

1 **Host species and environmental effects on bacterial communities associated**
2 **with *Drosophila* in the laboratory and in the natural environment**

3

4 Fabian Staubach^{1*}, John F. Baines², Sven Kuenzel², Elisabeth M. Bik³, and Dmitri A. Petrov¹

5 **1** Department of Biology, Stanford University, 371 Serra St, Stanford, California, 94305-5020,

6 United States of America, **2** Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, August-

7 Thienemann-Str. 2, 24306 Plön, Germany, **3** Department of Microbiology & Immunology,

8 Stanford School of Medicine, 269 Campus Drive, Stanford, California, 94305, United States of

9 America

10

11 key words: *Drosophila*, 16S, bacteria, microbial community, microbiota, 454

12

13 *corresponding author: Fabian Staubach, Department of Biology, Stanford University, 371 Serra

14 St, Stanford, California, 94305-5020, United States of America, phone: +1 (650) 736 2249, fax:

15 (650) 723 6132, email: fabians@stanford.edu

16

17 **Abstract**

18 The fruit fly *Drosophila* is a classic model organism to study adaptation as well as the

19 relationship between genetic variation and phenotypes. Although associated bacterial

20 communities might be important for many aspects of *Drosophila* biology, knowledge about their

21 diversity, composition, and factors shaping them is limited. We used 454-based sequencing of a

22 variable region of the bacterial 16S ribosomal RNA gene to characterize the bacterial

23 communities associated with wild and laboratory *Drosophila* isolates. In order to specifically

24 investigate effects of food source and host species on bacterial communities, we analyzed

25 samples from wild *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans* collected from a variety of natural

26 substrates, as well as from adults and larvae of nine laboratory-reared *Drosophila* species. We
27 find no evidence for host species effects in lab-reared flies, instead lab of origin and stochastic
28 effects, which could influence studies of *Drosophila* phenotypes, are pronounced. In contrast, the
29 natural *Drosophila*-associated microbiota appears to be predominantly shaped by food substrate
30 with an additional but smaller effect of host species identity. We identify a core member of this
31 natural microbiota that belongs to the genus *Gluconobacter* and is common to all wild-caught
32 flies in this study, but absent from the laboratory. This makes it a strong candidate for being part
33 of what could be a natural *D.melanogaster* and *D. simulans* core microbiome. Furthermore we
34 were able to identify candidate pathogens in natural fly isolates.

35

36 **Introduction**

37 Bacterial symbionts play important roles for metazoans covering the whole spectrum from
38 beneficial mutualists to infectious, disease-causing pathogens. Benefits that hosts derive from
39 mutualists are diverse and include extracting essential nutrients from food in humans [1],
40 breaking down cellulose in Ruminantia [2], and light production by *Vibrio fischeri* in the light
41 organs of the bobtail squid [3]. In arthropods, indigenous bacteria protect aphids from parasitoid
42 wasps [4], protect beewolf larvae from infectious disease [5], and keep leaf tissue of fallen leaves
43 photosynthetically active, providing larvae of leaf miner moths with nutrients [6]. Detrimental
44 effects microbes have on their hosts range from lethal disease [7] to changing the sex ratio of the
45 offspring in their favor [8].

46

47 Pathogens as well as mutualists not only interact with their hosts, but at the same time with other
48 members of the often diverse host associated microbial community [9]. Indirect evidence for
49 competition for ecological niches in the host comes from Staubach *et al.* [10] who found that the
50 lack of the glycosyltransferase B4galnt2 in mice leads to the replacement of bacterial taxa by
51 closely related taxa. Bakula [11] showed that *Escherichia coli* persists in *Drosophila* only when
52 monoxenic and is quickly replaced by other bacteria upon exposure suggesting that there is
53 competition between bacteria to colonize the fly. Ryu *et al.* [12] demonstrated that suppressing

54 the caudal gene by RNAi in *Drosophila* leads to replacement of an *Acetobacter* species by a
55 *Gluconobacter* species followed by strong pathological consequences. These examples indicate
56 that there is interaction and competition for ecological niches along the continuum of hosts and
57 microbes. Thus, a thorough understanding of host-microbe interactions also requires
58 comprehensive knowledge of host associated bacterial communities and the factors shaping
59 them.

60

61 These factors can roughly be grouped into two categories. The first category includes biotic and
62 abiotic environmental factors the host and its associated microbes are exposed to (e.g. diet). The
63 second category includes factors that are determined by host genetics. The relative importance of
64 these factors in shaping human associated microbial communities is a matter of recent debate
65 [13,14]. One approach to disentangle these effects is by studying the relationship of host genetic
66 divergence, diet, and divergence of microbial communities. A correlation of genetic divergence
67 between a set of host taxa and the divergence of their associated microbial communities would
68 suggest that genetic effects play a role in shaping these communities. On the other hand, a
69 correlation of microbial community composition with diet would suggest an effect of
70 environmental factors. This approach has been applied to a variety of mammals [15–17], but it
71 has proven difficult in mammals to control for diet and other environmental factors across host
72 taxa. Hence it is not yet clear, which factors are the strongest determinants of microbiota
73 composition.

74

75 In contrast to the complex microbial communities associated with mammals like humans and
76 mice, which are estimated to consist of hundreds or even thousands of taxa [10,18], some studies
77 suggest that only a handful of bacterial species dominate the microbial communities of
78 invertebrates [19,20]. This has turned a spotlight on *Drosophila* to serve as a simpler model for
79 understanding the complex interactions of hosts and their associated microbes [20–22]. The
80 *Drosophila* immune system is reasonably well understood [23] and the tractability of *Drosophila*
81 has helped to identify genes involved in specific interactions between host and microbes. This
82 includes genes underlying avoidance behavior towards harmful bacteria [24] and immune

83 defense [25] as well as interactions with commensals [26] and beneficial bacteria that prevent
84 pathogens from colonizing the host [12] or promote its growth [27,28].

85

86 As a first step in understanding the diversity of bacterial communities associated with
87 *Drosophila* it is important to investigate flies under natural conditions. Most studies conducted to
88 date focused on more specific interactions or those found in the lab [20,29], while few studies
89 described the natural diversity of fly associated bacterial communities. Cox and Gilmore [30]
90 included natural fly isolates and combined culture and culture-independent methods to
91 characterize fly associated microbial communities. Corby-Harris *et al.* [31] focused their study
92 on the diversity of microbial communities along latitudinal clines. Chandler *et al.* [32] conducted
93 the most comprehensive analysis of bacteria associated with *Drosophila* by sampling a range of
94 drosophilid flies from their natural food substrates. However, these studies were limited by either
95 throughput or dependence on cultivation [33]. Although Chandler *et al.* [32] sampled flies from
96 different natural substrates, their sampling scheme did not allow to directly disentangle host
97 species and diet effects on the natural microbiota because this requires replicated, pairwise
98 sampling of at least two host species from the identical substrate.

99

100 In order to understand bacterial communities associated with *Drosophila* and the factors shaping
101 their diversity, we investigated the relative effects of food substrate and fly species. Accordingly,
102 we analyzed *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* collected in pairs from different natural food
103 sources, as well as under controlled lab conditions. Furthermore, we assessed the communities of
104 nine lab-reared *Drosophila* species and their larvae to evaluate the influence of host genetic
105 background on a broad scale. These species were selected to span the *Drosophila* genus and
106 match the 12 species sequenced by Clark *et al.* [34] (*D. melanogaster*, *D. simulans*, *D. sechellia*,
107 *D. yakuba*, *D. erecta*, *D. pseudoobscura*, *D. persimilis*, *D. virilis*, *D. mojavensis*).

108

109 **Results**

110 In order to profile *Drosophila*-associated bacterial communities we amplified and sequenced
111 ~300 bp (base pairs) of the 16S rRNA gene (see Materials and Methods) spanning the variable

112 regions V1 and V2. Three types of fly isolates were used in our study. The samples are listed in
113 Table 1. First, species-pairs of wild-caught *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* samples were
114 collected from different substrates (oranges, strawberries, apples, peaches, compost) at multiple
115 locations on the East and West Coast of the USA. Within each sample pair, *D. melanogaster* and
116 *D. simulans* individuals were collected at the same location, time, and substrate (mostly by
117 aspiration of individual flies from the same fruit), thereby controlling for environmental
118 variables to the extent possible in the field. This allowed us to study the effects of both, substrate
119 and host species on the composition of bacterial communities independently of each other.
120 Second, we included isofemale, wild-derived strains of *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* that
121 were reared in the Petrov lab for ~3 years after collection. Third, a variety of *Drosophila* species
122 from the UCSD Stock Center was chosen to complement the analysis. We primarily focused on
123 adults, but also studied bacterial communities in larvae of the lab-reared strains. We analyzed a
124 total of ~340,000 sequences that matched our quality criteria (see Materials and Methods).
125 ~130,000 sequences matched the *Wolbachia* 16S rRNA gene and were excluded from the
126 analysis. For Petrov lab *D. simulans* sample 6, removal of *Wolbachia* sequences led to a very
127 low number of remaining sequences (18 sequences). Therefore, we excluded this sample from
128 further analysis (Supplementary Table 1 lists the total number of sequences and the proportion of
129 *Wolbachia* sequences for each sample).

