

***Tetranychus urticae* mites do not mount an induced immune response against
bacteria**

Authors: Gonalo Matos^{1,2*}; Nicky Wybouw^{3,4*}; Nelson E. Martins^{1*°}; Flore Z    ²; Maria Riga⁵; Alexandre B. Leit  o^{1*}; John Vontas^{6,7}; Miodrag Grbi  ^{8,9}; Thomas Van Leeuwen^{3,4}; Sara Magalh  es^{1  } and   lio Sucena^{1,10  }

Affiliations: 1- Instituto Gulbenkian de Ci  ncia, Rua da Quinta Grande, 6 2780-156 Oeiras, Portugal; 2- cE3c: Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes, Faculdade de Ci  ncias, Universidade de Lisboa, Campo Grande 1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal; 3- Laboratory for Agrozoology, Department of Crop Protection, University of Ghent, Coupure links 653, B-9000 Ghent; 4- Department of Evolutionary Biology, Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 904, 1098 XH, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; 5- Faculty of Applied Biotechnology and Biology, Department of Biology, University of Crete, Vasilika Vouton, P.O. Box 2208, 71409 Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 6- Institute of Molecular Biology & Biotechnology, Foundation for Research & Technology Hellas, 100 N. Plastira Street, GR-70013, Heraklion Crete, Greece; 7- Laboratory of Pesticide Science, Department of Crop Science, Agricultural University of Athens, 75 Iera Odos Street, GR-11855-, Athens, Greece. 8- Department of Biology, University of Western Ontario, N6A 5B7 London, Canada; 9- University of La Rioja, Logrono, Spain; 10- Departamento de Biologia Animal, Faculdade de Ci  ncias, Universidade de Lisboa, Campo Grande 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal.

* These authors contributed equally to this work

   Joint last authors

   present address: UPR 9022 CNRS, Institut de Biologie Mol  culaire et Cellulaire du CNRS, 15 rue Ren   Descartes, 67084 Strasbourg Cedex, France

29 • present address: Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing Street
30 Cambridge CB2 3EJ, UK

31

32 ¶ Corresponding authors:

33 É. Sucena: esucena@igc.gulbenkian.pt and S. Magalhães: snmagalhaes@fc.ul.pt

34

Abstract

The genome of the spider mite *Tetranychus urticae*, a plant herbivore, is missing important elements of the canonical *Drosophila* immune pathways necessary to fight bacterial infections. However, it is not known whether spider mites can mount an immune response and survive bacterial infection. In other chelicerates, bacterial infection elicits a response mediated by immune effectors leading to the survival of infected organisms.

In *T. urticae*, infection by either *Escherichia coli* or *Bacillus megaterium* did not elicit a response as assessed through genome-wide transcriptomic analysis. In line with this, spider mites died within days even upon injection with low doses of bacteria that are non-pathogenic to *Drosophila*. Moreover, bacteria populations grew exponentially inside the infected spider mites. In contrast, *Sancassania berlesei*, a litter-dwelling mite, controlled bacterial proliferation and resisted infections with both Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria lethal to *T. urticae*. This differential mortality between mite species was absent when mites were infected with heat-killed bacteria. Also, we found that spider mites harbour in their gut 1,000-fold less bacteria than *S. berlesei*.

We show that *T. urticae* has lost the capacity to mount an induced immune response against bacteria, in contrast to other mites and chelicerates but similarly to the phloem feeding aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. Hence, our results reinforce the putative evolutionary link between ecological conditions regarding exposure to bacteria and the architecture of the immune response.

Introduction

To deal with infection, arthropods rely on several defensive mechanisms that include behavioural avoidance, physical and chemical barriers, and the immune response [1][2]. For example, virtually all arthropods studied thus far mount some combination of cellular and humoral responses against bacteria that rely on coagulation, production of reactive oxygen species (ROS), melanization, phagocytosis and the synthesis of antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) and/or enzymes [3][4].

In the insect model system *Drosophila*, the humoral response has been dissected genetically in great detail. It relies strongly on the induction of two signalling pathways, Toll and Imd, through the recognition of Lys-type or DAP-type peptidoglycans, present in Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria, respectively, and culminating in the production of anti-microbial peptides (AMPs) [3][5].

Genomic analyses of other holometabolous insects has revealed that most genes of the Toll and Imd pathways are conserved, namely in mosquitoes, the honeybee and the beetle *Tribolium castaneum* [6][7][8]. However, in the pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum*, a hemimetabolous insect, the Imd pathway is incomplete and several genes coding for receptors and common AMPs could not be identified. Moreover, this aphid species does not mount an immune response to bacterial infection [9][10]. Yet, this is not a general feature of hemipterans, since the Toll and Imd pathways along with several receptors and AMPs were annotated in the genome of the brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens*, and several Toll pathway genes were shown to be upregulated upon bacterial infection in this species [11]. This pattern is also verified in another closely related hemipteran, *Rhodnius prolixus*, in which activity of the Imd pathway was experimentally confirmed [12]. Further, *Imd* has been found in

the genomes of other hemipterans such as the large milkweed bug (*Oncopeltus fasciatus*) and of the water strider *Gerris buenoi* (Maurijn van der Zee, pers. comm.). Together, these observations suggest that, to a great extent, the immune response in most insects is directly comparable to that of the dipteran *Drosophila*.

In chelicerates, however, the Imd pathway seems to be incomplete in all species thus far analysed [13][14]. Notwithstanding, in *Carcinoscorpius rotundicauda*, an orthologue of the *Drosophila* NF- κ B-like transcription factors, Relish, has been described and implicated in the immune response against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection [15][16]. In fact, in several studied chelicerates, a response is elicited through the canonical production of anti-microbial compounds [17][18].

