1	
2	A test for microbiome-mediated rescue via host phenotypic
3	plasticity in <i>Daphnia</i>
4	
5 6	René S. Shahmohamadloo ¹ *, Amir R. Gabidulin ¹ , Ellie R. Andrews ¹ , John M. Fryxell ² , Seth M. Rudman ¹ *
7	
8 9	¹ School of Biological Sciences, Washington State University, Vancouver, WA, United States ² Department of Integrative Biology, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada
10	
11	*Corresponding authors:
12 13 14	René S. Shahmohamadloo, School of Biological Sciences, Washington State University, 14204 NE Salmon Creek Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686, USA. Email: rene.shahmohamadloo@wsu.edu Seth M. Rudman, School of Biological Sciences, Washington State University, 14204 NE Salmon
15	Creek Ave, Vancouver, WA 98686, USA. Email: seth.rudman@wsu.edu
16	
17 18	Statement of authorship: S.M.R. and R.S.S. designed the research. J.M.F. and S.M.R. provided material resources. R.S.S. and S.M.R. conducted the experiment. R.S.S. and E.R.A. completed
19 20 21	extractions. A.R.G. and R.S.S. analyzed the data. R.S.S., S.M.R., A.R.G., and E.R.A. wrote the paper. All authors read, amended, and approved the final manuscript.
21 22 23	Running title: Testing Microbiome-Mediated Rescue in Daphnia
24 25	Data accessibility statement: The data supporting the results will be archived in the public repository Dryad (DOI will be released upon publication).
26 27	Competing interest statement: The authors declare no competing interests.
28 29 30	Keywords: Microbiome, Plasticity, Rescue, Genetic variation, Daphnia, Fitness
31 32	Acknowledgements: We thank S. Porter and the Rudman lab for helpful comments and discussions.
22	Free diam (This are descented by the Nistianal Institute of Community Medicines of the Nistianal
24 25	Funding: This work was supported by the National Institute of General Medicine of the National Institutes of Health (Award #1D25CM1472(4, SMD), Canada Einst Descents Excellence Euclid
35	through the Each from Thought Drogram (LME), a Parting Doctdoctoral Followship (SMP) and
30 37 38	NSERC Postdoctoral Fellowship (R.S.S.), and a Liber Ero Postdoctoral Fellowship (R.S.S.).
39 40	Type of article: Original article
40 41	One contance summary Dethnic exhibits considerable electicity is individual and executivity level
41 42 43	responses to a cosmopolitan stressor, yet shifts in microbiome composition are not correlated with the magnitude of this plasticity.

44 **Abstract:** Phenotypic plasticity is a primary mechanism by which organismal phenotypes shift in 45 response to the environment. Host-associated microbiomes often exhibit considerable shifts in response to environmental variation and these shifts could facilitate host phenotypic plasticity, 46 47 adaptation, or rescue populations from extinction. However, it is unclear how much shifts in 48 microbiome composition contribute to host phenotypic plasticity, limiting our knowledge of the 49 underlying mechanisms of plasticity and, ultimately, the fate of populations inhabiting changing 50 environments. In this study, we examined phenotypic responses and microbiome composition in 20 genetically distinct Daphnia magna clones exposed to non-toxic and toxic diets containing Microcystis, a 51 52 cosmopolitan cyanobacteria and common stressor for Daphnia. Daphnia exhibited significant plasticity 53 in survival, reproduction, and population growth rates in response to *Microcystis* exposure. However, 54 the effects of Microcystis exposure on the Daphnia microbiome were limited, with the primary effect 55 being differences in abundance observed across five bacterial families. Moreover, there was no 56 significant correlation between the magnitude of microbiome shifts and host phenotypic plasticity. 57 Our results suggest that microbiome composition played a negligible role in driving host phenotypic 58 plasticity or microbiome-mediated rescue.

