UNIVERSITÀ DI SIENA 1240

USiena air

Bacterial and fungal diversity in the gut of polystyrene-fed Alphitobius diaperinus (Insecta: Coleoptera)

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original:

Cucini, C., Leo, C., Vitale, M., Frati, F., Carapelli, A., Nardi, F. (2020). Bacterial and fungal diversity in the gut of polystyrene-fed Alphitobius diaperinus (Insecta: Coleoptera). ANIMAL GENE, 17-18 [10.1016/j.angen.2020.200109].

Availability:

This version is availablehttp://hdl.handle.net/11365/1120596 since 2021-11-04T12:53:54Z

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.angen.2020.200109

Terms of use:

Open Access

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license.
For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

(Article begins on next page)

25 June 2026

Bacterial and fungal diversity in the gut of polystyrene-fed *Alphitobius diaperinus* (Insecta: Coleoptera)

Claudio Cucini[a]*, Chiara Leo[b], Matteo Vitale[b], Francesco Frati[a], Antonio Carapelli[a] and Francesco Nardi[a]

[a]Department of Life Sciences, University of Siena, 53100 Siena, Italy

[b]Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, London, UK

*Correspondence: claudio.cucini@student.unisi.it (C. Cucini)

Abstract

The use of plastics burgeoned in the last decades to become an essential component of our society. An environment friendly method to dispose of plastic waste is not available yet, to the outcome that these accumulate in landfills or are scattered as microplastics. New researches reported that some coleopteran species are able to destroy plastics thanks to their chewing mouthparts and the metabolic activity of their gut microbiota. This study shows that the lesser mealworm *Alphitobius diaperinus* is capable of feeding on, and apparently degrading, polystyrene. The gut microbiota of polystyrene-fed larvae was characterized using an NGS metagenomic approach, targeting both bacteria and fungi. Several microbe taxa emerged as differentially abundant between treatment and control groups (*Cronobacter*, *Kocuria* and *Pseudomonas* as bacteria, *Aspergillus*, *Hyphodermella*, *Trichoderma* as fungi). Some of them have been found in association with plastic compounds and/or have been proposed to be capable of plastic degradation. This research supports the notion that, although synthetic molecules, unlike most natural compounds, do not generally enter the natural food chain to be degraded by the environmental microbiota, some microbial communities may be able to decompose plastics. We speculate that, once identified, such communities may open to the possibility of devising bioreactors for plastic degradation.

Keywords

insect gut; lesser mealworm; metagenomics; microbiota; plastics; polystyrene breakdown

30 **1. Introduction**

31 Since 1950 the yearly plastic demand has risen at untenable rates, from 2 to the 360 million of tons produced
32 in 2018, with a trend that is not expected to level over time. Polystyrene ($(C_8H_8)_n$) is one of the most commonly
33 used plastic materials world-wide, the seventh in terms of quantity. Food packaging, building insulation and
34 electrical equipment are the main applications of this product [1].

35 Although new technologies enabled the development of several recycling strategies, still an important
36 percentage of plastics end up in landfills with no chance of being recycled or processed to produce green
37 energy [2]. Furthermore, synthetic debris are causing important concerns such as environmental and water
38 pollution, as well as the accumulation of microplastic that are jeopardizing animal and human wellness (i.e.
39 cellular chemical toxicity, physical damage of tissues, modification of protein's secondary structure, etc.) [3-
40 7].

41 Unlike most natural compounds, plastics are synthetic materials of relatively recent origin, and are not
42 generally deteriorated. Nevertheless, several authors have recently identified insect species that are able to feed
43 on and, eventually, degrade various types of plastics [8-12]. While some Lepidoptera species were identified
44 that are able to degrade polyethylene, the most studied group in terms of polystyrene degradation are
45 tenebrionids. Mealworms and superworms are known to degrade up to 0.12 mg/d and 0.58 mg/d of polystyrene
46 respectively [11, 13]. It was also demonstrated that the insect gut's microbial community plays a key role in
47 the process, as supported by the observation that the suppression of microbial gut communities with antibiotics
48 leads to a disruption of plastic degradation [11-15]. Multiple bacterial species appear to be involved in the
49 process. Yang and colleagues [12] identified *Exiguobacterium* sp. as capable of creating biofilms and
50 degrading PS in *Tenebrio molitor*'s gut. Later works on the same tenebrionid beetle indicated other
51 Enterobacteriaceae as possible candidates for plastic consumption [14,16].

52 Furthermore, many free-living or insects' gut-associated bacteria have been identified as capable of the
53 breakdown of synthetic products [16-18]. Generally, Pseudomonadaceae and Enterobacteriaceae are reported
54 to be the main actors in insect's gut, although it is still not clear which environmental conditions may promote
55 polystyrene degradation.

56 Besides, some authors have described free-living fungi that appear to be efficient in synthetic polymers
57 degradation [20-22]. While the possible role of fungi in the breakdown of polystyrene inside insects' guts has
58 never, to our knowledge, been investigated in detail, synergic effects arising from the joint metabolic activities
59 of bacterial and fungal communities may play a key role in polystyrene biodegradation within insects' gut
60 [23].

61 We focused on the lesser mealworm, *Alphitobius diaperinus* (Insecta: Coleoptera), which is a well-known pest
62 of stored food grain products. Despite previous works tried to highlight the bacterial and fungal pathogens
63 within this species, focusing on its possible role as an alternative food-source, a similar survey was never
64 conducted in relation to plastic degrading [24,25]. We initially confirmed, in an experimental setting, that *A.*
65 *diaperinus* is actually capable of feeding on, and apparently degrading, polystyrene. Then, to better understand
66 which metabolic processes may be involved, we investigated both bacterial and fungal communities harboured
67 inside its gut. Finally, we compared our results with those from previous studies on other Tenebrionidae and
68 free-living organisms, trying to further highlight which bacterial and fungal forms may be responsible for
69 polystyrene breakdown.