130

131 Diversity of bacterial communities associated with *Drosophila*

132 For assessing the *Drosophila* associated bacterial diversity in general, we grouped all sequences
133 into 97% identity operational taxonomic units (OTUs) and calculated inverted Simpson diversity
134 indices [35]. Rarefaction curves are plotted in Figure 1. Bacterial communities associated with
135 lab-reared flies are strikingly less diverse than those of wild-caught flies ($P = 2.9 \times 10^{-5}$,
136 Wilcoxon test on Simpson diversity index), indicating a bias towards a few dominant species in
137 the lab compared to more complex and species-rich communities of wild-caught flies. However,
138 substantial variance of community diversity was found between individual samples from lab-
139 reared flies. While bacterial diversity in 14 out of 20 lab-reared fly samples is lower than in all
140 wild-caught samples, the diversity of lab-reared *D. erecta*, *D. persimilis*, *D. sechellia*, *D. virilis*,

141 and Petrov lab *D. melanogaster* sample 3 (m.pet3 in Table 1) lies within the range of wild-caught
142 samples. The diversity observed in Petrov lab *D. melanogaster* sample 6 (m.pet6) is even higher
143 than in wild-caught flies and its community composition appears to differ from the other Petrov
144 lab samples (Figure 2C). Because this sample was unusual, we conducted all of the subsequent
145 analyses with and without this sample, but did not notice any qualitative differences (data not
146 shown). All of the analyses described below that include lab-reared samples also include this
147 sample.

148

149 Comparing estimates of species richness and diversity from our study to estimates from lab-
150 reared flies in Wong *et al.* [20] supports the notion that bacterial communities of lab-reared flies
151 are less species rich (Table 2). Our species richness estimates from wild-caught flies are more
152 than twice as high on average (43 vs 19, $P < 0.001$), if we exclude all OTUs that contain fewer
153 than 10 sequences from our data as in Wong *et al.* [20]. Bacterial diversity, as measured by
154 Shannon's diversity index, is also significantly higher in wild-caught flies ($P < 0.01$) from this
155 study. We also compared the bacterial community diversity in this study to that observed in
156 previous studies of wild-caught *Drosophila* bacterial communities, namely Corby-Harris *et al.*
157 [31], Cox and Gilmore [30], and Chandler *et al.* [32]. A comparison of diversity indices among
158 studies is provided in Table 2. Estimated species-richness is more than seven times higher in our
159 study compared to all other studies ($P < 0.001$, Student's T-test). However, limiting our data
160 artificially to 100 sequences per sample, which is well within the range of the sequencing depth
161 of the above studies, results in an average Chao's richness estimate of 22 species. This is not
162 significantly different from the richness estimates of the other studies on wild-caught flies,
163 implying that different sequencing depths are responsible for the different species richness
164 estimates. When we limit our sample size to 100 sequences to make our study more comparable
165 to the clone library data from Cox and Gilmore [30] and Chandler *et al.* [32] we find values for
166 Shannon's diversity index that are similar and even a bit higher ($P < 0.001$, Student's T-test) in
167 these two studies. Note that direct comparison of diversity between studies is difficult due to
168 different sample preparations (whole flies, fly guts, washing procedure), sequencing depths, and
169 different regions of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene that were used for the analysis (see Table 2).

170

171 Bacterial community composition

172 In order to examine which bacterial taxa are associated with *Drosophila*, we classified the 16S
173 rRNA gene sequences by aligning them to the SILVA reference database [36] using MOTHUR
174 [37]. The results are summarized in Figure 2. Our results show that, on the family level, the
175 combined communities are dominated by Acetobacteraceae (55.3%) and Lactobacillaceae
176 (31.7%) (Figure 2A). Leuconostocaceae (3.8%), Enterobacteriaceae (3.3%) and Enterococcaceae
177 (1.9%) are less abundant. All five of these families are known to be associated with *Drosophila*
178 [6,32] including certain *Drosophila* pathogenic *Enterococcus* strains. The remaining sequences
179 (~3.9%) are low abundance families mainly belonging to the Proteobacteria.

180

181 In addition to the differences in overall diversity described above, different bacterial genera
182 dominate the communities of lab-reared and wild-caught flies (Figure 2B). The dominant genera
183 also vary sharply between flies from the Petrov lab and the UCSD Stock Center. Specifically,
184 communities associated with wild-caught flies are dominated by *Gluconobacter* (39.3% average
185 relative abundance), *Acetobacter* (25.5%), and an enteric bacteria cluster (10.4%) that is mainly
186 comprised of *Pectobacterium* (4.8% of total average relative abundance), *Serratia* (3.5%),
187 *Erwinia* (1.3%), and *Brenneria* (0.5%). In contrast, *Gluconobacter* and the enteric bacteria
188 cluster are virtually absent from our lab-reared flies (<0.001 and <0.1%). *Acetobacter* is
189 extremely common in UCSD Stock Center lab-reared flies (72.7%), but comprises only 1.2% of
190 the bacterial communities in flies from the Petrov lab. On the other hand, *Lactobacillus*
191 contributes a substantial fraction of sequences in lab-reared flies (60.4% in Petrov lab, 19.1%
192 UCSD Stock Center) while playing only a minor role in wild-caught flies (0.5%). In addition,
193 *Leuconostoc* is common in the Petrov lab (28.0%) but rare (1%) in wild-caught flies and the
194 UCSD Stock Center (<1%). Inspection of individual samples revealed that the relative
195 abundance of *Leuconostoc* is highly variable across *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*. In Petrov
196 lab flies, relative abundance ranges from 87.6% and 84.5% in samples m.pet1 and s.pet1,
197 respectively, to being undetectable in m.pet4, m.pet5, s.pet2, and s.pet5 (Figure 2C).

198

199 In addition to differences in broad patterns of community composition, we also detected two
200 wild-caught samples dominated by genera that are rare overall: 80.3% of all sequences in the *D.*
201 *melanogaster* sample m.ora1 collected from oranges were classified as *Enterococcus* (80.3%),
202 while the sample m.str collected from strawberries has a high prevalence of *Providencia*
203 (26.3%). The relative abundance of *Enterococcus* is smaller than 0.5% in all other wild-caught
204 samples. *Providencia* was detected in only three other samples at a relative abundance smaller
205 than or equal to 1%.

206

207 Intriguingly, 92% (1165 sequences) of all *Providencia* sequences from sample m.str are identical,
208 suggesting the presence of a single, high-frequency *Providencia* strain in m.str. The highly
209 prevalent sequence from sample m.str is 100% identical to the sequence of *P. alcalifaciens* from
210 Juneja and Lazzaro [38], while it differs from all other *Providencia* sequences in [38] by at least
211 two positions (Figure 3A). *P. alcalifaciens* was shown to be highly virulent in *D. melanogaster*
212 [7] causing the highest mortality amongst all strains tested and reaching cell counts of up to 10^6
213 colony forming units per fly.

214

215 By grouping all sequences into 97% identity OTUs we sought to obtain a more detailed picture
216 of bacterial community composition. Figure 3B depicts the relative abundance of the ten most
217 abundant OTUs across all samples. A single OTU classified as *Gluconobacter* is common among
218 all wild-caught flies (34.7% average relative abundance, OTU 25), but completely absent from
219 lab-reared flies. Even in the wild-caught fly sample m.ora1 that is dominated by an *Enterococcus*
220 OTU (OTU 60) this *Gluconobacter* OTU represents 8.9% of all non-*Enterococcus* sequences.
221 Because this OTU is common in all wild-caught flies, and specific to wild-caught flies, it is a
222 strong candidate for being a member of the *Drosophila* core microbiome in nature. Three
223 *Acetobacter* OTUs are also common in wild-caught flies (OTUs 26, 23, and 29). However, these
224 OTUs are rare in flies collected from oranges and OTU 26 is also prevalent in lab-reared flies
225 from the UCSD Stock Center. In lab-reared flies, especially flies from the Petrov lab, three
226 *Lactobacillus* OTUs are common (OTU 28, 22, and 35). The abundance of these OTUs is highly
227 variable between samples, with one dominant OTU (OTU 28) that is common in most Petrov lab

228 samples, while the other two OTUs are at high frequency in the larval samples mpet1_1 (OTU
229 22) and m.pet6_1 (OTU 35). The second most common *Acetobacter* OTU (OTU 38) is common
230 only in the UCSD Stock Center samples and larval sample s.pet3_1. In UCSD samples, this
231 OTU is strongly negatively correlated with OTU 26 ($P = 2.9 \times 10^{-5}$, $r^2 = 0.64$), which was also
232 classified as *Acetobacter*.

