High-resolution QTL mapping with Diversity Outbred mice identifies genetic

variants that impact gut microbiome composition

Florencia Schlamp*,1, David Y Zhang*, Juan Felipe Beltrán†, Elissa J Cosgrove*, Petr

Simecek‡,§, Matthew Edwards*, Julia K Goodrich*, Ruth E Ley**, Allan Pack††, Gary A

Churchill‡, Andrew G Clark*,1

Author Affiliations

* Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, Cornell University, Ithaca NY 14850,

USA.

† Department of Biomedical Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca NY 14850, USA.

‡ The Jackson Laboratory, Bar Harbor ME 04609, USA.

§ Central European Institute of Technology (CEITEC), Masaryk University, Brno 62500,

Czech Republic.

** Department of Microbiome Science, Max Planck Institute for Developmental Biology,

Tübingen 72026, Germany.

†† Department of Medicine, Perelman School of Medicine at the University of

Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA 19104, USA.

NCBI SRA BioProject ID: PRJNA639769

DO mice host-microbiome associations

KEYWORDS: Diversity Outbred mice; Microbiome; QTL mapping

[1]Corresponding authors: AGC or FS, Cornell University, Biotechnology Building 227,

526 Campus Rd, Ithaca NY 14853. E-mail: ac347@cornell.edu, mfs97@cornell.edu

ABSTRACT

The composition of the gut microbiome is impacted by a complex array of factors, from

nutrient composition and availability, to physical factors like temperature, pH, and flow

rate, as well as interactions among the members of the microbial community. Many of

these factors are affected by the host, raising the question of how host genetic variation

impacts microbiome composition. Though human studies confirm this type of role for

host genetics, its overall importance is still a subject of debate and remains difficult to

study. The mouse model, by allowing the strict control of genetics, nutrition, and other

environmental factors, has provided an excellent opportunity to extend this work, and

the Diversity Outbred (DO) mice in particular present a chance to pinpoint host genetic

variants that influence microbiome composition at different levels of generality. Here, we

apply 16S rRNA gene sequencing to fecal samples of 247 DO male mice to estimate

heritability and perform taxon-specific QTL mapping of microbial relative abundances

revealing an increasingly heterogeneous picture of host function and microbial taxa at

the host-microbiome interface. We present the first report of significant heritability of

phylum Tenericutes in mice, and find novel QTL-spanning genes involved in

antibacterial pathways, immune and inflammatory disease, and lipid metabolism.

INTRODUCTION

The gastrointestinal tract of all vertebrates, including humans, harbors a complex ecological community of highly diverse microbes referred to as the gut microbiota. The microbiota colonizes the gut for the first time during the birth of the host, and its composition is influenced by many factors during the host's life such as disease, diet, and antibiotics (FRANCINO 2016; BATTAGLIOLI AND KASHYAP 2018; DUDEK-WICHER *et al.* 2018; DASH *et al.* 2019). Variation in the human gut microbiome composition has also already been associated with host immune responses (ROUND AND MAZMANIAN 2009; GARRETT *et al.* 2010; VEIGA *et al.* 2010), metabolic phenotypes (TURNBAUGH *et al.* 2009; RIDAURA *et al.* 2013), and diseases such as obesity (LEY *et al.* 2005), heart disease (FAVA *et al.* 2006), and diabetes (WEN *et al.* 2008). Given the roles of the gut microbiome in complex human diseases, it is important to characterize the factors that impact microbiome composition.

While it is clear that the gut microbiome composition is strongly impacted by environmental exposures (ROTHSCHILD *et al.* 2018), the role of host genetics has only recently been implicated (GOODRICH *et al.* 2014; BLEKHMAN *et al.* 2015; GOODRICH *et al.* 2016). Studies have identified multiple genetic variants significantly associated with specific bacterial taxon abundances (DAVENPORT *et al.* 2015; BONDER *et al.* 2016; TURPIN *et al.* 2016; WANG *et al.* 2016; GOODRICH *et al.* 2017; IGARTUA *et al.* 2017; ROTHSCHILD *et al.* 2018) despite the observation that generally the primary determinants of microbiome composition are non-genetic (ROTHSCHILD *et al.* 2018). The relationship between genetic and non-genetic determinants is complex, as in the case of diet, which can influence the variability of complex traits by reshaping the gut microbiome

(VOROBYEV *et al.* 2019). Overall, it is clear that host-microbiome relationships are

impacted by interactions between genetics and environment to drive both community

composition and host traits (KURILSHIKOV *et al.* 2020). Human genetic studies have

significant limitations for accurate assessment of genetic effects on the microbiome,

including accessibility to large and diverse sample populations as well as a general lack

of control over confounding variables like diet, thus only detecting the strongest genetic

effects. This lack of experimental control can be circumvented through studies in model

organisms, which would allow us to better characterize host-microbiome relationships

and increase our chances of identifying genetic effects.

The mouse model, with the ability to control diet, provides a better opportunity to

dissect genetic and environmental factors impacting microbiome composition and has

been successful in this endeavor using inbred strains. Quantitative trait locus (QTL)

mapping efforts show that gut microbiota composition is a polygenic trait, with clearly

mappable genetic factors influencing the gut microbiome composition (BENSON *et al.*

2010; MCKNITE *et al.* 2012; SNIJDERS *et al.* 2016). Standard QTL mapping approaches

have low mapping resolution, however, and advanced intercross lines provide one

excellent means of improving mapping resolution. BELHEOUANE *et al.* (2017) performed

genetic and 16S rRNA gene analysis of skin microbiomes of a collection of 15-

generation advanced intercross lines, and demonstrated that the improved mapping

resolution also improved the specificity and significance of genetic associations. It is

clear that the mouse model will provide further opportunities to dissect the means by

which the host genome can modulate microbiome composition. A logical next step is a

mapping experiment to identify portions of the genome that influence functional

pathways that modulate the microbiome.

Here we extend the analysis of the link between the host genome and microbiome

using the Diversity Outbred mouse model. The Diversity Outbred (DO) population is a

heterogeneous mouse stock derived from the same eight progenitor lines (A/J,

C57BL/6J, 129S1/SvImJ, NOD/ShiLtJ, NZO/HlLtJ, CAST/EiJ, PWK/PhJ, and WSB/EiJ)

used to establish the Collaborative Cross (CC) (COLLABORATIVE CROSS CONSORTIUM

2012). Mice from the CC lines at early stages of inbreeding were used to establish the

DO population, which is maintained by randomized outbreeding among 175 mating

pairs. The result is each individual DO mouse represents a unique combination of

segregating alleles drawn from the original eight progenitor lines. The advantages of

this outbreeding include normal levels of heterozygosity — similar to the human genetic

condition — and substantially increased genetic resolution (CHURCHILL *et al.* 2012). Both

the DO mice and their founder progenitor lines have already proven to be successful in

identifying genetic associations with intestinal microbiome composition (O'CONNOR *et al.*

2014, KEMIS *et al.* 2019).

In this study, motivated by the high level of environmental control of the laboratory

mouse and the improved mapping resolution of the Diversity Outbred mouse system,

we identified genetic underpinnings of the gut microbiota of 247 Diversity Outbred mice.

We uncover evidence of host genetic factors influencing the composition of many

specific attributes of the gut microbiome (**Figure 1**). These included not only

associations between specific host genetic variants and abundances of particular

bacterial taxa, but also associations with functional molecular pathways.

Figure 1. Data flow schematic. Each of the 247 mice in this study represents a unique combination of

segregating alleles, whose genome is a unique sampling from the original eight progenitor lines (founder

mice). The SNP genotype of each mouse is represented by an eight-founder state probability. Microbial

16S rRNA from fecal pellets from each DO mouse provided bacterial relative abundances, which were

aggregated at each taxonomic level and used as separate phenotypes/traits.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animal population and sample collection

Male mice from the Diversity Outbred Mouse Panel were obtained from The Jackson Laboratory (Bar Harbor, ME, USA) at 6 weeks of age. Experiments were performed at the University of Pennsylvania, Center for Sleep. Mice were group-housed (5 animals per cage) for 2 weeks of post-travel acclimation, and then single-housed at identical conditions with lights on/lights off at 7:00 AM/7:00 PM with a lux level of 60 and temperature 23-25°C. Bedding used in home cages was Bed-o Cobs 1/8" (The Andersons Inc., Maumee, OH). Mice were fed *ad libitum* Laboratory Autoclavable Rodent Diet 5010 (Lab Diet, St. Louis, MO). Fecal pellets from 249 mice were collected at 3 months old (two samples were later discarded, leaving a final analyzed dataset of 247 mice). The pellets were collected from the mouse cage at 10:00 AM, i.e., 3 hours after lights on. Pellets were stored in Eppendorf tubes placed on dry ice and moved to a -80°C freezer until shipping and processing at Cornell University (Ithaca, NY, USA).

Microbial DNA extraction, 16S rRNA gene PCR, and sequencing

Microbial community DNA was extracted from one single frozen pellet per sample using the MO BIO PowerSoil-htp DNA Isolation Kit (MO BIO Laboratories, Inc., cat # 12955-4), but instead of vortexing, samples were placed in a BioSpec 1001 Mini-Beadbeater-96 for 2 minutes. We used 10-50 ng of sample DNA in duplicate 50 μl PCR reactions with 5 PRIME HotMasterMix and 0.1 μM forward and reverse primers. We amplified the V4 region of 16S rRNA gene using the universal primers 515F and barcoded 806R and the PCR program previously described CAPORASO *et al.* (2011), but

with 25 cycles. We purified amplicons using the Mag-Bind® E-Z Pure Kit (Omega Bio-

tek, cat # M1380) and quantified with Invitrogen Quant-iT™ PicoGreen® dsDNA

Reagent, and 100 ng of amplicons from each sample were pooled and paired end

sequenced (2x250bp) in two separate sequencing runs on an Illumina MiSeq instrument

at Cornell Biotechnology Resource Center Genomics Facility.

16S data processing

We performed demultiplexing of the 16S rRNA gene sequences and OTU picking

using the open source software package Quantitative Insights Into Microbial Ecology

(QIIME) version 1.9.0 with default methods (CAPORASO *et al.* 2010). The total number of

sequencing reads was 15,149,384, with an average of 61,334 sequences per sample

and ranging from 17,658 to 135,803. Open-reference OTU picking at 97% identity was

performed against the Greengenes 8_13 database. 12% of sequences failed to map in

the first step of closed-reference OTU picking. The taxonomic assignment of the

reference sequence was used as the taxonomy for each OTU. 'NR' within taxa names

represents New Reference OTUs defined as those with sequences that failed to match

the reference and are clustered *de novo*. Random subsamples were used to create a

new reference OTU collection and 'NCR' represents New Clean-up Reference OTUs

that failed to match the new reference OTU collection (RIDEOUT *et al.* 2014).

