Title

Geography, not food availability, reflects compositional differences in the bacterial

communities associated with larval sea urchins

Running title

Population-specific microbiome of urchin larvae

Authors

Tyler J. Carrier[1,*], Sam Dupont[2], and Adam M. Reitzel[1]

Affiliations

[1] Department of Biological Sciences, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 9201

University City Blvd., Charlotte, NC 28223 USA

[2] Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Gothenburg, The

Sven Lovén Centre for Marine Infrastructure, Kristineberg, Sweden

[*] Corresponding author: tcarrie1@uncc.edu

Keywords

Microbiome; host-microbe; ecology; plasticity; echinopluteus; symbiosis

Abstract

Determining the principles underlying the assembly, structure, and diversity of symbiont communities remains a focal point of animal-microbiome research. Much of these efforts focus on taxonomic variation within or between animal populations, but rarely test the proportional impacts of ecological components that may affect animal-associated microbiota. Using larvae from the sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* from the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, we test the hypothesis that inter-population differences in the composition of animal-associated bacterial communities are more pronounced than intra-population variation due to a heterogeneous feeding environment. Despite significant differences in bacterial community structure within each *S. droebachiensis* larval population (based on food availability, time, development, and phenotype), variation in OTU membership and community composition correlated more strongly with geography. Moreover, across these three locations, 20-30% of OTUs were specific to a single population while less than 10% were shared. Taken together, these results suggest that inter-populational variation in symbiont communities is more pronounced than intra-populational variation. This difference may suggest that ecological variables over broad geographic scales may mask smaller scale ecological variables; however, explicit testing of this potential principle requires common garden experiments as well as molecular and functional manipulations.

Introduction

Acclimating to environmental variability through morphological, developmental, and/or physiological plasticity is a common trait of animals (Bradshaw, 1965, Boidron-Metairon, 1988, Sterns, 1989, DeWitt *et al.*, 1998, Schlichting & Smith, 2002, West-Eberhard, 2003, Miner *et al.*, 2005). Over the past decade, the appreciation for the role that animal-associated microbiota play in responding to environmental stressors has grown profoundly (Kohl & Carey, 2016, Macke *et al.*, 2016, Shapira, 2016, Theis *et al.*, 2016, Apprill, 2017, Carrier & Reitzel, 2017, Carrier & Reitzel, 2018). When experiencing heterogeneous environments, an animal may recruit, expel, and/or shuffle the relative proportion of associated microbiota (Zilber-Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 2008, Bordenstein & Theis, 2015) to assemble a community with particular molecular pathways for the environmental conditions (Burke *et al.*, 2011, Louca *et al.*, 2016, Roth-Schulze *et al.*, 2018).

Microbial communities associated with animals often vary in response to a multitude of abiotic and biotic factors, including temperature, salinity, diet quality and quantity, season, and habitat-type (see reviews by Kohl & Carey, 2016, Carrier & Reitzel, 2017). Of these, dietary responses are best studied and shown to have a major impact on the composition and function of this community (Kohl & Dearing, 2012, David *et al.*, 2014, Rosenberg & Zilber-Rosenberg, 2016, Sonnenburg *et al.*, 2016). When faced with prolonged diet restriction, the composition and diversity of microbiota associated with both invertebrate and vertebrate hosts shift considerably (Kohl *et al.*, 2014, Carrier & Reitzel, 2018), a response hypothesized to buffer against reduced exogenous nutrients.

Microbial communities associated with animals are also species-specific (*e.g.*, Fraune & Bosch, 2007, Schmitt *et al.*, 2012, Carrier & Reitzel, 2018) and taxonomically variable

across the geographical distribution of the host (Dishaw *et al.*, 2014, Marzinelli *et al.*, 2015,

Mortzfeld *et al.*, 2015, Marino *et al.*, 2017, Huang *et al.*, 2018). Population-specific

microbial communities are partially dependent on environmental conditions (Pantos *et al.*,

2015) and dispersal limitations (Moeller *et al.*, 2017). Despite this taxonomic variation,

microbial communities can remain functionally similar due to shared genes across bacterial

taxa (Louca *et al.*, 2018, Roth-Schulze *et al.*, 2018). The microbial communities of the

bromeliad *Aechmea nudicaulis*, for example, are taxonomically dynamic but functionally

consistent between individuals (Louca *et al.*, 2016). Similarly, the bacterial community

associated with the green alga *Ulva* spp. are too spatially and temporally variable to define

a 'core' community; however, nearly 70% of the microbial genes are conserved across the

broad geography of *Ulva* spp. (Roth-Schulze *et al.*, 2018).

Efforts to classify the principles underlying the assembly of host-associated microbial

communities have primarily been within (*e.g.*, Webster *et al.*, 2011, Webster *et al.*, 2011,

David *et al.*, 2014, Lokmer & Wegner, 2015, Carrier & Reitzel, 2018, Carrier *et al.*, 2018)

or between (*e.g.*, (Yatsunenko *et al.*, 2012, Dishaw *et al.*, 2014, Marzinelli *et al.*, 2015,

Mortzfeld *et al.*, 2015, Marino *et al.*, 2017, Huang *et al.*, 2018) populations (but see

Webster *et al.*, 2018). This conceptual discontinuity highlights a gap in understanding the

patterns and principles underlying community assembly. To test for differences in

assembly and structure, direct comparisons of animal-associated microbial communities

within and between populations are needed to determine the relevance of each factor. The

fields of sensory, behavioral, and circadian biology have shown that organismal responses

to ecological variables are unequal and may be masked based on spatial significance

(Beauchard *et al.*, 2017, Hodin *et al.*, 2018, Li *et al.*, 2018, Yang *et al.*, 2018, Kerr & Kemp,

In Press). Factors within and between populations, therefore, may have differential impacts

on the composition of host-associated microbiota.

Planktotrophic (feeding) larvae are one biological system to compare ecological

components and how they influence the composition of animal-associated microbiota.

Many planktotrophic larvae (*e.g.*, the pluteus of sea urchins) inhabit heterogeneous

nutritional environments and are morphologically and physiologically plastic to food

availability (Boidron-Metairon, 1988, Hart & Strathmann, 1994, Miner, 2004, Byrne *et al.*,

2008, Soars *et al.*, 2009, Adams *et al.*, 2011, Miner, 2011, Carrier *et al.*, 2015, McAlister

& Miner, 2018). Larvae of the echinoid *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis*, for example,

associate with phenotype-, diet-, and developmental stage-specific bacterial communities

(Carrier & Reitzel, 2018, Carrier & Reitzel, 2019). *S. droebachiensis*, in particular, has an

Arctic-boreal distribution composed of a multiple ocean population with limited gene flow

(Addison & Hart, 2004, Addison & Hart, 2005, Scheibling & Hatcher, 2013) and evidence

for potential local adaption (Manier & Palumbi, 2008, Marks *et al.*, 2008).

Using the circumpolar distribution of *S. droebachiensis* and the ability of their larvae

to acclimate to heterogeneous feeding environments, we test the hypothesis that inter-

population differences in the composition of animal-associated bacterial communities are

more pronounced than intra-population variation. To test this, we performed differential

feeding experiments on *S. droebachiensis* larvae from populations in the Pacific and

Atlantic Oceans (Fig. 1) and used amplicon sequencing to profile the larval-associated

bacterial communities.