The two-spotted spider mite *Tetranychus urticae* feeds on the cell contents of a multitude of plant species. Its genome annotation failed to identify several canonical immunity genes, amongst which an important part of the Imd pathway and effectors such as hemolymph proteins (von Willebrand factor-like proteins) or defensins [13][14][19] (Suppl. Table 1). Two general hypotheses may explain this observation: 1) the spider mite mounts an immune response based on a different genetic basis, as do other chelicerates or 2) as in aphids, *T. urticae* does not possess an inducible anti-bacterial immune response.

To distinguish between these hypotheses, we present experimental data describing the response of mites to bacterial systemic infection, including host survival, bacterial proliferation in the host and transcriptional responses. Additionally, we tested the generality of our results by repeating this characterization on the litter-dwelling grain mite *Sancassania berlesei* [20].

Results

T. urticae is susceptible to infection with *E. coli* and *B. megaterium*

We tested survival of *T. urticae* following infection with *Escherichia coli*, a Gram-negative bacterium, or the Gram-positive *Bacillus megaterium*. Injecting spider mites with *E. coli* at three different concentrations – ODs 0.1, 1 or 10 – significantly affected survival (Cox model, bacterial concentration effect, $X^2_3=19.213$, $p=0.0002$; Fig. 1a). A pairwise comparison of the hazard ratios between spider mites injected with *E. coli* or with LB confirmed that spider mite survival was severely affected (OD0.1: $z=9.828$, $p<0.0001$; OD1: $z=11.124$, $p<0.0001$ and OD10: $z=14.267$, $p<0.0001$; Fig. 1c).

Injecting spider mites with *B. megaterium* at three different concentrations (ODs 0.1, 1 or 10) also significantly affected survival (Cox model, bacterial concentration effect, $X^2_4=19.471$; $p<0.0006$; Fig. 1b). Hazard ratios revealed no significant change in survival between mites injected with LB or with *B. megaterium* at OD0.1 ($z=1.769$; $p=0.0769$), but survival of *T. urticae* decreased significantly relative to the LB control at OD1 and OD10 (*B. megaterium* OD1: $z=8.792$, $p<0.0001$; *B. megaterium* OD10: $z=8.797$, $p<0.0001$; Fig. 1c).

The high mortality rate in *T. urticae* caused by infection with bacteria known to be non-pathogenic to *Drosophila melanogaster* [21] raised the possibility that our bacterial strains had an unexpected level of pathogenicity. To test this, we infected *D. melanogaster* adult females with the same bacteria and at the same concentrations applied to *T. urticae*. As previously reported [22][23], within the same time frame and bacteria inoculum range as our experiment with *T. urticae*, the survival of *D.*

melanogaster was not reduced upon infection with either bacterium (Cox model, bacterial concentration effect, $X^2_6=3.501$, $p=0.7439$; Suppl. Fig. 1).

The transcriptomic profile of *T. urticae* is unaltered upon infection

Next, we analysed genome-wide gene-expression patterns to assess the effect of bacterial infection on spider mites using a qPCR-validated microarray set-up [24]. Differential transcript levels were determined in mites injected with *E. coli* or with *B. megaterium* relative to mites injected with LB. Expression levels were measured 3, 6 and 12 h post-injection. Only a limited number of genes showed significant differences in expression between mites injected with or without bacteria and displayed an inconsistent response to bacteria across the three time points (Suppl. Table 2). Moreover, even though the 34 orthologues of immunity-related *Drosophila* genes identified in the *T. urticae* genome had multiple probes on the array, none of these showed significant differential expression upon bacterial infection (Suppl. Table 2).

In contrast, a more pronounced transcriptional response was observed between injected and non-injected mites. In these comparisons, we observed altered transcription of a total of 259 genes (out of 17,798 genes with probes on the array). More specifically, transcriptomic comparisons of the *E. coli* and *B. megaterium* injections, with their respective LB-controls, uncovered a total of 177 and 211 differentially expressed genes, respectively, at any of the three time points (Fig. 2 and Suppl. Fig. 2). Only 3 genes were significantly differentially expressed in a consistent manner across every time point of every injection treatment (LB-buffer, *E. coli* and *B. megaterium*). These are *tetur03g07900*, *tetur05g04720* and *tetur19g00860* none of which shows any significant homology to known immunity genes (sequence data

accessible at: <http://bioinformatics.psb.ugent.be/orcae/overview/Tetur> and
<http://www.uniprot.org/proteomes/> under UP000015104). No orthologues of
Drosophila genes classified as immunity-related were present in any of these gene sets
[19]. Of the 259 differentially expressed genes that showed significant differential
expression in any comparison, 118 were given a Gene Ontology (GO) term by Blast2GO
analysis [25]. Fisher's exact test showed that 16 and 12 GO-terms were significantly
over- and under-represented in the differentially expressed gene set, respectively
(Suppl. Table 3). No terms related to a physiological response to wounding were
observed.

As indicated by the hierarchical clustering analysis based on time series
alignments of the relative transcription levels across the different time points (Fig. 2)
and by corresponding gene-expression heatplots (Suppl. Fig. 2), the transcriptional
response to injection did not appear to be time dependent within the first 12 hours.
Indeed, no strong linear differential expression across the three time points was
observed in any of the three injection treatments. Moreover, the lack of consistent
differential expression across all time points of the different injection treatments
indicates that the injection procedure itself did not elicit an immune response.

The transcriptional responses observed in individual comparisons do show that
our pipeline is able to identify differential expression. Therefore, we interpret the lack
of significantly distinct transcript levels in the direct comparisons of bacteria-injected
vs LB-injected mites as caused by the virtual absence of immune response induction
and not to a technical artefact.

S. berlesei and *T. urticae* respond differently to systemic bacterial infection

To test whether the lack of an induced immune response in *T. urticae* is a general feature of the Acari, we mirrored the infections performed on the spider mite in the grain mite, *Sancassania berlesei*.