For the non-rarefied data, read count was used as an additional covariate during

QTL mapping to reduce the effect of sequencing depth. A rarefied dataset was also

used for heritability estimates and QTL mapping, as explained in **File S1**. Two extreme

outliers were omitted from further analysis, yielding a total of 247 samples. To

differentiate the non-rarefied taxa from the rarefied taxa, we use 'NonR' to represent the

non-rarefied dataset and 'R' to represent the rarefied dataset.

For heritability estimates and QTL mapping, a filter was applied across all 247

samples that removed any taxon that was not present in more than 50% of the samples.

Relative abundance of reads (number of reads clustered to each taxa divided by the

total number of reads in a given sample) was used as the tested phenotype. Relative

abundances were rank Z-score transformed using R-package *DOQTL* (GATTI *et al.*

2014).

Stacked bar plots of the most abundant taxa within each taxonomic level were

plotted with R-package *ggplot2*. A box-plot was first generated for each taxonomic level

depicting the relative abundances of the taxa within that taxonomic level across the 247

samples (**Figure S1**). The top ten taxa with the highest average relative abundances

are selected to be plotted in the stacked bar plot, ordered by the most abundant taxon.

A heatmap that correlates similarities between taxa from the non-rarefied and rarefied

datasets based on the Pearson correlation coefficient was plotted using the R-package

corrplot (**Figure S3**).

SNP genotyping

SNP genotyping was done at the Jackson Laboratories on each of the 247 mice

using The Mega Mouse Universal Genotyping Array (MegaMUGA). A total of 57,973

SNPs passed QC metrics and were used in the heritability and mapping analysis

reported here.

Heritability estimation

Heritabilities of the various bacterial taxa were quantified and calculated on

autosomes using a linear mixed model as implemented in R-package *lme4qtl* via the

relmatLmer() function (ZIYATDINOV *et al.* 2018) (https://github.com/variani/lme4qtl). This

linear mixed model enables us to decompose variability into genetic and environmental

components. The variance of the genetic component is expected to be $\sigma_g^2 K$, where K is

a kinship matrix normalized as proposed in (KANG *et al.* 2010). The kinship matrix is

specified via the "relmat" argument in relmatLmer(). To account for the potentially

confounding effects of shared cages during acclimation (as noted above under **Animal**

population and sample collection), we also included cage as a random effect in our

model. Thus, the model included estimates of variance of the genetic component (σ_g^2)

and the cage component (σ_{cage}^2), and the residual variance due to unspecified

environmental factors (σ_{rs}^2). The narrow sense heritability was then estimated as:

191
$$h^2 = \frac{\sigma_g^2}{\sigma_g^2 \; + \; \sigma_{cage}^2 \; + \; \sigma_{rs}^2}$$

Sequencing run was included as a covariate in both non-rarefied and rarefied

datasets. For our non-rarefied dataset, narrow sense heritabilities were calculated using

the number of read counts as an additional covariate. Significance of heritability

estimates was assessed by conducting a restricted likelihood ratio test using the

exactRLRT() function in the R-package *RLRsim* (SCHEIPL *et al.* 2008), as applied in

Supplementary Note 3 in ZIYATDINOV *et al.* (2018). We calculated standard errors for the

heritability estimates following code posted on the *lme4qtl* GitHub page:

https://github.com/variani/lme4qtl/blob/master/demo/se.R. This script uses the

deltamethod() function in the R-package *msm* (https://github.com/chjackson/msm) to

approximate standard errors using the delta method. Proportion variance estimates for

kinship and cage for all taxa and their taxonomic level for rarefied data are presented in

Figure S4. A comparison of heritability estimates and standard error between non-

rarefied and rarefied data can be seen in **Figure S5**.

QTL Mapping

For QTL mapping, rank Z-score transformed relative abundances were mapped

using a linear mixed model in R-package *lme4qtl::relmatLmer()* (ZIYATDINOV *et al.* 2018)

(fit using maximum likelihood (ML), REML=F) on autosomes with kinship included as a

random effect to account for genetic relatedness among animals. For the bacterial taxa

from the five taxonomic levels, we generated QTL mappings with the taxa designated

as the phenotype. Sequencing run (fixed effect) and cage (random effect) were included

in both non-rarefied and rarefied datasets. We included read count as an additional

covariate (fixed effect) for our non-rarefied dataset. Significant and suggestive

associations were identified in a two-step procedure. First, we applied likelihood ratio

tests comparing models with and without genotype. *P*-values derived from these tests

were adjusted for multiple testing across SNPs (within a given taxon) using R function

p.adjust() with method "BH" (BENJAMINI AND HOCHBERG 1995). In the second step, we

conducted permutation tests (1000 permutations) for taxa that had associations with

adjusted *p*-value < 0.1 in the maximum likelihood analysis. Due to the computational

cost of performing permutation tests for each taxa/peak combination, we further filtered

the permutation candidates by only querying the peak with the lowest likelihood p-value

in regions with peak overlaps. This resulted in permutation *p*-values for 4 taxa and 4

peaks (**Table 2**). Annotated genes found within QTL regions with permutation *p*-value <

0.1 can be found in **Table S5**. Although *p*-values are corrected within each trait, no

additional adjustment is made for the search across traits.

For every bacterial taxon from the five taxonomic levels with a statistically

significant QTL association, we mapped the OTUs belonging to that taxon. We applied

a 50% zero cut-off filter to only retain common OTUs and generated QTL mappings and

assessed significance as described above for the five taxonomic levels.

When necessary for comparison, genomic coordinate spans from other

publications were translated from human hg19 assembly to mouse mm10 assembly

using LiftOver (UCSC). Particularly in the case of small spans or single nucleotides,

LiftOver might require expanding the window being mapped. In our case, we iteratively

increased the window by adding a padding of 0, 10,100,1000,10000, and 100000 bps

on each side of the region of interest until a mapping was achieved. All mapped entries

listed include the final span of the genomic coordinates used including padding (**Table**

S7D).

Gene Set Pathway Analysis

We used Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA®, QIAGEN Redwood City, CA) software

to conduct gene set pathway analysis on the protein-coding non-predicted genes within

our QTL regions. Genes were uploaded as NCBI Gene IDs for ease of mapping across

IPA's source databases. All analyses were constrained to consider only direct

relationships and exclude any annotation predictions. Additionally, we used IPA's

stringent filter to constrain the analysis to Mouse annotation while considering all

Tissues and Cell Lines. IPA by default shows uncorrected *p*-values for enrichment

analyses. We customized all charts and tables to indicate Benjamini-Hochberg False

Discovery Rate instead. In total, we submitted 6 gene lists for parallel analyses, all of

which were filtered to exclude predicted genes and non-protein coding genes: (1) all

genes within any significant QTL region at any taxonomic level, (2) Bacillales only, (3)

Bacteroidales only, (4) Mollicutes only (5) Ruminococcaceae only, and (6)

Staphylococcus only. Many taxonomic groups result in similar-enough QTLs that their

gene sets are identical, these groups are the result of picking the lowest taxon for any

identical gene sets while covering all the taxa studied (for instance, phylum Tenericutes

is excluded as it matches the results of class Mollicutes).

Data Availability

Our study was performed on a subset of Diversity Outbred mice from the Allan

Pack Sleep Study; the genotypes can be downloaded from the Jackson Lab Diversity

Outbred Database (DODB) website (https://dodb.jax.org). QIIME demultiplexed fastq

files with microbiome data are available in the NCBI SRA, BioProject ID: PRJNA639769

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/639769). All Supplemental Materials (**File S1**,

Figures S1-S5, and **Tables S1-S9**) have been uploaded to GSA FigShare under

"Supplemental Material for Schlamp et al., 2020", and a description of each can be

found at the end of the manuscript.

RESULTS

Variation of gut microbiota

High-throughput sequencing of fecal samples from 247 three month old male mice

from the Diversity Outbred Mouse Panel generated 15,149,384 16S rRNA gene

sequences that passed the quality filtering criteria after demultiplexing (see **Materials**

and Methods). On average, 61,334 sequences were obtained per sample (ranging

from 17,658 to 135,803 sequences). Sequences were sorted into 57,014 operational

taxonomic units (OTUs) at 97% identity against the Greengenes 8_13 database using

open-reference OTU picking (**Table S1A**). Next, OTUs were summarized at five levels

of taxonomy (phylum, class, order, family, genus) (**Table S2A**). In order to focus on the

most abundant microbes, only the taxa present in at least 50% of samples (i.e. present

in 124 samples or more) were used for all following analysis, leaving a total of 75 taxa to

test at the five levels of taxonomy (6 phyla, 8 classes, 11 orders, 20 families, and 30

genera). The most predominant taxa at the phylum level were Firmicutes (average

relative abundance = 48.64%) and Bacteroidetes (46.41%), which is consistent with

previous findings in mice (BENSON *et al.* 2010; MCKNITE *et al.* 2012; ORG *et al.* 2015).

The relative abundances of these taxa were highly variable, with Firmicutes ranging

from 11% to 94%, and Bacteroidetes ranging from 1% to 88% (**Figure 2, Figure S1**).

Figure 2. Relative abundances of top ten most abundant phyla across the 247 DO mice. Relative

abundances shown, mouse samples sorted by phylum Firmicutes, the most abundant phylum.

The top 8 most abundant genera were present in at least 99% of the samples. The

two most abundant genera were an unidentified genus within Bacteroidales family S24-

7 (average relative abundance = 43.89%, ranging from 1% to 88%) and another

unidentified genus within Clostridiales (32.35%, ranging from 4% to 78%), consistent

with previous findings in mice (SHIN *et al.* 2016).

When dealing with uneven sequence counts across samples, microbiome studies

commonly normalize the data by rarefying sequence counts, which consists of randomly

selecting from each sample an equal number of sequences without replacement (WEISS

et al. 2017). It has been argued, however, that rarefaction is not an ideal approach due

to valuable data being discarded (MCMURDIE AND HOLMES 2014). Therefore, we decided

to present our analysis of the non-rarefied data using sequence counts per sample as a

covariate, noting also that the rarefied data consisted of highly similar relative

abundances, and provided similar heritability and QTL results (see **File S1** for a detailed

breakdown of these metrics**).