Materials and Methods

Adult urchin collection and larval rearing

Adult *S. droebachiensis* were collected from populations in the North Sea in March

2015, the Salish Sea in April 2016, and the Gulf of Maine in February 2017 (Fig. 1).

Individuals from the North Sea were collected by divers in Drøbak, Norway (59°39' N,

10°37' E) and transported in cold, aerated seawater to the Sven Lovén Centre for Marine

Infrastructure (Kristineberg, Sweden). Urchins were maintained in natural seawater and

fed *ad libitum* on a live mix of *Ulva lactuca* and *Laminaria* spp. collected from the

Kristineberg shoreline. Urchins from the Salish Sea were hand-collected at low tide at

Cattle Point, San Juan Island, USA (48°27' N, 122°57' W), transferred to the Friday Harbor

Laboratories (FHL; Friday Harbor, WA, USA) within one hour, suspended in sub-tidal

cages off the dock at FHL, and fed *Nereocystis* spp. *ad libitum*. Lastly, individuals from

the Gulf of Maine were collected by divers in Frenchman Bay, Maine (44°25' N 68°12'

W), shipped overnight to the Darling Marine Center (Walpole, ME, USA), and were

maintained in flow-through aquaria and fed *Saccharina latissima ad libitum*.

Within two weeks of collections, adult urchins were spawned by a one to two mL

intracoelomic injection of 0.50 M potassium chloride. For each population, gametes from

three males and females were pooled separately. Fertilization of eggs and larval rearing

followed Strathmann (1987), with the exception that embryos and larvae were reared using

5.0-µm filtered seawater (FSW) to include the environmental microbiota. Briefly, embryos

were incubated in 1 L of FSW at ambient temperature and salinity. Two hours post-

fertilization, seawater was decanted to remove excess sperm. Embryos were then

transferred to triplicate 3 L jars and diluted to a density of two individuals•mL^{-1}. Beginning

at the prism stage, larvae were provided *Rhodomonas lens* at 10,000 cells•mL^{-1}, for which

was made growth medium-free by centrifugation and resuspension in FSW prior to the

introduction to larval cultures. Larval cultures were subsequently diluted to one larva per

two mL at advanced developmental stages. Larval cultures were given 90-95% water

changes every other day and *R. lens* was replenished at 10,000 cells•mL^{-1}.

Monocultures of *R. lens* were grown in f/2 media at room temperature with a

combination of ambient and artificial lighting for 24 hours per day (Guillard, 1975).

Experimental feeding and larval morphometrics

At 48 hours post-fertilization, prism-stage larvae were divided into twelve replicate jars

that were sub-divided into four experimental feeding treatments: 10,000, 1,000, 100, or 0

cells•mL^{-1} of *R. lens*. For each experiment, larvae fed 10,000 cells•mL^{-1} were reared

through metamorphosis while diet-restricted (1,000 and 100 cells•mL^{-1}) and unfed larvae

were cultured until developmental stasis (Table S1). Larvae (n=100) from each replicate

for each treatment were sampled weekly. Immediately after sampling, larval samples were

concentrated into a pellet using a microcentrifuge, the FSW was removed with a sterile

glass pipette, and pelleted larvae were then preserved in RNAlater (Thermo Scientific,

Massachusetts, USA) and stored at -20°C before DNA extractions.

Complementary to sampling *S. droebachiensis* larvae, the environmental microbiota

from the seawater was also sampled. When larval cultures were sampled, triplicate ~1-L

of 5.0-µm FSW was filtered onto a 0.22-µm Millipore filter to retain the environmental

microbiota. Full filter disks were then preserved in RNAlater and stored at -20 °C before

DNA extractions.

In addition to sampling larvae to assay the associated bacterial communities, twenty

larvae (n=20) from a single replicate of each dietary treatment were sampled for

morphometric analysis. Larvae were imaged using a compound microscope (Salish Sea:

Nikon Eclipse E600; camera: QImaging MicroPublisher 5.0 RTV; Gulf of Maine: Zeiss

Primo Star HD digital microscope; North Sea: Leica stereomicroscope) and morphometrics

(length of larval body, post-oral arms, and stomach area; Figs. 1, S1-2) were performed

using ImageJ (v. 1.9.2; Schneider *et al.*, 2012). Statistical differences in larval size and

stomach volume were compared using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA; JMP Pro

v. 13) to test for differences over time and across feeding conditions. Moreover, differences

between sites were compared with a one-way ANOVA. Where statistical differences were

observed ($p < 0.05$), a Tukey's post-hoc test were used to determine the affect at each time

point and for each diet.

Assaying microbial communities

Total DNA was extracted from larval samples using the GeneJet Genomic DNA

Purification Kit (Thermo Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). For FSW samples, eDNA was

extracted using the FastDNA Spin Kit for Soil (MP Biomedical, Illkirch, France). DNA

was then quantified using the NanoDrop 2000 UV-Vis Spectrophotometer (Thermo

Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) and diluted to 5 ng•μL^{-1} using RNase/DNase-free water.

Bacterial sequences were amplified using universal primers for the V3/V4 regions of

the 16S rRNA gene (Forward: 5′ CTACGGGNGGCWGCAG, Reverse: 5′

GACTACHVGGGTATCTAATCC; Klindworth *et al.*, 2013). Products were purified

using the Axygen AxyPrep Mag PCR Clean-up Kit (Axygen Scientific, New York, USA),

indexed via PCR using the Nextera XT Index Kit V2 (Illumina, California, USA), and then

purified again. At each of these three steps, fluorometric quantitation was performed using

a Qubit (Life Technologies, California, USA) and libraries were validated using a

Bioanalyzer High Sensitivity DNA chip (Agilent Technologies, California, USA). Illumina

MiSeq sequencing (v3, 2x300 bp paired-end reads) was performed at the University of

North Carolina at Charlotte. See, Table S2 for PCR recipe and thermal profiles.

Forward and reverse sequences (that are freely available on the Dryad Digital

Repository) were paired and trimmed using PEAR (Zhang *et al.*, 2014) and Trimmomatic

(Bolger *et al.*, 2014), respectively, and converted from fastq to fasta using custom script

(see, Note S1). Chimeric sequences were then detected using USEARCH (Edgar *et al.*,

2011) and removed using filter_fasta.py prior to analysis of bacterial 16S rRNA sequences.

Using QIIME 1.9.1 (Caporaso *et al.*, 2010) and Greengenes (v. 13.5), bacterial 16S rRNA

sequences were analyzed and grouped into operational taxonomic units (OTUs) based on

a minimum 97% similarity. The biom table generated by pick_open_reference_otus.py was

filtered of OTUs with ten or less sequences as well as sequences matching the cryptophytes

(*i.e.*, *R. lens*; as per Carrier & Reitzel, 2018).