233

234 The composition of bacterial communities associated with flies differ between laboratories and 235 the wild

236 In order to further explore the factors shaping the observed variation in bacterial communities
237 between lab-reared and wild-caught flies, we carried out a Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA)
238 using pairwise Jaccard distances. Jaccard distances compare the number of OTUs that are shared
239 between two communities to the total number in both communities, with a smaller proportion of
240 shared OTUs leading to an increased Jaccard distance. Jaccard distance analysis requires that the
241 same number of sequences is used in each sample. This is because samples that contain more
242 sequences are more likely to include low frequency OTUs that can appear private to that sample
243 and inflate Jaccard distances. We therefore *in silico* capped the number of sequence reads per
244 sample to a common number by subsampling. In order to test for potential stochastic effects of
245 subsampling on our results, we analyzed 1000 bootstraps of the subsampling for all PCoAs
246 presented.

247

248 Figure 4A shows the position of all samples analyzed in this study relative to the first two PCos.
249 PCo1 explains 16.1% of the variation and separates wild-caught, Petrov lab, and UCSD Stock
250 Center communities from each other ($P < 5.4 \times 10^{-15}$ and $r^2 = 0.79$, ANOVA, 100% of bootstraps P
251 $< 1.9 \times 10^{-11}$). PCo2 explains 9.9% of the variation and separates wild-caught from lab-reared
252 flies ($P < 2 \times 10^{-16}$ and $r^2 = 0.87$, ANOVA, 100% of bootstraps $P < 9.3 \times 10^{-13}$). These results
253 suggest that Petrov lab, UCSD Stock Center, and wild-caught flies all have their own distinct
254 bacterial communities.

255

256 Similarity between larval and adult samples from the same laboratory further underscores the

257 importance of the origin of the flies (Petrov lab, UCSD Stock Center) for the composition of
258 their associated microbiota. The only exception is Petrov lab *D. simulans* larval sample 3
259 (s.pet3_1), which grouped closer to the UCSD samples in Figure 4A and has a more UCSD-like
260 community dominated by *Acetobacter* (Figure 2C).

261

262 Communities of wild-caught flies differ by substrate and between *D. melanogaster* and *D.*
263 *simulans*

264 We analyzed paired samples of wild-caught *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* isolated from five
265 different natural substrates (oranges, apples, peaches, strawberries, and compost) in order to
266 elucidate the influence of substrate on fly-associated bacterial communities in the wild. Figure
267 4B shows a PCoA including only wild-caught *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* samples.

268 Communities of flies collected from oranges at three different sampling locations are clearly
269 separated from the remaining samples by PCo1 ($P = 0.00017$, $r^2 = 0.71$, ANOVA, 100% of
270 bootstraps $P < 0.008$). PCo2 separates bacterial communities from the flies collected from the
271 compost pile and those from the flies collected from the fruit substrates ($P < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.61$,
272 ANOVA, 98.1% of bootstraps $P < 0.05$), indicating that food substrate or a variable correlated
273 with food substrate is an important factor shaping fly-associated bacterial communities.

274 Interestingly, communities of flies from strawberries, apples and peaches are relatively similar
275 irrespective of sampling location. Flies from strawberries were collected from a sampling
276 location on the West coast of the US while flies from apples and peaches were collected on the
277 East Coast of the US.

278

279 While the first two PCos in the PCoA of wild-caught flies (Figure 4B) reflect differences related
280 to food substrate, PCo3, PCo4, and PCo5 reveal a more subtle, but significant difference between
281 the communities associated with the two fly species. In 78% of all subsampling bootstraps, we
282 found a significant difference (ANOVA $P < 0.05$) between *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*
283 associated microbial communities along these PCos (Supplementary Figure 1). This represents a
284 significant enrichment of low p-values ($P < 4.9 \times 10^{-149}$, Chi-squared test). An example from
285 these bootstraps, in which PCo3 differentiates between *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*, is

286 given in Figure 4C ($P = 0.0011$, $r^2 = 0.60$, ANOVA). We do not detect such a difference between
287 lab-reared *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* (data not shown).

288

289 **Discussion**

290 In this study we focused primarily on understanding the factors that shape *Drosophila*-associated
291 bacterial communities, with an emphasis on the relative roles of environmental and host species
292 effects. In order to disentangle environmental from host species effects, we collected and
293 compared sample pairs of *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* from the same natural substrates. We
294 extended this approach by analyzing these two species under controlled laboratory conditions.
295 Finally, in order to generalize our results, we also analyzed a set of host species spanning the
296 *Drosophila* phylogeny. A correlation between genetic distance of different fly species and the
297 dissimilarity of their bacterial communities under controlled conditions would be an indication
298 that genetic differences between host species could play a role in shaping fly bacterial
299 communities. Therefore, we extracted bacterial DNA from whole flies by carrying out extensive
300 tissue homogenization. The bacterial load on the fly surface is known to be ~10 times lower than
301 the interior load [29]. Therefore, the influence of external bacteria on the total community
302 composition is expected to be rather minor. Additionally, our focus on the total bacteria
303 associated with the whole fly, and not only the intestinal tract, was motivated by the belief that
304 bacteria associated with fly surfaces might play important roles in shaping the fly environment.
305 This is supported by Ren *et al.* [29] who found acetic acid bacteria accumulating in bristled areas
306 on the fly surface, likely forming biofilms and by Barata *et al.* [33] who demonstrated that
307 damaged grapes do not acquire acetic acid bacteria when insects, particularly *Drosophila*, are
308 physically excluded. We therefore do not expect the These acetic acid bacteria could very well
309 be transported on the fly surface. Note that even though we aspirated flies from individual fruit
310 and attempted to associate bacterial communities with the substrate, we likely sampled bacterial
311 communities that the fly has acquired during its life span. This includes bacteria from the
312 particular fruit from which it was sampled, but could also include bacteria potentially from prior
313 locations.

314

315 Factors shaping natural fly associated communities

316 We determined that substrate or a strongly correlated variable is the most important factor
317 shaping bacterial communities in wild-caught flies. Diet has been previously suggested as a
318 major determinant of bacterial community composition in mammals [14,15,39] and flies [32] and
319 our results agree with these findings. The most distinct bacterial communities were associated
320 with flies collected from oranges. Oranges contain citric acid and might have a lower pH than
321 other substrates. Furthermore, orange peel contains essential oils that have bactericidal properties
322 that might influence the bacterial community composition [40]. Although the substrate appears to
323 be a plausible factor shaping the communities here, we cannot disentangle its effects from
324 seasonal effects (e.g. temperature, humidity). This is because we collected flies from different
325 substrates at different times of the year when the respective fruit were ripe.

326

327 We carefully sampled *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* across different sites and substrates in
328 nature which allowed us to disentangle environmental effects from host species effects on
329 microbial community composition. We found evidence that host fly species identity (*D.*
330 *melanogaster* vs. *D. simulans*) detectably influences the associated microbial communities, but
331 that the effect is subtle. Although our power comparing lab-reared *D. melanogaster* and *D.*
332 *simulans* might be lower because of smaller sample size and restriction to fewer sequences,
333 mainly due to high *Wolbachia* prevalence in some lab-reared samples, it is intriguing that this
334 host species effect is detectable only in the wild and could not be detected in lab-reared flies.
335 Moreover, while we detected differences between two closely related sister species in the wild,
336 we could not detect any differences for nine substantially more divergent *Drosophila* species in
337 the lab. We found no correspondence of distances between bacterial communities and genetic
338 distances between nine lab-reared fly species, unlike Ochman *et al.* [16] and Ley *et al.* [15], who
339 found this correlation in primates and other mammals. Taken together these findings imply that
340 the effects of host species on microbial communities are rather subtle in drosophilids and/or need
341 natural environmental conditions to manifest themselves.

342

343 The observed difference between *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* microbial communities
344 might be caused by a variety of host-associated factors, such as arrival times at fruit [41,42], age
345 distributions in the wild (Emily Behrman and Paul Schmidt, University of Pennsylvania,
346 personal communication), or host genetic differences [12,25,43].