Overall, infection with bacteria decreased significantly the survival of *S. berlesei* (Cox model, bacterial concentration effect, $X^2_6=17.461$, $p=0.0077$; Fig. 3a and 3b). A reduction in survival was observed upon bacterial injection with either bacterial species at all tested concentrations (*E. coli* OD0.1: $z=3.513$, $p<0.0022$; *E. coli* OD1: $z=3.446$, $p=0.0022$; *E. coli* OD10: $z=3.559$, $p=0.0022$; *B. megaterium* OD0.1: $z=2.899$, $p=0.0037$; *B. megaterium* OD1: $z=3.495$, $p=0.0022$; *B. megaterium* OD10: $z=3.414$, $p=0.0022$; Fig. 3c).

However, when survival of *S. berlesei* and *T. urticae* is contrasted, it is unequivocal that the grain mite is far more capable of surviving infection than the spider mite (compare Fig. 1a to 3a and Fig. 1b to 3b). Finally, the same experiment using heat-killed bacteria did not show a differential survival of the two mite species (Suppl. Fig. 3). This observation discards the possibility of host inflammatory misregulation causing self-damage independently of bacterial action [26][27].

Bacterial proliferation correlates with host survival

We observed the dynamics of the bacterial inoculum after infection of both mite species and *D. melanogaster* by counting the number of colony-forming units (CFUs), over 4 days (Fig. 4).

We found significant differences in the number of CFUs between *T. urticae* and *D. melanogaster* (ANOVA, $F_{1,20}=134.066$, $p<0.0001$; Fig. 4a), across time points (ANOVA, $F_{4,20}=70.044$, $p<0.0001$), and in the interaction between time point

and species (ANOVA, $F_{1,20}=25.131$, $p<0.0001$). The latter indicates that bacterial populations have distinct growth dynamics in *T. urticae* and in *D. melanogaster*. Indeed, in *T. urticae*, the number of CFUs increased across time points (Fig. 4a), whereas for *D. melanogaster* the number of CFUs started to decrease 2-3 days after injection, reaching in the last time-point a value similar to the bacterial number initially injected ($t_{20} = -0.201$, $p=0.8427$). In contrast, no significant differences were found between the dynamics of bacteria infecting *S. berlesei* and *D. melanogaster* (ANOVA, $F_{1,20}=0.51$, $p=0.482$) (Fig. 4b), between time points (ANOVA, $F_{4,20}=2.287$, $p=0.0957$), and in the interaction between time-points and species (ANOVA, $F_{4,20}= 0.069$, $p=0.9906$).

This experiment provides a further line of evidence that *S. berlesei* is able to fight bacterial proliferation, contrarily to *T. urticae*.

T. urticae has an impoverished gut microbiota

We proceeded to quantify the microbiota in both mite species motivated by three important facts: i) the ecological similarities between *T. urticae* and the aphid, ii) the genomic evidence for the absence of the *lmd* gene and a general degeneration of the *lmd* pathway in the spider mite [13][14][19] and, iii) the central role of this pathway in gut homeostasis regarding regulation of the microbiota [28][29]. We quantified bacteria in individuals that were 1) surface-sterilized in bleach and alcohol, which should not have bacteria in their external surface; 2) fed on rifampicin, which should not have bacteria in the gut; or 3) both, which should have neither and 4) mites taken directly from their natural substrate, which should present both internally and externally associated bacteria. We homogenized individual adult females of *T. urticae* and *S. berlesei* from each treatment and plated them on LB agar plates (Fig. 4c) or

extracted DNA to perform semi-quantitative PCR for the 16S gene (Suppl. Fig. 4). We found that the two mite species harbour a significantly different number of bacteria able to grow on LB agar plates (ANOVA, mite species effect, $F_{1,72} = 169.855$, $p < 0.0001$) and that the treatments applied significantly decreased the number of bacteria (ANOVA, treatment effect, $F_{3,72} = 93.543$, $p < 0.0001$; Fig. 4c). We found a significant species by treatment interaction (ANOVA, $F_{3,72} = 13.029$, $p < 0.0001$), and the treatment with external sterilization and antibiotic treatment brings bacteria numbers to non-significantly different levels in both species ($t_{72} = 1.924$, $p = 0.058$). All other comparisons between treatments across species are highly significant ($t_{72} > 5.492$, $p < 0.0001$). It is particularly striking that, once sterilized and only harbouring the bacteria inside the gut, single crushed *T. urticae* individuals only generate around 10 CFUs, a difference of three orders of magnitude relative to their *S. berlesei* counterparts (Fig. 4c).

It is expected that an undetermined number of bacterial species will not be detected with the specific culture conditions utilized in this test. However, it is unlikely that between the two mite species the distribution of bacterial species, which can and cannot be grown in LB, will be significantly different to change the qualitative conclusion we reach.

A semi-quantitative PCR provided independent confirmation that *S. berlesei* has a microbiota in the order of one thousand times higher than that of *T. urticae*. Whereas amplification products are clearly visible using gDNA from sterilized *S. berlesei* after 25 cycles, only after 35 cycles are bands detectable from sterilized *T. urticae* (Suppl. Fig. 4). For example, contrasting bands from TP at 35 cycles to SP at 25 cycles shows comparable amplification products in the two bacterial types ($2^{10} = 1024$). Despite the poor quantitative power of this technique, its qualitative interpretation

provides a rough estimate of the difference in bacteria present in either species, namely in their digestive tracts. Importantly, this difference is hardly attributable to any of the four most common described endosymbionts of spidermites [30], which are absent from our tested populations (Suppl. Fig 5).

Together these results concur in that most bacteria found in these species are inside the mite gut and that between *T. urticae* and *S. berlesei* their numbers differ by roughly three orders of magnitude.

Discussion

Spider mites are susceptible to bacterial infections.