70

71 ## 2. Materials and Methods

72

73 ### 2.1. Lesser mealworm sources and feedstock

74 *Alphitobius diaperinus* last instar larvae (approximately 7-10 mm in length) were purchased from Agripet
75 Garden (Padua, Italy; reared according to the factory protocol, see: https://www.agripetgarden.it/). Larvae
76 were separated into two groups. One group (treatment group, henceforth PS; 350gr of larvae, corresponding
77 to ~17,500 larvae) was reared on 20 gr of polystyrene (see below); the second (control group, henceforth CT;
78 150 gr of larvae, corresponding to ~7,500 individuals) was reared on 12gr of commercial organic carrots,
79 renewed every 2-3 days, as a combined source of energy and water as in [26]. Larvae were thus subdivided to
80 account for a higher mortality in the PS group (observed in preliminary experiments) and maintain the two
81 colonies at comparable numbers for the most part of the period (i.e. no transfer between groups was done).
82 Both groups were reared using the commercial substrate as in [26].

83 Both colonies were reared at the Department of Life Sciences of the University of Siena under controlled
84 conditions (20 ± 2°C; 12L:12D photo-period; 50-70% RH) for 30 days. The expanded polystyrene foam used
85 as feedstock for the PS group was purchased from Toscoespansi s.r.l. (https://www.toscoespansi.it/). This
86 product, known under the commercial name of Extir® (CAS 9003-53-6), had a density of 0.01 gr/cm^3 and,
87 according to the manufacturer information, contained no extra additives or catalysts.

88 ### 2.2. Survival and polystyrene consumption

89 At time 0 and after 30 days of rearing, the total weight of larvae, from both treated and control groups, was
90 assessed.

91 At the end of the experiment, undegraded polystyrene fragments were similarly weighted. In order to separate
92 these latter from contaminating dead larvae, exuviae and faecal pellets, polystyrene fragments were washed in
93 a 0.2x SDS 10%/1x Tween 20® solution at pH 3.5 in a magnetic stirrer for 10-15 minutes. The polystyrene
94 was then dried in absorbent paper and incubated overnight at 59°C to remove all remaining humidity and
95 carefully observed under a stereomicroscope to confirm the absence of organic materials (e.g. exuviae).
96 Undegraded substrate, ideally composed of not eaten PS debris and fecal pellets, was sieved to separate the
97 two components. The resulting PS fraction was weighted and added to the above figure.

98 ### 2.3. DNA extraction of gut microorganisms, markers amplification and sequencing

99 At the end of the experiment, total DNA was extracted from *A. diaperinus* guts to characterize its microbial
100 communities. Lesser mealworm larvae were collected and the whole intestines dissected under a Leica Wild
101 M3C stereomicroscope using Petri dishes filled with sterilized paraffin as support. Total DNA was extracted
102 using the QIAamp PowerFecal® DNA Kit according to the manufacturer's protocol. Extractions were made in
103 triplicates from each group, i.e. three individual larvae were used to have triplicate observations from the PS
104 group and three from the control group. DNA extractions were used for a metabarcoding analysis of the fungal
105 and bacterial communities using the ITS1 and the 16S v3-v4 region as molecular marker, respectively (details
106 in Protocol S1; Supplementary material).

107 ### 2.4. Data analysis

108 Raw sequences were demultiplexed based on their indices and primer sequences were removed. Quality
109 trimming/filtering was performed in trimmomatic v.0.39 [27] and then processed using the Quantitative
110 Insights Into Microbial Ecology v.2 software (QIIME2 - v.2019.7) [28] as described in Protocol S2
111 (Supplementary material).

Diversity analyses were performed in QIIME2 and data for both markers were rarefied at the minimum sampling depth observed among samples prior to analyses. Good's coverage, Simpson and Shannon diversity indices (α diversity), were calculated for both markers, using the Kruskal-Wallis test to compare values across groups. Bray-Curtis Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) was performed on both datasets. The phylogeny-based Unifrac distances (weighted and unweighted) PCoA were applied to the bacteria dataset only (β diversity). QIIME2 work-flows are provided as Protocol S3 (bacteria) and Protocol S4 (fungi) (Supplementary material).

Differential abundance of OTUs was evaluated for both datasets (on the original non rarefied datasets) using the Phyloseq and DESeq2 packages in R v.3.6.1 (R Core Team 2018, http://www.R-project.org/) [29, 30], and OTUs with an associated adjusted p-value (padj) < 0.05 were retained. The custom R script for this procedure is supplied as Protocol S5 of Supplementary material.

3. Results

3.1. *A. diaperinus* survival rate and polystyrene weight loss

Alphitobius diaperinus underwent a reduction of 77% and 89% of total weight in the CT and PS group, respectively. Reduction was more severe in the PS compared to the CT group (1.2x).

The weight of the polystyrene decreased during the experiment from 20gr (time zero) to 16gr (day 30) (*s=2.83*). Henceforth, 4gr (20%) of polystyrene was presumably degraded during 30 days of incubation.

3.2. Diversity of bacteria

The resulting sequencing data are available in Result R1 (Supplementary material).

The taxa bar plot showed the presence of six predominant bacterial phyla, mostly with different relative frequencies: Proteobacteria (76% and 57% in PS and CT, respectively), Bacteroidetes (3% and 26%), Firmicutes (13% and 8%), Actinobacteria (4% and 8%), Fusobacteria (3% and <1%) and an unassigned phylum (<1% in both groups) (Figure 1a).

Clustering at the level of classes identified eight predominant entities, often represented with different relative frequencies: Gammaproteobacteria (76% and 57%), Bacteroidia (3% and 25%), Bacilli (13% and 7%), Actinobacteria (4% and 8%), Fusobacteria (3% and 1%), Alphaproteobacteria (<1% and 1%), Erysipelotrichia (<1% both) and an unassigned class (<1% both) (Figure 1b).

Shared OTUs count indicated that ~ 30% OTUs were shared among treatment and control groups, ~ 50% were observed in control only and ~ 20% in treatment only (Figure 2).