347

348 Composition of bacterial communities in the lab and in the wild

349 PCoA revealed that, in concordance with earlier studies [30,32], bacterial communities
350 associated with *Drosophila* differ sharply between different laboratories and between
351 laboratories and the wild. Interestingly, bacteria from different genera, but with similar metabolic
352 properties, dominate the communities of wild-caught, Petrov lab, and UCSD Stock Center flies.
353 *Gluconobacter* species are the most prevalent bacteria in wild-caught flies in our study. This is in
354 accordance with Corby-Harris *et al.* [31], who also find abundant *Gluconobacter* sequences in
355 wild-caught flies, but different from Chandler *et al.* [32] who find a smaller fraction of
356 *Gluconobacter* sequences. More than 90% of all *Gluconobacter* sequences in our study can be
357 grouped into a single OTU that is common in all wild-caught flies. In contrast, *Gluconobacter* is
358 almost absent from the lab strains. Thus, this OTU is a strong candidate for being a major
359 member of a core microbiome that is shared among and specific to wild-caught *D. melanogaster*
360 and *D. simulans*. *Gluconobacter* belongs to the same family (Acetobacteraceae) as *Acetobacter*,
361 which is also common in wild-caught flies with the exception of flies from oranges that carry
362 less *Acetobacter*. *Acetobacter* is also the most prevalent genus in flies from the UCSD Stock
363 Center and has very similar metabolic capabilities. Both genera, *Gluconobacter* and *Acetobacter*,
364 oxidize sugars and alcohol to acetic acid, and tolerate low pH as well as high ethanol
365 concentrations [44]. Acetic acid bacteria have been reported to occur in association with many
366 insect species and a role as important symbionts has been postulated by Crotti *et al.* [45].
367 Lactobacilli, which are at high prevalence in Petrov lab flies, tolerate low pH and high ethanol
368 concentrations as well, but instead oxidize sugars to lactic acid [46]. The high prevalence of
369 bacteria with similar metabolic capabilities, tolerance of low pH, and high ethanol concentrations
370 strongly suggests that there is environmental selection for these bacterial groups. Rotting fruit,

371 the most important natural substrate for *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* in our study, contain
372 high amounts of sugar and are known to be colonized by a variety of ethanol producing yeasts
373 [47]. Yeasts can produce high alcohol concentrations, thereby generating a nutrient rich
374 environment for acetic acid or lactic acid producing bacteria (Acetobacteraceae and
375 Lactobacillaceae), while inhibiting the growth of those less tolerant to alcohol. The production of
376 these acids selects for acid tolerant microorganisms including the microorganisms that produced
377 the acids in the first place. This suggests that environmental selection [48] is an important factor
378 for the observed prevalence of these bacteria.

379

380 Interestingly bacteria of the genus *Lactobacillus*, which have been associated with effects on
381 *Drosophila* growth [28] and even assortative mating [49], are prevalent only in the lab in our
382 study. Sixty percent of all sequences from Petrov lab flies, and 19% of all sequences obtained
383 from UCSD Stock Center flies are *Lactobacillus*. In most wild-caught samples *Lactobacillus*
384 represented less than 1% of all sequences. This finding is corroborated by results from Chandler
385 *et al.* [32], who find an increase of the proportion of *Lactobacillus* species in lab-reared flies.
386 Thus, while studying the effects of *Lactobacillus* on drosophilids in the laboratory is useful as a
387 general model for insect-microbe interactions, its relevance to *Drosophila* in nature may be
388 limited.

389

390 In contrast to Chandler *et al.* [32], who found that Enterobacteriaceae from group Orbus are
391 highly prevalent in *Drosophila*, these bacteria are absent or at very low frequency in our samples
392 (not amongst the best BLAST hits for any of the 100 most abundant OTUs in our data set). We
393 can only speculate about the reasons for this difference here. One possibility might be an
394 epidemic of Orbus group bacteria in 2007 and 2008, when Chandler *et al.* [32] collected their
395 samples.

396

397 Given the strong effect of food substrates that we observed in wild *Drosophila*, similar effects
398 might play a role in lab-reared flies. Differences in the provided food substrates between
399 laboratories might therefore lead to differences in communities. For example, we provide our

400 flies with a corn meal molasses diet, whereas the Stock Center uses sugar instead of molasses. In
401 addition, our food contains Tegosept(r) to reduce microbial growth, while this ingredient is only
402 optional at UCSD. Intriguingly, Chandler *et al.* [32] found that fly-associated bacterial
403 communities differed between labs at UC Davis despite using the same food from the same
404 kitchen, suggesting that other factors are involved as well. Candidate explanations would involve
405 ecological drift, which is likely to be stronger in the laboratory, and priority effects [42,50,51]. A
406 potential role of stochastic drift processes and priority effects is supported by the notion that the
407 occurrence of the two major *Acetobacter* OTUs (OTU 26 and 38) in the UCSD Stock Center flies
408 is strongly antagonistic. This is in accordance with a model in which one of the OTUs quickly
409 occupies an ecological niche and excludes its ecologically similar, close relative.

410

411 Bacterial communities of lab-reared flies are highly variable in diversity and composition within
412 and between laboratories in this study. Because fly phenotypes are influenced by bacteria
413 [27,28,52], this bacterial variation can add to the variance of phenotypic traits. This makes it
414 more difficult to detect genetic variation underlying phenotypic traits and reduces reproducibility
415 between laboratories. The presence of a certain microbiota might also lead to unwanted results in
416 genetic trait mapping: Genetic variation that is attributed to directly underlie a phenotypic trait
417 might indeed interact with microbes that influence this trait instead, thus influencing the trait
418 only indirectly. Monitoring of microbial communities during experiments in which phenotypes
419 are measured could be a means to approach these difficulties.

420

421 Species richness of lab-reared and wild-caught *Drosophila* associated bacterial communities

422 Although diversity varies strongly across different samples from lab-reared flies, their bacterial
423 communities are on average less diverse than those of wild-caught. This has been reported
424 previously [30,32,53].

425

426 The three most plausible explanations for this pattern in our study are: (i) laboratory fly food is
427 highly homogeneous and contains antimicrobial preservatives, propionic acid and Tegosept(r) in
428 our case, which inhibit bacterial growth and likely reduce bacterial diversity, (ii) the transfer of

429 flies to vials with fresh food during stock keeping could lead to ecological drift [50], which
430 reduces diversity in the long run due to potential loss of taxa, (iii) while there is a
431 constant influx of new bacteria into natural fly habitats, e.g. from other insects or via aerial
432 transport, this influx is limited by cotton-sealed vials used in *Drosophila* husbandry.

433

434 It is known that species richness is often overestimated using pyrosequencing approaches (e.g.
435 [54]). We applied rigorous quality filtering and Chimera detection (see Materials and Methods)
436 and used an OTU threshold of 97% identity which is thought to be robust against sequencing and
437 PCR errors [54]. Although we take all these measures, we can not exclude that we are still
438 overestimating the diversity in our samples. On the other hand overly stringent removal of
439 sequences might make us miss important aspects of microbial communities [55].

440

441 Potential fly pathogens

442 The bacterial communities of certain wild-caught fly isolates contained potential *Drosophila*
443 pathogens at high frequencies. In one sample of *D. melanogaster* from strawberries, more than
444 25% of all sequences were identical to those of *P. alcalifaciens* whereas *Providencia* is absent or
445 at very low frequency in all other samples. This bacterium is known to be highly virulent in fruit
446 flies [7], but reaches high bacterial loads in flies usually only when flies are systemically infected
447 (personal communication, Brian Lazzaro, Cornell University). *Enterococcus* was present at high
448 abundance in one *D. melanogaster* orange sample 1 (m.ora1, 80.3%), but virtually absent from
449 all other samples. *Enterococcus* species were previously found to be associated with *D.*
450 *melanogaster* [32] and are highly prevalent in the lab-reared flies studied by Cox and Gilmore
451 [30]. These authors showed that *Enterococcus* can reach densities of 10^5 colony forming units
452 per fly, causing severe disease symptoms and high mortality. This compares to a total of $\sim 10^4$
453 colony forming units including all bacterial species in healthy flies [29,30].

454

455 The presence of these disease-associated genera in individual samples, and their absence or near
456 absence from other samples suggests that one or more flies were systemically infected in the
457 samples that showed a high relative abundance of the disease associated genus . Thus, detection

458 of infections with potential pathogens in natural fly populations seems possible by bacterial 16S
459 rRNA gene sequencing. Hence, 16S rRNA sequencing could be a powerful means for the
460 epidemiological monitoring of bacterial pathogens.

461

462 **Conclusion**

463 We show that under natural conditions the bacterial communities associated with *Drosophila*
464 correlate mainly with the substrate the flies have been collected from and to a smaller extent with
465 fly species. Despite appreciable effort, we did not find evidence for host species effects on the
466 bacterial communities under controlled laboratory conditions. Instead, laboratory of origin and
467 stochastic effects on microbial communities are pronounced in the laboratory. This suggests that
468 host genetic effects, as represented by genetic differences between the fly species in this study,
469 might be rather small or absent in the lab, while there is potential for such effects under natural
470 conditions. Furthermore, we find that acetic acid producing bacteria (Acetobacteracea) are
471 ubiquitous symbionts of *Drosophila* in nature. Intriguingly, it has been shown both that *D.*
472 *melanogaster* promotes dispersal and establishment of these bacteria [33] and that the presence
473 of acetic acid bacteria can have beneficial effects on *D. melanogaster* larval growth and
474 development time [27]. Together these findings suggest that *D. melanogaster* and its siblings
475 transport and establish the acetic acid bacteria on the substrates, which might modify these
476 substrates in ways beneficial to the flies and their offspring. We speculate that the microbial
477 community associated with *Drosophila* can be seen as an external organ of the fly holobiont [56]
478 in a similar way that the human gut flora has been referred to as the "forgotten organ" [57].

