Trends in Parasitology

Helminth microbiomes – a hidden treasure trove?

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	TREPAR-D-18-00201R1
Article Type:	Opinion
Keywords:	macrobiota; microbiota; helminth; nematode; host-parasite interactions
Corresponding Author:	Cinzia Cantacessi Cambridge, UNITED KINGDOM
First Author:	T.P. Jenkins
Order of Authors:	T.P. Jenkins
	P.J. Brindley
	R.B. Gasser
	Cinzia Cantacessi
Abstract:	There is increasing attention on the complex interactions occurring between gastrointestinal parasitic helminths and the microbial flora (microbiota) inhabiting the host gut. However, little is known about the occurrence, structure and function of microbial populations residing within parasite organs and tissues, referred to hereafter as the 'parabiome'. In this article, we argue that an in depth understanding of the parasite-parabiome interplay may significantly enhance current understanding of parasite biology and physiology, and may lead to the discovery of entirely novel, anthelmintic-independent interventions against parasites and parasitic diseases.

28 October 2018

Dear Doctor Kong,

REJOINDER: MS. No. (TREPAR-D-18-00201)
Entitled 'Helminth Microbiomes - a Hidden Treasure Trove?' *Trends in Parasitology*.

We are very grateful for the reviewers' and editor's time and efforts in evaluating this manuscript. The points raised by the reviewers are very constructive and have contributed to enhance the manuscript. We have provided detailed responses to individual points in the following rejoinder:

Reviewer #1:

I am not sure that Figure 1 is absolutely necessary. Perhaps a figure depicting the selective acquisition of bacteria by *Trichuris*- and then how these bacteria and murine host bacteria then aid the parasite may be of greater interest?

RESPONSE: The authors thank the reviewer for this comment and have provided an additional figure depicting the proposed microbiome acquisition strategies of *Trichuris muris*, *Haemonchus contortus*, and *Brugia malayi*. The focus of this figure lies on acquisition rather than mechanisms of gut microbial benefits, since the latter remains highly speculative.

Reading this article made me think of "microbes" other than bacteria that may inhabit parasites- i.e. viruses and fungi- and how these affect parasite development/host responses. Given it is an opinion article, could the authors speculate this field as one that will emerge in future? I am aware of some fungi that negatively affect plant nematodes. With the new technologies for culturing and sequencing it may be pertinent to identify more than just bacterial species?

RESPONSE: The authors thank the reviewer for the comment and agree that other microbes could be of importance and should be investigated alongside bacteria. Following the reviewer's suggestion, an additional "outstanding question" has been added and discussed in the "Concluding Remarks" section (lines 251-252).

Reviewer #2:
My only comment/concern is with the term 'parabiome'. Although it is defined within the text, I don't know that it is essential. My original interpretation of the term was that it referred to the parasitic component of a host microbiome (similar to virome, mycobiome referring to viral and fungal components). When I did an informal poll of colleagues and trainees to see what they thought a 'parabiome' referred to, the responses were either as above, or that it could refer to the microbiome of mice that undergone parabiosis. Overall, I think it would be clearer to

continue to refer to the 'helminthic microbiome' as laid out in the title, and interspersed throughout the text.

RESPONSE: The authors thank the reviewer for this constructive comment and agree that the term ‘parabiome’ may raise some confusion. Therefore, following the reviewer’s suggestion, we have replaced it with “helminth microbiome”.

In conclusion, we consider that we have rigorously addressed each of the points raised by each of the reviewers. We agree with the points raised, and modified the text accordingly. These comments have led to an enhanced manuscript, which we consider to meet the standard for publication in *Trends in Parasitology*.

Yours sincerely,
Cinzia Cantacessi
On behalf of all authors.

Highlights

- In spite of a plethora of evidence supporting key roles of resident bacteria for parasite fitness and survival (i.e. in filarial nematodes and whipworms), little is known of microbial populations inhabiting organs and tissues of gastrointestinal nematodes of major socio-economic significance.

- To date, one of the few well-characterised examples is the symbiotic relationship between bacteria of the genus *Wolbachia* and filarial nematodes.

- Notably, our understanding of this symbiosis has already been successfully exploited for therapeutic purposes.

- The relentless advancement in sequencing techniques, together with the rise of novel microbiome editing tools provide unprecedented opportunities to investigate helminth parabiomes and exploit parasite-parabiome relationships for the development of novel strategies of parasite control.

Helminth microbiomes – a hidden treasure trove?

T.P. Jenkins, [1] P.J. Brindley, [2] R.B. Gasser, [3] and C. Cantacessi [1]

[1] Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB3 0ES, UK

[2] Department of Microbiology, Immunology & Tropical Medicine, and Research Center for Neglected Diseases of Poverty, School of Medicine & Health Sciences, George Washington University, Washington DC, 20037, USA

[3] Department of Veterinary Biosciences, Melbourne Veterinary School, Faculty of Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia

* Correspondence: cc779@cam.ac.uk (C. Cantacessi)

Keywords: macrobiota, microbiota, helminth, nematode, host-parasite interactions

There is increasing attention on the complex interactions occurring between gastrointestinal parasitic helminths and the microbial flora (microbiota) inhabiting the host gut. However, little is known about the occurrence, structure and function of microbial populations residing within parasite organs and tissues. In this article, we argue that an in depth understanding of the interplay between parasites and their microbiomes may significantly enhance current knowledge of parasite biology and physiology, and may lead to the discovery of entirely novel, anthelmintic-independent interventions against parasites and parasitic diseases.