Using bacteria that are non-pathogenic to *Drosophila melanogaster*, we have shown that spider mites infected over a 100-fold concentration range with both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria display high mortality when compared to controls (both mock-infected or infected with heat-killed bacteria). In addition, no qualitatively different transcriptional change is induced consistently by the presence of bacteria. This is in sharp contrast with *Drosophila* which displays a strong upregulation of Imd and/or Toll pathways upon bacterial infection [3][31][32]. Although individual transcriptomic comparisons between injected and non-injected mites reveal differential expression, no consistent response to injection was observed across all time points and treatments. Therefore, wounding itself does not seem to induce an immune response. This is supported by the absence of enriched GO-terms related to wound response in lumped individual transcriptomic responses (Suppl. Table 3). Finally, in *T. urticae*, bacterial proliferation is maintained steadily across 4 days post-

injection in consonance with its mortality profile. This strongly indicates that no resistance or tolerance mechanisms are operating in the spider mite and that uncontrolled bacterial proliferation caused the observed mortality rates.

Our data is consistent with the absence of an induced immune response but does not address the putative role of other constitutive defences involving expression of effectors, such as lysozymes, AMPs and ROS, or cellular immunity and phagocytosis [33]. Be that as it may, we show that these other candidate mechanisms in *T. urticae* are clearly insufficient in face of bacterial infections that are innocuous to *Drosophila* and other chelicerates such as ticks [34] or the Wet Grain mite *Sancassania berlesei*, which occupies a very different ecological niche, namely bird litter and other substrates prone to bacterial proliferation and infection [20].

Bacterial infection affected the survival of *S. berlesei* but to a much lesser extent than observed for *T. urticae*. Moreover, unlike *T. urticae*, *S. berlesei* was capable of controlling and reducing the bacterial load, mimicking the characterized immune response in *D. melanogaster* [35][36]. The observation that bacterial load in *S. berlesei* increases initially and decreases over time, suggests that this mite species mounts an immune response against bacterial infection. The nature of this response in *S. berlesei*, induced and/or constitutive, remains to be determined. An induced response is supported in other chelicerates such as horseshoe crabs and spiders, which upregulate AMPs upon bacterial challenge [17][37], possibly without resorting to Imd or Toll pathways, as these are (at least partially) degenerated in genome-sequenced species [13][14]. In addition, anti-bacterial response may rely on higher basal levels of immune effectors such as circulating hemocyanin, C-reactive proteins and α 2-macroglobulin deployed upon infection [38].

Life-history correlates with immune degeneration in spider mites.

Genomic and physiological studies of the pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum* uncovered a very similar pattern to our results on *T. urticae* [9][10][39][40]. Similarly to *T. urticae*, the genome of *A. pisum* misses important genes of the IMD pathway as well as several other *Drosophila* immune genes [9]. Infected aphids, in which lysozyme activity could be detected, did not upregulate AMPs suggesting aphids do not deploy an induced immune response upon bacterial challenge [9][10]. Instead, pea aphids seem to rely on another layer of defence, that is provided by their endosymbionts, namely *Regiella insecticola*, *Rickettsia* and *Spiroplasma*, to fight some fungal infections [41][42] and *Hamiltonella defensa* against parasitoid attack [43]. Possibly, endosymbionts commonly detected in *T. urticae* populations might also confer protection to attacks by fungi and other natural enemies [30] but, to our knowledge, there has been no report of endosymbiont protection against bacterial infections in arthropods (reviewed in [44]). In addition, infection with *E. coli* also induces significant mortality in the pea aphid [39]. In any case, by using bacteria-challenged spider mites devoid of four common endosymbionts, we aimed at testing specifically the response on the host genomic and physiological levels [30].

As shown for the pea aphid [9][11][12], the degenerated immune genetic repertoire and immune response in *T. urticae* is also a secondary loss. One hypothesis for the genomic and physiological patterns observed in pea aphid immunity is that the virtually aseptic phloem diet of aphids would relax selection for the maintenance of costly immune response mechanisms [45]. This hypothesis may be extended to *T. urticae* as this species also feeds on a seemingly bacteria-free resource, the

cytoplasmic content of leaf cells and phloem. This ecological scenario is opposite to that of the house fly, where the genomic expansion of immune-related genes may underlie its adaptation to septic environments [46]. Moreover, the shared degeneration of the Imd pathway in spider mite and aphid reinforces this notion because of the central role played by this pathway in mediating the epithelial response to bacterial contacts in the gut and in the modulation of its bacterial contents [31][47][48][49]. Recent work has shown that, in addition to aphids, other phloem-sap feeders such as white flies and psyllids carry a reduced gut microbiota in both laboratory and natural populations [50]. Unfortunately, no information is yet available regarding immune responses in these insects.

The aseptic nature of the feeding source of spider mites is supported by the rough comparative characterization of the gut bacteria present in the two mite species studied here, which differs by several orders of magnitude. This ecological feature, by eliminating a constant necessity for balancing bacterial interactions (commensal or pathogenic), may relax the pressure to evolve or maintain a transcriptionally induced and regulated response. Further studies looking into immunity in other arthropods with obligate endosymbionts and/or with comparable dietary regimes will provide clearer answers about the forces driving convergent degeneration of this type of immune response.

Materials and Methods

(For most sections below, more detail is provided in *Supplementary materials and methods*).

Arthropod and bacterial strains:

Tetranychus urticae: All spider mites used in this work are of the London strain, a reference line originally collected in Ontario, Canada. The line used for the Spider Mite Genome Sequencing project [19] was derived from this population. Spider mites were reared under lab conditions (25°C, 60% humidity and L:D 16:8 photoperiod)

Sancassania berlesei: Grain mites (a kind gift from J. Radwan) were maintained in large numbers in Petri dishes (6cm diameter) with fly food under lab conditions (25°C, 50% humidity and L:D 12:12 photoperiod).

Drosophila melanogaster: The w¹¹¹⁸ laboratory stock kept under standard laboratory conditions, was used in the survival assays and the dynamics of bacterial infection.