479

480 **Materials and Methods**

481 Fly samples

482 *D. sechellia* (4021 0248.27), *D. erecta* (14021 0224.00), *D. yakuba* (14021 0261.01), *D.*
483 *persimilis* (14011-0111.49), *D. pseudoobscura* (14011-0121.148), *D. mojavensis* (15081-1351.30)
484 and *D. virilis* (15010-1051.00) were obtained from the UCSD Stock Center as well as one
485 additional *D. melanogaster* (14021-0231.131) and one *D. simulans* (14021-0251.250) strain.
486 The UCSD Stock Center strain ID numbers are in parentheses.

487 Petrov lab *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* were originally collected in Portland, OR and San
488 Diego, CA in 2008 and lab-reared on standard molasses corn meal diet for ~3 years (27g Agar,
489 75g corn meal, 200ml molasses, 42g dry active yeast, 40ml Tegosept, 15ml propionic acid, in
490 2.8l deionized water). Note that the food is boiled for 20 minutes killing most of the microbes in
491 the food and that Tegosept is added after cooling down to prevent excessive microbial growth.
492 We used flies from six independently acquired isofemale lines from each fly species (m.pet1-6
493 and s.pet 1-6). All lines were kept under the same conditions and on the same food, but in
494 independent vials. DNA extractions and library preparations, were performed independently for
495 each line.

496

497 All adult lab-reared flies were transferred to fresh Petrov lab food vials 24 hours prior to DNA
498 extraction. Petrov lab flies were taken from culture vials in the Petrov lab and placed on fresh
499 food 24 hours prior extraction. UCSD Stock Center flies were taken from the vials we received
500 from the Stock Center and placed on fresh Petrov lab food 24 hours prior extraction.

501

502 Wild *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* from rotting apples, peaches, and a compost pile were
503 collected in an orchard on the East coast of the USA (Johnston, RI) in August 2010. Flies from
504 oranges were collected from three locations in the Central Valley of California USA: at a location
505 close to Brentwood, at a site East of Manteca, and a site in Escalon in February and March 2011.
506 Flies from strawberries were collected close to Waterford, CA in May 2011. All sampling sites
507 were at least 10km apart from each other. In most cases pairs of *D. melanogaster* and *D.*
508 *simulans* were picked from the same individual fruit. Otherwise, flies were selected from the
509 same type of fruit in close proximity. Flies were transported to the lab alive, in empty vials. On
510 hot days, flies were slightly chilled using ice or car A/C. All flies were brought back to the lab
511 within 5 hours of collection. Males of *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* were identified by
512 genital morphology and stored at -80°C until DNA extraction. Flies from Johnston, RI were
513 shipped on dry ice to the Petrov lab for DNA extraction.

514

515 For the collection of larval samples from lab-reared flies, adult flies were transferred to fresh

516 Petrov lab food vials for two days and then removed from the vial again. Vials containing eggs
517 were kept at room temperature until larvae started to crawl out of the food for pupation. Larvae
518 leaving the food and larvae of the same size that were still in the food were regarded third instar
519 larvae and collected for DNA extraction. Excess food was removed from the larvae by
520 transferring them to a microcentrifuge tube containing 500µl PBS (pH 7.4), vortexing for 3
521 seconds, and then discarding the liquid. The larval samples correspond to the adult flies i.e. the
522 sample named m.pet1_1 was collected from the same isofemale line as m.pet1 using the
523 procedure described above.

524

525 DNA Extraction and PCR

526 DNA was extracted from pools of five males, with the exception of *D. simulans* orange sample 1
527 (s.ora1) and *D. melanogaster* orange sample 3 (m.ora3), for both of which we were able to
528 retrieve three males only. Larval samples included three third instar larvae per sample. DNA
529 extraction was performed using the Qiagen QIAamp DNA extraction kit (Qiagen, Carlsbad, CA)
530 following the manufacturer's protocol with the following modifications: Flies/larvae were
531 incubated in buffer ATL containing proteinase K at 56°C for 30 min to soften and predigest the
532 exoskeleton. Digestion was then interrupted by 3 minutes of bead beating on a BioSpec Mini
533 Bead Beater 96 with glass beads 0.1mm, 0.5mm, and 1mm in size (BioSpec, Bartlesville, OK),
534 followed by another 30 min of incubation at 56°C. After addition of lysis buffer AL samples
535 were incubated 30min at 70°C and 10min at 95°C. The remaining extraction procedure was
536 performed according to the manufacturer's protocol. Extraction controls were run in parallel with
537 all samples to monitor contamination. Broad range primers (27F and 338R) were fused to
538 identification tags and the 454 sequencing primers to amplify a fragment spanning the variable
539 regions V1 and V2 of the bacterial ribosomal 16S rRNA gene. The primer sequences are (5'-
540 CTATGCGCCTTGCCAGCCCGCTCAGTCAGAGTTTGATCCTGGCTCAG-3') and reverse (5
541 '-CGTATCGCCTCCCTCGCGCCATCAGXXXXXXXXXXCATGCTGCCTCCCGTAGGAGT-
542 3'). The Xs are a placeholder for identification tags (Multiplex Identifiers, MIDs); a different tag
543 was used for each amplification reaction. Primers 27F and 338R are underlined. DNA was
544 amplified using Phusion® Hot Start DNA Polymerase (Finnzymes, Espoo, Finland) and the

545 following cycling conditions: 30 sec at 98°C; 35 cycles of 9 sec at 98°C, 30 sec at 55°C, and 30
546 sec at 72°C; final extension for 10 min at 72°C). In order to reduce PCR bias, amplification
547 reactions were performed in duplicate and pooled. In order to reduce the number of *Wolbachia*
548 amplicons, PCR products were restriction digested with 2µl FastDigest® BstZ17 (Fermentas,
549 Glen Burnie, MD) at 37°C for 30 min. BstZ17 was selected to specifically cut *Wolbachia*
550 sequences close to the middle of the amplified region. Reaction products were run on an agarose
551 gel, extracted using the Qiagen MinElute Gel Extraction Kit and quantified with the Quant-iT™
552 dsDNA BR Assay Kit on a NanoDrop 3300 Fluorometer. Equimolar amounts of purified PCR
553 product from each sample were pooled and further purified using Ampure Beads (Agencourt).
554 The pool was run on an Agilent Bioanalyzer prior to emulsion PCR for final quantification.
555 Resulting PCR products were run on a 454 sequencer using Titanium Chemistry. A set of
556 samples was extracted using a FastPrep FP120 bead beater (Qbiogene, Carlsbad, CA). These
557 samples include *D. erecta*, *D. yakuba*, *D. sechellia* from the UCSD Stock Center, and wild-
558 caught samples collected in Johnston, RI. These samples were sequenced twice, with and without
559 the BstZ17 digest. Relative abundance of bacterial taxa correlated strongly between the two
560 procedures for these samples after removal of *Wolbachia* reads (mean $r^2 = 0.94$). Therefore, we
561 pooled the sequencing reads obtained with and without the digest to get a higher sequencing
562 depth per sample.

563

564 Amplicons from samples with a high *Wolbachia* load were often so effectively digested that the
565 final DNA yield was too small for library preparation. In order to have enough PCR-product for
566 library construction, we shortened digestion time for amplicons from these samples to 5 minutes,
567 resulting in an incomplete digest. Predictably, these samples yielded a high percentage of
568 *Wolbachia* sequences after the incomplete digest.

569

570 We verified the specificity of the BstZ17 for cutting *Wolbachia* sequences by an *in silico* search
571 for restriction sites in our sequences from undigested samples, all sequences from Chandler *et al.*
572 [32], and all bacterial sequences in the SILVA data base. A very small fraction of non-*Wolbachia*
573 sequences would have been cut in our sequence set from undigested samples (27 out of 23423)

574 and the data from Chandler *et al.* [32] (18 out of 3243, mainly confined to a single sample). The
575 majority of these sequences were classified as Rhizobiales. *In silico* search for the BstZ17
576 restriction site in sequences from the SILVA database revealed that the sequences that would
577 have been cut by the restriction enzyme fall mainly into the orders of Rhizobiales,
578 Myxococcales, and a non-*Wolbachia* Rickettsiales. Although these orders have either not been
579 reported to be associated with *Drosophila* or occur only at very low numbers, the pretreatment
580 with BstZ17 of most of our samples might have led to underestimation of their abundance in this
581 study.