Heritability estimation

Each of the 247 individual DO mice used in this study represents a unique

genomic combination of alleles from the original eight progenitor lines. The unit of

inference for phenotypes was the rank Z-score transformed relative abundance of each

taxon at each taxonomic level (phylum, class, order, family, genus) in each individual

mouse, while the units of genetic inference were the SNP genotypes at each of 57,973

sites for each mouse using the MegaMUGA mouse genotyping array (**Figure 1**). Each

SNP genotype is represented by an eight-founder state probability that corresponds to

the probabilities contributed by each founder at each SNP (SVENSON *et al.* 2012) and

those eight-founder probabilities are used to fit the linear models (see **Material and**

Methods).

We estimated narrow-sense "SNP" heritability (h^2) using a linear mixed model in R-

package *lme4qtl* (ZIYATDINOV *et al.* 2018). A linear mixed model was used to predict

whether the effects of the autosomal genotype on the phenotype is proportional to the

genetic similarity between the mice, after adjustment for known factors. Thus,

calculations were based on the kinship matrix (genetic similarity; also called genetic

relatedness matrix (GRM)), expression of a phenotype (taxon relative abundance)

across all samples, and additional covariates (such as sequencing run, read counts,

and cage effect). Significance was assessed by a restricted likelihood ratio test using R-

package *RLRsim* (SCHEIPL *et al.* 2008). More details can be found in **Materials and**

Methods. Heritability estimates ranged from 0% to 40%. In total, 23 of the 75 tested

taxa were significantly heritable (RLRT p-value < 0.05); we additionally note multiple-

hypothesis normalized Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) False Discovery Rates (**Figure 3**,

Table S3A). We hypothesized that higher-level taxa would be found to be more

heritable than lower level taxa, assuming strong functional relatedness between

members of the same taxonomic group, but found that there is no consistent trend

between the taxonomy level and heritability. Our most heritable taxon, the class

Mollicutes (40%, RLTR p-value of 0.0017, BH p-value of 0.0884) had a higher

heritability estimate than any clade below it (genus *Anaeroplasma* with 29% and an

unclassified genus in order RF39 with 35%). In contrast, the heritability estimate of class

Bacilli (25%), is surpassed by its subclade, the order Lactobacillales (33%), which is in

turn surpassed by its genus *Lactobacillus*, our second most heritable taxon (36%, RLTR

p-value of 0.0076, BH p-value of 0.1035). Proportion variance estimates for kinship and

cage for all taxa and their taxonomic level are presented in **Figure 3**.

Heritability % (BH.FDR)

Taxon	Heritability % (BH.FDR)
p_Actinobacteria	0 (1.000)
c_Coriobacteria	
o_Coriobacteriales	
f_Coriobacteriaceae	0 (1.000)
g_Adlercreutzia	0 (1.000)
p_Bacteroidetes	29 (0.103)
c_Bacteroidia	
o_Bacteroidales	29 (0.103)
f_Bacteroidaceae	
g_Bacteroides	1 (0.473)
f_Rikenellaceae	0 (1.000)
g_Unclassified	0 (1.000)
f_S24-7	
g_Unclassified	31 (0.103)
p_Firmicutes	20 (0.203)
c_Bacilli	25 (0.140)
o_Bacillales	15 (0.258)
f_Staphylococcaceae	17 (0.239)
g_Staphylococcus	18 (0.235)
o_Lactobacillales	33 (0.103)
f_Lactobacillaceae	
g_Lactobacillus	36 (0.103)
o_Turicibacterales	
f_Turicibacteraceae	
g_Turicibacter	31 (0.193)
c_Clostridia	
o_Clostridiales	25 (0.166)
f_Unclassified	
g_Unclassified	34 (0.103)
f_[Mogibacteriaceae]	5 (0.440)
g_Unclassified	8 (0.405)
f_Christensenellaceae	18 (0.251)
g_Unclassified	18 (0.239)
f_Clostridiaceae	0 (1.000)
g_Unclassified	0 (0.473)
g_Clostridium	31 (0.111)
f_Dehalobacteriaceae	
g_Dehalobacterium	0 (1.000)
f_Lachnospiraceae	7 (0.416)
g_Unclassified	13 (0.283)
g_[Ruminococcus]	2 (0.473)
g_Anaerostipes	0 (0.473)
g_Coprococcus	25 (0.103)
g_Dorea	2 (0.473)
Other	6 (0.416)
f_Ruminococcaceae	8 (0.348)
g_Unclassified	6 (0.416)
g_Oscillospira	9 (0.327)
g_Ruminococcus	13 (0.286)
Other	14 (0.286)
Other	
Other	0 (1.000)
c_Erysipelotrichi	
o_Erysopelotrichales	
f_Erysipelotrichaceae	12 (0.276)
g_Unclassified	4 (0.453)
g_Coprobacillus	23 (0.193)
p_Proteobacteria	0 (1.000)
c_Gammaproteobacteria	19 (0.207)
o_Enterobacteriales	
f_Enterobacteriaceae	23 (0.193)
g_Unclassified	20 (0.207)
p_Tenericutes	
c_Mollicutes	40 (0.088)
o_Anaeroplasmatales	
f_Anaeroplasmataceae	
g_Anaeroplasma	29 (0.103)
o_RF39	
f_Unclassified	
g_Unclassified	35 (0.103)
p_Verrucomicrobia	2 (0.473)
c_Verrucomicrobiae	
o_Verrucomicrobiales	
f_Verrucomicrobiaceae	
g_Akkermansia	2 (0.473)

kinship
cage
residual

0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0
variance component proportion

Figure 3. Proportion of variance estimates for kinship and cage for all taxa. Proportion of variance

estimates for kinship (green), cage effects (orange), and unexplained residual effects (blue) for each

taxon. The kinship proportion of variance is an estimate of narrow sense heritability. Heritability

percentages are shown on the left. Heritability standard errors are shown with black horizontal lines.

Designations p_, c_, o_, f_, and g_ are for phylum, class, order, family, and genus, respectively. When

results are identical across taxa in the same phylogenetic branch, only the lowest (most specific) taxa are

shown and the rest are shaded out. Heritability significance is marked with one plus (**+**, RLTR *p*-value <

0.05) and BH FDR is shown in parentheses next to heritability percentages. Taxa marked with a red

asterisk have statistically suggestive QTL (*, adj. *p*-value < 0.1). Complete table of heritability results,

including rarefied data, can be found in **Table S3**.

QTL Mapping

QTL mapping of the bacterial taxa at the five taxonomic levels revealed findings

that suggest statistically significant associations between host genotype and relative

abundances of certain taxa. QTL regions on autosomes were found using the R-

package *lme4qtl* (ZIYATDINOV *et al.* 2018). Significance was assessed first by

comparison of models with and without genotype via a likelihood ratio test, followed by a

genome-wide permutation test. The reported *p*-values were corrected for multiple

testing across SNPs (but not across taxa). In total, genetic associations with the

abundance of family Ruminococcaceae, family Staphylococcaceae, and genus

Staphylococcus were found to be statistically significant (adj. *p*-value < 0.05), and

additional genetic associations with phylum Bacteroidetes, order Bacteroidales, order

Bacillales, and class Mollicutes were statistically suggestive (adj. *p*-value < 0.1). QTLs

of order Bacteroidales, genus *Staphylococcus*, and family Ruminococcaceae were also

statistically suggestive at a permutation *p*-value < 0.1 (**Table S5**).

QTL regions are defined by all contiguous SNPs with LODs above significance

threshold of adjusted *p*-value < 0.1, as illustrated in **Figure 4C**. Multiple QTL for various

taxa overlapped with the QTL regions for their parent taxa, such as a QTL hit for genus

Staphylococcus (a genus in the family Staphylococcaceae) overlapping the QTL hit for

family Staphylococcaceae (**Table 1**). The relationship between loci and microbial

abundance is treated as an independent association analysis per taxa. An example of

how these parallel analyses detect similar genomic regions across related taxa is further

illustrated in **Figure 5**.

Table 1. QTL regions for taxa at five taxonomic levels. Only showing ranked results with adj. *p*-value <

0.1 (statistically suggestive). Results with adj. *p*-value < 0.05 (statistically significant) are bolded. When

results were overlapping across taxa in the same phylogenetic branch (such as phylum Bacteroidetes

and order Bacteroidales), permutations were calculated only for the lowest (most specific) taxon.

Complete table of QTL results, including rarefied data, can be found in **Table S4**.

	chr[a]	maxlod[b]	pos[c]	from[d]	to[e]	*p*-value	adj.*p*-value	perm.*p*-value
phylum Bacteroidetes	5	7.65	118.58	117.39	118.82	1.02E-05	0.068	NA
order Bacteroidales	5	7.67	118.58	117.39	118.82	9.69E-06	0.065	0.042
order Bacillales	19	8.24	27.02	26.55	27.42	3.12E-06	0.055	NA
	19	6.95	27.82	27.82	27.97	4.02E-05	0.085	NA
family Staphylococcaceae	**19**	**8.09**	**27.04**	**26.55**	**27.46**	**4.17E-06**	**0.032**	NA
	19	**7.84**	**27.82**	**27.61**	**28.18**	**6.96E-06**	**0.032**	NA
	19	6.58	32.10	31.83	32.22	8.33E-05	0.092	NA
	19	6.45	32.43	32.43	32.43	1.07E-04	0.098	NA
genus *Staphylococcus*	**19**	**8.26**	**27.04**	**26.51**	**27.46**	**3.00E-06**	**0.025**	**0.019**
	19	**7.93**	**27.82**	**27.61**	**28.20**	**5.78E-06**	**0.025**	**0.033**
	19	6.64	32.10	31.83	32.22	7.39E-05	0.082	0.271
	19	6.53	32.43	32.43	32.46	9.14E-05	0.082	0.304
family Ruminococcaceae	**2**	**7.01**	**170.57**	**170.51**	**170.66**	**3.63E-05**	**0.039**	0.137
	2	6.30	170.71	170.71	170.71	1.44E-04	0.100	0.427
	5	**7.18**	**31.93**	**31.77**	**32.19**	**2.59E-05**	**0.035**	0.106
	5	**7.44**	**32.52**	**32.27**	**33.36**	**1.55E-05**	**0.035**	0.066
Unclassified genus in family Ruminococcaceae	2	7.89	170.56	170.51	170.64	6.22E-06	0.090	NA
class Mollicutes	1	7.00	121.32	120.23	125.20	3.66E-05	0.089	0.142

Taxa (vertical row label)

[a] Chromosome in which lies the QTL
[b] Maximum LOD score within the QTL
[c] Position in the chromosome (Mbp) where the maximum LOD score is found
[d] Chromosomal position (Mbp) where the QTL begins
[e] Chromosomal position (Mbp) where the QTL ends

Figure 4. QTL scores for abundance of class Mollicutes. (A) LOD score profile of genome-wide QTL

mapping for relative abundance of class Mollicutes shows a significant QTL region (in red) on chr1.