Using the filtered biom table and "biom summarize-table" to count total sequences per

sample, the rarefaction depth of 3,193 reads was determined and applied to all subsequent

analyses (Fig. S3). Alpha diversity (*i.e.*, Fisher's alpha, Shannon equitability, Faith's

phylogenetic distance, and observed OTUs) was calculated using alpha_diversity.py and

compared statistically using one-way ANOVAs in JMP. Beta diversity was calculated

using the unweighted and weighted UniFrac (Lozupone & Knight, 2005) as part of

jackknifed_beta_diversity.py. These values were compared using principal coordinate

analyses (PCoA), recreated using make_2d_plots.py, and stylized for presentation in

Adobe Illustrator CS6. Community similarity across phenotypes, dietary states,

developmental stages, and biogeography were compared statistically using an analysis of

similarity (ANOSIM), permutational multivariate analysis of variance using distance

matrices (ADONIS), and permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA)

using compare_categories.py. Shared OTUs between urchin populations were determined

using compute_core_microbiome.py and shared_phylotypes.py. Average bacterial

community for each urchin population as well as across populations and the shared

community was generated using summarize_taxa_through_plots.py, visualized with Prism

7 (GraphPad Software), and stylized for presentation in Adobe Illustrator CS6.

A step-by-step listing of QIIME scripts used to convert raw reads to OTUs for

visualization of these data is located in Note S1.

Results

Morphological plasticity of larval sea urchin

Diet-induced morphological plasticity was observed for *S. droebachiensis* larvae from

each population (Figs. S1-2; Tables S3-4), with the extent and direction of expression being

location-specific (ANOVA, $p<0.0001$; Fig. 2). Diet-restricted larvae from the Salish Sea

and Gulf of Maine, in general, exhibited a higher post-oral arm to mid-body line ratio than

ad libitum counterparts (ANOVA, $p<0.0001$; Figs. S1-2; Tables S3-4), even though

analyses of Gulf of Maine larvae were partially confounded by developmental stage (Table

S1). Larvae from the North Sea, however, exhibited the opposite response: *ad libitum*

feeding induced a higher post-oral arm to mid-body line ratio than diet-restricted

individuals (ANOVA, $p<0.0001$; Fig. S1-2; Tables S3-4).

Structural comparisons of bacterial communities within populations

S. droebachiensis larvae from each population associated with a diet-specific bacterial

community (Figs. 3A-C, S4-7; Table S6). Larvae from the Salish Sea and Gulf of Maine

exhibited similar diet-specific community-level patterns in both alpha- and beta-diversity

(Figs. 3A-B, S4-6; Table S6), where the bacterial community associated with food

restricted larvae were more similar to each other than to well-fed counterparts. Larvae from

the North Sea, on the other hand, exhibited the opposite response (Figs. 3C, S4, S7; Table

S6), where diet-specific bacterial communities were observed (Table S6) except that all

food concentrations were more similar to each other than to starved larvae (Fig. S7; Table

S6).

The bacterial communities associated with larvae from each sea urchin population also

varied temporally in both alpha- and beta-diversity (Figs. 3D-F, S4, S8-10; Table S6).

Temporal changes in community diversity (*i.e.*, alpha-diversity) were reflective of

culturing environment: larval populations from the Atlantic Ocean increased in weeks one

through three and declined in week four while the larval population from the Pacific Ocean

decreased in the first three weeks and increased in week four (Table S5). Compositional

changes (*i.e.*, beta-diversity) in the associated bacterial communities for each larval

population, on the other hand, experienced similar time-dependent shifts from week one

though four (Figs. 3D-F, S4).

Complementary to dietary and temporal shifts in community structure and

composition, larval-associated bacterial communities for *S. droebachiensis* varied

significantly with larval morphology (Fig. S11; Table S7) and developmental stage (Figs.

S8-10; Table S7). Variation in the larval-associated bacterial communities across food

availability, time, morphology, and development, however, appeared to not co-depend on

the bacterial taxa observed in the seawater, as the composition of larval-associated and

environmental microbiota were significantly different (Fig. S12; Table S7).

Differences in the bacterial communities of urchin populations

Despite differences in bacterial community structure within each *S. droebachiensis*

larval population, variation in OTU membership and composition correlated best with

geography (ANOSIM, unweighted UniFrac, p<0.001; ANOSIM, weighted UniFrac,

p<0.001; Figs. 4A-B, S13-15; Table S8). Community relatedness of larval-associated

microbiota in the Western and Eastern Atlantic Ocean was more similar to each other than

to the Pacific Ocean population (Fig. 4 A-B). Moreover, bacterial community diversity and

structure were significantly different between these three populations (Fisher's alpha: F-

ratio = 142.2, *p*<0.001; Shannon equitability: F-ratio = 110.1, *p*<0.001; Faith's

phylogenetic distance: F-ratio = 159.2, *p*<0.001; observed OTUs: F-ratio = 124.2, *p*<0.001;

Fig. 4C; Table S8). For each of the tested indices, bacterial communities of Gulf of Maine

larvae were taxonomically richest and most diverse while Salish Sea larvae were the least

rich and diverse, leaving North Sea larvae as intermediate (Tukey's test, *p*<0.05 for each;

Fig. 4C; Table S8).

S. droebachiensis larvae from these populations primarily associated with seven

bacterial classes from three phyla: Saprospirae and Flavobacteriia (Bacteroidetes), Alpha-

, Beta-, Delta-, and Gammaproteobacteria (Proteobacteria), and Verrucomicrobiae

(Verrucomicrobia) (Fig. 5A). Of these classes, Flavobacteriia, Alpha- and

Gammaproteobacteria represented at least 10% of the relative community for each

population, where Gammaproteobacteria was the most abundant clade at 20-50% (Fig.

5A). Of the hundreds of OTUs associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae (Fig. S1), less than

10% were shared across populations, with 20-30% being specific to a single population

and 3-11% being shared between two populations (Fig. 5B). This shared community was

similar to the full communities for each population, in that it was composed primarily by

Flavobacteriia (24.7%), Alpha- (28.1%) and Gammaproteobacteria (34.9%) (Fig. 5A).

Discussion

Principles underlying the assembly and diversity of host-associated microbial communities has remained a focal point of host-microbiome research over the last few decades (Ley *et al.*, 2006, Ley *et al.*, 2008, Zilber-Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 2008, Rosenberg *et al.*, 2009, Bright & Bulgheresi, 2010, Bordenstein & Theis, 2015, Coyte *et al.*, 2015, Gilbert *et al.*, 2015, Marzinelli *et al.*, 2015, Brooks *et al.*, 2016, Macke *et al.*, 2016, Shapira, 2016, Carrier & Reitzel, 2017, Huang *et al.*, 2018, Miller *et al.*, 2018). Efforts to partition and categorize variation in community composition have suggested that evolutionary history (Ley *et al.*, 2006, Ley *et al.*, 2008, Zilber-Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 2008, Brooks *et al.*, 2016, Shapira, 2016), physiology (Kohl *et al.*, 2016, Kohl & Carey, 2016, Buckley & Rast, 2017), and environmental conditions (Alberdi *et al.*, 2016, Kohl & Carey, 2016, Carrier & Reitzel, 2017, Miller *et al.*, 2018) primarily drive these differences. The majority of this previous work, however, focuses on two spatiotemporal scales: within (Webster *et al.*, 2011, Webster *et al.*, 2011, David *et al.*, 2014, Lokmer & Wegner, 2015, Carrier & Reitzel, 2018, Carrier *et al.*, 2018) or between (Dishaw *et al.*, 2014, Marzinelli *et al.*, 2015, Mortzfeld *et al.*, 2015, Marino *et al.*, 2017, Huang *et al.*, 2018) host populations (but see Webster *et al.*, 2018). The potential to distinguish and discern intra- and inter-population processes for a single species highlights a potential conceptual gap in understanding the patterns and principles underlying microbiome assembly.