Gastrointestinal helminths – worm guts within host guts

The gastrointestinal (GI) tract of vertebrates is inhabited by 10–100 trillion microorganisms, including bacteria, viruses, fungi, protists and archaea, which are collectively known as the 'gut **microbiota**' (see Glossary) [1, 2]. This complex ecosystem exerts a number of highly specialised functions that are essential to host physiology, including the absorption of nutrients, synthesis of essential organic compounds, development of adaptive immunity and protection against pathogens [3-6]. In particular, amongst such pathogens are metazoan parasites (called 'the **macrobiota**', which includes parasitic nematodes such as roundworms, hookworms and whipworms) that are traditionally considered detrimental to the vertebrate host, as they can subtract nutrients, damage host tissues and release toxic waste products (reviewed by [7]). These parasites live in close association with the vertebrate microbiota and, over the last few years, evidence has started to emerge of the existence of complex **mutualistic** relationships between these two players that might facilitate the long-term establishment of nematodes in the gut of the host [8-11]. Similar to their vertebrate hosts, parasitic nematodes have complete, tubular digestive systems responsible for nutrient uptake, processing and absorption; yet, for most species of socio-economically important parasites, and GI nematodes in particular, little is known about the occurrence, structure and function of populations of resident gut microbes [12]. Nevertheless, critical evidence of the existence of essential **symbiotic** relationships between parasites and bacteria is provided by filarial nematodes, e.g., *Onchocerca volvulus* (causing river blindness) and *Wuchereria bancrofti* and *Brugia malayi* (causing lymphatic filariasis) (reviewed by [13]), whose propagation and survival are dependent on a genus of bacteria, i.e. *Wolbachia*, which has become the target of intense investigations aimed to develop novel filaricidal compounds [14-18]. This evidence supports the hypothesis, strongly corroborated by recent experimental findings [19, 20], that the digestive system as well as other organs and tissues of GI nematodes may also harbour resident microbes with essential roles in

parasite physiology and survival. Fully characterizing and understanding the structure and function of **helminth microbiomes**, and determining the role/s they play in key aspects of parasite biology and host-parasite interactions, could not only have broad implications for future studies of the origin of parasitism itself, but might also lead to the discovery of radically new interventions against these worms.

Here, we (i) summarize current knowledge of the origin, structure and function of helminth microbiomes; (ii) identify some key knowledge gaps for future research in this field; and (iii) discuss the potential therapeutic advances that such knowledge could deliver, with a particular focus on the development of novel, helminth microbiome-based strategies for the control of infections by GI nematodes of major socio-economic significance.

Strategies of acquisition and maintenance of helminth microbiomes

Investigations of the interactions between parasites and their resident bacteria rely on a thorough understanding of the dynamics of microbiome acquisition. Whilst for GI nematodes knowledge in this area is relatively limited, several investigations have documented the fine strategy *via* which bacteria of the genus *Wolbachia* are propagated through successive generations of filarial parasites (reviewed by [21]) (cf. Figure 1). In the filarial nematode *B. malayi*, these bacteria inhabit the lateral chords of both adult male and female worms, and the reproductive system of the latter sex, where they colonise the ovaries, oocytes and early embryos within the uteri [22]. Upon egg fertilisation, populations of *Wolbachia* segregate asymmetrically in the developing embryo, which results in an uneven distribution of these bacteria in the tissues of the resultant microfilariae [22]. In particular, the numbers of vertically transmitted *Wolbachia* remain stable (~70 per embryo [17]) throughout development of the new generation of filarial parasites into infective third-stage larvae (L3s) in the mosquito vector

(reviewed by [21]). Upon L3-invasion of a new, susceptible vertebrate host, the number of *Wolbachia* bacteria rapidly increases in the hypodermal cord of developing worms, with a further expansion occurring in the reproductive tissues of sexually mature females (reviewed by [21]). Crucially, embryonic development is entirely dependent on *Wolbachia*, as treatment with tetracycline antibiotics results in a marked reduction of viable microfilariae (reviewed by [22]). To daeujte, the **obligate relationship** between filarial nematodes and *Wolbachia* represents the only known example of a mutualistic association between parasitic nematodes and bacteria.

Members of another group of helminth parasites, the digenean trematodes, are known to harbour populations of *Neorickettsia* **endosymbionts** which share numerous genetic similarities with *Wolbachia* (reviewed by [23]). *Neorickettsia* inhabit a range of environments suitable for the development of the infective stages of digenean parasites and their intermediate hosts (e.g., aquatic molluscs), thus lending credit to the hypothesis that a proportion of these bacteria are horizontally transmitted (reviewed by [23, 24]). Nevertheless, in *Plagiorchis elegans*, a common GI helminth of a range of fishes, birds and mammals (including humans) [25], *Neorickettsia* is predominantly transmitted vertically across generations of parasites [26]. However, unlike *Wolbachia* in filarial nematodes, transmission of *Neorickettsia* in *P. elegans* occurs also through the asexual stages of this parasite [27]. Furthermore, since transmission rates of *Neorickettsia* from adult *P. elegans* to the offspring vary from 11% to 91% [27], it has been suggested that the life cycle of this flatworm is not dependent on their neorickettsial endosymbionts, but rather that *Neorickettsia* utilises *P. elegans* as a vehicle for transmission to vertebrate hosts [28].