582

583 Data analysis

584 The MOTHUR v1.23.1 [37] software was used for analysis. We used the trim.seqs command to
585 remove primer and MID tags and quality filter our sequences according to the following
586 requirements: Minimum average quality of 35 in each 50 bp window, minimum length of 260 bp,
587 homopolymers no longer than 8 bp. Only sequences matching the MIDs and the bacterial
588 primers perfectly were kept. Passing sequences were filtered for sequencing errors using the
589 pre.cluster command. Sequences were then screened for chimeras using UCHIME [58] as
590 implemented in MOTHUR with standard settings separately for each sample. 2% of all
591 sequences were identified as chimeric and discarded. The remaining sequences were aligned to
592 the SILVA reference database [36] using the MOTHUR implemented kmer algorithm with
593 standard settings. Sequences not aligning in the expected region were removed using the
594 screen.seqs command. Sequences were classified into bacterial taxa with the classify.seqs
595 command using the SILVA reference database and taxonomy with default settings. Sequences
596 classified as *Wolbachia* were removed from further analysis. Grouping of sequences into OTUs
597 was done using the MOTHUR implemented average neighbor algorithm. Inverted Simpson and
598 Shannon diversity indices were generated with the collect.single command. Rarefaction sampling
599 was performed with the rarefaction.single command. The sequence with the smallest distance to
600 all other sequences in each OTU was picked with the get.oturep command using the weighted
601 option and classified with the classify.otu command using the SILVA reference database and

602 taxonomy. Representative sequences of the 100 most common OTUs were also searched in the
603 nr/nt database of the National Center for Biotechnology Information (ncbi) using megablast with
604 default settings via the web server (<http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>). Taxonomy information from
605 the BLAST results was compared to the classification using the SILVA database. PCoA of
606 Jaccard distances was performed applying the pcoa command on a Jaccard distance matrix
607 generated with the dist.shared command. Because Jaccard distance is based on presence and
608 absence of OTUs, it is sensitive to information from low abundance OTUs, even in the presence
609 of other more abundant OTUs. In an abundance-based distance measure this information would
610 likely be swamped by few extremely common OTUs. These considerations are particularly
611 relevant to our study where a handful of bacterial families dominate the data (Figure 2A).
612 Jaccard distances are also less prone to be affected by biased abundance measurements that can
613 result from amplification biases during PCR amplification of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene. The
614 downside of the sensitivity of Jaccard distances to low abundance OTUs is that samples with a
615 higher number of bacterial sequence reads can be biased towards detecting more low abundance
616 OTUs which inflates Jaccard distance. Therefore the number of sequences per sample was *in*
617 *silico* capped to have the same number of sequences per sample before calculation of Jaccard
618 distances. The caps were 912 sequences per sample for the PCoA of wild-caught flies and 116
619 sequences per sample for the PCoA including all samples.

620

621 **Acknowledgements**

622 We thank Alan Bergland for providing samples and for helpful comments on the manuscript. We
623 thank Silke Carstensen and Heinke Buhtz for excellent technical assistance. We thank Angus
624 Chandler, Artyom Kopp, Jonathan Eisen and Brian Lazzaro for helpful discussions; and Anna
625 Sophie Fiston-Lavier, Diamantis Sellis, Heather Machado, David Enard, and Nandita Garud for
626 helpful comments on the manuscript. We thank the UCSD Stock Center for providing samples.

627

628

629 References

1. Nicholson JK, Holmes E, Kinross J, Burcelin R, Gibson G, et al. (2012) Host-Gut Microbiota Metabolic Interactions. *Science* 336: 1262–1267. doi:10.1126/science.1223813.
2. Krause DO, Denman SE, Mackie RI, Morrison M, Rae AL, et al. (2003) Opportunities to improve fiber degradation in the rumen: microbiology, ecology, and genomics. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews* 27: 663–693. doi:10.1016/S0168-6445(03)00072-X.
3. McFall-Ngai M, Heath-Heckman EAC, Gillette AA, Peyer SM, Harvie EA (2012) The secret languages of coevolved symbioses: Insights from the *Euprymna scolopes*–*Vibrio fischeri* symbiosis. *Seminars in Immunology* 24: 3–8. doi:10.1016/j.smim.2011.11.006.
4. Oliver KM, Russell JA, Moran NA, Hunter MS (2003) Facultative bacterial symbionts in aphids confer resistance to parasitic wasps. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100: 1803–1807.
5. Kaltenpoth M, Göttler W, Herzner G, Strohm E (2005) Symbiotic bacteria protect wasp larvae from fungal infestation. *Current Biology* 15: 475–479.
6. Kaiser W, Huguet E, Casas J, Commin C, Giron D (2010) Plant green-island phenotype induced by leaf-miners is mediated by bacterial symbionts. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 277: 2311–2319. doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.0214.
7. Galac MR, Lazzaro BP (2011) Comparative pathology of bacteria in the genus *Providencia* to a natural host, *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Microbes and Infection* 13: 673–683. doi:10.1016/j.micinf.2011.02.005.
8. Hurst GDD, Johnson AP, Schulenburg JHG v. d., Fuyama Y (2000) Male-Killing *Wolbachia* in *Drosophila*: A Temperature-Sensitive Trait With a Threshold Bacterial Density. *Genetics* 156: 699–709.
9. Ferrari J, Vavre F (2011) Bacterial symbionts in insects or the story of communities affecting communities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 366: 1389–1400. doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0226.
10. Staubach F, Künzel S, Baines AC, Yee A, McGee BM, et al. (2012) Expression of the blood-group-related glycosyltransferase *B4galnt2* influences the intestinal microbiota in mice. *The ISME Journal* 6: 1345–1355.
11. Bakula M (1969) The persistence of a microbial flora during postembryogenesis of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Journal of invertebrate pathology* 14: 365–374.
12. Ryu J-H, Kim S-H, Lee H-Y, Bai JY, Nam Y-D, et al. (2008) Innate Immune Homeostasis

by the Homeobox Gene Caudal and Commensal-Gut Mutualism in *Drosophila*. *Science* 319: 777–782. doi:10.1126/science.1149357.

13. Arumugam M, Raes J, Pelletier E, Le Paslier D, Yamada T, et al. (2011) Enterotypes of the human gut microbiome. *Nature* 473: 174–180.
14. Wu GD, Chen J, Hoffmann C, Bittinger K, Chen Y-Y, et al. (2011) Linking Long-Term Dietary Patterns with Gut Microbial Enterotypes. *Science* 334: 105–108. doi:10.1126/science.1208344.
15. Ley RE, Hamady M, Lozupone C, Turnbaugh PJ, Ramey RR, et al. (2008) Evolution of Mammals and Their Gut Microbes. *Science* 320: 1647–1651. doi:10.1126/science.1155725.
16. Ochman H, Worobey M, Kuo C-H, Ndjango J-BN, Peeters M, et al. (2010) Evolutionary Relationships of Wild Hominids Recapitulated by Gut Microbial Communities. *PLoS Biology* 8: e1000546. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000546.
17. Muegge BD, Kuczynski J, Knights D, Clemente JC, Gonzalez A, et al. (2011) Diet Drives Convergence in Gut Microbiome Functions Across Mammalian Phylogeny and Within Humans. *Science* 332: 970–974. doi:10.1126/science.1198719.
18. Yatsunenko T, Rey FE, Manary MJ, Trehan I, Dominguez-Bello MG, et al. (2012) Human gut microbiome viewed across age and geography. *Nature* 486: 222–228. doi:10.1038/nature11053.
19. Fraune S, Abe Y, Bosch TCG (2009) Disturbing epithelial homeostasis in the metazoan *Hydra* leads to drastic changes in associated microbiota. *Environmental Microbiology* 11: 2361–2369. doi:10.1111/j.1462-2920.2009.01963.x.
20. Wong CNA, Ng P, Douglas AE (2011) Low-diversity bacterial community in the gut of the fruitfly *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Environmental Microbiology* 13: 1889–1900. doi:10.1111/j.1462-2920.2011.02511.x.
21. Broderick N, Lemaitre B (2012) Gut-associated microbes of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Gut microbes* 3: 0–1.
22. Erkosar B, Storelli G, Defaye A, Leulier F (2013) Host-intestinal microbiota mutualism: “learning on the fly”. *Cell host & microbe* 13: 8.
23. Lemaitre B, Hoffmann J (2007) The Host Defense of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Annual Review of Immunology* 25: 697–743. doi:10.1146/annurev.immunol.25.022106.141615.
24. Stensmyr MC, Dweck HKM, Farhan A, Ibba I, Strutz A, et al. (2012) A Conserved Dedicated Olfactory Circuit for Detecting Harmful Microbes in *Drosophila*. *Cell* 151:

1345–1357. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.09.046.