Comparing the bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae across feeding environments and geographical location supports two primary findings. First, larvae from each population associate with bacterial communities correlated with food availability, time, development, and phenotype. Second, despite variation in the microbiota

within each population of urchin larvae, the composition of *S. droebachiensis* larval-

associated bacterial communities best correlated with geography.

Larval marine invertebrates associate with microbial communities that are diverse and

dynamic yet specific to host species and distinct from the environmental microbiota

(Webster *et al.*, 2011, Carrier *et al.*, 2018, Carrier & Reitzel, 2018, Carrier *et al.*, 2018,

Carrier & Reitzel, 2019). The bacterial community associated with larval echinoderms, in

particular, shifts with food availability (Carrier & Reitzel, 2018, Carrier *et al.*, 2018),

embryonic and larval development (Carrier & Reitzel, 2018, Carrier & Reitzel, 2019),

phenotype (Carrier & Reitzel, 2018), disease (Carrier *et al.*, 2018), and physiology

(Buckley & Rast, 2017). Common approaches for investigating larval-microbe interactions

involve single location studies of a widely distributed taxa (see Webster *et al.*, 2011, Carrier

& Reitzel, 2018, Carrier *et al.*, 2018, Carrier & Reitzel, 2019). The data presented here

suggest that community-level shifts in response to biotic (development and phenotype) and

abiotic (food availability and time) factors occur at multiple locations across a population

with limited gene flow. Three widely-distributed sea urchin species (including *S.*

droebachiensis) have previously been shown to associate with food-elicited phenotype-

specific bacterial communities (Carrier & Reitzel, 2018). It may, therefore, be

hypothesized that phenotype-specific microbiota for these and, potentially, other species

of larval echinoderms (*e.g.*, *Acanthaster* sp. in the Pacific Ocean, including on the Great

Barrier Reef; Wolfe *et al.*, 2015, Wolfe *et al.*, 2015, Wolfe *et al.*, 2017, Carrier *et al.*, 2018)

occur throughout the geographical distribution of the species.

Marine invertebrate larvae are not unique in their ability to respond to environmental

variability by exhibiting shifts in the associated bacterial community (Kohl & Carey, 2016,

Carrier & Reitzel, 2017). Several groups of marine and terrestrial vertebrates (*e.g.*,

mammals, reptiles, and fish) respond to diet variability and abiotic stress by restructuring

their gut microbiota that, in turn, are likely to differ in community function (Muegge *et al.*,

2011, Kohl & Dearing, 2012, David *et al.*, 2014, Schmidt *et al.*, 2015, Kohl *et al.*, 2016,

Kohl & Carey, 2016, Kohl *et al.*, 2018). Similar to larval marine invertebrates, marine and

terrestrial vertebrates can be widely-distributed and, thus, multiple genetically distinct

populations may exhibit similar community-levels shifts in microbiota at multiple locations

across these populations. To our knowledge, however, parallel responses between

populations for vertebrates and other taxa have not yet been documented.

Inter-populational variation in the composition of *S. droebachiensis* larval-associated

bacterial communities was more pronounced than intra-populational differences. While the

mechanisms driving this result is unknown, genetic and ecological differences between *S.*

droebachiensis populations are likely contributing factors (Pantos *et al.*, 2015, Moeller *et*

al., 2017). *S. droebachiensis* from the Salish Sea, Gulf of Maine, and North Sea have some

degree to genetic isolation (Addison & Hart, 2004, Addison & Hart, 2005, Cowen &

Sponaugle, 2009, Norderhaug *et al.*, 2016). Moreover, each urchin population inhabit

environments that differ in physical (Otto *et al.*, 1990, Pettigrew *et al.*, 2005, Sutherland &

MacCready, 2011) and biological (Winter *et al.*, 1975, Thomas *et al.*, 2003, McQuatters-

Gollop *et al.*, 2007) factors. Inter-populational variation in the bacterial communities

associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae may, therefore, have been due to differences in

host genetics and the oceanographic environment, a result that requires future explicit

testing using common garden experiments and molecular manipulations (Williams &

Carrier, 2018).

Population-specific bacterial communities for *S. droebachiensis* larvae are consistent

with the hypothesis that host-associated microbial communities are taxonomically variable

across host geography (Dishaw *et al.*, 2014, Marzinelli *et al.*, 2015, Mortzfeld *et al.*, 2015,

Marino *et al.*, 2017, Huang *et al.*, 2018). Studies using diverse animal taxa (*e.g.*, sponges,

corals, fish, and humans) support that the environment, not genotype, principally drives

community differences (Sullam *et al.*, 2012, Burgsdorf *et al.*, 2014, Pantos *et al.*, 2015,

Rothschild *et al.*, 2018). Genetic comparison of *S. droebachiensis* indicates that individuals

from the Salish Sea and Gulf of Maine sub-populations are more related to each other than

to the North Sea sub-population (Addison & Hart, 2004, Addison & Hart, 2005, Scheibling

& Hatcher, 2013). Microbial communities from these populations, however, suggest the

contrary: larvae from the Gulf of Maine and North Sea are more similar to each other than

to Salish Sea larvae. This result reinforces the hypothesis that environment (or, here,

geography) is a larger influence on community assembly than genetic similarity. The

mechanistic linkage between host genetics, the environment, and microbial community,

however, is unknown.

By comparing host-associated bacterial communities across feeding environments and

biogeography in larval sea urchins, we propose that inter-populational variation in

symbiont communities is more biologically significant than intra-populational variation.

This difference suggests that larger scale ecological variables that correspond to different

geographic locations may mask smaller scale ecological variables (*e.g.*, feeding, time,

development, and phenotype). Explicit testing with diverse animal taxa by experimental

manipulations and functional characterization are merited to understand the priority of

exogenous factors in the composition of host-associated microbial communities.

Acknowledgements

We thank the staffs of the Friday Harbor Laboratories, Darling Marine Center, and

Sven Lovén Centre for Marine Infrastructure for facility access and logistical assistance;

Jason Hodin and Billie Swalla for providing laboratory space; Richard Strathmann for

collection assistance; Daniel Janies for sequencing resources; Karen Lopez for technical

assistance with sequencing; and Jason Macrander for bioinformatics assistance.

T.J.C. was supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, Charles Lambert

Memorial Endowment fellowship from the Friday Harbor Laboratories, and a Sigma Xi

Grants-in-Aid of Research grant; S.D. was funded by the Centre for Marine Evolutionary

Biology and supported by a Linnaeus grant from the Swedish Research Councils VR and

Formas; and A.M.R. was supported by Human Frontier Science Program Award

RGY0079/2016.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Location of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* experiments. Cartoon representation of adult populations and the geographical distribution for where differential feeding experiments were conducted.