The Good's coverage index, an estimate of the representativity of the data, produced values higher than 0.99 for both PS and CT groups, thus indicating that the sequencing depth could be considered appropriate to provide an adequate estimation of the bacterial diversity in the samples. The Shannon and Simpson (Table 3) produced high values overall, with the only exception of one PS sample (library PS3). Based on the Simpson index, species richness appeared to be slightly lower in PS samples (0.43-0.87) compared to CT samples (0.88-0.90). The Shannon index provided comparable results, with PS samples displaying a more limited diversity (1.54-3.60) than CT samples (3.72-4.71). This disparity in richness between PS and CT groups emerged as statistically supported by the Kruskal-Wallis test (p-value < 0.05).

Based on beta-diversity measures, PS and CT samples appeared in PCoA plots as separate clusters according to all estimators, nevertheless this difference was not recovered as statistically significant (p-value > 0.05).

152 Four bacterial families appeared as differentially abundant between PS and CT samples (Figure 4a).
153 Pseudomonadaceae, Micrococcaceae, Bacillaceae and Enterobacteriaceae were recovered as significantly
154 more abundant in PS samples than in CT samples, whereas all others appeared to be more abundant in CT (i.e.
155 depleted in PS samples). At the genus level, one Gram-positive (i.e. *Kocuria*) and two Gram-negative bacteria
156 (i.e. *Cronobacter* and *Pseudomonas*, with two species) were found to be significantly over-represented in PS
157 samples, with a Log_2-fold change between 4.1 and 6.5. Two Gram-positive bacteria (i.e. *Pseudogracilibacillus*
158 and *Virgibacillus*) were similarly over-represented in PS samples, with Log_2-fold change of 4.8 and 5.8,
159 respectively (Table 2). Noteworthy, two different OTUs from both these latter genera were also under-
160 represented in PS samples (Log_2-fold change of -7.4 and -7.3 respectively) (Figure 4).

161 The resampling analysis, performed to support the identification of differentially abundant OTUs in PS
162 specimens, showed that the two *Pseudomonas* species resulted as overrepresented in all resamples (100%),
163 whereas *Pseudogracilibacillus* and *Kocuria* were recovered in 75-80% of resamples. At variance, *Cronobacter*
164 and *Virgibacillus* were recovered in a mere 25% of resamples, possibly questioning the significance of this
165 result (Figure 4b).

166 3.3. Diversity of fungi

167 The resulting sequencing data are available in Result R1 (Supplementary material).

168 The taxa bar plot showed that, at the phylum level, Ascomycota were predominant overall over Basidiomycota.
169 On average, Ascomycota accounted for 70% of taxa in PS samples and 85% in CT samples (Figure 5a).
170 Basidiomycota were also well represented in PS samples (29% on average), although with large differences
171 among replicates, while appearing to be utterly rare in CT samples, where a single library showed a mere 0.4%.
172 A significant portion of detected fungal entities remained unidentified. These accounted for 14% on average
173 in CT groups and as much as 39% in one single CT sample (CT1), while unidentified taxa were rare in PS
174 samples (<1%).

175 Among these groups, six predominant classes were recorded (Agaricomycetes, Saccharomycetes,
176 Sordariomycetes, Dothideomycetes, Eurotiomycetes, Leotiomycetes), plus one unidentified taxon (Figure 5b).
177 Good's coverage indices higher than 0.99 for both CT and PS samples indicated an adequate estimation of
178 fungal diversity. Both the Shannon and Simpson indices were generally higher in PS samples (Simpson: 0.58-
179 0.69 in PS, 0.19-0.63 in CT; Shannon: 1.65-2.72 in PS, 0.73-1.67 in CT), with the exception of one replicate
180 (CT2) which had values in line with PS specimens (Table 1). The differences observed in both indices were
181 nevertheless recovered as non-significant by the Kruskal-Wallis test ($p > 0.05$).

182 Shared OTUs count indicated that ~10% OTUs were shared among treatment and control groups, ~ 30% were
183 observed in control only and ~ 60% in treatment only (Figure 2).

184 Non-phylogenetic β diversity, as described by the Bray-Curtis PCoA, suggested a marked difference in OTUs
185 presence and abundance between the CT and PS groups (Figure 3d). Nevertheless, the β diversity measures
186 resulted as non-significant in a PERMANOVA analysis (p-value > 0.05), most likely as an outcome of the
187 small number of included samples.

188 The differential abundance analysis performed with DESeq2 identified five genera that appeared to be
189 overrepresented in PS samples compared to CT samples: *Trichoderma*, *Penicillium*, *Hyphodermella*,
190 *Aspergillus* plus an unidentified genus belonging to the Agaricomycetes class, with a Log_2-fold change
191 between 11.8 and 18 (Figure 6a; Table 2). Among them, only *Aspergillus*, *Hyphodermella* and the unidentified
192 agaricomycete were recovered with a sizeable frequency in resamples (80%), whereas *Penicillium* and
193 *Trichoderma* were recovered rarely (25%), possibly questioning the significance of this result (Figure 6b).

4. Discussion

The fairly high reduction observed in larvae weight during the experiment may be dependent on the overall stressful rearing conditions, exacerbated in the PS group by the use of polystyrene as the only source of food [26]. Nevertheless, both groups survived for the entire length of the experiment and, in the following weeks, several larvae underwent pupation and moult into adult forms (data not shown). However, further and more focused eco-physiological experiments are needed to evaluate the ability of *A. diaperinus*, alongside alternative plastic-degrading insects, to actually survive for more than one generation on a non-conventional food source such as polystyrene. The use of a combined source of energy and water in the PS treatment might improve the insect's physiological resistance to the stress caused by the use of an unnatural food source [31]. This possibility may be considered in following experiments if the total PS degradation rate is to be maximised, but did not seem the primary choice in this initial phase where the differences between PS and control groups was to be maximised.

Alpha-diversity estimates (Table 1), as well as the count of shared OTUs, highlighted that the bacterial microbiota harboured in *A. diaperinus*' gut of PS samples is significantly impoverished compared to CT specimens (Figures. 1-2). This may be the outcome of the critical conditions encountered, that may not be viable for a portion of bacterial species naturally occurring in *A. diaperinus*' gut. Alternatively, it might be the result of the reliance on one single and simple source of carbon, that possibly favoured only one degradation pathway at the expense of others. Alpha-diversity estimates of the fungal microbiota, on the other hand, indicate that PS samples display a richer microbial diversity than CT (although differences between the two groups appear not to be statistically significant). This observation may be associated with the almost total absence, in CT samples, of Basidiomycota, a phylum of fungi that is is encountered at fairly high frequency in PS samples.

