ago (18

generations). Females were dissected and their tissues isolated individually. Total DNA of each

biological sample was extracted using the Qiagen DNeasy 96 Blood & Tissue kit. DNA purity

and quantity were measured as described above. The haemolymph of two females could not

be sequenced because it did not yield enough DNA. DNA libraries were prepared using the

TruSeq Nano DNA Library Prep kit and sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq 2000 platform to

generate 2×150 pb reads, by Genoscreen (Lille, France). Read quality was assessed with

FastQC 0.11.9 (http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc). Fastp 0.23.0

[61] was used to remove adapter contamination and systematic base calling errors. To

mitigate misalignments of reads originating from the host genome, notably from *Wolbachia*-

derived nuclear insertions, reads were aligned using bwa-mem2 [46] against a reference

including our *w*VulC genome assembly, the assembly of the partial mitochondrial genome of

A. vulgare (GenBank accession number: MF187614.1, [62]) and the genome assembly of *A.*

vulgare (accession number: GCA_004104545.1, [63]). PCR duplicates were marked with

samtools markdup (v1.14). Read coverage along the *w*VulC genome was computed for each

sample for adjacent 5 kb windows using mosdepth 0.2.9 [64]. For a given sample, normalized

coverage for each window was calculated by dividing the coverage value by the median of all

values in R (v. 4.2.1) [65]. SNPs and short indels were detected using Freebayes 1.3.1 [49], with

a filter on the minimum fraction of observations supporting a variant (F = 0.03), disabling

population priors (-k argument) and using an aggregate probability of observation balance

between alleles (-a argument). Variants were then filtered using a custom R script. This script

selected only variable positions for which the read total depth was over 200 and for which the

alternative allele was supported by at least 10 reads within a tissue (*Wolbachia* genome

coverage - mean ± se: ovaries = 723.9 reads ± 134.8, nerve chain = 769.8 ± 81.0, haemolymph

= 533.7).

2.7 Variant validation

The *A. vulgare* reference genome was assembled from animals belonging to a different lineage

from the one used in our experiments [63]. To exclude spurious variants originating from

Wolbachia genome insertions into the genome of the *A. vulgare* line used in this study, we

implemented a four-step approach. (**1**) We aligned short reads from five individuals and five

pools of individuals from three different *A. vulgare* lineages uninfected by *Wolbachia* [66] on

the reference sequence. Variant calling was carried out with the same parameters as above,

but only at positions of detected candidate *Wolbachia* variants. All variants for which the

alternative allele was present in the reads sequenced from uninfected individuals were

eliminated. (**2**) We defined a 300-bp window around the position of each remaining variant

(starting 150 bp before the site) and excluded variants in windows containing at least two

reads from uninfected individuals. (**3**) For each remaining variable region, we then designed

PCR primers to amplify 120-250 bp targets encompassing the focus variant. These primers

were tested on two females from the recipient lineage (i.e., uninfected by *Wolbachia*), on two

females from the source lineage (i.e., infected by *Wolbachia*) and on two of their brothers (not

infected by *Wolbachia,* since infection induces feminization). If the primers amplified DNA

from at least one non-infected host, then the variant was eliminated. (**4**) Finally, read

alignments around all the variable regions that passed the previous filters were visualized

independently by two researchers using the IGV genome browser. Reads carrying the

alternative allele were checked to ensure that their insert size (distance between mates) was

consistent with that of the other reads, that they did not display unusual clipping (which may

indicate alignment errors) and that there was no significant increase in sequencing depth in

the region (which could indicate the presence of duplications rather than variants of the same

locus). To predict the effect of retained SNPs and indels on proteins coded by annotated genes,

we used SNPeff 5.2c [67]. Functional domains in these proteins were annotated using the

InterProScan online service (http://www.ebi.ac.uk/interpro/, database release 100.0 [68]).

2.8 Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were carried out using the R software [65]. The influence of the tissular

origin of the injected *Wolbachia* on *A. vulgare* mortality was evaluated using the 'survreg'

function with either exponential or Weibull errors distribution ('survival' package, [69]). The

model included survival as a response variable, and infection status (i.e., injected with

Wolbachia-infected or uninfected tissue filtrate), tissue origin of the injected filtrate and

experimental block as explanatory variables. The influence of *Wolbachia* tissue origin on its

ability to colonize and infect different focal tissues of recipient hosts over time was assessed

using a generalized linear mixed model (GLMM). Log-transformed relative quantification (RQ)

values representing the per-host cell *Wolbachia* dose were fitted as a response variable,

assuming normal error distribution. The tissular origin of *Wolbachia* and the focal tissue of

recipient injected hosts and the day post injection were used as explanatory variables. The

quadratic term day post injection was added to assess whether it significantly improved the

model fit. Individual IDs nested in experimental block were specified as random-effect

variables in the model.

Maximal models including all higher-order interactions were simplified by sequentially

eliminating non-significant terms and interactions to establish a minimal model [70]. The

significance of the effects of explanatory variables was established using a likelihood ratio test

[70] whose statistics approximately follows a Chi-square distribution [71]. The significant Chi-

square values given in the Results section are for the minimal model, whereas non-significant

values correspond to those obtained before the deletion of the variables from the model. *A*

posteriori contrasts were carried out by aggregating factor levels together and by testing the

fit of the simplified model using a likelihood-ratio test [70,71].

3. Results

3.1 *Wolbachia* infection does not significantly influence host survival

Under the assumption of both exponential errors and non-constant hazard, no effect of *Wolbachia* tissue origin on the survival rate of *A. vulgare* during early stage of infection (from day 0 to 60) was detected (exponential errors: LRT = 0.600, p = 0.740, Weibull errors: LRT = 0.602, p = 0.741, **Fig. 1A**). Overall, the injection of *Wolbachia*, irrespective of its tissue origin, was not shown to influence the survival of individuals (exponential errors: LRT = 1.040, p = 0.308, Weibull errors: LRT = 1.039, p = 0.307). Sixty days after injection, the survival rate of infected individuals was 0.87 (± 95% CI, ± 0.79-0.96), compared to 0.80 (± 0.71-0.91) for control animals.