Figure 2. Morphology of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from three populations. Post-oral arm and mid-body line lengths for *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the Salish Sea, Gulf of Maine, and North Sea, with feeding quantity, developmental stage, and time being collapsed. (See, Figs. S1-2 for the sub-division of larval features.)

Figure 3. Dietary and temporal shifts in the bacterial communities associated with *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae. Community similarity based on *S. droebachiensis* larval-associated bacterial communities based on food availability (A-C) over a multi-week exposure (D-F) for populations from the Salish Sea (A, D), Gulf of Maine (B, E), and North Sea (C, F). Comparisons between food availability (A-C) and over time (D-F) are based on weighted UniFrac comparisons.

Figure 4. Structure of the bacterial communities associated with *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from three populations. Community similarity of *S. droebachiensis* larval-associated bacterial communities between three geographic locations based on (A) unweighted and weighted UniFrac comparisons, with the relatedness of the weighted UniFrac represented by a microbial dendrogram (B). Diversity within each population was

estimated using four (C) alpha metrics: observed OTUs, Faith's phylogenetic distance,

Fisher's alpha, and Shannon diversity.

Figure 5. Bacterial taxa associated with *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae. (A)

Class-level profiles of the bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae

from the Salish Sea, Gulf of Maine, and North Sea as well as the mean community across

populations and the shared taxa between each population. (B) Distribution of OTUs

associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae uniquely found in each population, common

between two populations, and shared between all populations.

References

Adams DK, Sewell MA, Angerer RC & Angerer LM (2011) Rapid adaptation to food
availability by a dopamine-mediated morphogenetic response. *Nature Communications*
2: 592.

Addison JA & Hart MW (2004) Analysis of population genetic structure of the green sea
urchin (*Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis*) using microsatellites. *Marine Biology* **144**:
243-251.

Addison JA & Hart MW (2005) Colonization, dispersal, and hybridization influence
phylogeography of North Atlantic sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis*).
Evolution **59**: 532-543.

Alberdi A, Aizpurau O, Bohmann K, Zepeda-Mendoze ML & Gilbert MTP (2016) Do
vertebrate gut metagenomes confer rapid ecological adaptation. *Trends in Ecology &*
Evolution **311**: 689-699.

Apprill A (2017) Marine animal microbiomes: toward understanding host-microbiome
interactions in a changing ocean. *Frontiers in Marine Science* **4**: 222.

Beauchard O, Veríssimo H, Queirós AM & Herman PMJ (2017) The use of multiple
biological traits in marine community ecology and its potential in ecological indicator
development. *Ecological Indicators* **76**: 81-96.

Boidron-Metairon IF (1988) Morphological plasticity in laboratory-reared echinoplutei of
Dendraster excentricus (Eschscholtz) and *Lytechinus variegatus* (Lamarck) in
response to food conditions. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **119**:
31-41.

Bolger AM, Lohse M & Usadel B (2014) Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**: 2114-2120.

Bordenstein SR & Theis KR (2015) Host biology in light of the microbiome: ten principles

of holobionts and hologenomes. *PLoS Biol* **13**: e1002226.

Bradshaw A (1965) Evolutionary significance of phenotypic plasticity in plants. *Advances*

in Genetics **13**: 115-155.

Bright M & Bulgheresi S (2010) A complex journey: transmission of microbial symbionts.

Nat Rev Microbiol **8**: 218-230.

Brooks AW, Kohl KD, Brucker RM, van Opstal EJ & Bordenstein SR (2016)

Phylosymbiosis: relationships and functional effects of microbial communities across

host evolutionary history. *Plos Biol* **14**: e2000225.

Buckley KM & Rast JP (2017) An organismal model for gene expression networks in the

gut-associated immune response. *Frontiers in Immunology* **8**: 1297.

Burgsdorf I, Erwin PM, López-Legentil S, Cerrano C, Haber M, Frenk S & Steindler L

(2014) Biogeography rather than association with cyanobacteria structures symbiotic

microbial communities in the marine sponge *Petrosia ficiformis*. *Frontiers in*

Microbiology **5**: 529.

Burke B, Steinberg P, Rusch D, Kjelleberg S & Thomas T (2011) Bacterial community

assembly based on functional genes rather than species. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **108**:

14288-14293.

Byrne M, Sewell MA & Prowse TAA (2008) Nutritional ecology of sea urchin larvae:

influence of endogenous and exogenous nutrition on echinopluteal growth and

phenotypic plasticity in *Tripneustes gratilla*. *Functional Ecology* **22**: 643-648.

Caporaso JG, Kuczynski J, Stombaugh J*, et al.* (2010) QIIME allows analysis of high-

throughput community sequencing data. *Nat Methods* **7**: 335-336.

Carrier TJ & Reitzel AM (2017) The hologenome across environments and the
implications of a host-associated microbial repertoire. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **8**:
802.

Carrier TJ & Reitzel AM (2018) Convergent shifts in host-associated microbial
communities across environmentally elicited phenotypes. *Nature Communications* **9**:
952.

Carrier TJ & Reitzel AM (2019) Bacterial community dynamics during embryonic and
larval development of three confamilial echinoids. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* **611**: 179-188.

Carrier TJ, King BL & Coffman JA (2015) Gene expression changes associated with the
developmental plasticity of sea urchin larvae in response to food availability.
Biological Bulletin **228**: 171-180.

Carrier TJ, Macrander J & Reitzel AM (2018) A microbial perspective on the life-history
evolution of marine invertebrate larvae: if, where, and when to feed. *Marine Ecology*
39: e12490.

Carrier TJ, Wolfe K, Lopez K, Gall M, Janies DA, Byrne M & A.M. R (2018) Diet-induced
shifts in the crown-of-thorns (*Acanthaster* sp.) larval microbiome. *Marine Biology* **165**:
157.

Cowen RK & Sponaugle S (2009) Larval dispersal and marine population connectivity.
Annual Review of Marine Science **1**: 443-466.

Coyte KZ, Schluter J & Foster KR (2015) The ecology of the microbiome: networks,
competition, and stability. *Science* **350**: 663-666.

David LA, Maurice CF, Carmody RN*, et al.* (2014) Diet rapidly and reproducibly alters
the human gut microbiome. *Nature* **505**: 559-564.

DeWitt TJ, Sih A & Wilson DS (1998) Costs and limits of phenotypic plasticity. *Trends in*

Ecology & Evolution **13**: 77-81.

Dishaw LJ, Flores-Torres J, Lax S*, et al.* (2014) The gut of geographically disparate *Ciona*

intestinalis harbors a core microbiota. *PLoS One* **9**: e93386.

Edgar RC, Haas BJ, Clemente JC, Quince C & Knight R (2011) UCHIME improves

sensitivity and speed of chimera detection. *Bioinformatics* **27**: 2194-2200.

Fraune S & Bosch TCG (2007) Long-term maintenance of species-specific bacterial

microbiota in the basal metazoan *Hydra*. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**: 13146-13151.