Apart from sheer species richness, some differences in the presence and relative abundance of individual taxa (i.e., β diversity) are highlighted by PCoA plots of PS compared to CT samples (Figure 3), although these differences are not recovered as statistically supported. In fact, all distance measures produced plots where PS and CT samples are separated over at least one of the major axes. This difference is further supported by visual observation of the taxa bar plots (Figure 1 for bacteria, 5 for fungi). In some instances, differences tend to emerge from the presence of specific taxa in some samples that are absent in others, such as, in the fungi dataset, Basidiomycota that are present at sizable frequency in at least 2 PS samples and nearly absent in all CT samples. Similarly, in the bacterial dataset, Bacteroidetes are well represented in CT samples and nearly absent in PS ones. In other instances, a large increase in relative frequency of a given taxon, as in the case of Proteobacteria in PS samples, produces a proportional shrinkage in the relative frequency of all other taxa, suggesting these as, possibly, the driving cause of observed differences.

Given that the main focus of this study is the identification of microbial species that are associated with polystyrene-fed insects, and hence potentially involved in plastic degradation, a detailed OTUs differential abundance analysis was performed (Figures. 4,6; Table 2). The bacteria genera *Pseudomonas*, *Kocuria*, *Cronobacter*, *Pseudogracilibacillus* and *Virgibacillus* were generally found to be significantly more abundant in PS compared to CT samples and henceforth possibly associated and/or involved in polystyrene degradation in the beetles' gut.

Pseudomonas has already been identified in the context of studies on plastic degradation and has been proposed to be strictly associated with polystyrene consumption [17,18,32-34] as well as with the degradation of other plastic materials [35-38]. Following from the observation that this mechanism of plastic degradation would require an initial breakdown of the polymer, previous studies tried to identify the enzyme classes that, based on their structure and functional parameters, may be responsible for the degradation of several different types of polystyrene and other synthetic polymers [18, 38-41]. As an example, *Azotobacter beijerinckii* HM121 is

239 known to produce a Hydroquinone Peroxidase capable of polystyrene degradation in a dichloromethane-water
240 system [42]. In *Pseudomonas* the *alkb* gene was identified as the key enzyme in alkane biodegradation during
241 polyethylene (PE) breakdown [40]. Furthermore, Mooney et al. [41] reconstructed the entire process of styrene
242 breakdown, identifying styrene monooxygenase as the first enzyme along the styrene degradation pathway,
243 describing its subunit structure (*styA* and *styB*) and its regulation by *styS* and *styR*. In addition, an unknown
244 type of esterase produced by *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus* was associated with high impact polystyrene (HIPS)
245 degradation [18]. Yet, *Pseudomonas* seems to be strictly associated with lesser mealworm larvae as assessed
246 in previous metabarcoding researches on *A. diaperinus*, indicating the constant presence and the resilience of
247 this microorganism even in different rearing conditions [24-25].

248 The genus *Kocuria*, found to be significantly overrepresented in the gut of polystyrene-fed larvae has never
249 been recorded as associated with plastic consumption. Nevertheless, Parshetti et al. [43] demonstrated that *K.*
250 *rosea* is able to degrade malachite green, a chemical compound that is used as a textile dye or as an antimicrobic
251 in aquacultures. Interestingly, malachite green shows a styrene core structure, a molecular substructure that is
252 also present in polystyrene. It can therefore be envisioned that *Kocuria* may be able to produce enzymes that,
253 using the styrene core as substrate, may be effective in the degradation of polystyrene.

254 The Gram-negative *Cronobacter*, similarly overrepresented in PS, is known to create biofilms on plastic
255 surfaces, but it has never been recorded as involved in plastic breakdown [44]. However, *Cronobacter* is a
256 member of the Enterobacteriaceae, a bacterial family that includes a number of species that were shown to
257 degrade HIPS, PHA and EPS as free-living organisms [18,19,33,45] or as part of insects' gut microbiota
258 [9,14,16]. The presence of similar enzymatic pathways, involved in polystyrene breakdown, is therefore
259 possible.

260 Although bacteria are probably more abundant and diverse, they are not the only microbial component
261 characterizing a particular environment. As such, since no previous work (to our knowledge) focused on
262 insect's intestinal fungi as related to plastic consumption, we deem the inventory of the fungal community in
263 *A. diaperinus*' gut of significant interest for the characterization of its microbiome at large. At variance with
264 bacteria, α diversity measures, alongside taxa bar plots (Figure 5; Table 1), show a higher intrinsic variability
265 of fungi in PS compared to CT samples. It has been shown that fungal species are able to produce a variety of
266 readily used vitamins [46] amino acids and sterols [47,48]. This capability may provide fungi with a substantial
267 advantage under stringent conditions, where a single and uniform source of carbon and no food source with a
268 high-water content are available. It is therefore possible to speculate that the added nutritional role of these
269 compounds may explain the higher abundance of fungi observed in the gut of polystyrene-fed larvae compared
270 to control.

271 Five genera plus an unidentified form belonging to the Agaricomycetes class appear to be over-represented in
272 PS compared to CT samples (Figure 6; Table 2).

273 Agaricomycetes, especially abundant in PS samples, is a very diverse and species rich class (at least 21,000
274 species according to Kirk et al. [49]) but no study seems to associate species of this group to plastic breakdown.
275 No reference relevant to plastic breakdown is similarly available for *Hyphodermella*.

276 On the other hand, relevant information is available for *Aspergillus*, *Trichoderma* and *Penicillium*, three genera
277 that have variously been associated with plastic degradation. All of them were found to be over-represented in
278 PS samples. Some *Aspergillus* species were reported that are capable of degrading several plastic materials
279 [50-52]. *Trichoderma viride* and *Aspergillus nomius* were both screened as soil free-living fungi able to attack
280 and destroy LDPE [53]. Yamada-Onodera and colleagues [20] described the capacity of *Penicillium*
281 *simplicissimum* to break the C=C bond of polyethylene. More recently, *Penicillium variabile* was shown to
282 mineralize polystyrene after long incubation [54]. These two fungal species have been already described as

associated with *A. diaperinus* in a previous study [25] and may be part of the natural insect associated microbiota.