In the trans-infection batches used to investigate the influence of *Wolbachia* tissue origin on its ability to persist in recipient host tissue, the mortality of animals was also not significantly influenced by *Wolbachia* tissue origin (exponential errors: LRT = 2.65, p = 0.265, Weibull errors: LRT = 2.88, p = 0.236) or even just by the fact of being infected by the bacteria (whatever the origin of the tissue, exponential errors: LRT = 2.22, p = 0.136, Weibull errors: LRT = 2.45, p = 0.117, **Fig. 1B**). The survival rate of infected individuals 200 days after the experimental infection was 0.59 ± 0.48-0.74 and 0.47 ± 0.36-0.61 for infected and control animals respectively.

Figure 1. Survival rate of *Armadillidium vulgare* following *Wolbachia* (*w*VulC) trans-infection. Effect of tissue origin of injected *Wolbachia* on mortality of recipient hosts monitored (**A**) every 10 days from day 0 to day 60 post-injection and (**B**) every 15-20 days from day 0 to day 200 post-injection. Solid lines: recipient hosts injected with crushed filtered tissue from animals naturally infected by *Wolbachia w*Vulc. Dotted lines: control individuals injected with crushed filtered tissue *from A. vulgare* not infected by *Wolbachia.* The three colours correspond to the tissue of origin of Wolbachia. Green: nerve chain, red: ovaries, blue: haemolymph.

3.2 The tissue origin of *Wolbachia* influence its early infection dynamics in recipient host tissues

After injection, the presence of *Wolbachia* was detected by qPCR in the three tested tissues of all recipient hosts, confirming its ability to colonize a new host. *Wolbachia* density increased over time (post-injection day: LRT = 16.239, p < 0.0001) and fitting the quadratic term (day_post_injection^2) strongly improved model fit (LRT = 32.181, p < 0.0001), suggesting that *Wolbachia* burden was more accurately modelled by an accelerated polynomial function of day post-injection (**Fig. 2A**). The density of *Wolbachia* in tissues started very low on day 20

post-injection, then rose slightly between day 20 and day 40, to drastically increase between

day 40 and day 60 post-injection. Although the pattern of infection in the different recipient

tissues was overall similar, *Wolbachia* load was significantly influenced by the interaction

between the colonized recipient tissue and the day post-injection (LRT = 74.309, p < 0.0001).

The dynamics of infection within the nerve chain were significantly different from those

observed in the haemolymph and ovaries, leading to a higher bacterial load in nerve tissues

60 days post-infection (LRT = 57.228, p < 0.0001, LRT = 122.240, p < 0.0001, respectively, **Fig.**

2A). The dynamics of infection were also significantly different within haemolymph and

ovaries (LRT = 17.771, p = 0.0013, **Fig. 2A**), as bacterial load was lower in ovaries at the end of

monitoring (mean RQ ± se, nerve chain = 6.582 ± 1.596, haemolymph = 4.864 ± 1.612, ovaries

= 2.533 ± 0.594, **Fig. 2A**). *Wolbachia* infection dynamics were also influenced by the tissue

origin of the injected bacteria (interaction between days post-injection and tissue origin: LRT

= 24.205, p < 0.0001). Whether the bacteria came from the haemolymph or ovaries of

naturally infected animals did not significantly affect the colonization dynamics of *Wolbachia*

in the injected recipients (LRT = 0.647, p = 0.723, **Fig. 2B**). However, bacteria from the nerve

chain colonized recipient hosts less rapidly than bacteria from other tissues (nerve chain

versus haemolymph: LRT = 28.981, p < 0.0001, nerve chain versus ovaries: LRT = 33.64, p <

0.0001). At 60 days post-injection, the *Wolbachia* load was on average more than twice as

high when the bacteria came from the ovaries and haemolymph than when they came from

the nerve chain of infected source hosts (mean RQ ± se, ovaries = 8.191 ± 2.18, haemolymph

= 5.26 ± 1.077, nerve chain = 0.899 ± 0.197, **Fig. 2B**). However, there was no significant

interaction between the colonized recipient tissue and the *Wolbachia's* original tissue,

suggesting that bacteria originating from a tissue do not colonize that same tissue more

effectively in recipient hosts (LRT = 6.957 p = 0.138).

Figure 2. Infection dynamics of *Wolbachia* (*w*VulC) in *Armadillidium vulgare* from day 0 to day 60 post-injection. (A) *Wolbachia* loads in nerve chain (green), haemolymph (blue) and ovaries (red) of recipient hosts trans-infected by *Wolbachia*, all source tissue considered. (B) Influence of *Wolbachia* tissue origin on infection dynamics in tissue loads in recipient host, all recipient tissue considered. Green: nerve chain, red: ovaries, blue: haemolymph. Error bars correspond to the standard error. Infection dynamics not connected by the same letter are significantly different (p < 0.05).

3.3 The tissue origin of Wolbachia does not influence significantly its persistence in recipient host tissues

Wolbachia densities at 200 days after infection were significantly different between tissues from the recipient hosts (LRT = 39.224, p < 0.0001, **Fig. 3**). Bacterial load was the highest in the nerve chain and the lowest in the haemolymph (contrast analyses, haemolymph versus nerve chain: LRT = 38.133, p < 0.0001, haemolymph versus ovaries: LRT = 20.823, p < 0.0001,

nerve chain versus ovaries: LRT = 6.969, p = 0.008, **Fig. 3**). Contrary to what was observed

during the early phase of infection, there was no effect of the tissue origin of *Wolbachia* on

the bacterial load in recipient tissues at 200 days post-injection (LRT = 0.368, p = 0.832).