Gilbert SF, Bosch TCG & Ledon-Rettig C (2015) Eco-Evo-Devo: developmental

symbiosis and developmental plasticity as evolutionary agents. *Nature Reviews*

Genetics **16**: 611-622.

Guillard RRL (1975) Culture of phytoplankton for feeding marine invertebrates. (Smith

WL & Chanley MH, eds.). Plenum Press, New York, USA.

Hart MW & Strathmann RR (1994) Functional consequences of phenotypic plasticity in

echinoid larvae. *Biological Bulletin* **186**: 291-299.

Hodin J, Ferner MC, Heyland A & Gaylord B (2018) I feel that! Fluid dynamics and

sensory aspects of larval settlement across scales. *Evolutionary Ecology of Marine*

Invertebrate Larvae. (Carrier TJ, Reitzel AM & Heyland A, eds.). Oxford University

Press, Oxford, UK.

Huang B-H, Chang C-W, Huang C-W, Gao J & Liao P-C (2018) Composition and

functional specialists of the gut microbiota of frogs reflect habitat differences and

agricultural activity. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **8**: 2670.

Kerr JR & Kemp PS (In Press) Masking a fish's detection of environmental stimuli:

application to improving downstream migration at river infrastructure. *Journal of Fish*

Biology 1-10.

Klindworth A, Pruesse E, Schweer T, Peplies J, Quast C, Horn M & Glockner FO (2013)

Evaluation of general 16S ribosomal RNA gene PCR primers for classical and next-

generation sequencing-based diversity studies. *Nucleic Acids Research* **41**: e1.

Kohl KD & Dearing MD (2012) Experience matters: prior exposure to plant toxins

enhances diversity of gut microbes in herbivores. *Ecol Lett* **15**: 1008-1015.

Kohl KD & Carey HV (2016) A place for host-microbe symbiosis in the comparative

physiologist's toolbox. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **219**: 3496-3504.

Kohl KD, Amaya J, Passement CA, Dearing MD & McCue MD (2014) Unique and shared

responses of the gut microbiota to prolonged fasting: a comparative study across five

classes of vertebrate hosts. *Fems Microbiol Ecol* **90**: 883-894.

Kohl KD, Brun A, Magallanes M, Brinkerhoff J, Laspiur A, Acosta JC, Bordenstein SR &

Caviedes-Vidal E (2016) Physiological and microbial adjustments to diet quality

permit facultative herbivory in an omnivorous lizard. *Journal of Experimental Biology*

219: 1903-1912.

Kohl KD, Oakeson KF, Orr TJ, Miller AW, Forbey JS, Phillips CD, Dale C, Weiss RB &

Dearing MD (2018) Metagenomic sequencing provides insights into microbial

detoxification in the guts of small mammalian herbivores (*Neotoma* spp.). *FEMS*

Microbiol Ecol **94**: fiy184.

Ley RE, Petersen DA & Gordon JI (2006) Ecological and evolutionary forces shaping

microbial diversity in the human intestine. *Cell* **124**: 837-848.

Ley RE, Hamady M, Lozupone C*, et al.* (2008) Evolution of mammals and their gut

microbes. *Science* **320**: 1647-1651.

Li Y, He N, Hou J, Xu L, Liu C, Zhang J, Wang Q, Zhang X & Wu XB (2018) Factors

influencing leaf chlorophyll content in natural forests at the biome scale. *Frontiers in*

Ecology and the Environment **6**: 64.

Lokmer A & Wegner KM (2015) Hemolymph microbiome of Pacific oysters in response

to temperature, temperature stress and infection. *The ISME Journal* **9**: 670-682.

Louca S, Jacques SMS, Pires APF, Leal JS, Srivastava DS, Parfrey LW, Farjalla VF &

Doebeli M (2016) High taxonomic variability despite stable functional structure across

microbial communities. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **1**: 15.

Louca S, Polz MF, Mazel F*, et al.* (2018) Function and functional redundancy in microbial

systems. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **2**: 936-943.

Lozupone C & Knight R (2005) UniFrac: a new phylogenetic method for comparing

microbial communities. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **71**: 8228-8235.

Macke E, Tasiemski A, Massol F, Callens M & Decaestecker E (2016) Life history and

eco-evolutionary dynamics in light of the gut microbiota. *Oikos*.

Manier MK & Palumbi SR (2008) Intraspecific divergence in sperm morphology of the

green sea urchin, *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis*: implications for selection in

broadcast spawners. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **8**: 283.

Marino CM, Pawlik JR, López-Legentil S & Erwin PM (2017) Latitudinal variation in the

microbiome of the sponge *Ircinia campana* correlates with host haplotype but not anti-

predatory chemical defense. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* **565**: 53-66.

Marks JA, Biermann CH, Eanes WF & Kryvi H (2008) Sperm polymorphism within the

sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis*: divergence between Pacific and Atlantic

Oceans. *Biological Bulletin* **215**: 115-125.

Marzinelli EM, Campbell AH, Valdes EZ*, et al.* (2015) Continental-scale variation in

seaweed host-associated bacterial communities is a function of host condition, not

geography. *Environmental Microbiology* **17**: 4078-4088.

McAlister JS & Miner BG (2018) Phenotypic plasticity of feeding structures in marine

invertebrate larvae. *Evolutionary Ecology of Marine Invertebrate Larvae.* (Carrier TJ,

Reitzel AM & Heyland A, eds.). Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

McQuatters-Gollop A, Raitsos DE, Edwards M, Pradhan Y, Mee LD, Lavender SJ & Attrill

MJ (2007) A long-term chlorophyll dataset reveals regime shift in North Sea

phytoplankton biomass unconnected to nutrient levels. *Limnology and Oceanograhpy*

52: 635-648.

Miller ET, Svanbäck R & Bohannan BJM (2018) Microbiomes as metacommunities:

understanding host-associated microbes through metacommunity ecology. *Trends in*

Ecology & Evolution **33**: 926-935.

Miner BG (2004) Evolution of feeding structure plasticity in marine invertebrate larvae: a

possible trade-off between arm length and stomach size. *Journal of Experimental*

Marine Biology and Ecology **315**: 117-125.

Miner BG (2011) Mechanisms underlying feeding structure plasticity in echinoderm

larvae. *Mechanisms of Life History Evolution.* (Flatt T & Heyland A, eds.). Oxford

University Press.

Miner BG, Sultan SE, Morgan SG, Padilla DK & Relyea RA (2005) Ecological

consequences of phenotypic plasticity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **20**: 685-692.

Moeller AH, Suzuki TA, Lin D, Lacey EA, Wasser SK & Nachman MW (2017) Dispersal

limitation promotes the diversification of the mammalian gut microbiota. *P Natl Acad*

Sci USA **114**: 13768-13773.

Mortzfeld BM, Urbanski S, Reitzel AM, Kunzel S, Technau U & Fraune S (2015)

Response of bacterial colonization in *Nematostella vectensis* to development,

environment and biogeography. *Environmental Microbiology* **18**: 1764-1781.

Muegge BD, Kuczynski J, Knights D, Clemente JC, Gonzalez A, Fontana L, Henrissat B,

Knight R & Gordon JI (2011) Diet drives convergence in gut microbiome functions

across mammalian phylogeny and within humans. *Science* **332**: 970-974.