For GI nematodes, experimental evidence of microbiome acquisition strategies is available for two species, namely *Haemonchus contortus*, an abomasal roundworm of small ruminants [19] and *Trichuris muris*, a large intestinal whipworm of rodents [20] (cf. Figure 1). For the former,

a recent study [19] localised selected genera of bacteria (i.e. *Weissella* and *Leuconostoc*) to the gut of adult worms and to the uterus of sexually mature females by fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH) and transmission electron microscopy; using DNA fingerprinting, the same genera could be identified in eggs laid by these females and, following larval culture, their L3 offspring [19]. Notably, these microorganisms could not be identified in the faecal matter on which larval culture was performed, thus providing evidence of maternal transmission of these bacteria [19]. Other bacterial genera (i.e. *Lactococcus* and *Streptococcus*) could be identified in the distal uterus of sexually mature females of *H. contortus* [19]. Nevertheless, these bacteria were not detected in newly deposited eggs and developed L3s. Since these bacteria occur in the rumen of the host [29], the authors hypothesized that female worms acquired them by ingesting ruminal fluid [19]. Whilst the roles that species of *Lactococcus* and *Streptococcus* might play in the fundamental biology of *H. contortus* is presently unknown, these data suggest that this parasite might employ a 'hybrid' microbiome acquisition strategy, with some 'core' endosymbionts (i.e. *Weissella* and *Leuconostoc*), which may play essential roles in parasite fitness and survival, being vertically transmitted, and others (i.e. *Lactococcus* and *Streptococcus*) being acquired from the host to underpin a certain level of microbiome plasticity and capacity for environmental adaptation.

A clear strategy of microbiome acquisition from the mammalian host has been recently demonstrated for *T. muris* [20] (cf. Figure 1). The essential role that the host microbiome plays in the development and propagation of this parasite had already been demonstrated in a seminal study [30], which showed that parasite egg hatching in the large intestine of the mouse was dependent on the microbial flora within the host gut. Recently, a study by the same research group [20] demonstrated that, following egg hatching, *T. muris* acquires populations of bacteria that, together, form a 'core' nematode microbiome, which is markedly distinct from the microbiome inhabiting the environment in which the worms reside [20]. Although the

Trichuris microbiome described predominantly comprised Firmicutes and Bacteroidetes, similar to the host microbiome, it was also rich in Proteobacteria. Proteobacteria constituted 9% of the entire *T. muris* microbiome – a 31-fold and 13-fold increase in relative proportions of this bacterial group compared with the microbiome of uninfected mice and *T. muris*-infected mice, respectively [20]. This process of selective microbiome acquisition was demonstrated to be independent from the initial host microbiome composition, and the administration of broad-spectrum antibiotics to adult *T. muris ex vivo* resulted in a marked decrease in parasite fitness and survival rates, thus providing cogent evidence for an essential role of the host-acquired microbiome for the successful completion of the whipworm life cycle. Whether *T. muris* acquires its own microbiome passively, or actively selects populations of bacteria with functional properties which are able to facilitate its survival in the vertebrate host, remains to be established (cf. [20]). Nevertheless, the observation that mono-colonisation of germ-free mice with a single species of bacterium, i.e. *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron*, resulted in successful egg hatching and establishment of chronic *T. muris* infection [20] provides a unique opportunity to design targeted experiments that can shed light on the precise mechanisms of acquisition of the *T. muris* microbiome. In turn, this knowledge will form the necessary basis to answer fundamental questions regarding helminth microbiome structure and function.

Are helminth microbiomes key to parasite fitness?

Studies of the structure and function of helminth microbiomes are in their infancy. Nevertheless, over the past decades, evidence has emerged about the functional association between the free-living nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans* and the bacteria inhabiting it [31, 32]. Indeed, *C. elegans* is known to host a species-rich bacterial community, dominated by Proteobacteria, such as *Enterobacteriaceae* and members of the genera *Pseudomonas*, *Stenotrophomonas*, *Ochrobactrum*, and *Sphingomonas* [31, 32]. Crucially, the relative

144 proportions of bacterial populations forming the *C. elegans* microbiome vary according to the
145 developmental stage of this nematode [32], thus suggesting that worm development relies on a
146 range of bacterial functions that differ over time. In support of this hypothesis, worms
147 experimentally colonised with a subset of bacterial isolates representing the *C. elegans* '**core**'
148 **microbiome** displayed increased fitness and survival rates, and were maintained under
149 stressful conditions of temperature and osmolarity, compared with worms colonised solely by
150 *Escherichia coli* [32]. In addition, compared with *E. coli*-colonised *C. elegans*, worms fed with
151 the soil bacterium *Comamonas* displayed accelerated development, which was attributed to the
152 ability of this bacterial group to up-regulate the expression of genes associated with the
153 nematode's moulting program [33]. The *C. elegans* microbiome has also been demonstrated to
154 play important roles in worm defence against pathogens; indeed, *Pseudomonas* isolates
155 detected amongst the worm resident populations of bacteria produce anti-mycotic compounds
156 that prevent colonisation by fungal agents [32].

157 Evidence from investigations of *C. elegans*, employed as a model for nematode-microbiome
158 interactions, points to a likely functional role of the microbiomes of parasitic helminths for
159 worm physiology, development and survival. However, the parasite microbiome itself may
160 benefit from the protected and nutrient-rich environment that the worm host offers [34, 35].
161 For instance, the Gammaproteobacteria *Photorhabdus* and *Xenorhabdus*, that inhabit the gut
162 of the entomopathogenic nematodes *Heterorhabditis* and *Steinernema*, are released upon
163 infection of the insect host by the infective juveniles; following their release, these bacteria
164 actively replicate and kill the insect host, while converting the insect carcass into a source of
165 nutrients to support nematode growth and development [36, 37].