In full evidence, while association studies are definitely relevant to identify microbial species possibly associated with plastic degradation, these do not provide a proof of their functional role in the process. Culturing studies are underway in order to establish whether these selected microbial species are (or are not) culturable. Chemical and biochemical studies may be warranted in the near future, in line with previous works on *Tenebrio* and *Zophobas atratus* [11-17]. Moreover, translational studies to deploy the microbial chain that naturally emerged as capable of plastic degradation in the insect's gut may be functional for the possible future development of artificial, sustainable and eco-friendly waste degradation technologies. In addition, due to the cannibalistic capability of tenebrionids in sub-optimal rearing condition, an improved rearing protocol should be adopted in further works to eliminate this further breeding variable. Lastly future studies should focus on other commensals or parasites that are known to be present in the Coleoptera's gut (i.e. gregarines [55]).

5. Conclusion

In this study we compared the gut microbial community of three *A. diaperinus* larvae reared on polystyrene with three control larvae fed on vegetable food. Several bacterial and fungal entities were significantly modulated in polystyrene fed animals. Some of these correspond to taxa already reported in this context in other organisms, some had never been reported but display biochemical features that suggest a possible role in this process. Future studies on *A. diaperinus* should focus on a chemical analysis of faeces to confirm plastic degradation and characterize the chemical reactions taking place. Moreover, since it is not known if these species are culturable, microbiological studies to assess the necessary culturing parameters are required in order to assess the possibility to culture these microbes in biochemical reactors aimed at degrading synthetic polymers.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The authors appreciate the help provided from Toscoespansi s.r.l. (Loc. Cusona 53037 San Gimignano (Siena)) in the polystyrene concession and Alessandro Donati for providing computational resources for data analysis. The authors wish to thank Prof. Romano Dallai and Prof. Laura Marri for useful discussions. This work was partially supported by internal University of Siena program PSR.

314 **6. References**

315

316 [1] Plastics Europe, 2019. Plastics-The Facts. An analysis of European plastics production, demand and waste
317 data www.plasticseurope.org/

318 [2] R. Geyer, J.R. Jambeck, K.L Law, Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made. Sci. Adv. 3 (2017)
319 25–29. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1700782

320 [3] D.K.A Barnes, F. Galgani, R.C. Thompson, M. Barlaz, Accumulation and fragmentation of plastic debris
321 in global environments. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci 364 (2009) 1985–1998.
322 https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0205

323 [4] M.C Goldstein, D.S. Goodwin, Gooseneck barnacles (*Lepas spp.)* ingest microplastic debris in the north
324 Pacific subtropical gyre. PeerJ 1 (2013). https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.184

325 [5] J. R. Jambeck, R. Geyer, C. Wilcox, T.R. Siegler, M. Perryman, A. Andrady, R. Narayan, K.L. Law,
326 Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. Science 347 (2015) 768-771.
327 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260352

328 [6] C.M. Rochman, A. Tahir, S.L. Williams, D.V. Baxa, R. Lam, J.T. Miller, F.C. Teh, S. Werorilangi, S.J.
329 Teh, Anthropogenic debris in seafood: Plastic debris and fibers from textiles in fish and bivalves sold for
330 human consumption. Sci. Rep. 5 (2015) 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep14340

331 [7] O. Hollóczki, S. Gehrke, Nanoplastics Can Change the Secondary Structure of Proteins. Sci. Rep. 9 (2019)
332 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-52495-w

333 [8] J. Riudavets, I. Salas, M.J. Pons, Damage characteristics produced by insect pests in packaging film. J.
334 Stored Prod. Res. 43 (2007) 564–570. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspr.2007.03.006

335 [9] J. Yang, Y. Yang, W.M. Wu, J. Zhao, L. Jiang, Evidence of polyethylene biodegradation by bacterial
336 strains from the guts of plastic-eating waxworms. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48 (2014) 13776–13784.
337 https://doi.org/10.1021/es504038a

338 [10] P. Bombelli, C.J. Howe, F. Bertocchini, Polyethylene bio-degradation by caterpillars of the wax moth
339 *Galleria mellonella*. Curr. Biol. 27 (2017) R292–R293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.02.060

340 [11] Y. Yang, J. Yang, W.M. Wu, J. Zhao, Y. Song, L. Gao, R. Yang, L. Jiang, Biodegradation and
341 Mineralization of Polystyrene by Plastic-Eating Mealworms: Part 1. Chemical and Physical
342 Characterization and Isotopic Tests. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49 (2015) 12080–12086.
343 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b02661

344 [12] Y. Yang, J. Yang, W.M. Wu, J. Zhao, Y. Song, L. Gao, R. Yang, L. Biodegradation and Mineralization
345 of Polystyrene by Plastic-Eating Mealworms: Part 2. Role of Gut Microorganisms. Environ. Sci. Technol.
346 49 (2015) 12087–12093. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b02663

347 [13] Y. Yang, J. Wang, M. Xia, Biodegradation and mineralization of polystyrene by plastic-eating
348 superworms *Zophobas atratus*. Sci. Total Environ. 708 (2020) 135233.
349 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135233

350 [14] B.Y. Peng, Y. Su, Z. Chen, J. Chen, X. Zhou, M.E. Benbow, C.S. Criddle, W.M. Wu, Y. Zhang,
351 Biodegradation of Polystyrene by Dark (*Tenebrio obscurus*) and Yellow (*Tenebrio molitor*) Mealworms
352 (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae). Environ. Sci. Technol. 53 (2019) 5256–5265.
353 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b06963

354 [15] S.W. Przemieniecki, A. Kosewska, S. Ciesielski, O. Kosewska, Changes in the gut microbiome and
355 enzymatic profile of *Tenebrio molitor* larvae biodegrading cellulose, polyethylene and polystyrene waste.
356 Environ. Pollut. 256 (2020) 113265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113265