Bacteria: *Escherichia coli* (Gram -) and *Bacillus megaterium* (Gram +) stocks were kept at -80°C and bacteria plated onto Petri dishes with Luria Broth (LB). Per experiment, one colony was picked from selective medium cultures, transferred to liquid LB and grown overnight at 37°C for *E. coli* and at 30°C for *B. megaterium*.

Survival Assays

T. urticae, *S. berlesei* and *D. melanogaster* survival was monitored after injection with *E. coli* or *B. megaterium* for up to 96 hours at 24-hour intervals. Individuals were injected with LB with or without bacteria. For the former treatment, we used three different concentrations of bacteria, OD0.1, OD1 and OD10 measured with a BioRad SmartSpec 3000. OD10 corresponds to 5x10⁹ cell/ml, OD1 and OD0.10 were obtained by diluting bacteria at OD1 in LB at a 1:10 ratio and 1:100 ratio, respectively.

***T. urticae* transcriptome analysis**

Female adult spider mites were injected with *E. coli* or *B. megaterium* at OD1 concentration with LB as a negative control, or were left un-manipulated. Three, 6 and 12 h post-infection, 4 biological replicates of every injection treatment were collected. Two biological replicates were collected from non-treated, non-injected mites. Every RNA sample was extracted from a pool of 300 mites and labelled with Cy5 or with Cy3. Significant differential expression was identified by an empirical Bayes approach employing cut-offs for the Benjamini-Hochberg FDR adjusted *p*-values and log₂-converted fold change at 0.05 and 1, respectively [51]. The proxy, NbClust and dtw packages in R were used in the distance matrix construction and clustering of the transcriptomic responses. Distance measures were generated through alignments of the relative transcription levels (injected vs non-injected) using dynamic time warp algorithms. This technique allows for the comparison of the transcriptomic responses over time [52][53].

Infection with heat-killed bacteria

T. urticae and *S. berlesei* survival was measured after infection (injection or pricking, respectively) with live or heat-killed *E. coli* or *B. megaterium* at OD10. Three replicates of 30, 1-3 day-old, adult females were used per treatment: LB, live *E. coli*, heat-killed *E. coli*, live *B. megaterium* and heat-killed *B. megaterium*. Survival was monitored every 24 hours over 4 days.

Dynamics of bacterial growth

We infected 150 females of *T. urticae*, *S. berlesei* and *D. melanogaster* with 5 to 100 CFUs of *E. coli* per individual. The dynamics of the bacterial population was followed every 24 hours from 0 to 96 hours. At each time point, three replicates of 4 individuals were homogenized in 50µl of LB and serially diluted. Homogenates (4 µl) were plated

in triplicate on LB plates supplemented with 100 mg/ml kanamycin and incubated overnight. The next day, the number of CFUs was counted. For *S. berlesei* and *D. melanogaster*, only the homogenates of the individuals alive were plated. However, for *T. urticae*, individuals collected and plated at 72 and 96 hours were dead because no survivors could be recovered at those time points. The standard error was obtained by dividing the standard deviation of the 3 biological replicates datapoints (values in log₁₀ CFU), divided by the square root of three, the number of samples for each time point/species.

Estimating the microbiota associated to each mite species

Sterilization and rifampicin treatments

To measure the approximate number of bacteria present either outside or inside each mite species, adult *T. urticae* and *S. berlesei* females were exposed to one of four different treatments: no sterilization, sterilization, feeding on rifampicin, and feeding on rifampicin plus sterilization. Single individuals were homogenized in 50 µl of LB, plated (4 µl) in LB-Agar and incubated overnight at 30°C. The next day, the number of CFUs was counted and used as a proxy to estimate the microbiota associated to each mite (five per treatment and per species).

Semi-quantitative PCR of bacterial 16S

DNA was extracted from individual mites after sterilization (GenElute™ Mammalian Genomic DNA Miniprep Kit, Sigma-Aldrich Co, St. Louis, USA). PCR were performed using standardized concentration of DNA templates (c.a. 4.5ng/µl) and using universal primers for the bacterial 16S gene defined by Lane [54], 27f: GAG AGT TTG ATC CTG GCT CAG and 1495r: CTA CGG CTA CCT TGT TAC GA. PCR amplification conditions were

as follows: 15 min at 95°C, followed by 15/20/25/30 three-step cycles of 94°C for 30 s, 58°C for 1 min30 s, 72°C for 1 min followed by a final step of 10 min at 72°C.

Statistical analysis

Analyses were carried out using the R statistical package (version 3.1.2). To compare survival between uninfected and infected individuals, we used Cox proportional hazards mixed-effect models (*coxme*, *coxme* package). To compare the dynamics of bacterial infection, a linear model on log₁₀ transformed bacterial counts was employed with species, time-point and the interaction between species and time-point as fixed factors. To analyse the microbial community of both mite species, a linear model on the log₁₀-transformed bacteria counts was employed with species and treatment as fixed factors. In both tests, the significance of the explanatory variables was tested using type I ANOVA. Pairwise comparisons between time-points or treatments were performed using the *lsmeans* function of the package *lsmeans*. When a significant interaction was found, comparisons were done separately for each species or each treatment.

Data accessibility

T. urticae sequence data may be accessed at:

<http://bioinformatics.psb.ugent.be/orcae/overview/Tetur> and

<http://www.uniprot.org/proteomes/> under UP000015104.

Transcriptomic data may be accessed at the GEO database of NCBI under accession number GSE64199.