Similarly, *Wolbachia* density in recipient tissues was not influenced by the interaction between

the colonized tissue and the tissue origin of the injected bacteria (LRT = 9.539, p = 0.0589).

Figure 3. *Wolbachia* (*w*VulC) load in *Armadillidium vulgare* tissues six months post-injection. The colored

boxplots illustrate the tissue origin of Wolbachia (green: nerve chain, red: ovaries, blue: haemolymph). However,

the analysis did not reveal any significant effect of the tissue origin of the bacteria on the intensity of infection

in the recipient host tissues. Boxes above and below the medians (horizontal lines) show the first and third

quartiles, respectively. Black diamonds represent the means. Levels not connected by the same letter are

significantly different (p < 0.05).

3.4 Complete genome assembly of the *w*VulC *Wolbachia* strain

Using ONT reads, a complete circular genome sequence (1,638,144 bp) of the *w*VulC

Wolbachia strain was assembled. The estimated completeness of the assembly was very high,

with 99.8% of the expected BUSCO genes found in the sequence (C: 99.8% [S: 99.5%, D: 0.3%],

F: 0.0%). The annotation of the genome resulted in 1,390 protein-coding sequences and 208

pseudogenes (**Fig. 4**). The *w*VulC genome contained 138 IS elements that are larger than 150

bp, representing 8.45% of the total length of the genome. This high proportion of repeated

sequences for a bacterium is similar to that of other *Wolbachia* strains [72]. We also identified

seven prophage regions (six potentially intact and one questionable region, following

PHASTEST scoring criteria), representing 12.1% of the *w*VulC genome.

Figure 4. Circos plot of the *w*VulC *Wolbachia* genome. Prophage-derived regions are indicated inside the

genome ideogram (outer track), with their colour corresponding to the score attributed by PHASTEST (dark blue:

intact, light blue: questionable). Ticks on the ideogram are separated by 10 kb intervals, and indicated values are

in Mb. Predicted protein-coding genes are represented by grey rectangles (second track), and Insertion Sequence

elements by black rectangles (third track). In the fourth track, the normalized read coverage for 5 kb adjacent

windows (averaged over recipient individuals) is represented for the different resequenced tissues: ovaries (red),

nerve chain (green) and haemolymph (blue). The black line corresponds to a mean normalized coverage of one,

and grey lines are separated by 0.1 unit. Triangles indicates the position of detected variants after filtering (black

triangle: found in only one recipient individual, grey triangle: found in all recipient individuals).

404 3.5 Whole-genome resequencing and variant calling reveal *Wolbachia* genome stability

The variant calling performed using the whole-genome resequencing of tissues from three

females naturally infected by *Wolbachia* (i.e., source lineage) detected 641 SNPs and short

indels. However, 584 of these apparent variants were also detected in the resequenced

genome of several *A. vulgare* lineages not infected by *Wolbachia* (validation procedure, step

1), meaning that these variants probably amounted to *Wolbachia* sequences inserted into the

host nuclear genome. The presence of reads sequenced from uninfected hosts within a 300-

bp window around the 57 remaining polymorphic regions resulted in the exclusion of 25

variants (validation procedure step 2). Of the remaining 32 SNPs and small indels, 17 were

excluded because their regions were PCR-amplified in males not infected with *Wolbachia*

(infection status confirmed by qPCR, validation procedure step 3). Finally, during the last step

of manual validation of the variants, we excluded 18 variants due to detected anomalies, such

as inconsistent insert size, excessive soft-clipping, or substantial increases in sequencing depth

in their region. Overall, only 0.47% (two SNPs and one small indel) of the originally detected

variants were finally validated. Among the three variants, one SNP showed variation in all

tested tissues of all females (**Table 1**, **Fig. 5**). The frequency of the rarer allele was relatively

stable across tissues and varied between 8.7% and 14.3% (**Table 1**, **Fig. 5**). One SNP and one

indel of one nucleotide were observed in a single individual (F_1999, **Fig. 5**). The frequency of

these two variants varied slightly among the three tissues (**Fig. 5**). The three polymorphisms

affected three protein-coding genes, with two being non-synonymous substitutions and one

causing a frameshift (**Table 1**). Two of the putative proteins did not have any recognized

functional domain. The third one, whose gene is located in a prophage-derived region (**Fig. 4**)

contained ankyrin repeat domains and a latrotoxin C-terminal domain.

Figure 5. Frequency of rare variants in the tissues of naturally infected hosts. Pedigree of the three *Wolbachia*-

infected *Armadillidium vulgare* females associated to the frequency of the three variants identified. SNP1: variant

observed at the genome position 1266439, SNP2: variant observed at the genome position 1269492, SNP3:

variant observed at the genome position 1536425 (see Table 1). Colours correspond to host's tissues. Green:

nerve chain, red: ovaries, blue: haemolymph. Error bar: CI 95%.

4. Discussion

Experimental trans-infections enabled us to study the influence of the tissue origin of *Wolbachia* on the early infection dynamics of the endosymbiont in different recipient host tissues, and the ability of each bacterial sub-population to establish a chronic infection. At the same time, regular monitoring of injected individuals over a period of six months shed light on the influence of *Wolbachia* on the survival rate of recipient hosts and did not reveal any difference between *Wolbachia* sub-populations with respect to their virulence. In addition, our results corroborate a previous report showing a similar survival rate between trans-infected and un-infected animals [40]. As the source and recipient lines belonged to the same field-collected *A. vulgare* population, they should be ecologically similar for *Wolbachia*. Low virulence is therefore expected, as for most vertically transmitted endosymbionts transferred between closely related hosts [73].