Horizontal axis shows genome physical location by chromosome, vertical axis shows LOD score at each

site. Horizontal dashed red line marks the significance threshold at adjusted *p*-value < 0.1. **(B)** Chr1

zoomed in shows the significant QTL region in red (chr1:120.24-125.15 Mbp). **(C)** Further zoom into the

area of interest shows in clearer detail how the QTL region is determined by a collection of contiguous

significant SNPs (above significance threshold). **(D)** *Mus musculus* protein-coding genes within the QTL

region are colored in blue.

OTU level analysis

Next, we decided to increase the specificity of the taxonomic classifications to operational taxonomic units (OTUs) by compiling all OTUs identified within taxa that had statistically suggestive QTL (**Table 1**). We filtered out OTUs that were present in less than 50% of the samples, resulting in 362 OTUs. QTL mapping performed on these selected OTUs resulted in 28 OTUs with at least one statistically significant association (adj. p-value < 0.05), and 33 additional OTUs with at least one statistically suggestive association (adj. p-value < 0.1) (**Table S6**).

QTL associations to OTUs sometimes overlapped with QTL regions associated to taxa at higher taxonomic levels, with the most significant ones corresponding to wider QTL regions (**Table 2**). These results are interesting because if the overlapping QTL region associated with the broader taxonomic group is narrower and more specific than the region seen on an individual OTU, this might suggest a cumulative effect of multiple sub-taxonomies driving a stronger signal at the broader taxonomic level. For example, QTL for OTU 338796 (chr2:169.64-171.00Mbp) and NCR OTU 170146 (chr5:32.27-35.85Mbp) within family Ruminococcaceae were both statistically significant (**Table 2**) and overlapped with QTL regions for Ruminococcaceae (chr2:170.51-170.66Mbp and chr5:32.27-33.36Mbp, respectively) (**Table 1**), but the QTL regions for the OTUs were both wider, as shown in **Figure 5**. Note that factors such as the local recombination intensity profile and SNP density will affect the width of the QTL regions equally across taxonomies, since the relative abundance of each taxon at each taxonomic level is considered as a single phenotype queried against the same static, underlying set of SNPs.

Table 2. QTL regions for OTUs. Only showing OTUs with adj. *p*-value < 0.1 (statistically suggestive) and

with a QTL region overlapping QTL from higher-level taxonomies. Results with adj. *p*-value < 0.05

(statistically significant) are bolded. Permutations were calculated only for peaks with the lowest likelihood

p-value in regions with peak overlaps. OTU numbers are assigned by Greengenes database, 'NR'

prefixes denote "New Reference" OTUs defined as those with sequences that failed to match the

reference and are clustered *de novo*. 'NCR' prefixes denote "New Clean-up Reference" OTUs that failed

to match the new reference OTU collection and are assigned a new random number. Complete table of

QTL results for OTUs can be found in **Tables S6**.

		chr[a]	maxlod[b]	pos[c]	from[d]	to[e]	*p*-value	adj.*p*-value	perm.*p*-value
	OTU 421792 (order Bacteroidales)	5	5.52	118.69	118.67	118.79	6.36E-04	0.088	NA
	OTU 460953 (order Bacteroidales)	5	5.71	118.67	118.63	118.74	4.49E-04	0.085	NA
	OTU 190835 (order Bacteroidales)	5	5.52	118.67	118.67	118.69	6.35E-04	0.090	NA
	OTU 209408 (order Bacteroidales)	5	6.84	118.67	118.52	118.82	5.02E-05	0.066	0.195
Taxa	OTU NR.OTU100 (family Ruminococcaceae)	5	8.35	31.93	30.25	32.10	2.46E-06	0.052	0.015
	OTU 338796 (family Ruminococcaceae)	**2**	**8.28**	**170.56**	**169.64**	**171.00**	**2.84E-06**	**0.032**	**0.019**
	OTU NR.OTU95 (family Ruminococcaceae)	5	7.65	31.83	31.30	32.00	1.01E-05	0.065	NA
		5	7.45	32.27	32.11	32.39	1.51E-05	0.065	NA
	OTU 336810 (family Ruminococcaceae)	2	6.47	170.54	170.27	170.59	1.03E-04	0.093	NA
	OTU NCR.OTU170146 (family Ruminococcaceae)	**5**	**7.68**	**33.33**	**32.27**	**35.85**	**9.58E-06**	**0.026**	**0.056**

[a] Chromosome in which lies the QTL
[b] Maximum LOD score within the QTL
[c] Position in the chromosome (Mbp) where the maximum LOD score is found
[d] Chromosomal position (Mbp) where the QTL begins
[e] Chromosomal position (Mbp) where the QTL ends

Figure 5. Overlap of QTL regions across taxa in the same phylogenetic branch. (**A**) LOD score profile of genome-wide QTL mapping for relative abundance family Ruminococcaceae (top panel), and two OTUs found within family Ruminococcaceae: OTU 338796 (middle panel), and NCR OTU 170146 (bottom panel). (**B**) Zoom into the area of interest in chr2 shows overlap in QTL regions between family Ruminococcaceae (170.51-170.66Mbp, top panel) and OTU 338796 (169.64-171.00Mbp, middle panel). (**C**) Zoom into the area of interest in chr5 shows overlap in QTL regions between family Ruminococcaceae (32.27-33.36Mbp, top panel) and NCR OTU 170146 (32.27-35.85Mbp, bottom panel). Horizontal axis shows genome physical location by chromosome, vertical axis shows LOD score at each site. Horizontal dashed red line marks the significance threshold at adjusted *p*-value < 0.1.

Comparison to other studies

Results from other published studies on heritabilities of the various bacterial taxa in

the gut microbiome of mice, pigs, and humans were compiled and compared with our

results (**Figure 6, Table S7**). We find new evidence of heritability of bacterial taxa in

mice only previously seen in human studies. For example, we observed significant

heritability in the phylum Tenericutes as well as several of its subclades, including

genus *Anaeroplasma* and order RF39. These results were consistent across both our

rarefied and non-rarefied datasets, and had not been seen in any other mouse studies,

either because they did not detect these taxa in their studies or their results failed to

identify significant heritability. This novel result is similar to previous host-microbe

associations seen in human studies where significant heritabilities for this taxonomic

lineage were identified in phylum Tenericutes (h^2 = 0.34 (GOODRICH *et al.* 2016) and

0.23 (LIM *et al.* 2017)), class Mollicutes (h^2 = 0.32 (GOODRICH *et al.* 2016) and 0.23 (LIM

et al. 2017)), and order *RF39* (h^2 = 0.31 (GOODRICH *et al.* 2016)).

In some instances, taxa that we did not identify as being significantly heritable —

and in fact have some of our lowest heritability scores — are reported to have high

heritability in other studies. We show some examples of this in **Figure 6**: families

Clostridiaceae and Lachnospiraceae as well as the entire phylum Verrucomicrobia.

Interestingly, both of these families have significantly heritable subclades, whereas the

entire branch of phylum Verrucomicrobia had low heritability estimates. We see a very

low heritability estimate in both our non-rarefied and rarefied datasets for the genus

Akkermansia (h^2 = 0.02) and every taxonomic level up to phylum Verrucomicrobia, yet

estimates for mice in other studies were as high as h^2 = 0.92 (ORG *et al.* 2015), and h^2 =

 0.62 (O'CONNOR *et al.* 2014). This discrepancy between heritability estimates for

Akkermansia is not mouse specific, as human microbiome studies see similarly

conflicting results in their heritability estimates for this same genus: Reporting

significantly high (h^2 = 0.30 (TURPIN *et al.* 2016)), significantly low (h^2 = 0.14 (GOODRICH

et al. 2016)), and close to zero and not significant estimates (h^2 = 0, 0.01 (DAVENPORT *et*

al. 2015), and 0.06 (LIM *et al.* 2017)).

Figure 6. Comparison of taxon heritabilities across mouse, human, and pig studies. The green

shading over heritability estimates ranges from each study's lowest heritability estimate (white) to each

study's highest heritability estimate (green) to highlight the relative heritability of each taxa per study.

Statistically significant results are shown in bold font when significance is reported. For our Diversity

Outbred study, we report both non-rarefied (nonR) and rarefied (R) results. For ORG *et al.* (2015) we

report results using all mice (All), just males (M), just females (F), an average per strain (Avg), and a

single mouse per strain (One). ORG *et al.* (2015) and O'CONNOR *et al.* (2014) did not report significances.

For GOODRICH *et al.* (2016) the estimates are calculated by the ACE model, bold values indicate

estimates with a 95% confidence interval not overlapping 0. For DAVENPORT *et al.* (2015) the estimates

are the proportion of variance explained (PVE) estimates ("chip heritability"), we report winter (W),

summer (S), and combined seasons (C) datasets, and bold values indicate estimates with a standard

error not overlapping 0. For TURPIN *et al.* (2016) and LIM *et al.* (2017) estimates are polygenic heritability

(H2r). For CAMARINHA-SILVA *et al.* (2017) and HUGHES *et al.* (2020) estimates are narrow-sense heritability

(h^2). Grey indicates that the taxon was not observed or excluded in a given study. Figure adapted from

GOODRICH *et al.* (2016). Comparisons relevant to the text are shown here, with the full comparison found

in **Table S7**.

In addition to comparing our heritability estimates with other studies, we also

contrasted our QTL mapping results of the gut microbiome with those from previous

QTL and GWA studies (**Figure 7, Table S7**).