166 For parasitic nematodes of medical and veterinary importance, the mutualistic association
167 between filarial nematodes and *Wolbachia* offers a key example of the fundamental functions
168 that the helminth microbiome exerts in the biology of its worm host, and *vice versa*. Indeed,

besides its known role in the development and survival of filarial embryos (reviewed by [21]), *Wolbachia* is essential for worm nutrition and metabolism. The bacterium synthesizes haem, riboflavin (vitamin B_2), and flavin adenine dinucleotide, which the parasite host is unable to synthesize and that have been inferred to play an important role in filarial reproduction and development, as well as nucleotides, which are required during oogenesis and embryogenesis [18, 38, 39]. In addition, members of the genus *Wolbachia* participate in pathways aimed at preventing apoptosis of filarial reproductive, embryonic and somatic cells [17, 40], likely by the direct targeting of the apoptotic signalling cascade [41-43]. Finally, in the filarial parasite of cattle *Onchocerca ochengi*, *Wolbachia* has been demonstrated to play a key role in host immune evasion, specifically by attracting host neutrophils and, thus, averting a potentially lethal effector response by degranulating eosinophils [44].

Over the years, the fundamental roles that *Wolbachia* play in pathways linked to reproduction, metabolism and immune defence of filarial nematodes have been the subject of intense scrutiny, focusing on developing novel chemotherapeutics to disrupt this mutualistic relationship; some have been successful [15, 17, 21, 45]. For instance, the administration of 4-week courses of doxycycline (belonging to the tetracycline family of antibiotics) and rifampicin have been deemed effective in reducing the transmission of *O. volvulus* microfilariae to mosquito intermediate hosts and filarial embryogenesis, respectively (reviewed by [13]). Nevertheless, the length of drug administration required to achieve significant effects, along with the severe adverse reactions that tetracyclines can cause in children and pregnant women (e.g. permanent dental staining, teratogenic effects and potentially fatal hepatotoxicity [46]), limit the use of these antibiotics in mass drug administration (MDA) programs in areas where filariases are endemic. Nevertheless, these findings raise the question as to whether a deep exploration of the microbiomes of other helminth parasites of major socio-economic significance could hold promise for the

identification of novel targets for the development of antibiotic-independent control strategies against the diseases caused by these worms.

A new generation of helminth microbiome-targeting chemotherapeutics?

Globally, more than two billion people are at risk of infection by GI nematodes, mainly the hookworms *Ancylostoma duodenale* and *Necator americanus*, the whipworm *T. trichiura*, the roundworm *Ascaris lumbricoides*, and the threadworm, *Strongyloides stercoralis*. Collectively, these nematodes are responsible for more than 5.5 million disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) (reviewed by [47]). Moreover, GI nematodes inflict significant production losses in livestock due to the extensive morbidity and mortality associated with a range of diseases that they cause (reviewed by [48]). Complete reliance on anthelmintics for the control of these parasites (*via* MDA or targeted strategic worming programmes in humans and livestock) bears substantial risks, linked to the global threat of emerging anthelmintic resistance, as already observed in several GI nematodes of veterinary importance (reviewed by [49, 50]). Yet, the discovery of alternative strategies for parasite control should be built on a thorough understanding of the fundamental biology of these pathogens, and of key mechanisms of interactions with their vertebrate hosts. A deeper knowledge of the structure and function of the microbiomes of parasitic helminths, and of mechanisms of microbiome acquisition and transmission, could lead to unprecedented discoveries in parasite physiology, pathology and reproduction, and thus, to the development of completely novel control tools. Nevertheless, for such discoveries to be harnessed, fundamental information needs to be acquired. We propose that, in the first instance, the microbiomes of representative species of GI nematodes of considerable medical and veterinary significance (Figure 2) could be qualitatively characterized using high-throughput sequencing of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene (Box 1). The selection of specimens of a range of parasite species from different hosts and geographical

219 locations would assist the determination of species-specific ‘core’ parasite microbiomes.
220 Following the establishment of reference 16S rRNA databases for each key parasite species,
221 shotgun metagenomic sequencing of their microbiomes would provide important information
222 on the relative abundance of each ‘core’ microbial species, and clues about their functional
223 potential. The latter, coupled to investigations of the proteomes and metabolomes of the
224 microbial communities inhabiting these parasites, could lead to a better understanding of the
225 possible role/s that the microbiomes of parasitic helminths play in the biology and physiology
226 of individual worms.

227 Key information on the modes of transmission of helminth microbiomes could be acquired *via*
228 experimental infections of vertebrate hosts with selected GI nematodes, followed by qualitative
229 and quantitative comparative analyses of the host microbiomes and key parasite developmental
230 stages. Furthermore, for selected GI nematodes (e.g. *Nippostrongylus brasiliensis*),
231 experimental infections of germ-free or antibiotic-treated mice re-colonised with fluorescently
232 labelled bacteria might provide clues on host-parasite microbiome transfer using *in vivo*
233 imaging (cf. [51]). Similar techniques could be used to localise species or groups of bacteria
234 in parasite organs and tissues, thus providing additional clues on the functions of such
235 microorganisms in worm biology. Together, this information would form a basis for
236 experimentation, aimed at interfering with such functions that may potentially lead to the
237 discovery of entirely novel, antibiotic-independent strategies for parasite control (Figure 3), for
238 example, *via* cutting-edge **microbiome editing** techniques including CRISPR/Cas9,
239 engineered probiotics, and/or bactericidal bacteriophages (reviewed by [52]).