Author Contributions

Designed research: GSM, NW, NEM, TVL, SM, ES; wrote the paper: GSM, NW, SM, ES; performed research: GSM, NW, NEM, FZ, ABL, MR; analysed data: GSM, NW, NEM; contributed reagents and resources: MG, JV, TVL, SM, ES.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Funding

NW was supported by a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action (MSCA) Individual fellowship (658795-DOGMITE) of Horizon 2020. TVL acknowledges funding from the Fund for Scientific Research Flanders (FWO) (grant [G009312N](#) and grant [G053815N](#)), the European Commission (EC contract 618105) via FACCE ERA-NET Plus and FACCE-JP (Genomite, project ID 137 via NWO). This work was supported by Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência/ Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian to ES and by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT, Portugal) grants ANR/BIA-EVF/0013/2012 and FCT-TUBITAK/0001/2014 to SM. MG acknowledges funding from the Government of Canada through Genome Canada and the Ontario Genomics Institute (OGI-046), Ontario Research Fund–Global Leadership in Genomics and Life Sciences GL2-01-035, NSERC Strategic Grant STPGP322206-05 and JGI Community Sequencing Program grant 777506.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to several researchers for providing the biological material used here: Jacek Radwan (Jagiellonian University, Poland) for *Sancassania berlesei*, Adriano Henriques (ITQB, Portugal) for *Bacillus megaterium* and Olivier Duron (MiVEGEC, France) for the endosymbiont positive controls. We also thank the Magalhães, Sucena, Beldade and Mirth Labs for discussion, Francisco Dionísio (cE3c, FCUL, Portugal) for generously hosting some of the bacteria experiments, Jacques Denoyelle for help with the greenhouse, Inês Santos for keeping mite colonies and Ioannis Livadaras (IMBB-FORTH, Greece) for mite injection. We thank David Duneau (Laboratoire Évolution et Diversité Biologique, Toulouse, France) for suggesting the experiment in figure 4a/b and for comments following the critical reading of the manuscript.

References

1. Beckage NE. 2008 *Insect Immunology*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
2. Schmid-Hempel P. 2011 *Evolutionary Parasitology: The Integrated Study of Infections, Immunology, Ecology, and Genetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Lemaitre B, Hoffmann J. 2007 The host defense of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Annu Rev Immunol* **25**, 697–743.
4. Park JW *et al.* 2010 Beetle immunity. *Adv Exp Med Biol* **708**, 163–80.
5. Capo F, Charroux B, Royet J. 2016 Bacteria sensing mechanisms in *Drosophila* gut: Local and systemic consequences. *Developmental & Comparative Immunology* **64**, 11–21. (
6. Waterhouse RM *et al.* 2007 Evolutionary dynamics of immune-related genes and pathways in disease-vector mosquitoes. *Science* **316**, 1738–43.
7. Evans JD *et al.* 2006 Immune pathways and defence mechanisms in honey bees *Apis mellifera*. *Insect Molecular Biology* **15**, 645–656.
8. Zou Z, Evans JD, Lu Z, Zhao P, Williams M, Sumathipala N, Hetru C, Hultmark D, Jiang H. 2007 Comparative genomic analysis of the *Tribolium* immune system. *Genome Biol* **8**, R177.
9. Gerardo NM *et al.* 2010 Immunity and other defenses in pea aphids, *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *Genome Biol* **11**, R21.
10. Altincicek B, Gross J, Vilcinskis A. 2008 Wounding-mediated gene expression and accelerated viviparous reproduction of the pea aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *Insect Molecular Biology* **17**, 711–716.
11. Bao Y-Y, Qu L-Y, Zhao D, Chen L-B, Jin H-Y, Xu L-M, Cheng J-A, Zhang C-X. 2013 The genome- and transcriptome-wide analysis of innate immunity in the brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens*. *BMC Genomics* **14**, 160.
12. Mesquita RD *et al.* 2015 Genome of *Rhodnius prolixus*, an insect vector of Chagas disease, reveals unique adaptations to hematophagy and parasite infection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 14936–14941.
13. Palmer WJ, Jiggins FM. 2015 Comparative Genomics Reveals the Origins and Diversity of Arthropod Immune Systems. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **32**, 2111–2129.
14. Bechsgaard J, Vanthournout B, Funch P, Vestbo S, Gibbs RA, Richards S, Sanggaard KW, Enghild JJ, Bilde T. 2016 Comparative genomic study of arachnid immune systems indicates loss of beta-1,3-glucanase-related proteins and the immune deficiency pathway. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **29**, 277–291.
15. Wang XW, Tan NS, Ho B, Ding JL. 2006 Evidence for the ancient origin of the NF-kappaB/IkappaB cascade: its archaic role in pathogen infection and immunity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **103**, 4204–4209.