We identified statistically significant QTL associations for the order Bacillales as

well as for the family Staphylococcaceae and the genus *Staphylococcus* within

Bacillales in chr19; another mouse study also found statistically significant QTL

associations for all of the same taxa but on chr17 (MCKNITE *et al.* 2012). A human

microbiome study found statistically significant QTL regions for the class Bacilli, which

comprise the above mentioned order and families (BLEKHMAN *et al.* 2015).

Family Ruminococcaceae has been previously found to have significant QTL

associations both in mice (chr12 (BENSON *et al.* 2010) and 3 (BELHEOUANE *et al.* 2017))

and humans (BLEKHMAN *et al.* 2015, HUGHES *et al.* 2020). In our study,

Ruminococcaceae was identified as associated with chromosomes 2 and 5. We also

identified a QTL hit for the phylum Bacteroidetes in chr5 while another mouse study

identified a significant hit in chr14 (WANG *et al.* 2015). Within Bacteroidetes, even

though we did not find any significant QTL results for the genus *Bacteroides*, many

other mouse studies have (chr1 (WANG *et al.* 2015, BELHEOUANE *et al.* 2017), 4

(MCKNITE *et al.* 2012), 9 (LEAMY *et al.* 2014), 11 (BUBIER *et al.* 2018), 16 (LEAMY *et al.*

2014), and 18 (LEAMY *et al.* 2014)) as well as a human study (BLEKHMAN *et al.* 2015).

Phylum Tenericutes had a significant hit in chr1 in both our non-rarefied and

rarefied datasets, and family Lachnospiraceae had a statistically suggestive QTL in

chr10 in our rarefied dataset but not in our non-rarefied dataset. Both of these taxa had

significant QTL hits in a human study (BLEKHMAN *et al.* 2015).

Finally, we did not observe any QTL overlaps with KEMIS *et al.* (2019) (**Table S7**),

which also used the Diversity Outbred mice population in their microbiome association

study. This lack of overlap is likely due to the highly different diet used in their

experiments (high-fat, high-sucrose), and further highlights the strong impact of diet

alone in microbiome composition.

| | QTL/GWAS signals | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mouse | | | | | | | | | Human | |
	Schlamp '20 nonR	R	Benson	McKnite	Leamy	Wang '15 H	Bubier	Belheouane	Kemis	Blekhman	Hughes RNT
p_Bacteroidetes	5	5				14					
└ c_Bacteroidia											
└ o_Bacteroidales	5	5									
└ f_Bacteroidaceae											
└ g_*Bacteroides*				4	9,16,18	1	11	1		9 (4)	
p_Firmicutes											1 (3)
└ c_Bacilli										2 (12), 10 (7), 14 (12)	
└ o_Bacillales	19			17							
└ f_Staphylococcaceae	19			17							
└ g_*Staphylococcus*	19			17							
└ c_Clostridia											
└ o_Clostridiales											1 (3), 11 (9)
└ f_Lachnospiraceae		10								1 (1)	3 (3)
└ f_Ruminococcaceae	2,5	2,5	12					3		10 (10)	7 (9)
p_Tenericutes										6 (17)	
└ c_Mollicutes	1	1									

Figure 7. Comparison of taxa with QTL associations across mouse and human studies.

Associations with each taxon are marked in dark blue if statistically suggestive and bolded in white if statistically significant, or light blue if not significant. Gray indicates that the taxon was not observed or excluded in a given study. The chromosome numbers where the QTL were found are denoted in each box. For our Diversity Outbred study, we report both non-rarefied (nonR) and rarefied (R) results. In the human studies, the corresponding syntenic mouse chromosome was added in parenthesis. Figure adapted from GOODRICH *et al.* (2016). Selected comparisons shown, full comparison found in **Table S7**.

Gene level analysis

Examining the QTL mapping results from previous studies, it was apparent that although different studies might all have found significant QTL regions for a particular bacterial taxon, they identified different genomic positions as showing associations. In order to identify common functions and diseases associated with the genes within our QTL regions, we used Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA®, QIAGEN Redwood City, CA) to run a cumulative gene set enrichment analysis on all 1423 genes associated with non-rarefied microbiome abundance spanning 7 significant QTL and 11 suggestive QTL across the five taxonomic levels (phylum, class, order, family, genus) (**Table S4**) and 54

significant QTL and 232 suggestive QTL at the OTU level (**Table S6**). All genes found

within each QTL region were included. When QTL regions overlapped across taxa of

the same phylogenetic branch (as illustrated in **Figure 5**), overlapping genes were only

counted once. Additionally, we ran taxon-specific enrichment analysis to profile the

specific functions and diseases associated with genes in the QTL regions associated

with relative abundance of phylum Firmicutes (n = 23 genes), class Mollicutes (n = 9),

order Bacteroidales (n = 10), family Ruminococcaceae (n = 15), and genus

Staphylococcus (n = 8), excluding OTU-specific QTL regions.

Through the cumulative gene set analysis, we found 25 networks each containing

subsets of our genes. We can try to characterize the biological significance of these

networks by measuring the enrichment of disease and functional annotations in the

genes of each network (**Table S8**). We find remarkable functional signatures in the

highest-ranked of these 25 networks, with enrichment in the broad categories of

Immunological Disease and Inflammatory Response (Network 1, **Figure 8A**), Lipid

Metabolism and Molecular Transport (Network 2, **Figure 8B**), and Connective Tissue

Development and Function (Network 3, **Figure 8C**). These associations are highly

concordant with increasingly well-understood roles in host-microbiome interaction

studies. In Network 1, we find the most enriched specific functions relate to microbiome

associated phenotypes, namely hypersensitive reactions (BH-FDR = 7.56e-4), allergies

(BH-FDR = 1.39e-3), and atopic dermatitis (BH-FDR = 6.35e-3). Additionally, we find

that despite lack of overlap between the gene membership of these four highest-ranked

networks, they all have a significant enrichment for functions in both Gastrointestinal

Disease (BH-FDRs between 1.26e-3 and 2.47e-3) and Digestive System Development

and Function (BH-FDRs between 3.41e-3 and 3.34e-2). Interestingly, we also find

consistent significant enrichment of cancer annotations across all four networks with

varying overlap of tissues: prostate and renal cancers (Network 1), metastasis and

colorectal cancer (Network 2), and breast, ovarian, and gastrointestinal cancer (Network

3). Only liver cancer appeared to be enriched in all three networks. A full exhaustive list

of significantly enriched categories, diseases, and functions can be found in **Table S9**.

Figure 8. Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA) three highest-ranked interaction networks generated

from cumulative gene set analysis. Genes circled in color are all associated with disease and

functional annotations as specified below. Nodes marked with an asterix belong to closely associated

genes added by IPA that were not in the input dataset. (**A**) Network 1 shows genes associated with

Immunological Disease (circled in red) and Inflammatory Response (blue). (**B**) Network 2 shows genes

associated with Lipid Metabolism (green) and Molecular Transport (purple). (**C**) Network 3 shows genes

associated with Connective Tissue Development and Function (orange).

Through taxon-specific enrichment analysis we find a consistent enrichment in

development of adenocarcinoma (FDRs between 0.00% and 2.87%) in what are

otherwise heterogeneous functional profiles (**Figure S2A-E**). We observe an

enrichment of lipid metabolism pathway annotation through genes ASAH2, VLDLR, and

SGMS1 in the phylum Firmicutes (FDRs 0.31% to 2.73%) all of which are again

detected in its subclade, the genus *Staphylococcus* (FDRs 0.22% to 2.98%) (**Figure**

S2A,B). We also observe an enrichment in breast and ovarian cancer annotations in

phylum Firmicutes (FDRs 0.31% to 2.73%), which is shared with its larger subclade, the

family Ruminococcaceae (FDRs 0.34% to 2.95%) (**Figure S2A,C**).

Finally, in both the cumulative and taxon-specific gene sets we find genes

canonically tied to the commensal microbiome and pathogen-host interactions. The

gene MARCO, which lies within a QTL for the abundance of class Mollicutes, encodes a

pattern recognition receptor which is part of the innate antimicrobial immune system,

binding both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria. We consistently find genes

associated with bacterial response in these gene sets, including TLR2, a membrane

protein that recognizes bacterial, fungal and viral molecules and has been shown to

have benign associations when binding a protein produced by the gut microbiome

(OTTMAN *et al.* 2017). These gene sets also include both FCGR1A and FCER1G,

fragments of the high affinity IgE Receptor, Spondin2, a cell adhesion protein that binds

directly to bacteria and their components as an opsonin for the macrophage

phagocytosis of bacteria, BPIFA1, an antimicrobial protein that inhibits the formation of

biofilm by Gram negative bacteria, and both PGLYRP3 and PGLYRP4, both

peptidoglycan recognition proteins that bind to murein peptidoglycan of Gram-positive

bacteria.

DISCUSSION

There exists a complex and multifaceted relationship between the gut microbiome

and its host's genome, where recent studies are beginning to show the true magnitude

of these connections. Our results seek to further understand this relationship by

measuring the heritability of bacterial relative abundance phenotypes and by

categorizing the functional and disease pathways that may be associated with specific

bacterial abundances in the mouse gut microbiome.

We detect the first instance of statistically significant heritability in the phylum

Tenericutes in a mouse model. Specifically, we see that its subclade, class Mollicutes,

is our most heritable taxon (40% BH p-value of 0.088). Dramatic increases in Mollicute

abundance have been observed in mice when subjected to a high-fat, high-sugar diet in

comparison to a plant polysaccharide-rich diet. This Mollicute bloom seems to come at

the expense of Bacteroidetes abundance and an overall lower diversity in murine

microbiomes (TURNBAUGH *et al.* 2017). Understanding the heritable aspects of Mollicute

abundance could help elucidate the host-genetic determinants of body weight control

and the etiology of obesity, which has been thus far extremely challenging with host-

genome GWAS alone (MÜLLER *et al.* 2018, SPEAKMAN et al. 2018).

Our second most heritable taxon is genus *Lactobacillus* (36% BH p-value of

0.103), which shares a similarly strong but benign association to body weight control in

the literature. The genus *Lactobacillus* contains several species with strains commonly

used as probiotics. In contrast to the Mollicute lineage, *Lactobacilli* have been used in

mouse models of hyperlipidemia to show an increase of abundance of Bacteroidetes

and Verrucomicrobia, and improving their lipid metabolism (CHEN *et al.* 2014). The

function of these clades as a whole is, however, not clear-cut: *Lactobacillus* is a large

genus containing species and strains with differing roles and probiotic effects in humans

(MCFARLAND *et al.* 2018) and members of the class Mollicutes may have strain-specific

positive effects on gastrointestinal disease in mice, rather than a negative phenotype as

a whole (ZHAI *et al.* 2019).