357 [16] A.M. Brandon, S.H. Gao, R. Tian, D. Ning, S.S. Yang, J. Zhou, W.M. Wu, C.S. Criddle, Biodegradation
358 of Polyethylene and Plastic Mixtures in Mealworms (Larvae of *Tenebrio molitor*) and Effects on the Gut
359 Microbiome. Environ. Sci. Technol. 52 (2018) 6526–6533. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02301

360 [17] A.K. Urbanek, J. Rybak, M. Wróbel, K. Leluk, A.M. Mirończuk, A comprehensive assessment of
361 microbiome diversity in *Tenebrio molitor* fed with polystyrene waste. Environ. Pollut. 262 (2020) 114281.
362 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114281
363 [18] A.J. Mohan, V.C. Sekhar, T. Bhaskar, K.M. Nampoothiri, Microbial assisted High Impact Polystyrene
364 (HIPS) degradation. Bioresour. Technol. 213 (2016) 204–207.
365 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.03.021
366 [19] V.C. Sekhar, K.M. Nampoothiri, A.J. Mohan, N.R. Nair, T. Bhaskar, A. Pandey, Microbial degradation
367 of high impact polystyrene (HIPS), an e-plastic with decabromodiphenyl oxide and antimony trioxide. J.
368 Hazard. Mater. 318 (2016) 347–354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.07.008
369 [20] K. Yamada-Onodera, H. Mukumoto, Y. Katsuyama, Y. Tani, Degradation of long-chain alkanes by a
370 polyethylene-degrading fungus, a YK. Enzyme Microb. Technol. 30 (2002) 828–831.
371 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-0229(02)00065-0
372 [21] M.C. Krueger, U. Hofmann, M. Moeder, D. Schlosser, Potential of wood-rotting fungi to attack
373 polystyrene sulfonate and its depolymerisation by *Gloeophyllum trabeum* via hydroquinone-driven
374 Fenton chemistry. PLoS One 10 (2015) 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0131773
375 [22] A. Gajendiran, S. Krishnamoorthy, J. Abraham, Microbial degradation of low-density polyethylene
376 (LDPE) by *Aspergillus clavatus* strain JASK1 isolated from landfill soil. 3 Biotech 6 (2016) 52.
377 https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-016-0394-x
378 [23] K. Nam, J.J. Kukor, Combined ozonation and biodegradation for remediation of mixtures of polycyclic
379 aromatic hydrocarbons in soil. Biodegradation 11 (2000) 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026592324693
380 [24] J. Stoops, D. Vandeweyer, S. Crauwels, C. Verreth, H. Boeckx, M. Van Der Borght, J. Claes, B. Lievens,
381 L. Van Campenhout, Minced meat-like products from mealworm larvae (*Tenebrio molitor* and
382 *Alphitobius diaperinus):* microbial dynamics during production and storage. Innov. Food Sci. Emerg.
383 Technol. 41 (2017) 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2017.02.001
384 [25] E. Wynants, S. Crauwels, C. Verreth, N. Gianotten, B. Lievens, J. Claes, L. Van Campenhout, Microbial
385 dynamics during production of lesser mealworms (*Alphitobius diaperinus*) for human consumption at
386 industrial scale. Food Microbiol. 70 (2018) 181-191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2017.06.004
387 [26] J.D. Bjørge, J. Overgaard, H. Malte, N. Gianotten, L.H. Heckmann, Role of temperature on growth and
388 metabolic rate in the tenebrionid beetles *Alphitobius diaperinus* and *Tenebrio molitor*. J. Insect Physiol.
389 107 (2018) 89–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2018.02.010
390 [27] A.M. Bolger, M. Lohse, B. Usadel, Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.
391 Bioinformatics 30 (2014) 2114–2120. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170
392 [28] E. Bolyen, M. Dillon, N. Bokulich, C. Abnet, G. Al-Ghalith, H. Alexander, E. Alm, M. Arumugam, F.
393 Asnicar, Y. Bai, J. Bisanz, K. Bittinger, A. Brejnrod, C. Brislawn, T. Brown, B. Callahan, J. Chase, E.
394 Cope, P. Dorrestein, G. Douglas, D. Durall, C. Duvallet, C. Edwardson, M. Ernst, M. Estaki, J. Fouquier,
395 J. Gauglitz, D. Gibson, A. Gonzalez, K. Gorlick, J. Guo, B. Hillmann, S. Holmes, H. Holste, C.
396 Huttenhower, G. Huttley, S. Janssen, A. Jarmusch, L. Jiang, B. Kaehler, C. Keefe, P. Keim, S. Kelley, D.
397 Knights, I. Koester, T. Kosciolek, J. Kreps, J. Lee, R. Ley, Y.X. Liu, E. Loftfield, C. Lozupone, M. Maher,
398 C. Marotz, B. Martin, D. McDonald, L. McIver, A. Melnik, J. Metcalf, S. Morgan, J. Morton, J. Navas-
399 Molina, S. Orchanian, T. Pearson, S. Peoples, D. Petras, E. Pruesse, A. Rivers, M. Robeson, P. Rosenthal,
400 N. Segata, M. Shaffer, A. Shiffer, R. Sinha, J. Spear, A. Swafford, L. Thompson, P. Torres, P. Trinh, A.
401 Tripathi, P. Turnbaugh, S. Ul-Hasan, F. Vargas, E. Vogtmann, W. Walters, Y. Wan, M. Wang, J. Warren,
402 K. Weber, A. Willis, J. Zaneveld, Y. Zhang, Q. Zhu, R. Knight, G. Caporaso, QIIME 2: Reproducible,
403 interactive, scalable, and extensible microbiome data science. Nat. Biotechnol. 37 (2019) 852-857.
404 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0209-9
405 [29] M.I. Love, W. Huber, S. Anders, Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data
406 with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 15 (2014) 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8