- 515 16. Fan ZH, Wang XW, Lu J, Ho B, Ding JL. 2008 Elucidating the Function of an Ancient NF-
516 B p100 Homologue, CrRelish, in Antibacterial Defense. *Infection and Immunity* **76**,
517 664–670.
- 518 17. Fukuzawa AH, Vellutini BC, Lorenzini DM, Silva Jr PI, Mortara RA, da Silva JMC, Daffre
519 S. 2008 The role of hemocytes in the immunity of the spider *Acanthoscurria*
520 *gomesiana*. *Developmental & Comparative Immunology* **32**, 716–725.
- 521 18. Tonk M, Cabezas-Cruz A, Valdés JJ, Rego ROM, Grubhoffer L, Estrada-Peña A, Vilcinskis
522 A, Kotsyfakis M, Rahnamaeian M. 2015 *Ixodes ricinus* defensins attack distantly-related
523 pathogens. *Developmental & Comparative Immunology* **53**, 358–365.
- 524 19. Grbic M *et al.* 2011 The genome of *Tetranychus urticae* reveals herbivorous pest
525 adaptations. *Nature* **479**, 487–92.
- 526 20. Timms S, Ferro DN, Emberson RM. 1982 General biology and nomenclature of
527 *Sancassania berlesei* (Michael). *Acarologia* **22**, 359–362.
- 528 21. Shirasu-Hiza MM, Schneider DS. 2007 Confronting physiology: how do infected flies
529 die?: Confronting physiology: how do infected flies die? *Cellular Microbiology* **9**, 2775–
530 2783.
- 531 22. Lemaitre B, Kromer-Metzger E, Michaut L, Nicolas E, Meister M, Georgel P, Reichhart
532 JM, Hoffmann JA. 1995 A recessive mutation, immune deficiency (imd), defines two
533 distinct control pathways in the *Drosophila* host defense. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **92**,
534 9465–9.
- 535 23. Takehana A, Yano T, Mita S, Kotani A, Oshima Y, Kurata S. 2004 Peptidoglycan
536 recognition protein (PGRP)-LE and PGRP-LC act synergistically in *Drosophila*
537 immunity. *The EMBO Journal* **23**, 4690–4700.
- 538 24. Dermauw W, Wybouw N, Rombauts S, Menten B, Vontas J, Grbic M, Clark RM,
539 Feyereisen R, Van Leeuwen T. 2013 A link between host plant adaptation and
540 pesticide resistance in the polyphagous spider mite *Tetranychus urticae*. *Proc. Natl.*
541 *Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **110**, E113–122.
- 542 25. Conesa A, Götz S, García-Gómez JM, Terol J, Talón M, Robles M. 2005 Blast2GO: a
543 universal tool for annotation, visualization and analysis in functional genomics
544 research. *Bioinformatics* **21**, 3674–3676.
- 545 26. Read AF, Graham AL, Råberg L. 2008 Animal Defenses against Infectious Agents: Is
546 Damage Control More Important Than Pathogen Control? *PLoS Biology* **6**, e4.
- 547 27. Brandt SM, Dionne MS, Khush RS, Pham LN, Vigdal TJ, Schneider DS. 2004 Secreted
548 Bacterial Effectors and Host-Produced Eiger/TNF Drive Death in a *Salmonella*-
549 Infected Fruit Fly. *PLoS Biol* **2**, e418.
- 550 28. Buchon N, Broderick NA, Lemaitre B. 2013 Gut homeostasis in a microbial world:
551 insights from *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **11**, 615–626.
- 552 29. Myllymaki H, Valanne S, Ramet M. 2014 The *Drosophila* Imd Signaling Pathway. *The*
553 *Journal of Immunology* **192**, 3455–3462.

- 554 30. Zhang Y-K, Chen Y-T, Yang K, Qiao G-X, Hong X-Y. 2016 Screening of spider mites
555 (Acari: Tetranychidae) for reproductive endosymbionts reveals links between co-
556 infection and evolutionary history. *Scientific Reports* **6**, 27900.
- 557 31. Buchon N, Broderick NA, Poidevin M, Pradervand S, Lemaitre B. 2009 *Drosophila*
558 intestinal response to bacterial infection: activation of host defense and stem cell
559 proliferation. *Cell Host Microbe* **5**, 200–11.
- 560 32. Chakrabarti S, Liehl P, Buchon N, Lemaitre B. 2012 Infection-induced host
561 translational blockage inhibits immune responses and epithelial renewal in the
562 *Drosophila* gut. *Cell Host Microbe* **12**, 60–70.
- 563 33. Schmid-Hempel P. 2005 Evolutionary Ecology of Insect Immune defenses. *Annual*
564 *Review of Entomology* **50**, 529–551.
- 565 34. Aung KM *et al.* 2012 HSRB, a Class B Scavenger Receptor, Is Key to the Granulocyte-
566 Mediated Microbial Phagocytosis in Ticks. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e33504.
- 567 35. Lemaitre B, Nicolas E, Michaut L, Reichhart JM, Hoffmann JA. 1996 The dorsoventral
568 regulatory gene cassette *spatzle/Toll/cactus* controls the potent antifungal response
569 in *Drosophila* adults. *Cell* **86**, 973–83.
- 570 36. Ayres JS, Schneider DS. 2008 A signaling protease required for melanization in
571 *Drosophila* affects resistance and tolerance of infections. *PLoS Biol* **6**, 2764–73.
- 572 37. Kawabata S. 2010 Immunocompetent molecules and their response network in
573 horseshoe crabs. *Adv Exp Med Biol* **708**, 122–36.
- 574 38. Iwanaga S. 2002 The molecular basis of innate immunity in the horseshoe crab. *Curr.*
575 *Opin. Immunol.* **14**, 87–95.
- 576 39. Altincicek B, Braak B Ter, Laughton AM, Udekwu KI, Gerardo NM. 2011 *Escherichia*
577 *coli* K-12 pathogenicity in the pea aphid, *Acyrtosiphon pisum*, reveals reduced
578 antibacterial defense in aphids. *Dev. Comp. Immunol.* **35**, 1091–1097.
- 579 40. Braak B ter, Laughton AM, Altincicek B, Parker BJ, Gerardo NM. 2013 Exposure to
580 Bacterial Signals Does Not Alter Pea Aphids' Survival upon a Second Challenge or
581 Investment in Production of Winged Offspring. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e73600.
- 582 41. Scarborough CL, Ferrari J, Godfray HC. 2005 Aphid protected from pathogen by
583 endosymbiont. *Science* **310**, 1781.
- 584 42. Łukasik P, Guo H, van Asch M, Ferrari J, Godfray HCJ. 2013 Protection against a fungal
585 pathogen conferred by the aphid facultative endosymbionts *Rickettsia* and
586 *Spiroplasma* is expressed in multiple host genotypes and species and is not influenced
587 by co-infection with another symbiont. *J. Evol. Biol.* **26**, 2654–2661.
- 588 43. Oliver KM, Moran NA, Hunter MS. 2005 Variation in resistance to parasitism in aphids
589 is due to symbionts not host genotype. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **102**, 12795–800.
- 590 44. Ford SA, King KC. 2016 Harnessing the Power of Defensive Microbes: Evolutionary
591 Implications in Nature and Disease Control. *PLoS Pathogens* **12**, e1005465.
- 592 45. The International Aphid Genomics Consortium. 2010 Genome Sequence of the Pea
593 Aphid *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *PLoS Biology* **8**, e1000313.