The quantification of *Wolbachia* in the main organs of recipient hosts showed that its infection dynamics varies according to its tissue origin. Bacteria from the nerve chain colonized recipient hosts much less rapidly than bacteria from ovaries and haemolymph. Two months after infection with a similar dose of bacteria, *Wolbachia* load was more than three times lower in hosts injected with bacteria from nerve chain, compared with hosts infected by bacteria from the other two tissues. The growth rate of bacteria is known to largely vary according to the type and amount of nutrients available in their environment [74,75]. The lower growth rate of bacteria from nerve chain, compared with those from the other tissues, could therefore be explained by the fact that in naturally infected hosts, this tissue is less favourable to the development of *Wolbachia* (e.g., poorer in resources). If so, bacteria from the nerve chain could be subject to growth-limiting stress at the time of their horizontal

transfer, which would explain their lower replication rate within the recipient host at the start

of infection. However, the recipient host tissue that was the most rapidly colonized by

Wolbachia after trans-infection, and the one showing the highest bacterial load at each

sampling point irrespective of the tissue origin of the bacteria, was the nerve chain. As well as

showing no tropism towards the bacteria's tissue of origin, this result suggests that nervous

tissue is favourable to the development of *Wolbachia.*

Alternatively, the lower growth rate from bacteria originating from the nerve chain

could be adaptive. Classic theory for the evolution of virulence is based on a trade-off between

parasite growth, transmission and host survival, which predicts that higher growth increases

not only transmission but also virulence [76,77]. In a tissue that is not directly involved in

parasite transmission, we predicted that virulence should constrain the parasite growth to low

levels. Our results corroborate this prediction, as *Wolbachia* from the nerve chain of *A. vulgare*

should not be transmissible – except maybe in rare cases of cannibalism and predation [73] –

and may prove detrimental to the host if they proliferate. Uncontrolled colonization of nerve

cells has indeed been shown to alter host behaviour in several *Wolbachia*-host pairs [38,40],

and to lead to severe tissue degeneration and premature host death [40,41,78,79]. In tissues

that allow parasite transmission, the balance between *Wolbachia* growth and host fitness

should favour higher growth rates. In terrestrial isopods, both ovaries and haemolymph play

a key role in both intra- and inter-host dissemination of *Wolbachia*. Ovaries are the route for

vertical transmission and haemolymph, in addition to participating in the dissemination of the

bacteria across host tissues [37,80,81], may also be involved in horizontal transfer via contact

between injured individuals [82].

Despite differences observed at two months following infection, the tissue origin of

the injected *Wolbachia* had no significant effect on the bacterial load in the three tissues of

the recipient hosts at six months after injection. The decrease of growth rate differences

within a few weeks suggests that the phenotypic variability observed at the start of the

infection corresponded to phenotypic plasticity. This assumption is supported by the lack of

recurring small genomic variation associated with tissue types in naturally infected individuals

from the source lineage. More generally, with respect to SNPs and small indels, we found very

little genomic variability within naturally infected hosts as only three mutations were detected

in sequence data from seven tissue samples. Interestingly however, a SNP showed variation

in all sequenced individuals. The two *A. vulgare* sisters (F1_2015 & F2_2015) have been

separated from individual F_1999 for 18 generations, suggesting that two *Wolbachia* lineages

varying at this SNP have been co-infecting the source lineage for at least 18 years (generation

time is one year in *A. vulgare*). The other two mutations were only observed in individual

F_1999, which suggests that they appeared after the divergence of its maternal lineage from

that of the two sisters. This very low number of mutations is consistent with reported low

mutation rates, as far as short genomic variation is concerned [83–86]. Long-read sequencing

of multiple individuals would allow studying structural genomic variation, which may play a

more important role than point mutations in *Wolbachia* evolution [87–89].

In conclusion, our study reveals that within-host environmental heterogeneity can lead

to diverse phenotypes in the most widespread bacterial endosymbiont in animals, *Wolbachia*.

This variability did not appear to result from genomic variation, but from phenotypic plasticity.

Knowing the pedigree of *Wolbachia*-infected animal lines proved pivotal in assessing the

stability of the *Wolbachia* genome over time. From a methodological point of view, we

showed that the detection of variants in endosymbiont populations requires considerable

caution, as our conservative approach led us to exclude more than 99.5% of the initially called

variants. We recommend the use of a rigorous step-by-step approach to eliminate spurious

genetic variants caused by the presence of endosymbiont genomic sequences inserted into

the host genome.

Data accessibility statement

The R scripts and data supporting the conclusions of this article are available on the Figshare

data repository (https://figshare.com/s/b1f84643b65b4f897c54). To ensure the stability and

reliability of the command-lines used for genome assembly and SNP calling we have included

all necessary information and options in the github repository (https://github.com/UMR-

CNRS-7267/Wolbachia_endosymbiont_heterogeneity_paper). We have taken proactive

measures to address potential volatility on GitHub by uploading a compressed archive of this

GitHub methodology to the Figshare data repository. Raw sequencing data have been

deposited in GenBank (*w*VulC genome assembly: BioProject PRJNA1116085; Wolbachia

resequencing: PRJNA1117639).

Author's contributions

517   R.P. and R.C. conceived and designed the experiments. R.P., R.J., M.P. and M.R. performed the

518   trans-infection experiments. R.P. and C.D prepared the samples for resequencing and carried

519   out the PCRs. D.O. performed *Wolbachia* genome sequencing. Y.D. assembled the *Wolbachia*

520   genome. R.P., Y.D., B.M. and J.P. analysed the data. R.P. wrote the first draft of the manuscript,

521   and all authors contributed substantially to revision.

Competing interests

523   We declare we have no competing interests.
524

Funding

526   This work was funded by Agence Nationale de la Recherche Grants ANR-21-CE02-0004

527   (RESIST) to RC and ANR-20-CE02-004 (SymChroSex) to JP, and intramural funds from the CNRS

528   and the University of Poitiers.