These examples present a microbiome-host interaction landscape in which

associations between host health and microbiome abundance can be extremely taxon-

specific, displaying functional heterogeneity at the species level. Building a baseline

understanding of the resolution at which genetic associations change for different

lineages is vital to build an understanding of health, function, and coevolution in

microbe-host models.

We perform parallel analyses to find specific associations between genetic loci and

individual taxonomic groups, treating sub-clades as independent phenotypes from their

parent taxa during QTL calculations. This setup allows us to contextualize significant

QTL across the bacterial taxonomy, and we find similarities in both the genomic regions

detected and the functional annotation of covered genes for taxa in the same clade. We

also greatly benefit from the type of QTL analysis facilitated by the DO mouse model,

where the genotype for specific loci can be calculated and contrasted consistently

across all samples, eliminating the need for the windowed confidence intervals which

are common in this type of analysis.

We find functional associations in the gene sets identified by the QTL results that

span disease and development phenotypes beyond obesity. We find QTL regions

spanning genes with annotations for various phenotypes that are already widely studied

in the context of host-microbiome interactions. Among them we see cancer-associated

annotations, both in the more obvious gastrointestinal categories like colorectal cancer

(CHEN *et al.* 2012; AHN *et al.* 2013, ZACKULAR *et al.* 2014; ERICSSON *et al.* 2015) and the

surprising, but well-studied, breast (YANG *et al.* 2017; FERNÁNDEZ *et al.* 2018; ZHU *et al.*

2018), ovarian (XU *et al.* 2020), and liver cancers (YU AND SCHWABE 2017). We also see

an expected plethora of immune and inflammatory pathways, including some

microbiome-associated disease hallmarks, including colitis (KNOX *et al.* 2019), allergic

response (Pascal *et al.* 2018), and atopic dermatitis (KIM AND KIM 2019). Beyond

pathology, we see an enrichment of lipid metabolism pathways, coherent with the gut

microbiome's direct and indirect role in host lipid modulation (GHAZALPOUR *et al.* 2016;

HEAVER *et al.* 2018; BROWN *et al.* 2019; JOHNSON *et al.* 2019).

The relationship between a host's health and their microbiome seems increasingly

complex. Links to host development, disease, and metabolism are still being found

across body sites and a wealth of bioinformatic and modelling strategies continue to

emerge (MALLA *et al.* 2019). These results are a promising and heavily funded target for

precision medicine (PROCTOR *et al.* 2019), identifying potential biomarkers for

predisposition to type 1 diabetes (UUSITALO *et al.* 2016) and asthma (DURACK *et al.*

2018) in children, and colorectal cancer in adults (SHAH *et al.* 2018). As we move

forward to understand the mechanisms underlying host-health modulation by the

microbiome, it is imperative that we understand which parts of host genomes might

have underlying associations with microbial species, both to understand the limitations

of animal models as a relevant human proxy, and to determine whether host genetics

plays a causal role.

Currently, there is a scarcity of studies discussing heritabilities and QTL mappings

of bacteria within the gut microbiome. Despite the potential and funding of this field,

there is still an absence of a standardized methodology for performing these studies

that leads to the use of different procedures and analytical methods, making it

increasingly difficult to compare results across studies (GOODRICH *et al.* 2017;

KURILSHIKOV *et al.* 2020). We see this in our comparisons of results with previous

studies, as we do not observe consistent overlap in the estimated heritabilities and QTL

associations in any one taxa. Depending on the study, we see differences in which

covariates are able to be included, which databases or mapping algorithms are used to

determine OTUs, and the manner in which results are reported. One salient example is

our use of both the kinship matrix and co-housing as a random effect in our analysis,

which required a tailored approach that extended the standard DO mice pipeline, which

usually only allows a kinship matrix as random effect. Ultimately, the current state of the

field for profiling different characteristics of the gut microbiome is still rapidly evolving

and as it matures and more studies are undertaken, it will become easier to compare,

validate, and aggregate results.

Although our results support the claim that host genetics can impact the gut

microbiome composition in ways that are relevant to the health of the host, our study

has some limitations. There is significant room for improvement in the statistical power

of this study design through an increase in sample size (currently $n = 247$ DO mice).

Conducting QTL mapping with small sample sizes may lead to the 'Beavis effect' which

is a failure to detect QTL of small effect sizes as well as an overestimation of effect size

of the QTL that are discovered (MILES AND WAYNE 2008). Our study is also subject to the

trade-offs inherent in the Diversity Outbred design: since the genome of each mouse is

a unique mixture of the 8 strains from the CC population, the genotype of each DO

mouse is independent from other DO mice, and is irreproducible. This hampers the

ability to generate biological replicates relative to inbred models, which in turn makes

replicating results from the DO population limited to replication of marginal genetic

effects. However, this limitation can be partially circumvented by using the CC lines as a

form of validation, since they can provide reproducible genotypes (SVENSON *et al.* 2012).

Finally, associations between host genetics, microbiome abundance, and functional

pathways must be investigated experimentally to confirm mechanism and causality.

This is particularly difficult in the overlap of microbiome and genetic association, as

hypothesis generation is a challenging and often gene-specific approach which must

account for variation in both host and microbial communities.

Our results provide insight into the complex interplay between host genetics and

the gut microbiome, and isolate associations between microbial taxa and QTL. Overall,

this is a challenging analytical setup as we are trying to associate locus-specific

variation with several inter-dependent phenotypes in a system with several covariates.

Microbiome analyses are very sensitive to the traits, population, and environment under

study, which we mitigate by taking into account co-housing and relatedness while also

performing computationally intensive permutation tests to provide empirical *p*-values on

our most significant QTL hits. As it stands, this method could be further utilized in a

study with a novel microbial colonization (or other microbiome perturbation), where

measuring the same phenotypes, in a similar setup, could be used to estimate the

heritability and identify QTL for the successful introduction of a new taxon (or response

to some other perturbation).

While most of the variation in the gut microbiome composition is not due to

genetics but rather environmental factors (ROTHSCHILD *et al.* 2018), attributes of the gut

microbiome that are clearly heritable may provide important insights about host-

microbiome interactions and the mechanisms that impact microbiome composition. As

the microbiome field moves toward novel disease models, biomarkers, and treatments,

it is imperative that we understand the host-genetic variation that might influence the

appropriateness of our models, the accuracy of our biomarkers, and the efficacy of new

treatments.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors want to thank Noah Clark, Jessica L. Sutter, Qiaojuan Shi, Emily Davenport, and Afrah Shafquat for all the help and advice provided. F.S. was supported by a Presidential Life Science Fellowship (PLSF) from Cornell University. This work was supported by NIH grant R01 GM 070683.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

F.S., A.G.C, G.A.C, and R.E.L. conceived the study. A.P. provided the samples. F.S. extracted and generated the 16S rRNA gene sequencing data. F.S., E.J.C., P.S., J.K.G., R.E.L., G.A.C, and A.G.C. conceived the computational and statistical analyses. F.S., D.Y.Z., E.J.C., J.F.B., M.E., and P.S. performed the computational and statistical analyses. F.S., J.F.B., D.Y.Z., E.J.C, and A.G.C. wrote the manuscript.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

File S1 - Analysis on rarefied data. Detailed breakdown of variation of gut microbiota, heritability estimates, and QTL association results for rarefied data.

Figure S1 - **Taxa relative abundance frequencies.** Stacked bar plots and box plots depicting relative abundance frequencies of the top ten most abundant taxa for each of five taxonomic levels. Relative abundance frequencies are plotted for taxa levels from both the non-rarefied and the rarefied datasets.

Figure S2 - Heatmaps showing the genes involved in any function that were found enriched by IPA gene set analysis. Taxon-specific analysis on genes in the QTL regions associated with relative abundance of phylum Firmicutes **(A)**, genus *Staphylococcus* **(B)**, family Ruminococcaceae **(C)**, class Mollicutes **(D)**, and order Bacteroidales **(E)**. We only show annotations with a False Discovery rate under 3% after multiple-hypothesis correction. Filled-in cells indicate that

the gene listed at the top of that column is annotated with the function or disease of that row. Only

genes in the gene set of interest are shown, these charts do not display all gene members of each

pathway.

Figure S3 - **Correlation plot between non-rarefied and rarefied taxa.** Heatmap

depicting the Pearson correlations between the relative common taxa relative abundances in non-

rarefied (NonR) and rarefied (R) data, revealing that the same taxa from both non-rarefied and

rarefied datasets always group closer together than with other taxa, followed by taxa belonging to the

same clade.

Figure S4 - Proportion of variance estimates for kinship and cage for all taxa in

rarefied data. Proportion of variance estimates for kinship (green), cage effects (orange), and

unexplained residual effects (blue) for each taxon. The kinship proportion of variance is an estimate

of narrow sense heritability. Heritability percentages are shown on the left. Heritability standard error

values are shown with black horizontal lines. Designations p_, c_, o_, f_, and g_ are for phylum,

class, order, family, and genus, respectively. When results are identical across taxa in the same

phylogenetic branch, only the lowest (most specific) taxa are shown and the rest are shaded out.

Heritability significance is marked with one plus (**+**, RLTR p-value < 0.05) and BH FDR is shown in

parentheses next to heritability percentages. Taxa marked with a red asterisk have statistically

suggestive QTL (*, adj. p-value < 0.1). Complete table of heritability results, including non-rarefied

data, can be found in **Table S3**.

Figure S5 - Comparison of heritability estimates between non-rarefied and

rarefied taxa. Circles with purple fill correspond to non-rarefied taxa with statistically significant

heritabilities. Circles with green outlines correspond to rarefied taxa with statistically significant

heritabilities. Standard errors are shown as horizontal blue lines for non-rarefied taxa and vertical

orange lines for rarefied taxa.

Table S1 - Relative abundance of OTUs. Relative microbial abundance at the OTU level for

each DO mouse in non-rarefied data (**A**) and rarefied data (**B**).

Table S2 - Microbial relative abundance summarized at five levels of taxonomy.

Relative microbial abundance summarized at five levels of taxonomy (phylum, class, order, family, and genus) for each DO mouse in non-rarefied data (**A**) and rarefied data (**B**).