407 [30] P.J. McMurdie, S. Holmes, Phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive Analysis and Graphics
408 of Microbiome Census Data. PLoS One 8 (2013) e61217 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061217
409 [31] S.S. Yang, A.M. Brandon, J.C.A. Flanagan, J. Yang, D. Ning, S.Y. Cai, H.Q. Fan, Z.Y. Wang, J. Ren, E.
410 Benbow, N.Q. Ren, R. M. Waymouth, J. Zhou, C. S. Criddle, W.M. Wu, Biodegradation of polystyrene
411 wastes in yellow mealworms (larvae of *Tenebrio molitor* Linnaeus): Factors affecting biodegradation
412 rates and the ability of polystyrene-fed larvae to complete their life cycle. Chemosphere. 191 (2018) 979-
413 989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.10.117.
414 [32] P. Galgali, A.J. Varma, U.S. Puntambekar, D.V. Gokhale, Towards biodegradable polyolefins: strategy
415 of anchoring minute quantities of monosaccharides and disaccharides onto functionalized polystyrene,
416 and their effect on facilitating polymer biodegradation. Chem. Commun. 2 (2002) 2884–2885.
417 https://doi.org/10.1039/b209254a
418 [33] N. Atiq, S. Ahmed, M.I. Ali, S. Andleeb, B. Ahmad. Isolation and identification of polystyrene
419 biodegrading bacteria from soil. African J. Microbiol. Res. 4 (2010) 1537–1541.
420 [34] E. Syranidou, K. Karkanorachaki, F. Amorotti, M. Franchini, E. Repouskou, M. Kaliva, M. Vamvakaki,
421 B. Kolvenbach, F. Fava, P.F.X. Corvini, N. Kalogerakis, Biodegradation of weathered polystyrene films
422 in seawater microcosms. Sci. Rep. 7 (2017) 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-18366-y
423 [35] G.T. Howard, C. Ruiz, N.P. Hilliard, Growth of *Pseudomonas chlororaphis* on a polyester-polyurethane
424 and the purification and characterization of a polyurethanase-esterase enzyme. Int. Biodeter. Biodegr. 43
425 (1999) 7–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0964-8305(98)00057-2
426 [36] R.E. Vega, T. Main, G.T. Howard, Cloning and expression in *Escherichia coli* of a polyurethane-
427 degrading enzyme from *Pseudomonas fluorescens*. Int. Biodeter. Biodegr. 43 (1999) 49-55.
428 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0964-8305(98)00068-7
429 [37] B.M. Kyaw, R. Champakalakshmi, M.K. Sakharkar, C.S. Lim, K.R. Sakharkar, Biodegradation of low-
430 density polythene (LDPE) by *Pseudomonas* species. Indian J. Microbiol. 52 (2012) 411-419.
431 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12088-012-0250-6
432 [38] N. Shimpi, M. Borane, S. Mishra, M. Kadam, Biodegradation of polystyrene (PS)-poly (lactic acid)(PLA)
433 nanocomposites using *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Macromol. Res. 20 (2012) 181-187.
434 https://doi.org/10.1007/s13233-012-0026-1
435 [39] B.T. Ho, T.K. Roberts, S. Lucas, An overview on biodegradation of polystyrene and modified
436 polystyrene: the microbial approach. Crit. Rev. Biotechnol. 38 (2018) 308–320.
437 https://doi.org/10.1080/07388551.2017.1355293
438 [40] M.G. Yoon, H. Jeong Jeon, M. Nam Kim, Biodegradation of Polyethylene by a Soil Bacterium and AlkB
439 Cloned Recombinant Cell. *J. Bioremediati Biodegrad*. 3 (2012) 1-8. https://doi.org/10.4172/2155-
440 6199.1000145
441 [41] A. Mooney, P.G. Ward, K.E. O'Connor, Microbial degradation of styrene: biochemistry, molecular
442 genetics, and perspectives for biotechnological applications. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 72 (2006) 1.
443 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-006-0443-1
444 [42] K. Nakamiya, G. Sakasita, T. Ooi, S. Kinoshita, Enzymatic degradation of polystyrene by hydroquinone
445 peroxidase of *Azotobacter beijerinckii* HM121. J. Ferment. Bioeng. 84 (1997) 480–482.
446 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0922-338X(97)82013-2
447 [43] G. Parshetti, S. Kalme, G. Saratale, S. Govindwar, Biodegradation of malachite green by *Kocuria rosea*
448 MTCC 1532. Acta Chim. Slov. 53 (2006) 492–498.
449 [44] E. Torlak, M. Gökmen, S. Aydemir, Efficacy of disinfectants against *Cronobacter* biofilm on plastic
450 surfaces. Qual. Assur. Saf. Crop. Foods 7 (2015) 819–823. https://doi.org/10.3920/QAS2014.0423
451 [45] T.G. Volova, A.N. Boyandin, A.D. Vasiliev, V.A. Karpov, S.V. Prudnikova, O.V. Mishukova, U.A.
452 Boyarskikh, M.L. Filipenko, V.P. Rudnev, B. Bá Xuân, V. Vit Dũng, I.I. Gitelson, Biodegradation of
453 polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHAs) in tropical coastal waters and identification of PHA-degrading bacteria.
454 Polym. Degrad. Stab. 95(2010) 2350–2359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2010.08.023