Acknowledgements

We thank Isabelle Giraud for the extraction of the DNA used to sequence and assemble the genome of *Wolbachia w*VulC and Pierre Grève and Didier Bouchon for providing us with preliminary data so that we could fine-tune the bioinformatics analyses. We would like to thank Alexandra Lafitte for her invaluable work supervising the breeding of *A. vulgare*.

5. References

1. Ben-Hur E, Kadmon R. 2020 Heterogeneity–diversity relationships in sessile organisms: a unified framework. *Ecol. Lett.* **23**, 193–207. (doi:10.1111/ele.13418)

2. Stein A, Kreft H. 2015 Terminology and quantification of environmental heterogeneity in species-richness research. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc* **90**, 815–836. (doi:10.1111/brv.12135)

3. Burnett MR, August PV, Brown JH, Killingbeck KT. 1998 The influence of geomorphological heterogeneity on biodiversity: I. a patch-scale perspective. *Conserv. Biol.y* **12**, 363–370.

4. Stein A, Gerstner K, Kreft H. 2014 Environmental heterogeneity as a universal driver of species richness across taxa, biomes and spatial scales. *Ecol. Lett.* **17**, 866–880. (doi:10.1111/ele.12277)

5. Yang Z, Liu X, Zhou M, Ai D, Wang G, Wang Y, Chu C, Lundholm JT. 2015 The effect of environmental heterogeneity on species richness depends on community position along the environmental gradient. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 15723. (doi:10.1038/srep15723)

6. Houle C, Pelletier F, Bélisle M, Garant D. 2020 Impacts of environmental heterogeneity on natural selection in a wild bird population. *Evolution* **74**, 1142–1154. (doi:10.1111/evo.13939)

7. Huang B-H, Huang C-W, Huang C-L, Liao P-C. 2017 Continuation of the genetic divergence of ecological speciation by spatial environmental heterogeneity in island endemic plants. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 5465. (doi:10.1038/s41598-017-05900-1)

8. Mcdonald JF, Ayala FJ. 1974 Genetic response to environmental heterogeneity. *Nature* **250**, 572–574. (doi:10.1038/250572a0)

9. Rainey PB, Travisano M. 1998 Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment.
Nature **394**, 69–72. (doi:10.1038/27900)

10. Huang Y, Tran I, Agrawal AF. 2016 Does genetic variation maintained by environmental
heterogeneity facilitate adaptation to novel selection? *Am. Nat.* **188**, 27–37.
(doi:10.1086/686889)

11. Qian H, Qian S, Zhang J, Kessler M. 2024 Effects of climate and environmental
heterogeneity on the phylogenetic structure of regional angiosperm floras worldwide.
Nat. Comm. **15**, 1079. (doi:10.1038/s41467-024-45155-9)

12. Trevail AM *et al.* 2021 Environmental heterogeneity promotes individual specialisation in
habitat selection in a widely distributed seabird. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **90**, 2875–2887.
(doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13588)

13. van Houte S, Padfield D, Gómez P, Luján AM, Brockhurst MA, Paterson S, Buckling A.
2021 Compost spatial heterogeneity promotes evolutionary diversification of a
bacterium. *J. Evol. Biol.* **34**, 246–255. (doi:10.1111/jeb.13722)

14. Langenheder S, Lindström ES. 2019 Factors influencing aquatic and terrestrial bacterial
community assembly. *Envir. Microb. Rep.* **11**, 306–315. (doi:10.1111/1758-2229.12731)

15. Johnson PTJ, Wood CL, Joseph MB, Preston DL, Haas SE, Springer YP. 2016 Habitat
heterogeneity drives the host-diversity-begets-parasite-diversity relationship: evidence
from experimental and field studies. *Ecol. Lett.* **19**, 752–761. (doi:10.1111/ele.12609)

16. Regoes RR, Nowak MA, Bonhoeffer S. 2000 Evolution of virulence in a heterogeneous
host population. *Evolution* **54**, 64–71. (doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2000.tb00008.x)

17. White PS, Choi A, Pandey R, Menezes A, Penley M, Gibson AK, de Roode J, Morran L.
2020 Host heterogeneity mitigates virulence evolution. *Biol. Lett.* **16**, 20190744.
(doi:10.1098/rsbl.2019.0744)

18. Kamiya T, O'Dwyer K, Nakagawa S, Poulin R. 2014 What determines species richness of
parasitic organisms? A meta-analysis across animal, plant and fungal hosts. *Biol. Rev.*
Camb. Philos. Soc. **89**, 123–134. (doi:10.1111/brv.12046)

19. Didelot X, Walker AS, Peto TE, Crook DW, Wilson DJ. 2016 Within-host evolution of
bacterial pathogens. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **14**, 150–162. (doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2015.13)

20. Wernegreen JJ, Wheeler DE. 2009 Remaining flexible in old alliances: functional plasticity
in constrained mutualisms. *DNA Cell Biol.* **28**, 371–382. (doi:10.1089/dna.2009.0872)

21. Chrostek E, Teixeira L. 2018 Within host selection for faster replicating bacterial
symbionts. *PLoS One* **13**. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0191530)

22. Ailloud F, Didelot X, Woltemate S, Pfaffinger G, Overmann J, Bader RC, Schulz C,
Malfertheiner P, Suerbaum S. 2019 Within-host evolution of *Helicobacter pylori* shaped
by niche-specific adaptation, intragastric migrations and selective sweeps. *Nat. Comm.*
10, 2273. (doi:10.1038/s41467-019-10050-1)

23. Gupta K *et al.* 2022 Structural insights in cell-type specific evolution of intra-host
diversity by SARS-CoV-2. *Nat. Comm.* **13**, 222. (doi:10.1038/s41467-021-27881-6)

24. Jridi C, Martin J-F, Marie-Jeanne V, Labonne G, Blanc S. 2006 Distinct viral populations
differentiate and evolve independently in a single perennial host plant. *J. Virol.* **80**, 2349–
2357. (doi:10.1128/jvi.80.5.2349-2357.2006)