Table S3 - **Heritability results at five taxonomic levels.** Complete heritability measurements (h^2) as well as their respective *p*-values, adjusted *p*-values, and standard errors for all tested taxonomies at the five taxonomic levels from the non-rarefied (**A**) and rarefied (**B**) datasets.

Table S4 - **QTL results at five taxonomic levels.** QTL regions and their respective *p*-values, permutation *p*-values (when applicable), and genes found within the QTL interval at the five taxonomic levels from the non-rarefied (**A**) and rarefied (**B**) datasets.

Table S5 - Genes within QTL regions with suggestive permutation *p*-value. Detailed annotations for all genes found within QTL regions with a permutation *p*-value <0.1 at the five taxonomic levels.

Table S6 - **QTL results at OTU level in non-rarefied dataset.** QTL regions and their respective *p*-values, permutation *p*-values (when applicable), and genes found within the QTL interval at the OTU level from the non-rarefied dataset.

Table S7 - **Comparison of heritabilities and QTL with other studies.** Comparison of taxa heritabilities and QTL from our analyses with other studies across mouse, human, and pig studies (**A**). Information on source studies for heritability values in (**B**) and for QTL/GWAS in (**C**). Full human to mouse synteny mapping results for human studies in (**D**).

Table S8 - Gene network relationships from Figure 8. Annotated relationships between the genes in network 1 (**A**), network 2 (**B**), and network 3 (**C**) from **Figure 8**.

Table S9 - Functional annotation table from IPA analysis. Detailed functional annotations from cumulative gene set enrichment analysis using IPA on 1423 genes associated with non-rarefied microbiome abundance.

LITERATURE CITED

LITERATURE CITED

Ahn, J., R. Sinha, Z. Pei, C. Dominianni, J. Wu *et al.*, 2013 Human gut microbiome and

risk for colorectal cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 105**:** 1907-

1911.

Battaglioli, E. J., and P. C. Kashyap, 2018 Chapter 33 - Diet Effects on Gut Microbiome

Composition, Function, and Host Physiology, pp. 755-766 in *Physiology of the*

Gastrointestinal Tract (Sixth Edition), edited by H. M. Said. Academic Press.

Belheouane, M., Y. Gupta, S. Künzel, S. Ibrahim and J. F. Baines, 2017 Improved

detection of gene-microbe interactions in the mouse skin microbiota using high-

resolution QTL mapping of 16S rRNA transcripts. Microbiome 5**:** 59.

Benjamini, Y., and Y. Hochberg, 1995 Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical

and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical

Society. Series B (Methodological) 57**:** 289-300.

Benson, A. K., S. A. Kelly, R. Legge, F. Ma, S. J. Low *et al.*, 2010 Individuality in gut

microbiota composition is a complex polygenic trait shaped by multiple

environmental and host genetic factors. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences 107**:** 18933-18938.

Blekhman, R., J. K. Goodrich, K. Huang, Q. Sun, R. Bukowski *et al.*, 2015 Host genetic

variation impacts microbiome composition across human body sites. Genome

Biology 16**:** 191.

Bonder, M. J., A. Kurilshikov, E. F. Tigchelaar, Z. Mujagic, F. Imhann *et al.*, 2016 The

effect of host genetics on the gut microbiome. Nature Genetics 48**:** 1407.

Brown, E. M., X. Ke, D. Hitchcock, S. Jeanfavre, J. Avila-Pacheco *et al.*, 2019

Bacteroides-derived sphingolipids are critical for maintaining intestinal

homeostasis and symbiosis. Cell Host & Microbe 25**:** 668-680.e667.

Bubier, J., V. Philip, C. Quince, J. Campbell, Y. Zhou *et al.*, 2018 Systems genetic

discovery of host-microbiome interactions reveals mechanisms of microbial

involvement in disease. bioRxiv.

Camarinha-Silva, A., M. Maushammer, R. Wellmann, M. Vital, S. Preuss *et al.*, 2017

Host Genome Influence on Gut Microbial Composition and Microbial Prediction of

Complex Traits in Pigs. Genetics 206**:** 1637-1644.

Caporaso, J. G., J. Kuczynski, J. Stombaugh, K. Bittinger, F. D. Bushman *et al.*, 2010

QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. Nature

methods 7**:** 335-336.

Caporaso, J. G., C. L. Lauber, W. A. Walters, D. Berg-Lyons, C. A. Lozupone *et al.*,

2011 Global patterns of 16S rRNA diversity at a depth of millions of sequences

per sample. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United

States of America 108 Suppl 1**:** 4516-4522.

Chen, D., Z. Yang, X. Chen, Y. Huang, B. Yin *et al.*, 2014 The effect of *Lactobacillus*

rhamnosus hsryfm 1301 on the intestinal microbiota of a hyperlipidemic rat

model. BMC complementary and alternative medicine 14**:** 386-386.

Chen, W., F. Liu, Z. Ling, X. Tong and C. Xiang, 2012 Human Intestinal Lumen and

Mucosa-Associated Microbiota in Patients with Colorectal Cancer. PLOS ONE 7**:**

e39743.

Churchill, G. A., D. M. Gatti, S. C. Munger and K. L. Svenson, 2012 The Diversity

Outbred mouse population. Mammalian genome : official journal of the

International Mammalian Genome Society 23**:** 713-718.

Collaborative Cross Consortium, 2012 The genome architecture of the Collaborative

Cross mouse genetic reference population. Genetics 190**:** 389-401.

Dash, N. R., G. Khoder, A. M. Nada and M. T. Al Bataineh, 2019 Exploring the impact of

Helicobacter pylori on gut microbiome composition. PLOS ONE 14**:** e0218274.

Davenport, E. R., D. A. Cusanovich, K. Michelini, L. B. Barreiro, C. Ober *et al.*, 2015

Genome-Wide Association Studies of the Human Gut Microbiota. PLOS ONE 10**:**

e0140301.

Dudek-Wicher, R. K., A. Junka and M. Bartoszewicz, 2018 The influence of antibiotics

and dietary components on gut microbiota. Prz Gastroenterol 13**:** 85-92.

Durack, J., N. E. Kimes, D. L. Lin, M. Rauch, M. McKean *et al.*, 2018 Delayed gut

microbiota development in high-risk for asthma infants is temporarily modifiable

by *Lactobacillus* supplementation. Nature Communications 9**:** 707.

Ericsson, A. C., S. Akter, M. M. Hanson, S. B. Busi, T. W. Parker *et al.*, 2015 Differential

susceptibility to colorectal cancer due to naturally occurring gut microbiota.

Oncotarget 6**:** 33689-33704.

Fava, F., J. Lovegrove, R. Gitau, K. Jackson and K. Tuohy, 2006 The gut microbiota

and lipid metabolism: implications for human health and coronary heart disease.

Current medicinal chemistry 13**:** 3005-3021.

Fernández, M. F., I. Reina-Pérez, J. M. Astorga, A. Rodríguez-Carrillo, J. Plaza-Díaz *et*

al., 2018 Breast Cancer and Its Relationship with the Microbiota. International

journal of environmental research and public health 15**:** 1747.

Francino, M. P., 2016 Antibiotics and the Human Gut Microbiome: Dysbioses and

Accumulation of Resistances. Frontiers in Microbiology 6.

Gao, C., B. P. Ganesh, Z. Shi, R. R. Shah, R. Fultz *et al.*, 2017 Gut Microbe-Mediated

Suppression of Inflammation-Associated Colon Carcinogenesis by Luminal

Histamine Production. The American Journal of Pathology 187**:** 2323-2336.

Garrett, W. S., J. I. Gordon and L. H. Glimcher, 2010 Homeostasis and inflammation in

the intestine. Cell 140**:** 859-870.

Gatti, D. M., K. L. Svenson, A. Shabalin, L.-Y. Wu, W. Valdar *et al.*, 2014 Quantitative

trait locus mapping methods for diversity outbred mice. G3 (Bethesda, Md.) 4**:**

1623-1633.

Ghazalpour, A., I. Cespedes, B. J. Bennett and H. Allayee, 2016 Expanding role of gut

microbiota in lipid metabolism. Current opinion in lipidology 27**:** 141-147.

Goodrich, J. K., E. R. Davenport, M. Beaumont, M. A. Jackson, R. Knight *et al.*, 2016

Genetic Determinants of the Gut Microbiome in UK Twins. Cell host & microbe

19**:** 731-743.

Goodrich, J. K., E. R. Davenport, A. G. Clark and R. E. Ley, 2017 The Relationship

Between the Human Genome and Microbiome Comes into View. Annual review

of genetics 51**:** 413-433.

Goodrich, Julia K., Jillian L. Waters, Angela C. Poole, Jessica L. Sutter, O. Koren *et al.*,

2014 Human Genetics Shape the Gut Microbiome. Cell 159**:** 789-799.

Heaver, S. L., E. L. Johnson and R. E. Ley, 2018 Sphingolipids in host–microbial

interactions. Current Opinion in Microbiology 43**:** 92-99.

Hughes, D. A., R. Bacigalupe, J. Wang, M. C. Rühlemann, R. Y. Tito *et al.*, 2020

Genome-wide associations of human gut microbiome variation and implications

for causal inference analyses. Nature Microbiology.

Igartua, C., E. R. Davenport, Y. Gilad, D. L. Nicolae, J. Pinto *et al.*, 2017 Host genetic

variation in mucosal immunity pathways influences the upper airway microbiome.

Microbiome 5**:** 16.

Johnson, E. L., S. L. Heaver, J. L. Waters, B. I. Kim, A. Bretin *et al.*, 2019 Sphingolipid

production by gut Bacteroidetes regulates glucose homeostasis. bioRxiv**:**

632877.

Kang, H. M., J. H. Sul, S. K. Service, N. A. Zaitlen, S.-y. Kong *et al.*, 2010 Variance

component model to account for sample structure in genome-wide association

studies. Nature Genetics 42**:** 348.

Kemis, J. H., V. Linke, K. L. Barrett, F. J. Boehm, L. L. Traeger *et al.*, 2019 Genetic

determinants of gut microbiota composition and bile acid profiles in mice. PLOS

Genetics 15**:** e1008073.

Kim, J. E., and H. S. Kim, 2019 Microbiome of the Skin and Gut in Atopic Dermatitis

(AD): Understanding the Pathophysiology and Finding Novel Management

Strategies. Journal of clinical medicine 8**:** 444.