455 [46] G. Fraenkel, M. Blewett, The Basic Food Requirements of Several Insects. J. Exp. Biol. 20 (1943) 28–
456 34.
457 [47] H. Noda, Y. Koizumi, Sterol biosynthesis by symbiotes: Cytochrome P450 sterol C-22 desaturase genes
458 from yeastlike symbiotes of rice planthoppers and anobiid beetles. Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol. 33 (2003)
459 649–658. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0965-1748(03)00056-0
460 [48] C.M. Gibson, M.S. Hunter, Extraordinarily widespread and fantastically complex: Comparative biology
461 of endosymbiotic bacterial and fungal mutualists of insects. Ecol. Lett. 13 (2010) 223–234.
462 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01416.x
463 [49] P.M. Kirk, P.F. Cannon, D.W. Minter, Stalpers. J.A. Ainsworth & Bisby's dictionary of the Fungi, 10th
464 ed., CABI International. 12 2008
465 [50] G. Mathur, A. Mathur, R. Prasad, Colonization and degradation of thermally oxidized high-density
466 polyethylene by *Aspergillus niger* (ITCC No. 6052) isolated from plastic waste dumpsite. Bioremediat. J.
467 15 (2011) 69–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/10889868.2011.570281
468 [51] N. Raaman, N. Rajitha, A. Jayshree, R. Jegadeesh, Biodegradation of plastic by *Aspergillus spp.* isolated
469 from polythene polluted sites around Chennai. J. Acad. Ind. Res. 1 (2012) 313–316.
470 [52] H. Maeda, Y. Yamagata, K. Abe, F. Hasegawa, M. Machida, R. Ishioka, K. Gomi, T. Nakajima,
471 Purification and characterization of a biodegradable plastic-degrading enzyme from *Aspergillus oryzae*.
472 Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 67 (2005) 778–788. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-004-1853-6
473 [53] E. Munir, R.S.M. Harefa, N. Priyani, D. Suryanto, Plastic degrading fungi *Trichoderma viride* and
474 *Aspergillus nomius* isolated from local landfill soil in Medan. IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci. 126
475 (2018) 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/126/1/012145
476 [54] L. Tian, B. Kolvenbach, N. Corvini, S. Wang, N. Tavanaie, L. Wang, Y. Ma, S. Scheu, P.F.X. Corvini,
477 R. Ji, Mineralisation of 14C-labelled polystyrene plastics by *Penicillium variabile* after ozonation pre-
478 treatment. N. Biotechnol. 38 (2017) 101–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nbt.2016.07.008
479 [55] C. Nocciolini, C. Cucini, C. Leo, V. Francardi, E. Dreassi, A. Carapelli, Assessing the Efficiency of
480 Molecular Markers for the Species Identification of Gregarines Isolated from the Mealworm and Super
481 Worm Midgut. Microorganisms 6 (2018) 119. https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms6040119
482

483 **Table 1**. Coverage and alpha-diversity estimators calculated per dataset/group/marker

Dataset	Group	Sample	Good's coverage	Simpson index	Shannon index
Bacteria	PS	PS1	0.99	0.87	3.60
	PS	PS2	0.99	0.82	3.30
	PS	PS3	0.99	0.43	1.54
	CT	CT1	0.99	0.88	3.72
	CT	CT2	0.99	0.88	4.27
	CT	CT3	0.99	0.90	4.71
Fungi	PS	PS1	0.99	0.69	2.72
	PS	PS2	0.99	0.58	1.69
	PS	PS3	0.99	0.63	1.65
	CT	CT1	0.99	0.63	1.67
	CT	CT2	0.99	0.38	1.08
	CT	CT3	0.99	0.19	0.73

484

485

486 **Table 2.** Species that appeared to be over-represented in PS vs. CT groups.

Bacteria				
Phylum	**Class**	**Species**	**Log_2-FC**	**padj**
Proteobacteria	Gammaproteobacteria	*Pseudomonas sp.*	6.5	2.31×10^{-3}
Proteobacteria	Gammaproteobacteria	*Pseudomonas sp.*	4.1	1.89×10^{-2}
Proteobacteria	Gammaproteobacteria	*Cronobacter sp.*	5.8	4.73×10^{-2}
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	*Kocuria sp.*	4.2	2.48×10^{-2}
Bacilli	Bacillaceae	*Virgibacillus sp.*	5.8	4.14×10^{-2}
Bacilli	Bacillaceae	*Pseudogracilibacillus sp.*	4.8	2.41×10^{-2}
Fungi				
Phylum	**Class**	**Species**	**Log_2-FC**	**padj**
Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	*Aspergillus sp.*	13.9	1.33×10^{-2}
Ascomycota	Eurotiomycetes	*Penicillium sp.*	16.3	2.54×10^{-3}
Ascomycota	Agaricomycetes	Unidentified	18.0	8.66×10^{-4}
Ascomycota	Agaricomycetes	*Hyphodermella sp.*	12.0	4.00×10^{-2}
Ascomycota	Sordariomycetes	*Trichoderma sp.*	11.8	4.00×10^{-2}

487

488

489 ## Figure Legends

490

491 1. **Figure 1.** Bacterial OTUs diversity. Taxa bar plots of (a) phyla and (b) classes of bacteria. Taxa are
492 colour coded.
493 2. **Figure 2.** Venn diagram of bacterial and fungal OTUs. Number of OTUs shared/not shared between
494 treatment and control. (a) bacteria; (b) fungi.
495 3. **Figure 3.** PCoA based on β diversity indices. (a) bacteria, Bray-Curtis; (b) bacteria, unweighted
496 Unifrac distances; (c) bacteria, weighted Unifrac distances; (d) fungi, Bray-Curtis. Black dots
497 represent treated samples, white dots controls.
498 4. **Figure 4.** Bacterial OTUs differential abundance. (a) DESeq2 differential abundance of bacteria
499 clustered by genus. Taxa are colour coded. Species recovered as significantly more/less abundant in
500 PS with respect to CT samples correspond to positive/negative of Log_2-fold change, respectively.
501 Asterisks indicate taxa that are observed at a frequency above 0.1% in the original data. (b) DESeq2
502 differential abundance in resampled data set. Columns are colour coded according to the frequency a
503 taxon is recovered significantly over/under expressed in the resamples. Red error bars indicate the
504 range of Log2-fold changes in the resamples.
505 5. **Figure 5.** Fungal OTUs diversity. Taxa bar plots of: a) phyla and b) classes of fungi. Taxa are colour
506 coded.
507 6. **Figure 6.** Fungal OTUs differential abundance. (a) DESeq2 differential abundance of fungi clustered
508 by genus. Taxa are colour coded. Species recovered as significantly more/less abundant in PS with
509 respect to CT samples correspond to positive/negative of Log_2-fold change, respectively. Asterisks
510 indicate taxa that are observed at a frequency above 0.1% in the original data. (b) DESeq2 differential
511 abundance in resampled data set. Columns are colour coded according to the frequency a taxon is
512 recovered significantly over/under expressed in the resamples. Red error bars indicate the range of
513 Log_2-fold changes in the resamples.

514

515 ## Figures

516

517



518 **Figure 1**



519

520 **Figure 2**

521

522



523 **Figure 3**

524



525

526 **Figure 4**

527



528 **Figure 5**

529



530

531 **Figure 6**