- 594 46. Scott JG *et al.* 2014 Genome of the house fly, *Musca domestica* L., a global vector of
595 diseases with adaptations to a septic environment. *Genome Biol.* **15**, 466.
596 (doi:10.1186/s13059-014-0466-3)
- 597 47. Ferrandon D, Jung AC, Criqui M, Lemaitre B, Uttenweiler-Joseph S, Michaut L,
598 Reichhart J, Hoffmann JA. 1998 A drosomycin-GFP reporter transgene reveals a local
599 immune response in *Drosophila* that is not dependent on the Toll pathway. *EMBO J* **17**,
600 1217–27.
- 601 48. Tzou P, Ohresser S, Ferrandon D, Capovilla M, Reichhart JM, Lemaitre B, Hoffmann JA,
602 Imler JL. 2000 Tissue-specific inducible expression of antimicrobial peptide genes in
603 *Drosophila* surface epithelia. *Immunity* **13**, 737–48.
- 604 49. Ryu JH *et al.* 2008 Innate immune homeostasis by the homeobox gene *caudal* and
605 commensal-gut mutualism in *Drosophila*. *Science* **319**, 777–82.
- 606 50. Jing X, Wong AC-N, Chaston JM, Colvin J, McKenzie CL, Douglas AE. 2014 The bacterial
607 communities in plant phloem-sap-feeding insects. *Molecular Ecology* **23**, 1433–1444.
- 608 51. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1997 Multiple Hypotheses Testing with Weights.
609 *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **24**, 407–418.
- 610 52. Giorgino T. 2009 Computing and Visualizing Dynamic Time Warping Alignments in R:
611 The dtw Package. *Journal of Statistical Software* **31**, 1–24.
- 612 53. Charrad M, Ghazzali N, Boiteau V, Niknafs A. 2014 **NbClust** : An R Package for
613 Determining the Relevant Number of Clusters in a Data Set. *Journal of Statistical*
614 *Software* **61**.
- 615 54. Lane DJ. 1991 16S/23S rRNA sequencing. In *Nucleic Acid Techniques in Bacterial*
616 *Systematics* (eds E Stackebrandt, M Goodfellow), pp. 115–175. New York.: John Wiley
617 & Sons.

618

619

Figure legends

Figure 1 - Bacterial infection severely affects survival of *T. urticae*.

(a) *T. urticae* adult females were infected with *E. coli* at ODs 0.1, 1 and 10 and with LB as control. There is a clear reduction in survival of *T. urticae* after infection, independently of the bacteria concentration tested. (b) *T. urticae* adult females were infected with *B. megaterium* at ODs 0.1, 1 and 10, with LB and *E. coli* at OD 0.1 as controls. A reduction in the survival of *T. urticae* was observed after infection with *B. megaterium* with the two highest concentrations tested, but not for OD 0.1. In a) and b), vertical bars correspond to the standard errors of survival estimates, obtained from the Cox proportional hazards models. (c) Hazard ratios between *T. urticae* adults infected with LB or with bacteria (light grey – *B. megaterium*; dark grey – *E. coli*). Vertical bars correspond to the 95% confidence intervals of the estimated hazard ratios. ***P< 0,001.

Figure 2- Spider mites do not trigger an induced immune response against bacterial infection.

T. urticae adult females were infected with *E. coli*, *B. megaterium* and LB-buffer by an injection method and collected 3, 6 or 12 hours post infection (pi) to analyse the transcriptomic responses. Using non-injected mites as a reference, the relative transcription levels of the gene sets that showed significant differential expression in any time point of each bacterial and LB-control treatment was subjected to hierarchical clustering based on the distance calculated by dynamic time warping alignments. Resulting clusters were grouped of which the means (solid line) and

confidence interval (α : 0.05) (shaded regions) are shown for infections with *E. coli* (in red) (a) or *B. megaterium* (in green) (b) together with their respective LB-controls (in black).

Figure 3 – *Sancassania berlesei* can resist bacterial infection.

(a and b) *S. berlesei* adult females were infected with *E. coli* (a) or *B. megaterium* (b) at three concentrations or with LB as control and their survival was followed daily over 4 days. Bacterial infection decreased survival but to a lesser degree than that observed in *T. urticae*. In a) and b), vertical bars correspond to the standard errors of survival estimates, obtained from the Cox proportional hazards models. (c) Hazard ratios of *S. berlesei* adults injected with bacteria relative to LB injected controls. Vertical bars correspond to the 95% confidence intervals of the estimated hazard ratios. * $P < 0,05$; ** $P < 0,01$ and *** $P < 0,001$.


Figure 4 - *E. coli* proliferation in different species correlates with host survival patterns and gut microbiota size.

T. urticae, *D. melanogaster* and *S. berlesei* were infected with 5-100 CFUs of *E. coli* per individual and bacterial dynamics within the host was quantified daily for up to 4 days after infection. (a) In *T. urticae* an increase in the number of CFUs in living individuals was observed over the course of 2 days. At 3 days and 4 days (between brackets) only dead individuals were plated as there were no survivors, but the CFUs did not increase significantly. (b) For *S. berlesei* injection, the dynamics of *E. coli* growth was similar to that of *D. melanogaster*. (c) Gut microbiota is virtually absent in *T. urticae* as opposed to *S. berlesei*. Untreated mites (control) or treated with different protocols to remove

668 bacteria from their surface (sterilized), from their organism (rifampicin) and from both
669 their surface and organism (sterilized and rifampicin) were homogenized and plated on
670 a petri dish containing LB-Agar. *T. urticae* is colonized by 2 to 3 orders of magnitude
671 less bacteria than *S. berlesei*. *** $P < 0,001$.

672


673 *Figure 1*



674


675

676 *Figure 2*



677

678 *Figure 3*




679

680

681

682 *Figure 4*



683