25. Lazzaro BP, Scurman BK, Clark AG (2004) Genetic Basis of Natural Variation in *D. melanogaster* Antibacterial Immunity. *Science* 303: 1873–1876. doi:10.1126/science.1092447.
26. Lhocine N, Ribeiro PS, Buchon N, Wepf A, Wilson R, et al. (2008) PIMS Modulates Immune Tolerance by Negatively Regulating *Drosophila* Innate Immune Signaling. *Cell Host & Microbe* 4: 147–158. doi:10.1016/j.chom.2008.07.004.
27. Shin SC, Kim S-H, You H, Kim B, Kim AC, et al. (2011) *Drosophila* Microbiome Modulates Host Developmental and Metabolic Homeostasis via Insulin Signaling. *Science* 334: 670–674. doi:10.1126/science.1212782.
28. Storelli G, Defaye A, Erkosar B, Hols P, Royet J, et al. (2011) *Lactobacillus plantarum* Promotes *Drosophila* Systemic Growth by Modulating Hormonal Signals through TOR-Dependent Nutrient Sensing. *Cell Metabolism* 14: 403–414. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2011.07.012.
29. Ren C, Webster P, Finkel SE, Tower J (2007) Increased Internal and External Bacterial Load during *Drosophila* Aging without Life-Span Trade-Off. *Cell Metabolism* 6: 144–152. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2007.06.006.
30. Cox CR, Gilmore MS (2007) Native Microbial Colonization of *Drosophila melanogaster* and Its Use as a Model of *Enterococcus faecalis* Pathogenesis. *Infection and Immunity* 75: 1565–1576. doi:10.1128/IAI.01496-06.
31. Corby-Harris V, Pontaroli AC, Shimkets LJ, Bennetzen JL, Habel KE, et al. (2007) Geographical Distribution and Diversity of Bacteria Associated with Natural Populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 73: 3470–3479. doi:10.1128/AEM.02120-06.
32. Chandler JA, Lang JM, Bhatnagar S, Eisen JA, Kopp A (2011) Bacterial Communities of Diverse *Drosophila* Species: Ecological Context of a Host–Microbe Model System. *PLoS Genetics* 7: e1002272. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1002272.
33. Barata A, Santos SC, Malfeito-Ferreira M, Loureiro V (2012) New Insights into the Ecological Interaction Between Grape Berry Microorganisms and *Drosophila* Flies During the Development of Sour Rot. *Microbial Ecology* 64: 416–430. doi:10.1007/s00248-012-0041-y.
34. Clark AG, Eisen MB, Smith DR, Bergman CM, Oliver B, et al. (2007) Evolution of genes and genomes on the *Drosophila* phylogeny. *Nature* 450: 203–218. doi:10.1038/nature06341.

35. Simpson EH (1949) Measurement of Diversity. *Nature* 163: 688–688.
36. Pruesse E, Quast C, Knittel K, Fuchs BM, Ludwig W, et al. (2007) SILVA: a comprehensive online resource for quality checked and aligned ribosomal RNA sequence data compatible with ARB. *Nucleic Acids Research* 35: 7188–7196. doi:10.1093/nar/gkm864.
37. Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, Hall JR, Hartmann M, et al. (2009) Introducing mothur: Open-Source, Platform-Independent, Community-Supported Software for Describing and Comparing Microbial Communities. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 75: 7537–7541. doi:10.1128/AEM.01541-09.
38. Juneja P, Lazzaro BP (2009) *Providencia sneebia* sp. nov. and *Providencia burhodogranariae* sp. nov., isolated from wild *Drosophila melanogaster*. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* 59: 1108–1111. doi:10.1099/ijs.0.000117-0.
39. Ravussin Y, Koren O, Spor A, LeDuc C, Gutman R, et al. (2011) Responses of Gut Microbiota to Diet Composition and Weight Loss in Lean and Obese Mice. *Obesity* 20: 738–747. doi:10.1038/oby.2011.111.
40. Dabbah R, Edwards VM, Moats WA (1970) Antimicrobial action of some citrus fruit oils on selected food-borne bacteria. *Applied microbiology* 19: 27–31.
41. Nunney L (1996) The colonization of oranges by the cosmopolitan *Drosophila*. *Oecologia* 108: 552–561.
42. Young TP, Chase JM, Huddleston RT (2001) Community succession and assembly comparing, contrasting and combining paradigms in the context of ecological restoration. *Ecological Restoration* 19: 5–18.
43. Lazzaro BP, Sackton TB, Clark AG (2006) Genetic Variation in *Drosophila melanogaster* Resistance to Infection: A Comparison Across Bacteria. *Genetics* 174: 1539–1554. doi:10.1534/genetics.105.054593.
44. Deppenmeier U, Hoffmeister M, Prust C (2002) Biochemistry and biotechnological applications of *Gluconobacter* strains. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* 60: 233–242. doi:10.1007/s00253-002-1114-5.
45. Crotti E, Rizzi A, Chouaia B, Ricci I, Favia G, et al. (2010) Acetic Acid Bacteria, Newly Emerging Symbionts of Insects. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 76: 6963–6970. doi:10.1128/AEM.01336-10.
46. De Vos P, Garrity G, Jones D, Krieg NR, Ludwig W, et al. (2009) *Bergey's Manual of*

Systematic Bacteriology: Volume 3: The Firmicutes. Springer.

47. Rao RS, Bhadra B, Shivaji S (2008) Isolation and characterization of ethanol-producing yeasts from fruits and tree barks. *Letters in Applied Microbiology* 47: 19–24. doi:10.1111/j.1472-765X.2008.02380.x.
48. Vellend M (2010) Conceptual Synthesis in Community Ecology. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 85: 183–206.
49. Sharon G, Segal D, Ringo JM, Hefetz A, Zilber-Rosenberg I, et al. (2010) Commensal bacteria play a role in mating preference of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107: 20051–20056. doi:10.1073/pnas.1009906107.
50. Hubbell SP (2001) *The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography*. Princeton University Press.
51. Peay KG, Belisle M, Fukami T (2011) Phylogenetic relatedness predicts priority effects in nectar yeast communities. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279: 749–758. doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.1230.
52. Linderman JA, Chambers MC, Gupta AS, Schneider DS (2012) Infection-Related Declines in Chill Coma Recovery and Negative Geotaxis in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS ONE* 7: e41907. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0041907.
53. Tsiropoulos GJ (1983) Microflora associated with wild and laboratory reared adult olive fruit flies, *Dacus oleae* (Gmel.). *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Entomologie* 96: 337–340.
54. Kunin V, Engelbrekton A, Ochman H, Hugenholtz P (2010) Wrinkles in the rare biosphere: pyrosequencing errors can lead to artificial inflation of diversity estimates. *Environmental Microbiology* 12: 118–123. doi:10.1111/j.1462-2920.2009.02051.x.
55. Auld RR, Myre M, Mykyteczuk NCS, Leduc LG, Merritt TJS (2013) Characterization of the microbial acid mine drainage microbial community using culturing and direct sequencing techniques. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 93: 108–115. doi:10.1016/j.mimet.2013.01.023.
56. Rosenberg E, Koren O, Reshef L, Efrony R, Zilber-Rosenberg I (2007) The role of microorganisms in coral health, disease and evolution. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 5: 355–362. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1635.
57. O’Hara AM, Shanahan F (2006) The gut flora as a forgotten organ. *EMBO reports* 7: 688–693. doi:10.1038/sj.embor.7400731.
58. Edgar RC, Haas BJ, Clemente JC, Quince C, Knight R (2011) UCHIME improves

sensitivity and speed of chimera detection. *Bioinformatics* 27: 2194–2200.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr381.