25. Xiao Y, Dolan PT, Goldstein EF, Li M, Farkov M, Brodsky L, Andino R. 2017 Poliovirus
intrahost evolution is required to overcome tissue-specific innate immune responses.
Nat. Commun. **8**, 375. (doi:10.1038/s41467-017-00354-5)

26. Jorth P *et al.* 2015 Regional Isolation Drives Bacterial Diversification within Cystic Fibrosis
Lungs. *Cell Host Micro.* **18**, 307–319. (doi:10.1016/j.chom.2015.07.006)

27. Lieberman TD, Wilson D, Misra R, Xiong LL, Moodley P, Cohen T, Kishony R. 2016
Genomic diversity in autopsy samples reveals within-host dissemination of HIV-
associated *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *Nat. Med.* **22**, 1470–1474.
(doi:10.1038/nm.4205)

28. Bessière P, Volmer R. 2021 From one to many: The within-host rise of viral variants. *PLOS*
Path. **17**, e1009811. (doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1009811)

29. Avettand-Fenoel V, Hocqueloux L, Müller-Trutwin M, Prazuck T, Melard A, Chaix M-L,
Agoute E, Michau C, Rouzioux C. 2011 Greater diversity of HIV DNA variants in the
rectum compared to variants in the blood in patients without HAART. *J. Med. Virol.* **83**,
1499–1507. (doi:10.1002/jmv.22132)

30. Clement S, Vaudaux P, Francois P, Schrenzel J, Huggler E, Kampf S, Chaponnier C, Lew D,
Lacroix J-S. 2005 Evidence of an intracellular reservoir in the nasal mucosa of patients
with recurrent *Staphylococcus aureus* rhinosinusitis. *J. Infect. Disea.* **192**, 1023–1028.
(doi:10.1086/432735)

31. Obaldia N *et al.* 2018 Bone marrow is a major parasite reservoir in *Plasmodium vivax*
infection. *MBio* **9**. (doi:10.1128/mBio.00625-18)

32. Kaur R, Shropshire JD, Cross KL, Leigh B, Mansueto AJ, Stewart V, Bordenstein SR,
Bordenstein SR. 2021 Living in the endosymbiotic world of *Wolbachia*: A centennial
review. *Cell Host Microb.* **29**, 879–893. (doi:10.1016/j.chom.2021.03.006)

33. LePage D, Bordenstein SR. 2013 *Wolbachia*: Can we save lives with a great pandemic?
Trends Parasitol. **29**, 385–393. (doi:10.1016/j.pt.2013.06.003)

34. Cordaux R, Gilbert C. 2017 Evolutionary significance of *Wolbachia*-to-animal horizontal
gene transfer: Female sex determination and the f element in the Isopod *Armadillidium*
vulgare. *Genes* **8**, 186. (doi:10.3390/genes8070186)

35. Sicard M, Dittmer J, Grève P, Bouchon D, Braquart-Varnier C. 2014 A host as an
ecosystem: *Wolbachia* coping with environmental constraints. *Environ. Microbiol.* **16**,
3583–3607. (doi:10.1111/1462-2920.12573)

36. Cordaux R, Michel-Salzat A, Frelon-Raimond M, Rigaud T, Bouchon D. 2004 Evidence for
a new feminizing *Wolbachia* strain in the isopod *Armadillidium vulgare*: evolutionary
implications. *Heredity* **93**, 78–84. (doi:10.1038/sj.hdy.6800482)

37. Braquart-Varnier C, Raimond M, Mappa G, Chevalier FD, Le Clec'h W, Sicard M. 2015 The
hematopoietic organ: A cornerstone for *Wolbachia* propagation between and within
hosts. *Front. Microbiol.* **6**. (doi:10.3389/fmicb.2015.01424)

38. Bi J, Wang Y. 2020 The effect of the endosymbiont *Wolbachia* on the behavior of insect
hosts. *Insect Sci* **27**, 846–858. (doi:10.1111/1744-7917.12731)

39. Templé N, Richard F-J. 2015 Intra-cellular bacterial infections affect learning and
memory capacities of an invertebrate. *Front. Zool.* **12**, 36. (doi:10.1186/s12983-015-
0129-6)

40. Le Clec'h WL, Braquart-Varnier C, Raimond M, Ferdy J-B, Bouchon D, Sicard M. 2012 High
virulence of *Wolbachia* after host switching: When autophagy hurts. *PLOS Path.* **8**,
e1002844. (doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1002844)

41. Strunov A, Kiseleva E. 2016 *Drosophila melanogaster* brain invasion: pathogenic
Wolbachia in central nervous system of the fly. *Insect Sci.* **23**, 253–264.
(doi:10.1111/1744-7917.12187)

42. Sicard M, Chevalier F, De Vlechouver M, Bouchon D, Grève P, Braquart-Varnier C. 2010
Variations of immune parameters in terrestrial isopods: a matter of gender, aging and
Wolbachia. *Naturwissenschaften* **97**, 819–826. (doi:10.1007/s00114-010-0699-2)

43. Durand S, Lheraud B, Giraud I, Bech N, Grandjean F, Rigaud T, Peccoud J, Cordaux R.
2023 Heterogeneous distribution of sex ratio distorters in natural populations of the
isopod *Armadillidium vulgare*. *Biol. Lett.* **19**, 20220457. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2022.0457)

44. De Coster W, D'Hert S, Schultz DT, Cruts M, Van Broeckhoven C. 2018 NanoPack:
visualizing and processing long-read sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 2666–2669.
(doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty149)

45. Kolmogorov M, Yuan J, Lin Y, Pevzner PA. 2019 Assembly of long, error-prone reads using
repeat graphs. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **37**, 540–546. (doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0072-8)