240

241 ## Concluding Remarks

In spite of substantial evidence that points towards key role(s) of microbial species inhabiting parasitic helminths in the fundamental biology of these pathogens and host-parasite interactions, e.g. in filarial nematodes and, more recently, whipworms, current knowledge of the microbiomes of key parasites of major socio-economic significance, such as GI nematodes of humans and livestock, is scarce and fragmented. Nonetheless, the relentless progress in microbiome investigation and editing technologies (Box 1), and novel high-throughput bioinformatics pipelines, provides us with unprecedented opportunities to thoroughly characterize the structures and functions of such microbial populations. At the core lie questions surrounding modes of helminth microbiome acquisition and propagation to successive generations of parasites, the localisation of endosymbiont microorganisms in the organs and tissues of parasites, the functions that helminth microbiomes (including bacteria, viruses and fungi) play in parasite biology and physiology, and the effects that disrupting parasite-microbiome interactions may exert on parasite propagation and survival (see Outstanding Questions). In turn, the new knowledge can be expected to provide us with a plethora of opportunities to exploit parasite-microbiome associations to our advantage, for example, by applying cutting-edge microbiome-editing techniques as novel intervention strategies against parasitic nematodes and the diseases that they cause.

Acknowledgements

T.P.J. is the grateful recipient of a PhD scholarship by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) of the United Kingdom. Research in the C.C. laboratory is funded by grants by the Isaac Newton Trust, the Isaac Newton Trust/Wellcome Trust/ University of Cambridge joint grant scheme and by the Royal Society (UK). Research in the R.B.G. laboratory is supported predominantly by the Australian Research Council (ARC), the

National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), Melbourne Water Corporation and Yourgene Bioscience.

References

1 Rajilic-Stojanovic, M. and de Vos, W.M. (2014) The first 1000 cultured species of the human gastrointestinal microbiota. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 38, 996-1047

2 Turnbaugh, P.J., *et al.* (2007) The human microbiome project. *Nature* 449, 804-810

3 Brestoff, J.R. and Artis, D. (2013) Commensal bacteria at the interface of host metabolism and the immune system. *Nat Immunol* 14, 676-684

4 Brown, E.M., *et al.* (2013) The role of the immune system in governing host-microbe interactions in the intestine. *Nat Immunol* 14, 660-667

5 Hooper, L.V., *et al.* (2012) Interactions between the microbiota and the immune system. *Science* 336, 1268-1273

6 Tremaroli, V. and Backhed, F. (2012) Functional interactions between the gut microbiota and host metabolism. *Nature* 489, 242-249

7 McCarty, T.R., *et al.* (2014) Global progress towards eliminating gastrointestinal helminth infections. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol* 30, 18-24

8 Bancroft, A.J., *et al.* (2012) Life on the edge: the balance between macrofauna, microflora and host immunity. *Trends Parasitol* 28, 93-98

9 Glendinning, L., *et al.* (2014) The microbiota and helminths: sharing the same niche in the human host. *Parasitology* 141, 1255-1271

10 Reynolds, L.A., *et al.* (2015) Cohabitation in the intestine: Interactions among helminth parasites, bacterial microbiota, and host immunity. *J Immunol* 195, 4059-4066

11 Kreisinger, J., *et al.* (2015) Interactions between multiple helminths and the gut microbiota in wild rodents. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 370, 20140295

12 Dheilly, N.M., *et al.* (2017) Parasite microbiome project: Systematic investigation of microbiome dynamics within and across parasite-host interactions. *Msystems* 2, e00050-e000517

13 Bouchery, T., *et al.* (2013) The symbiotic role of *Wolbachia* in Onchocercidae and its impact on filariasis. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 19, 131-140

14 Hoerauf, A., *et al.* (2003) Doxycycline as a novel strategy against bancroftian filariasis—depletion of *Wolbachia* endosymbionts from *Wuchereria bancrofti* and stop of microfilaria production. *Med Microbiol Immunol* 192, 211-216

15 Johnston, K.L., *et al.* (2017) Identification and prioritization of novel anti-*Wolbachia* chemotypes from screening a 10,000-compound diversity library. *Sci Adv* 3, eaao1551

16 Johnston, K.L., *et al.* (2014) Repurposing of approved drugs from the human pharmacopoeia to target *Wolbachia* endosymbionts of onchocerciasis and lymphatic filariasis. *Int J Parasitol Drugs Drug Resist* 4, 278-286

17 Landmann, F., *et al.* (2011) Anti-filarial activity of antibiotic therapy is due to extensive apoptosis after *Wolbachia* depletion from filarial nematodes. *PLoS Pathog* 7, e1002351

18 Slatko, B.E., *et al.* (2010) The *Wolbachia* endosymbiont as an anti-filarial nematode target. *Symbiosis* 51, 55-65

19 Sinnathamby, G., *et al.* (2018) The bacterial community associated with the sheep gastrointestinal nematode parasite *Haemonchus contortus*. *PLoS One* 13, e0192164

20 White, E.C., *et al.* (2018) Manipulation of host and parasite microbiotas: Survival strategies during chronic nematode infection. *Sci Adv* 4, eaap7399

21 Slatko, B.E., *et al.* (2014) *Wolbachia* endosymbionts and human disease control. *Mol Biochem Parasitol* 195, 88-95

22 Landmann, F., *et al.* (2010) Asymmetric *Wolbachia* segregation during early *Brugia malayi* embryogenesis determines its distribution in adult host tissues. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 4, e758