630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656

657 **Tables**

658 Table 1 Sample list.

sample name	species	substrate	location	n	larva
m.	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
s.	<i>D. simulans</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
sech	<i>D. sechellia</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
yak	<i>D. yakuba</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
erec	<i>D. erecta</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
pers	<i>D. persimilis</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
pseu	<i>D. pseudoobscura</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
vir	<i>D. virilis</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
moja	<i>D. mojavensis</i>	lab diet	UCSD Stock Center	1	yes
m.pet1-m.pet6	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	lab diet	Petrov lab	6	yes
s.pet1-s.pet6	<i>D. simulans</i>	lab diet	Petrov lab	6	yes
m.app	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	apple	Johnston, RI	1	no
s.app	<i>D. simulans</i>	apple	Johnston, RI	1	no
m.pea	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	peach	Johnston, RI	1	no
s.pea	<i>D. simulans</i>	peach	Johnston, RI	1	no
m.com	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	compost	Johnston, RI	1	no
s.com	<i>D. simulans</i>	compost	Johnston, RI	1	no
m.ora1	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	orange	Central Valley 1/Manteca	1	no
s.ora1	<i>D. simulans</i>	orange	Central Valley 1/Manteca	1	no
m.ora2	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	orange	Central Valley 2/Escalon	1	no
s.ora2	<i>D. simulans</i>	orange	Central Valley 2/Escalon	1	no
m.ora3	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	orange	Central Valley 3/Brentwood	1	no
s.ora3	<i>D. simulans</i>	orange	Central Valley 3/Brentwood	1	no
m.str	<i>D. melanogaster</i>	strawberry	Central Valley 4/Waterford	1	no
s.str	<i>D. simulans</i>	strawberry	Central Valley 4/Waterford	1	no

659 n = number of samples, each sample consisting of 5 male flies with the exception of s.ora1 and

660 m.ora3 where only 3 males were available

661

662

663

664

665 Table 2 Comparison of bacterial community diversity with previous studies on *Drosophila*.

study	fly type	tissue	Chao's species richness estimate	SD	Shannon diversity index	SD	Mean no. of sequences per sample	sequence type	primer position
This study	wild-caught <i>D. melanogaster</i> and <i>D. simulans</i>	whole flies	181 (22) [43]	97.1 (14.5) [15.0]	1.79 (1.65) [1.63]	0.44 (0.38) [0.34]	3800 (100)	454 pyro	27F 338R
This study	9 lab-reared <i>Drosophila</i> species	whole flies	94* (15) [21***]	91.8 (24.6) [15.9]	0.77*** (0.69***) [0.64***]	0.67 (0.61) [0.58]	3580	455 pyro	27F 338R
Wong et al. 2011	lab-reared 3-7 day old males <i>D. melanogaster</i>	gut	19*** [***]	n.a.	1.26** [*]	n.a.	113614 (single sample)	454 pyro	27F 338R
Wong et al. 2011	lab-reared 3-5 week old males <i>D. melanogaster</i>	gut	17*** [***]	n.a.	0.72** [***]	n.a.	85095 (single sample)	454 pyro	27F 338R
Chandler et al. 2011	wild-caught <i>D. melanogaster</i>	surface washed whole flies/gut	19*** (n.s.)	11.5	2.03 n.s. (***)	0.52	83	clone library	27F 1492R
Corby-Harris et al. 2007	wild-caught <i>D. melanogaster</i>	surface washed whole flies	24*** (n.s.)	15.8	n.a.	n.a.	66	clone library	27F 1522R
Cox and Gilmore 2007	wild-caught <i>D. melanogaster</i>	surface washed whole flies	25*** (n.s.)	n.a.	2.3*** (***)	n.a.	211	clone library	27F 1492R

666 *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$ Student's T-test; n.s. = non significant; n.a. = not available.
 667 P-values are relative to wild-caught flies in this study. Values and p-values in parentheses are for
 668 subsampling our samples to 100 16S rRNA gene sequences per sample to make the results
 669 comparable to other studies on wild-caught *Drosophila*. Values in square brackets are for
 670 removing all OTUs that contain fewer than 10 sequences from the analysis to make our study
 671 more comparable to Wong *et al.* [20].

672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688

689 **Figures**

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699


700

701

702








703

704



705 Figure 1

706 Rarefaction curves of 97% identity OTUs (A) for adult male flies.



- Methylobacterium
- Swaminathania
- Helicobacter
- Brenneria
- Frateuria
- Morganella
- Weissella
- Ralstonia
- Erwinia
- Denitratisoma
- Pseudomonas
- Providencia
- Gluconacetobacter
- Corynebacterineae
- Acinetobacter
- Serratia
- Chloroplast
- Pectobacterium
- Herbaspirillum
- Enterococcus
- Leuconostoc
- Gluconobacter
- Lactobacillus
- Acetobacter


708 Figure 2

709 Relative abundance of bacterial taxa as assessed by 16S rRNA gene sequences. *Wolbachia*
710 sequences were excluded. (A) The five most abundant bacterial families associated with
711 *Drosophila* across all samples in the study. (B) Relative abundance of bacterial genera. Genera
712 present at levels less than 5% were grouped into “others” category. (C) Relative abundance of
713 bacterial genera for individual samples. Each vertical bar represents one sample of five pooled
714 male flies. Bacterial genera of abundance < 3% have been removed for clarity. *D. melanogaster*
715 sample names start with m., *D. simulans* with s.. In wild-caught samples the sample names
716 include an abbreviation for the substrate they were collected from: ora = orange, str = strawberry,
717 app = apple, pea = peach, com = compost. Names of flies from the Petrov lab contain “pet”
718 instead. Samples names ending with “_l” mark larval samples.
719

A

	11111111111	
	670012366788	
	690185559015	
Providencia_from_m.str	TAAAATATGACA	
<i>P.alcalifaciens</i> _DSM30120	
<i>P.sneebia</i> _DSM19967	CG.....A...T	virulence
<i>P.rettgeri</i> _C	..C.....A...T	
<i>P.burhodogranariea</i> _DA...T	
<i>P.burhodogranariea</i> _DSM19968	.G.....A...T	

B



721 Figure 3

722 (A) Segregating sites of the 16S rRNA gene alignment of the highly abundant *Providencia*
723 sequence from *D. melanogaster* (grey background) collected from strawberries (m.str) to
724 *Providencia* species from [38]. Sequences are sorted by virulence as determined by [7]. Note that
725 Galac and Lazzaro determined virulence of a different but closely related *P. alcalifaciens* strain.
726 (B) Heatmap of the 10 most abundant 97% identity OTUs across all samples. OTUs are sorted
727 by average relative abundance across all samples from left to right with the most abundant OTU
728 to the left. Grey shades indicate the relative abundance of each OTU for a given sample.
729 Numbers in brackets are OTU identifiers.


730

731

732

733

734




736 Figure 4

737 PCoA of Jaccard distances based on 97% identity OTUs. (A) All samples in this study. Colors
738 are according to origin. (B) Wild-caught samples. Colors are according to food-substrate (C)
739 Wild-caught samples PCo3. *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* differ significantly for PCo3 ($P =$
740 0.0011). Colors are according to food-substrate.

741 Supplementary Table 1 Number of sequences per sample after quality filtering before Wolbachia
 742 removal.

sample ID	sample type	number of sequences	% Wolbachia sequences
m.ora1	adult	4487	0.51
s.ora1	adult	8944	89.8
m.ora2	adult	4104	0.05
s.ora2	adult	4148	6.65
m.ora3	adult	4456	0
s.ora3	adult	5463	83.23
m.str	adult	4802	0
s.str	adult	5395	53.09
m.app	adult	7366	9.84
s.app	adult	6912	33.03
m.pea	adult	6815	0.63
s.pea	adult	8242	43.24
m.com	adult	7165	73.72
s.com	adult	7679	67.99
m.pet1	adult	2738	0
m.pet2	adult	12143	95.25
m.pet3	adult	7165	0
m.pet4	adult	5306	20.67
m.pet5	adult	5824	0
m.pet6	adult	3939	94.19
s.pet1	adult	11037	98.95
s.pet2	adult	6618	98.11
s.pet3	adult	7738	87.18
s.pet4	adult	2641	0
s.pet5	adult	10309	97.47
s.pet6	adult	10604	99.83
m.pet1_l	larva	4270	0
m.pet2_l	larva	2329	5.97
m.pet3_l	larva	1880	0
m.pet4_l	larva	4206	3
m.pet5_l	larva	11846	0
m.pet6_l	larva	7949	0.74
s.pet1_l	larva	4434	93.82
s.pet2_l	larva	6793	6.07
s.pet3_l	larva	5815	1.44
s.pet4_l	larva	927	0
s.pet5_l	larva	721	17.06

s.pet6_l	larva	2371	96.88
mel	adult	8261	48.58
sim	adult	11048	92.65
sech	adult	8864	65.81
yak	adult	10371	0
erec	adult	8286	0.02
pers	adult	4066	0.02
pseu	adult	4887	0
vir	adult	4418	0
moja	adult	6590	0
mel_l	larva	6463	7.64
sim_l	larva	6294	4.27
sech_l	larva	3355	15.83
yak_l	larva	5492	0
erec_l	larva	4548	0
pers_l	larva	4614	0
pseud_l	larva	4996	0
vir_l	larva	6566	0
moja_l	larva	3970	0
neg	negative control	34	0



743 Supplementary Figure 1

744 P-value distributions for ANOVAs testing the alternative hypothesis that microbial communities
 745 differ between wild caught *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* based on PCoA of Jaccard
 746 distances. If there was no species effect on microbial community composition p-values are
 747 expected to be uniformly distributed. PCos 1-9 are displayed. Axes 3, 4, and 5 are enriched for
 748 low p-values indicating a species effect.