46. Vasimuddin Md, Misra S, Li H, Aluru S. 2019 Efficient architecture-aware acceleration of
BWA-MEM for multicore systems. *IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing*
Symposium (IPDPS), pp. 314–324. (doi:10.1109/IPDPS.2019.00041)

47. Wick RR, Holt KE. 2022 Polypolish: Short-read polishing of long-read bacterial genome
assemblies. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **18**, e1009802. (doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009802)

48. Marçais G, Delcher AL, Phillippy AM, Coston R, Salzberg SL, Zimin A. 2018 MUMmer4: A
fast and versatile genome alignment system. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **14**, e1005944.
(doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005944)

49. Garrison E, Marth G. 2012 Haplotype-based variant detection from short-read
sequencing. Arxiv:**1207**.3907 (doi:10.48550/arXiv.1207.3907)

50. Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Wenger AM, Zehir A, Mesirov JP. 2017 Variant Review
with the Integrative Genomics Viewer. *Cancer Res* **77**, e31–e34. (doi:10.1158/0008-
5472.CAN-17-0337)

51. Danecek P *et al.* 2021 Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *GigaScience* **10**, giab008.
(doi:10.1093/gigascience/giab008)

52. Ioannidis JPA. 2007 Non-replication and inconsistency in the genome-wide association
setting. *Hum. Hered*. **64**, 203–213. (doi:10.1159/000103512)

53. Hunt M, Silva ND, Otto TD, Parkhill J, Keane JA, Harris SR. 2015 Circlator: automated
circularization of genome assemblies using long sequencing reads. *Genom. Biol.* **16**, 294.
(doi:10.1186/s13059-015-0849-0)

54. Haft DH *et al.* 2024 RefSeq and the prokaryotic genome annotation pipeline in the age of
metagenomes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **52**, D762–D769. (doi:10.1093/nar/gkad988)

55. Li W *et al.* 2021 RefSeq: expanding the prokaryotic genome annotation pipeline reach
with protein family model curation. *Nucleic Acids Res* **49**, D1020–D1028.
(doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa1105)

56. Tatusova T *et al.* 2016 NCBI prokaryotic genome annotation pipeline. *Nucleic Acids Res.*
44, 6614–6624. (doi:10.1093/nar/gkw569)

57. Puterová J, Martínek T. 2021 digIS: towards detecting distant and putative novel
insertion sequence elements in prokaryotic genomes. *BMC Bioinfo.* **22**, 258.
(doi:10.1186/s12859-021-04177-6)

58. Wishart DS, Han S, Saha S, Oler E, Peters H, Grant JR, Stothard P, Gautam V. 2023
PHASTEST: faster than PHASTER, better than PHAST. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **51**, W443–W450.
(doi:10.1093/nar/gkad382)

59. Krzywinski M, Schein J, Birol I, Connors J, Gascoyne R, Horsman D, Jones SJ, Marra MA.
2009 Circos: an information aesthetic for comparative genomics. *Genome Res.* **19**, 1639–
1645. (doi:10.1101/gr.092759.109)

60. Manni M, Berkeley MR, Seppey M, Zdobnov EM. 2021 BUSCO: Assessing genomic data
quality and beyond. *Current Prot.* **1**, e323. (doi:10.1002/cpz1.323)

61. Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Gu J. 2018 fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor.
Bioinformatics **34**, i884–i890. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty560)

62. Peccoud J, Chebbi MA, Cormier A, Moumen B, Gilbert C, Marcadé I, Chandler C, Cordaux
R. 2017 Untangling heteroplasmy, structure, and evolution of an atypical mitochondrial
genome by PacBio Sequencing. *Genetics* **207**, 269–280.
(doi:10.1534/genetics.117.203380)

63. Chebbi MA, Becking T, Moumen B, Giraud I, Gilbert C, Peccoud J, Cordaux R. 2019 The
genome of *Armadillidium vulgare* (Crustacea, Isopoda) provides insights into sex
chromosome evolution in the context of cytoplasmic sex determination. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*
36, 727–741. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msz010)

64. Pedersen BS, Quinlan AR. 2018 Mosdepth: quick coverage calculation for genomes and
exomes. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 867–868. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btx699)

65. R Core Team. 2022 R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

66. Cordaux R, Chebbi MA, Giraud I, Pleydell DRJ, Peccoud J. 2021 Characterization of a sex-
determining region and its genomic context via statistical estimates of haplotype
frequencies in daughters and sons sequenced in pools. *Gen. Biol. Evol.* **13**, evab121.
(doi:10.1093/gbe/evab121)

67. Cingolani P, Platts A, Wang LL, Coon M, Nguyen T, Wang L, Land SJ, Lu X, Ruden DM.
2012 A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide
polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of *Drosophila melanogaster* strain w1118;
iso-2; iso-3. *Fly* **6**, 80–92. (doi:10.4161/fly.19695)

68. Paysan-Lafosse T *et al.* 2023 InterPro in 2022. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **51**, D418–D427.
(doi:10.1093/nar/gkac993)

69. Therneau TM, Lumley TL, Elizabeth A, Cynthia C. 2024 survival: Survival Analysis.

70. Crawley MJ. 2012 *The R Book*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons,

71. Bolker BM. 2008 *Ecological Models and Data in R*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University
Press.