23 Tkach, V.V. and Greiman, S.E. (2016) Transmission biology, host associations, distribution and molecular diagnostics of *Neorickettsia*. In *Rickettsiales: Biology, Molecular Biology, Epidemiology, and Vaccine Development* (Thomas, S., ed), pp. 295-325, Springer International Publishing

24 McNulty, S.N., *et al.* (2017) Genomes of *Fasciola hepatica* from the Americas reveal colonization with *Neorickettsia* endobacteria related to the agents of potomac horse and human sennetsu fevers. *PLoS Genet* 13, e1006537

25 Tkach, V.V., *et al.* (2008) Family Plagiorchiidae. In *Keys to the Trematoda* (Bray, R.A., *et al.* eds), pp. 295–325, CABI

26 Vaughan, J.A., *et al.* (2012) Neorickettsial endosymbionts of the digenea: diversity, transmission and distribution. *Adv Parasitol* 79, pp. 253-297

27 Greiman, S.E., *et al.* (2013) Transmission rates of the bacterial endosymbiont, *Neorickettsia risticii*, during the asexual reproduction phase of its digenean host, *Plagiorchis elegans*, within naturally infected lymnaeid snails. *Parasit Vectors* 6, 303

28 Greiman, S.E., *et al.* (2014) Large scale screening of digeneans for *Neorickettsia* endosymbionts using real-time PCR reveals new *Neorickettsia* genotypes, host associations and geographic records. *PLoS One* 9, e98453

29 De Barbieri, I., *et al.* (2015) Production attributes of Merino sheep genetically divergent for wool growth are reflected in differing rumen microbiotas. *Livestock Science* 178, 119-129

30 Hayes, K.S., *et al.* (2010) Exploitation of the intestinal microflora by the parasitic nematode *Trichuris muris*. *Science* 328, 1391-1394

31 Clark, L.C. and Hodgkin, J. (2014) Commensals, probiotics and pathogens in the *Caenorhabditis elegans* model. *Cell Microbiol* 16, 27-38

32 Dirksen, P., *et al.* (2016) The native microbiome of the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*: gateway to a new host-microbiome model. *BMC Biol* 14, 38

33 MacNeil, L.T., *et al.* (2013) Diet-induced developmental acceleration independent of TOR and insulin in *C. elegans*. *Cell* 153, 240-252

34 Sansonetti, P.J. and Medzhitov, R. (2009) Learning tolerance while fighting ignorance. *Cell* 138, 416-420

35 Zeng, Q., *et al.* (2017) Models of microbiome evolution incorporating host and microbial selection. *Microbiome* 5, 127

348 36 Goodrich-Blair, H. and Clarke, D.J. (2007) Mutualism and pathogenesis in *Xenorhabdus*
349 and *Photorhabdus*: two roads to the same destination. *Mol Microbiol* 64, 260-268

350 37 Clarke, D.J. (2008) *Photorhabdus*: a model for the analysis of pathogenicity and
351 mutualism. *Cell Microbiol* 10, 2159-2167

352 38 Foster, J., *et al.* (2005) The *Wolbachia* genome of *Brugia malayi*: Endosymbiont evolution
353 within a human pathogenic nematode. *PLoS Biol* 3, 599-614

354 39 Taylor, M.J., *et al.* (2005) *Wolbachia* bacterial endosymbionts of filarial nematodes. *Adv*
355 *Parasitol* 60, 245-284

356 40 Foray, V., *et al.* (2018) *Wolbachia* control stem cell behavior and stimulate germline
357 proliferation in filarial nematodes. *Dev Cell* 45, 198-211 e193

358 41 Faherty, C.S. and Maurelli, A.T. (2008) Staying alive: bacterial inhibition of apoptosis
359 during infection. *Trends Microbiol* 16, 173-180

360 42 James, E.R. and Green, D.R. (2004) Manipulation of apoptosis in the host-parasite
361 interaction. *Trends Parasitol* 20, 280-287

362 43 Hacker, G. and Fischer, S.F. (2002) Bacterial anti-apoptotic activities. *FEMS Microbiol*
363 *Lett* 211, 1-6

364 44 Hansen, R.D.E., *et al.* (2011) A worm's best friend: recruitment of neutrophils by
365 *Wolbachia* confounds eosinophil degranulation against the filarial nematode *Onchocerca*
366 *ochengi*. *Proc Biol Sci* 278, 2293-2302

367 45 Turner, J.D., *et al.* (2017) Albendazole and antibiotics synergize to deliver short-course
368 anti-*Wolbachia* curative treatments in preclinical models of filariasis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S*
369 *A* 114, E9712-E9721

370 46 Aronson, J.K. (2015) Tetracyclines. In *Meyler's side effects of drugs: the international*
371 *encyclopedia of adverse drug reactions and interactions* (16th edn) (Aronson, J.K., ed), pp.
372 772-788, Elsevier

373 47 Jourdan, P.M., *et al.* (2018) Soil-transmitted helminth infections. *Lancet* 391, 252-265

48 Charlier, J., *et al.* (2014) Chasing helminths and their economic impact on farmed ruminants. *Trends Parasitol* 30, 361-367

49 Kaplan, R.M. and Vidyashankar, A.N. (2012) An inconvenient truth: global warming and anthelmintic resistance. *Vet Parasitol* 186, 70-78

50 Rose, H., *et al.* (2015) Widespread anthelmintic resistance in European farmed ruminants: a systematic review. *Vet Rec* 176, 546