Knox, N. C., J. D. Forbes, G. Van Domselaar and C. N. Bernstein, 2019 The Gut

Microbiome as a Target for IBD Treatment: Are We There Yet? Curr Treat

Options Gastroenterol 17**:** 115-126.

Kurilshikov, A., C. Medina-Gomez, R. Bacigalupe, D. Radjabzadeh, J. Wang *et al.*, 2020

Genetics of human gut microbiome composition. bioRxiv**:**

2020.2006.2026.173724.

Leamy, L. J., S. A. Kelly, J. Nietfeldt, R. M. Legge, F. Ma *et al.*, 2014 Host genetics and

diet, but not immunoglobulin A expression, converge to shape compositional

features of the gut microbiome in an advanced intercross population of mice.

Genome biology 15**:** 552-552.

Ley, R. E., F. Bäckhed, P. Turnbaugh, C. A. Lozupone, R. D. Knight *et al.*, 2005 Obesity

alters gut microbial ecology. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of

the United States of America 102**:** 11070-11075.

Lim, M. Y., H. J. You, H. S. Yoon, B. Kwon, J. Y. Lee *et al.*, 2017 The effect of

heritability and host genetics on the gut microbiota and metabolic syndrome. Gut

66**:** 1031.

Malla, M. A., A. Dubey, A. Kumar, S. Yadav, A. Hashem *et al.*, 2019 Exploring the

Human Microbiome: The Potential Future Role of Next-Generation Sequencing in

Disease Diagnosis and Treatment. Frontiers in Immunology 9.

McFarland, L. V., C. T. Evans and E. J. C. Goldstein, 2018 Strain-Specificity and

Disease-Specificity of Probiotic Efficacy: A Systematic Review and Meta-

Analysis. Frontiers in medicine 5**:** 124-124.

McKnite, A. M., M. E. Perez-Munoz, L. Lu, E. G. Williams, S. Brewer *et al.*, 2012 Murine

Gut Microbiota Is Defined by Host Genetics and Modulates Variation of Metabolic

Traits. PLOS ONE 7**:** e39191.

McMurdie, P. J., and S. Holmes, 2014 Waste Not, Want Not: Why Rarefying

Microbiome Data Is Inadmissible. PLOS Computational Biology 10**:** e1003531.

Miles, C. M., and M. Wayne, 2008 Quantitative trait locus (QTL) analysis. Nature

Education 1**:** 208.

Müller, M. J., C. Geisler, J. Blundell, A. Dulloo, Y. Schutz *et al.*, 2018 The case of

GWAS of obesity: does body weight control play by the rules? International

Journal of Obesity 42**:** 1395-1405.

O'Connor, A., P. M. Quizon, J. E. Albright, F. T. Lin and B. J. Bennett, 2014

Responsiveness of cardiometabolic-related microbiota to diet is influenced by

host genetics. Mammalian genome : official journal of the International

Mammalian Genome Society 25**:** 583-599.

Org, E., B. W. Parks, J. W. J. Joo, B. Emert, W. Schwartzman *et al.*, 2015 Genetic and

environmental control of host-gut microbiota interactions. Genome research 25**:**

1558-1569.

Ottman, N., J. Reunanen, M. Meijerink, T. E. Pietilä, V. Kainulainen *et al.*, 2017 Pili-like

proteins of *Akkermansia muciniphila* modulate host immune responses and gut

barrier function. PLOS ONE 12**:** e0173004.

Pascal, M., M. Perez-Gordo, T. Caballero, M. M. Escribese, M. N. Lopez Longo *et al.*,

2018 Microbiome and Allergic Diseases. Frontiers in immunology 9**:** 1584-1584.

924 Proctor, L., J. LoTempio, A. Marquitz, P. Daschner, D. Xi *et al.*, 2019 A review of 10

925   years of human microbiome research activities at the US National Institutes of

926   Health, Fiscal Years 2007-2016. Microbiome 7**:** 31.

927 Ridaura, V. K., J. J. Faith, F. E. Rey, J. Cheng, A. E. Duncan *et al.*, 2013 Gut microbiota

928   from twins discordant for obesity modulate metabolism in mice. Science (New

929   York, N.Y.) 341**:** 1241214-1241214.

930 Rideout, J. R., Y. He, J. A. Navas-Molina, W. A. Walters, L. K. Ursell *et al.*, 2014

931   Subsampled open-reference clustering creates consistent, comprehensive OTU

932   definitions and scales to billions of sequences. PeerJ 2**:** e545-e545.

933 Rothschild, D., O. Weissbrod, E. Barkan, A. Kurilshikov, T. Korem *et al.*, 2018

934   Environment dominates over host genetics in shaping human gut microbiota.

935   Nature 555**:** 210.

936 Round, J. L., and S. K. Mazmanian, 2009 The gut microbiota shapes intestinal immune

937   responses during health and disease. Nature reviews. Immunology 9**:** 313-323.

938 Scheipl, F., S. Greven and H. Küchenhoff, 2008 Size and power of tests for a zero

939   random effect variance or polynomial regression in additive and linear mixed

940   models. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 52**:** 3283-3299.

941 Shah, M. S., T. Z. DeSantis, T. Weinmaier, P. J. McMurdie, J. L. Cope *et al.*, 2018

942   Leveraging sequence-based faecal microbial community survey data to identify a

943   composite biomarker for colorectal cancer. Gut 67**:** 882.

Shin, J., S. Lee, M.-J. Go, S. Y. Lee, S. C. Kim *et al.*, 2016 Analysis of the mouse gut

microbiome using full-length 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing. Scientific Reports

6**:** 29681.

Snijders, A. M., S. A. Langley, Y.-M. Kim, C. J. Brislawn, C. Noecker *et al.*, 2016

Influence of early life exposure, host genetics and diet on the mouse gut

microbiome and metabolome. Nature Microbiology 2**:** 16221.

Speakman, J. R., R. J. F. Loos, S. O'Rahilly, J. N. Hirschhorn and D. B. Allison, 2018

GWAS for BMI: a treasure trove of fundamental insights into the genetic basis of

obesity. International Journal of Obesity 42**:** 1524-1531.

Svenson, K. L., D. M. Gatti, W. Valdar, C. E. Welsh, R. Cheng *et al.*, 2012 High-

Resolution Genetic Mapping Using the Mouse Diversity Outbred Population.

Genetics 190**:** 437-447.

Turnbaugh, P. J., 2017 Microbes and Diet-Induced Obesity: Fast, Cheap, and Out of

Control. Cell host & microbe 21**:** 278-281.

Turnbaugh, P. J., M. Hamady, T. Yatsunenko, B. L. Cantarel, A. Duncan *et al.*, 2009 A

core gut microbiome in obese and lean twins. Nature 457**:** 480-484.

Turpin, W., O. Espin-Garcia, W. Xu, M. S. Silverberg, D. Kevans *et al.*, 2016

Association of host genome with intestinal microbial composition in a large

healthy cohort. Nature Genetics 48**:** 1413-1417.

Uusitalo, U., X. Liu, J. Yang, C. A. Aronsson, S. Hummel *et al.*, 2016 Association of

Early Exposure of Probiotics and Islet Autoimmunity in the TEDDY Study. JAMA

Pediatr 170**:** 20-28.

Veiga, P., C. A. Gallini, C. Beal, M. Michaud, M. L. Delaney *et al.*, 2010 Bifidobacterium

animalis subsp. lactis fermented milk product reduces inflammation by altering a

niche for colitogenic microbes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences

of the United States of America 107**:** 18132-18137.

Vorobyev, A., Y. Gupta, T. Sezin, H. Koga, Y. C. Bartsch *et al.*, 2019 Gene-diet

interactions associated with complex trait variation in an advanced intercross

outbred mouse line. Nature Communications 10**:** 4097.

Wang, J., S. Kalyan, N. Steck, L. M. Turner, B. Harr *et al.*, 2015 Analysis of intestinal

microbiota in hybrid house mice reveals evolutionary divergence in a vertebrate

hologenome. Nature Communications 6**:** 6440.

Wang, J., L. B. Thingholm, J. Skiecevičienė, P. Rausch, M. Kummen *et al.*, 2016

Genome-wide association analysis identifies variation in vitamin D receptor and

other host factors influencing the gut microbiota. Nature genetics 48**:** 1396-1406.

Weiss, S., Z. Z. Xu, S. Peddada, A. Amir, K. Bittinger *et al.*, 2017 Normalization and

microbial differential abundance strategies depend upon data characteristics.

Microbiome 5**:** 27.

Wen, L., R. E. Ley, P. Y. Volchkov, P. B. Stranges, L. Avanesyan *et al.*, 2008 Innate

immunity and intestinal microbiota in the development of Type 1 diabetes. Nature

455**:** 1109-1113.

Xu, J., J.-J. Peng, W. Yang, K. Fu and Y. Zhang, 2020 Vaginal microbiomes and

ovarian cancer: a review. American journal of cancer research 10**:** 743-756.

Yang, J., Q. Tan, Q. Fu, Y. Zhou, Y. Hu *et al.*, 2017 Gastrointestinal microbiome and

breast cancer: correlations, mechanisms and potential clinical implications.

Breast Cancer 24**:** 220-228.

Yu, L.-X., and R. F. Schwabe, 2017 The gut microbiome and liver cancer: mechanisms

and clinical translation. Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology 14**:** 527-

539.

Zackular, J. P., M. A. M. Rogers, M. T. Ruffin and P. D. Schloss, 2014 The Human Gut

Microbiome as a Screening Tool for Colorectal Cancer. Cancer Prevention

Research 7**:** 1112.

Zhai, R., X. Xue, L. Zhang, X. Yang, L. Zhao *et al.*, 2019 Strain-Specific Anti-

inflammatory Properties of Two Akkermansia muciniphila Strains on Chronic

Colitis in Mice. Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology 9.

Zhu, J., M. Liao, Z. Yao, W. Liang, Q. Li *et al.*, 2018 Breast cancer in postmenopausal

women is associated with an altered gut metagenome. Microbiome 6**:** 136.

Ziyatdinov, A., M. Vázquez-Santiago, H. Brunel, A. Martinez-Perez, H. Aschard *et al.*,

2018 lme4qtl: linear mixed models with flexible covariance structure for genetic

studies of related individuals. BMC bioinformatics 19**:** 68-68.