Norderhaug KM, Anglès d'Auriac MB, FagerliH. Gundersen CW, Christie H, Dahl K &

Hobæk A (2016) Genetic diversity of the NE Atlantic sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus*

droebachiensis unveils chaotic genetic patchiness possibly linked to local selective

pressure. *Marine Biology* **163**: 36.

Otto L, Zimmerman JTF, Furnes GK, Mork M, Saetre R & Becker G (1990) Review of the

physical oceanography of the North Sea. *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research* **26**: 161-

238.

Pantos O, Bongaerts P, Dennis PG, Tyson GW & Hoegh-Guldberg O (2015) Habitat-

specific environmental conditions primarily control the microbiomes of the coral

Seriatopora hystrix. *The ISME Journal* **9**: 1916-1927.

Pantos O, Bongaerts P, Dennis PG, Tyson GW & Hoegh-Guldberg O (2015) Habitat-

specific environmental conditions primarily control the microbiomes of the coral

Seriatopora hystrix. *ISME Journal* **9**: 1916-1927.

Pettigrew NR, Churchill JH, Janzen CD, Mangum LJ, Signell RP, Thomas AC, Townsend

DW, Wallinga JP & Xue H (2005) The kinematic and hydrographic structure of the

Gulf of Maine Coastal Current. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in*
Oceanography **52**: 2369-2391.

Rosenberg E & Zilber-Rosenberg I (2016) Interaction between the microbiome and diet:
the hologenome concept. *Journal of Nutrition & Food Sciences* **6**: 5.

Rosenberg E, Sharon G & Zilber-Rosenberg I (2009) The hologenome theory of evolution
contains Lamarckian aspects within a Darwinian framework. *Environmental*
Microbiology **11**: 2959-2962.

Roth-Schulze AJ, Pintado J, Zozaya-Valdés E, Cremades J, Ruiz P, Kjelleberg S & Thomas
T (2018) Functional biogeography and host specificity of bacterial communities
associated with the Marine Green Alga Ulva spp. *Molecular Ecology* **27**: 1952-1965.

Rothschild D, Weissbrod O, Barkan E*, et al.* (2018) Environment dominates over host
genetics in shaping human gut microbiota *Nature* **555**: 210-215.

Scheibling RE & Hatcher BG (2013) *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis*. *Sea Urchins:*
Biology and Ecology. (Lawrence JM, ed.). Acedemic Press, San Diego, CA.

Schlichting CD & Smith H (2002) Phenotypic plasticity: linking molecular mechanisms
with evolutionary outcomes. *Evol Ecol* **16**: 189-211.

Schmidt VT, Smith KF, Melvin DW & Amaral-Zettler LA (2015) Community assembly
of a euryhaline fish microbiome during salinity acclimation. *Molecular Ecology* **24**:
2537-2550.

Schmitt S, Tsai P, Bell J*, et al.* (2012) Assessing the complex sponge microbiota: core,
variable and species-specific bacterial communities in marine sponges. *ISME Journal*
6: 564-576.

Schneider C, Rasband W & Eliceiri K (2012) NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image
analysis. *Nat Methods* **9**: 671-675.

Shapira M (2016) Gut microbiotas and host evolution: scaling up symbiosis. *Trends in*

Ecology & Evolution **31**: 539-549.

Soars NA, Prowse TAA & Byrne M (2009) Overview of phenotypic plasticity in echinoid

larvae, '*Echinopluteus transversus*' type vs. typical echinoplutei. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*

383: 113-125.

Sonnenburg ED, Smits SA, Tikhonov M, Higginbottom SK, Wingreen NS & Sonnenburg

JL (2016) Diet-induced extinctions in the gut microbiota compound over generations.

Nature **529**: 212-U208.

Sterns S (1989) The evolutionary significance of phenotypic plasticity. *BioScience* **39**: 436-

445.

Strathmann MF (1987) *Reproduction and development of marine invertebrates of the*

northern Pacific coast: data and methods for the study of eggs, embryos, and larvae.

University of Washington Press.

Sullam KE, Essinger SD, Lozupone CA, O'Connor MP, Rosen GL, Knight R, Kilham SS

& Russell JA (2012) Environmental and ecological factors that shape the gut bacterial

communities of fish: a meta-analysis. *Molecular Ecology* **21**: 3363-3378.

Sutherland DA & MacCready P (2011) A model study of the Salish Sea estuarine

circulation. *Journal of Physical Oceanography* **41**: 1125-1143.

Theis KR, Dheilly NM, Klassen JL*, et al.* (2016) Getting the hologenome concept right:

An eco-evolutionary framework for hosts and their microbiomes. *mSystems* **1**: e00028-

00016.

Thomas AC, Townsend DW & Weatherbee R (2003) Satellite-measured phytoplankton

variability in the Gulf of Maine. *Continental Shelf Research* **23**: 971-989.

Webster NS, Botte ES, Soo RM & Whalan S (2011) The larval sponge holobiont exhibits

high thermal tolerance. *Environmental Microbiology Reports* **3**: 756-762.

Webster NS, Soo R, Cobb R & Negri AP (2011) Elevated seawater temperature causes a

microbial shift on crustose coralline algae with implications for the recruitment of coral

larvae. *ISME Journal* **5**: 759-770.

Webster TMU, Consuegra S, Hitchings M & de Leaniz CG (2018) Inter-population

variation in the Atlantic salmon microbiome reflects environmental and genetic

diversity. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **84**: e00691-00618.

West-Eberhard M (2003) *Developmental Plasticity and Evolution*. Oxford University Pres,

Oxford, UK.

Williams EA & Carrier TJ (2018) An -omics perspective on marine invertebrate larvae.

Evolutionary Ecology of Marine Invertebrate Larvae. (Carrier TJ, Reitzel AM &

Heyland A, eds.). 288-304. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Winter DF, Banse K & Anderson GC (1975) The dynamics of phytoplankton blooms in

puget sound a fjord in the Northwestern United States. *Marine Biology* **29**: 139-176.

Wolfe K, Graba-Landry A, Dworjanyn S & Byrne M (2015) Larval starvation to satiation:

influence of nutrient regime on the success of *Acanthaster planci. PLoS ONE*

e0122010.

Wolfe K, Graba-Landry A, Dworjanyn S & Byrne M (2015) Larval phenotypic plasticity

in the boom-and-bust crown-of-thorns seastar, *Acanthaster planci. Mar Ecol Prog Ser*

539: 179-189

Wolfe K, Graba-Landry A, Dworjanyn S & Byrne M (2017) Superstars: Assessing nutrient

thresholds for enhanced larval success of *Acanthaster planci*, a review of the evidence.

Marine Pollution Bulletin **116**: 307-314.

Yang Y, Niu H, Xiao L, Lin Q, Han B-P & Naselli-Flores L (2018) Spatial heterogeneity

of spring phytoplankton in a large tropical reservoir: could mass effect homogenize the

heterogeneity by species sorting? *Hydrobiologia* **819**: 109-122.

Yatsunenko T, Rey FE, Manary MJ*, et al.* (2012) Human gut microbiome viewed across

age and geography. *Nature* **486**: 222-227.