51 Geva-Zatorsky, N., *et al.* (2015) *In vivo* imaging and tracking of host-microbiota interactions *via* metabolic labeling of gut anaerobic bacteria. *Nat Med* 21, 1091-1100

52 Sheth, R.U., *et al.* (2016) Manipulating bacterial communities by *in situ* microbiome engineering. *Trends Genet* 32, 189-200

53 Franzosa, E.A., *et al.* (2015) Sequencing and beyond: integrating molecular 'omics' for microbial community profiling. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 13, 360-372

54 Goodwin, S., *et al.* (2016) Coming of age: Ten years of next-generation sequencing technologies. *Nat Rev Genet* 17, 333-351

55 Salter, S.J., *et al.* (2014) Reagent and laboratory contamination can critically impact sequence-based microbiome analyses. *BMC Biol* 12, 87

56 Glassing, A., *et al.* (2016) Inherent bacterial DNA contamination of extraction and sequencing reagents may affect interpretation of microbiota in low bacterial biomass samples. *Gut Pathog* 8, 24

57 Howe, K.L., *et al.* (2017) WormBase ParaSite - a comprehensive resource for helminth genomics. *Mol Biochem Parasitol* 215, 2-10

58 Roumpeka, D.D., *et al.* (2017) A review of bioinformatics tools for bio-prospecting from metagenomic sequence data. *Front Genet* 8, 23

59 Tropini, C., *et al.* (2017) The gut microbiome: Connecting spatial organization to function. *Cell Host Microbe* 21, 433-442

60 Parkinson, J., *et al.* (2004) A transcriptomic analysis of the phylum Nematoda. *Nat Genet* 36, 1259-1267

Glossary

Core microbiome: The group of microbes consistently found within a host microbiome, which demonstrate a persistent association and provide a critical function within the habitat in which they are detected.

Endosymbionts: Any organism that lives within the body or cells of another organism in a symbiotic relationship with the host body or cell, often but not always to mutual benefit.

Macrobiota: Collective term used to describe the macroorganisms (e.g. helminths) that live in a particular niche, on or in a living being, and are large enough to be seen with the naked eye.

Microbiota: Collective term used to describe the microorganisms that live in a particular niche, on or in a living being, and exhibit a symbiotic relationship with the host.

Microbiome editing: Targeted manipulation of microbiota through the use of technology and/or other microbiota.

Mutualism: A symbiosis which is beneficial to both organisms involved.

Obligate relationship: One or both of the symbionts entirely depend on each other for survival.

Helminth microbiome: The collective microbiome of parasitic helminths.

Symbiosis: A relationship between two or more organisms that live closely together.

Box 1: Sequencing and analysis of helminth microbiomes – a need for standardisation

The most commonly used techniques for microbiome profiling include high-throughput sequencing of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene (often referred to as '16S rRNA sequencing'), and whole genome sequencing of microbial communities ('metagenome sequencing') [53, 54]. Whilst these techniques are highly suitable for the study of vertebrate microbiomes, their application to investigations of the microbiomes of helminth parasites, and GI nematodes in particular, will require careful considerations surrounding sample processing, as well as data analysis and interpretation. First, GI nematode specimens are usually directly harvested from vertebrate hosts (e.g. experimentally infected animals), or cultured in host faecal matter, which dramatically increases the risk of 'contaminating' microbial populations, for instance coating the outer nematode cuticle, in the parasite DNA of interest. In order to overcome this potential limitation, the cuticle of worms collected from infected hosts should be sterilized (e.g. using sodium hypochlorite) prior to microbial DNA extraction. In addition, in order to generate meaningful data on parasite microbiome structure and function, the determination of 'core' taxa, specific to a given parasite species and/or species group will be necessary. Importantly, negative ('no-DNA template') samples must be processed alongside samples of interest, in order to ensure that sequences generated from microorganisms contaminating laboratory surfaces and equipment, glassware and plastic ware, as well as nucleic acid isolation and amplification and sequencing reagents [55, 56] are correctly identified and subtracted from the final sequence dataset(s). Whilst existing high throughput genome sequencing datasets generated from a range of GI nematodes (particularly as part of whole genome sequencing projects; [57]) might include useful sequence information on the occurrence of resident microbial populations within parasite tissues (which, in such datasets, are traditionally considered 'contaminant sequences' and therefore discarded), the absence of adequate controls

in these experiments largely prevents the retrospective use of these data in parasite microbiome-sequencing studies. Once microbial sequence data have been obtained and annotated [58], information on the localization of specific taxa of interest in parasite tissues can be obtained using microscopy techniques, including fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (= FISH), immunofluorescence, and transmission electron microscopy (TEM) (reviewed in [59]). Whilst all of these techniques require highly specialized staff and are relatively costly and time consuming to use, they might provide useful insights into means of helminth microbiome acquisition and function.

Figure 1. Proposed helminth microbiome acquisition strategies for *Brugia malayi, Trichuris muris, and Haemonchus contortus*.

(A) *B. malayi* microfilariae acquire *Wolbachia* microorganisms via the female germ line, and populations of resident microbes expand throughout larval development through to infective third stage larvae in the mosquito intermediate host. In adult male and female *B. malayi*, the bacteria localise to the lateral chords of both sexes and the female reproductive system, where they colonise the ovaries, oocytes and early embryos within the uteri (B) Unembryonated *T. muris* eggs are passed through murine faeces and embryos develop inside the eggs. Upon ingestion by a murine host, the eggs hatch in the small intestine and release larvae that acquire selected populations of bacteria from the gut of their rodent hosts. Thereafter, the larvae mature and establish themselves as adult males and females in the colon. (C) Female *H. contortus* transfer selected populations of bacteria to the offspring via the germline. Eggs shed in the environment with the faeces of the ruminant host hatch and release first-stage larvae. Upon ingestion of the latter by a new ruminant host, the developing worms acquire further populations of bacteria from the rumen of the latter. Red arrows indicate helminth microbiome acquisition events. Empty blue circles indicate the absence of a microbiome.