72. Cerveau N, Leclercq S, Leroy E, Bouchon D, Cordaux R. 2011 Short- and long-term
evolutionary dynamics of bacterial insertion sequences: Insights from *Wolbachia*
endosymbionts. *Gen. Biol. Evol.* **3**, 1175–1186. (doi:10.1093/gbe/evr096)

73. Le Clec'h W, Raimond M, Guillot S, Bouchon D, Sicard M. 2013 Horizontal transfers of
feminizing versus non-feminizing *Wolbachia* strains: from harmless passengers to
pathogens. *Environ. Microbiol.* **15**, 2922–2936. (doi:10.1111/1462-2920.12172)

74. Keiblinger KM *et al.* 2010 The effect of resource quantity and resource stoichiometry on
microbial carbon-use-efficiency. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* **73**, 430–440. (doi:10.1111/j.1574-
6941.2010.00912.x)

75. Liu M, Durfee T, Cabrera JE, Zhao K, Jin DJ, Blattner FR. 2005 Global transcriptional
programs reveal a carbon source foraging strategy by *Escherichia coli*. *J. Biol. Chem.* **280**,
15921–15927. (doi:10.1074/jbc.M414050200)

76. Alizon S, Hurford A, Mideo N, Baalen MV. 2009 Virulence evolution and the trade-off
hypothesis: history, current state of affairs and the future. *J. Evol. Biol.* **22**, 245–259.
(doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01658.x)

77. Frank SA. 1996 Models of parasite virulence. *Q. Rev. Biol.* **71**, 37–78.
(doi:10.1086/419267)

78. Kosmidis S, Missirlis F, Botella JA, Schneuwly S, Rouault TA, Skoulakis EMC. 2014
Behavioral decline and premature lethality upon pan-neuronal ferritin overexpression in
Drosophila infected with a virulent form of *Wolbachia*. *Front. Pharmacol.* **5**, 66.
(doi:10.3389/fphar.2014.00066)

79. Min KT, Benzer S. 1997 *Wolbachia*, normally a symbiont of *Drosophila*, can be virulent,
causing degeneration and early death. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **94**, 10792–10796.
(doi:10.1073/pnas.94.20.10792)

80. Chevalier F, Herbinière-Gaboreau J, Bertaux J, Raimond M, Morel F, Bouchon D, Grève P,
Braquart-Varnier C. 2011 The immune cellular effectors of terrestrial isopod

Armadillidium vulgare: Meeting with their invaders, *Wolbachia*. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e18531.

(doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0018531)

81. Sanaei E, Charlat S, Engelstädter J. 2021 *Wolbachia* host shifts: routes, mechanisms,

constraints and evolutionary consequences. *Biol. Rev.* **96**, 433–453.

(doi:10.1111/brv.12663)

82. Rigaud T, Juchault P. 1995 Success and failure of horizontal transfers of feminizing

Wolbachia endosymbionts in woodlice. *J. Evol. Biol.* **8**, 249–255. (doi:10.1046/j.1420-

9101.1995.8020249.x)

83. Dainty KR *et al.* 2021 *w*Mel *Wolbachia* genome remains stable after 7 years in Australian

Aedes aegypti field populations. *Microb. Genom.* **7**, 000641.

(doi:10.1099/mgen.0.000641)

84. Huang B, Yang Q, Hoffmann AA, Ritchie SA, Hurk AF van den, Warrilow D. 2020

Wolbachia genome stability and mtDNA variants in *Aedes aegypti* field populations eight

years after release. *iScience* **23**. (doi:10.1016/j.isci.2020.101572)

85. Ross PA *et al.* 2022 A decade of stability for *w*Mel *Wolbachia* in natural *Aedes aegypti*

populations. *PLOS Path.* **18**, e1010256. (doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1010256)

86. Trouche B, Schrieke H, Duron O, Eren AM, Reveillaud J. 2024 *Wolbachia* populations

across organs of individual *Culex pipiens*: highly conserved intra-individual core

pangenome with inter-individual polymorphisms. *ISME Comm.* , ycae078.

(doi:10.1093/ismeco/ycae078)

87. Kaur R, Siozios S, Miller WJ, Rota-Stabelli O. 2017 Insertion sequence polymorphism and

genomic rearrangements uncover hidden *Wolbachia* diversity in *Drosophila suzukii* and

D. subpulchrella. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 14815. (doi:10.1038/s41598-017-13808-z)

88. Vancaester E, Blaxter M. 2023 Phylogenomic analysis of *Wolbachia* genomes from the

Darwin Tree of Life biodiversity genomics project. *PLOS Biol.* **21**, e3001972.

(doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3001972)

89. Vostokova EV, Dranenko NO, Gelfand MS, Bochkareva OO. 2023 Genome

rearrangements drive evolution of ANK genes in *Wolbachia. BioRxiv*. **10**.25.563763.

(doi:10.1101/2023.10.25.563763)

Table 1. Nucleotide differences between *Wolbachia* sub-populations from three tissues of naturally infected *Armadillidium vulgare*. HAEM: haemolymph, NC: nerve chain, OVA: ovaries. Nucl: Nucleotide, AA: amino acid; Ser: serine, Arg: arginine, Gln: glutamine, Ile: isoleucine, Thr: threonine, fs: Frameshift.

Genome position	Individual	Tissue	Frequency	Type of change	Nucl. change	AA change	ORF effect	Gene name	Functional domains
1266439	F1_2015	NC	0	Insertion	T -> TT	Ser419fs	Frameshift	ABOJ95_001272	No recognized functional domain
		OVA	0						
	F2_2015	NC	0						
		OVA	0						
	F_1999	HAEM	0.112						
		NC	0.006						
		OVA	0.006						
1269492	F1_2015	NC	0	Substitution	G -> A	Arg340Gln	Missense variant	ABOJ95_001275	No recognized functional domain
		OVA	0						
	F2_2015	NC	0						
		OVA	0						
	F_1999	HAEM	0.466						
		NC	0.584						
		OVA	0.239						
1536425	F1_2015	NC	0.087	Substitution	T -> C	Ile1264Thr	Missense variant	ABOJ95_001539	Domain of unknown function DUF1601 Ankyrin repeats Latrotoxin, C-terminal domain
		OVA	0.111						
	F2_2015	NC	0.125						
		OVA	0.110						
	F_1999	HAEM	0.143						

		NC	0.116						
		OVA	0.104						