Zhang J, Kobert K, Flouri T & Stamatakis A (2014) PEAR: A fast and accurate Illumina

Paired-End reAd mergeR. *Bioinformatics* **30**: 614-620.

Zilber-Rosenberg I & Rosenberg E (2008) Role of microorganisms in the evolution of

animals and plants: the hologenome theory of evolution. *Fems Microbiol Rev* **32**: 723-

735.

1
2
3 **Figure S1.** *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae alter phenotype to feeding environment.
4 Ratio between the post-oral arm and mid body line (mean ± standard error; n=20) for *S.*
5 *droebachiensis* from the Salish Sea (A), Gulf of Maine (B), and North Sea (C) larvae having been
6 fed either 10,000 (black), 1,000 (dark grey), 100 (grey), and 0 cells•mL^{-1} (white).

Figure S2. *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae alter gut volume to feeding environment. Gut volume (mean ± standard error; n=20) for larval *S. droebachiensis* from the Salish Sea (A), Gulf of Maine (B), and North Sea (C) having been fed either 10,000 (black), 1,000 (dark grey), 100 (grey), and 0 cells•mL^{-1} (white).

Figure S3. Alpha rarefaction curves for *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from three geographic locations and of the seawater. Alpha rarefaction curves for the associated microbiota for *S. droebachiensis* larvae (circles) from the Salish Sea (blue), Gulf of Maine (red), and North Sea (yellow) and seawater (squares) based on the rarefaction depth (3,193 sequences) used for all analyses.

24
25
Figure S4. Dietary and temporal shifts in the bacterial communities associated with
Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis larvae. Community similarity based on *S. droebachiensis*
larval-associated bacterial communities based on food availability (A-C) over a multi-week
exposure (D-F) for populations from the Salish Sea (A, D), Gulf of Maine (B, E), and North Sea
(C, F). Comparisons between food availability (A-C) and over time (D-F) are based on unweighted
UniFrac comparisons. (Note: this is the unweighted complement to Fig. 2.)
32
33

Figure S5. Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from the Salish Sea across time. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the Salish Sea for one (A; p < 0.002), two (B; p < 0.001), three (C; p < 0.001), or four (D; p < 0.001) weeks and having been fed 10,000 (orange), 1,000 (blue), 100 (purple), or 0 (yellow) cells•mL^{-1}.

Figure S6. Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from the Gulf of Maine across time. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the Gulf of Maine for one (A; p < 0.001), two (B; p < 0.005), three (C; p < 0.007), or four (D; p = 0.430) weeks and having been fed 10,000 (orange), 1,000 (blue), 100 (purple), or 0 (yellow) cells•mL^{-1}.

51
52
53 **Figure S7.** Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from the North Sea
54 across time. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the
55 North Sea for one (A; $p < 0.002$), two (B; $p < 0.001$), three (C; $p < 0.001$), or four (D; $p < 0.020$)
56 weeks and having been fed 10,000 (orange), 1,000 (blue), 100 (purple), or 0 (yellow) cells•mL^{-1}.
57
58

59
60
61 **Figure S8.** Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from the Salish Sea
62 across diets. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the
63 Salish Sea having been fed 10,000 (A; $p < 0.001$), 1,000 (B; $p < 0.001$), 100 (C; $p < 0.001$), or 0
64 (D; $p < 0.001$) cells•mL^{-1} for one (orange), two (blue), three (purple), or four (yellow) weeks.
65
66

67
68
69 **Figure S9.** Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from the Gulf of
70 Maine across diets. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae
71 from the Gulf of Maine having been fed 10,000 (A; $p < 0.005$), 100 (B; $p < 0.001$), or 0 (C; $p <$
72 0.002) cells•mL^{-1} for one (orange), two (blue), three (purple), or four (yellow) weeks.
73
74

75
76
Figure S10. Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae from the North
Sea across diets. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from
the North Sea having been fed 10,000 (A; p < 0.002), 1,000 (B; p < 0.002), 100 (C; p < 0.002), or
0 (D; p < 0.006) cells•mL^{-1} for one (orange), two (blue), three (purple), or four (yellow) weeks.
81
82

Figure S11. Community similarity of the associated microbial community along a phenotypic continuum for *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* from three geographic locations. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the Salish Sea (A; p = 0.046), Gulf of Maine (B; p < 0.005), and North Sea (C; p < 0.004) pre (orange) and post (blue and purple) expression of plasticity.

94 **Figure S12.** Similarity of the associated microbial community for *Strongylocentrotus*
95 *droebachiensis* larvae from three geographic locations. Community similarity (p < 0.001) of the
96 associated microbiota between *S. droebachiensis* larvae (circles) from the Salish Sea (blue), Gulf
97 of Maine (red), and North Sea (yellow) and seawater (squares).

Figure S13. Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae across diets. Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the Salish Sea (purple), Gulf of Maine (blue), or North Sea (orange) and having been fed 10,000 (A; p < 0.001), 1,000 (B; p < 0.001), 100 (C; p < 0.001), and 0 (D; p < 0.001) cells•mL^{-1}.

108
109
110 **Figure S14.** Community similarity of *Strongylocentrotus droebachiensis* larvae across time.
111 Similarity of bacterial communities associated with *S. droebachiensis* larvae from the Salish Sea
112 (purple), Gulf of Maine (blue), or North Sea (orange) and having been differentially fed for one
113 (A; p < 0.001), two (B; p < 0.001), three (C; p < 0.001), or four (D; p < 0.001) weeks.
114

Note S1

QIIME analysis

Starting with raw read files from MiSeq:

1) Pair forward and reverse files using PEAR (pear-0.9.10-bin-64)
2) Trim paired files using Trimmomatic (trimmomatic-0.36.jar)
3) Convert paired and trimmed .fastq to .fasta using the custom code: cat [input .fastq] | paste – - - - | cut -f 1,2 | sed 's/^/>/'| tr "\t" "\n" >[output .fasta]
4) Validate tab-delimited mapping file using "validate_mapping_file.py"
5) Generate meta-.fasta files using "add_qiime_labels.py"
6) Detect chimeras from meta-.fasta (called, "combined_seqs.fna")
7) Filter chimeras using "filter_fasta.py"
8) Pick OTUs using "pick_open_reference_otus.py"
9) Filter OTUs with >10 reads using "filter_otus_from_otu_table.py"
10) Filter 'o__Cryptophyta' using "filter_taxa_from_otu_table.py"
11) Determine rarefaction depth using "biom summarize-table"
12) Filtered .biom table was rarified using "single_rarefaction.py"
13) Filtered filtered .biom table was split using "split_otu_table.py" to test specific hypotheses
14) Alpha diversity was compared using "alpha_diversity.py"
15) Beta diversity was compared using "jackknifed_beta_diversity.py" and 2D PCoA plots of unweighted and weighted UniFrac values were generated using "make_2d_plots.py"
16) Statistical comparisons of unweighted and weighted UniFrac were performed with "compare_categories.py" using the '--method' "anosim," "adonis," and "permanova."
17) Taxonomic plots were generated using "summarize_taxa_through_plots.py"
18) Unique and shared OTUs were determined both using "compute_core_microbiome.py"and "shared_phylotypes.py"