Figure 2. Identification of key helminth taxa to be investigated as representatives of their taxonomic clades.

Asterisks (*) indicate taxa for which published data on parasite microbiome structure and/or function(s) is available. The figure was adapted from Parkinson et al. [60].

Figure 3. Plan of action for an efficient investigation and consequent exploitation of helminth microbiomes.

475 (A) 16S rRNA gene sequencing of helminth microbiomes to establish core microbiota present.
476 (B) Shotgun metagenomic sequencing (i), proteomic (ii), and metabolomic (iii) analyses of the
477 helminth microbiota to annotate functional roles to the core microbiota. (C) Implementation of
478 animal models in wild type and germ-free mice to assess helminth-microbiota acquisition and
479 transmission. (D) Localization of microbiota through fluorescent light- and electron
480 microscopy. (E) Identification and targeting of key microbiota to decrease parasite fitness
481 (based on the previously assessed parameters) through the implementation of microbiome
482 editing techniques.

Outstanding questions

- Which microbial taxa form the core microbiomes of different helminth species?

- How do helminths acquire their microbiomes?

- Where do endosymbionts localise within the parasite host?

- What are the functions of the microbiomes of parasitic helminths?

- What role/s do microbes other than bacteria (i.e. viruses and fungi), play in parasite biology and physiology?

- Can helminth-microbiome relationships be exploited for the development of new strategies for parasite control?

28 October 2018

Dear Doctor Kong,

REJOINDER: MS. No. (TREPAR-D-18-00201)
Entitled 'Helminth Microbiomes - a Hidden Treasure Trove?' *Trends in Parasitology*.

We are very grateful for the reviewers' and editor's time and efforts in evaluating this manuscript. The points raised by the reviewers are very constructive and have contributed to enhance the manuscript. We have provided detailed responses to individual points in the following rejoinder:

Reviewer #1:

I am not sure that Figure 1 is absolutely necessary. Perhaps a figure depicting the selective acquisition of bacteria by *Trichuris*- and then how these bacteria and murine host bacteria then aid the parasite may be of greater interest?

RESPONSE: The authors thank the reviewer for this comment and have provided an additional figure depicting the proposed microbiome acquisition strategies of *Trichuris muris*, *Haemonchus contortus*, and *Brugia malayi*. The focus of this figure lies on acquisition rather than mechanisms of gut microbial benefits, since the latter remains highly speculative.

Reading this article made me think of "microbes" other than bacteria that may inhabit parasites- i.e. viruses and fungi- and how these affect parasite development/host responses. Given it is an opinion article, could the authors speculate this field as one that will emerge in future? I am aware of some fungi that negatively affect plant nematodes. With the new technologies for culturing and sequencing it may be pertinent to identify more than just bacterial species?

RESPONSE: The authors thank the reviewer for the comment and agree that other microbes could be of importance and should be investigated alongside bacteria. Following the reviewer's suggestion, an additional "outstanding question" has been added and discussed in the "Concluding Remarks" section (lines 251-252).

Reviewer #2:
My only comment/concern is with the term 'parabiome'. Although it is defined within the text, I don't know that it is essential. My original interpretation of the term was that it referred to the parasitic component of a host microbiome (similar to virome, mycobiome referring to viral and fungal components). When I did an informal poll of colleagues and trainees to see what they thought a 'parabiome' referred to, the responses were either as above, or that it could refer to the microbiome of mice that undergone parabiosis. Overall, I think it would be clearer to

continue to refer to the 'helminthic microbiome' as laid out in the title, and interspersed throughout the text.

RESPONSE: The authors thank the reviewer for this constructive comment and agree that the term ‘parabiome’ may raise some confusion. Therefore, following the reviewer’s suggestion, we have replaced it with “helminth microbiome”.

In conclusion, we consider that we have rigorously addressed each of the points raised by each of the reviewers. We agree with the points raised, and modified the text accordingly. These comments have led to an enhanced manuscript, which we consider to meet the standard for publication in *Trends in Parasitology*.

Yours sincerely,
Cinzia Cantacessi
On behalf of all authors.

Figure

Your Postscript file "Figure1.eps" cannot be opened and processed.
Please see the common list of problems, and suggested resolutions below.

Reason: The submitted postscript could not be processed. Please check the file and resubmit.

Other Common Problems When Creating a PDF from a Postscript file
---

You will need to convert your Postscript file to another format or fix the current Postscript file, then re-submit it.

Figure

Your Postscript file "Figure2.eps" cannot be opened and processed.
Please see the common list of problems, and suggested resolutions below.

Reason: The submitted postscript could not be processed. Please check the file and resubmit.

Other Common Problems When Creating a PDF from a Postscript file
---

You will need to convert your Postscript file to another format or fix the current Postscript file, then re-submit it.

Figure

Your Postscript file "Figure3.eps" cannot be opened and processed.
Please see the common list of problems, and suggested resolutions below.

Reason: The submitted postscript could not be processed. Please check the file and resubmit.

Other Common Problems When Creating a PDF from a Postscript file
---

You will need to convert your Postscript file to another format or fix the current Postscript file, then re-submit it.