59

60 Introduction

61

62 Projected biodiversity losses from anthropogenic global change this century (Urban et al., 2016) 63 necessitate an understanding of the magnitude and mechanisms of adaptive phenotypic responses to 64 environmental change (Bellard et al., 2012; Lavergne et al., 2010). Although organisms can rapidly 65 evolve in response to global change (Hendry & Kinnison, 1999; Hoffmann & Sgrò, 2011; Rudman et al., 2022), environmentally induced phenotypic plasticity—defined as the capacity for a given genotype 66 67 to express different phenotypes when faced with a different environmental challenge (West-Eberhard, 2003)—is a primary mechanism by which organisms respond to environmental changes (Ghalambor 68 69 et al., 2007; Merilä & Hendry, 2014). This plasticity can be adaptive, meaning it can enhance an 70 organism's fitness in response to environmental change, and such adaptive plasticity is a key 71 component of reducing phenotype-environment mismatches that can cause extinction (Bell & Collins, 72 2008; Bell & Gonzalez, 2009). Yet, the mechanisms that produce adaptive phenotypic plasticity are 73 not always well understood.

74

75 The microbiome impacts nearly all aspects of host phenotype (Akbar et al., 2022; Berg et al., 2020; 76 Flandroy et al., 2018; Moran & Baumann, 2000) and extends the host's genetic repertoire 77 (Decaestecker et al., 2024). Host-associated microbiomes both show sensitivity to environmental 78 changes and have demonstrated diverse impacts on host fitness (Decaestecker et al., 2024). The 79 composition of associated microbial communities can influence host performance and relative fitness 80 (Gould et al., 2018), and intraspecific variation in microbiome composition has been observed to 81 affect host physiology and performance in various taxa (Bolnick et al., 2014; Rudman et al., 2019; J. 82 Wang et al., 2015). This variation and its impact on host phenotypes have spurred considerable 83 speculation about the microbiome's crucial role in host population persistence(White et al., 2023) and 84 in extending host adaptive capacities (Henry et al., 2021).

85

Microbiome-mediated plasticity—defined as changes in microbiome composition or function that influence host phenotype—has been proposed as a general mechanism that facilitates evolutionary

adaptation by reducing mismatches between host phenotype and the environment (Henry et al., 2021;

Kolodny & Schulenburg, 2020). Experimental work on sea anemones suggest that microbiome-

mediated plasticity can enhance thermal acclimation and that the benefits of such acclimation can be

transmitted to the next generation, suggesting microbiota as a mechanism of rapid adaptation to

92 environmental changes (Baldassarre et al., 2022). Coral microbiomes too may shift to protect against 93 extreme challenges like heat stress and pathogens, underpinning the health and resilience of reef 94 ecosystems (Bourne et al., 2016; Webster & Reusch, 2017). Research using *Caenorhabditis elegans* in a 95 novel environment—though with limited population-level replication—also suggests that adaptation 96 to new conditions can be jointly influenced by host genetics and microbiome composition, 97 highlighting the complex interactions between host and microbiome in shaping evolutionary 98 trajectories (Petersen et al., 2023).

99

100 Cases where microbiome-mediated plasticity impact host population growth and persistence under 101 challenging environments have received particular attention. This has led to the concept of 102 microbiome rescue-defined here as changes in microbiome abundance, composition, or activity that 103 improves host fitness and decreases the likelihood of extinction (Mueller et al., 2020)—and speculation 104 that it may be an important process for the maintenance of biodiversity in rapidly changing 105 environments (Mueller et al., 2020; Shade, 2023). Microbiomes can play a critical role in helping hosts cope with various environmental challenges, including toxicants, by potentially modulating 106 107 detoxification mechanisms and stress responses (Adamovsky et al., 2018; Kikuchi et al., 2012; G.-H. 108 Wang et al., 2020). However, while these studies highlight the potential for microbiomes to influence 109 host responses to stress, they do not provide direct evidence of microbiome rescue in populations. Limited empirical evidence remains linking shifts in microbiome composition to significant impacts 110 on host population dynamics outside of obligate symbiosis, leaving considerable uncertainty about the 111 112 strength of any such beneficial effects or the potential for rescue (Mason, 2020).

113

114 Empirical tests of the contributions of shifts in the microbiome to adaptive plasticity are needed to determine whether microbiomes facilitate population persistence or rescue in response to 115 116 environmental stress. Daphnia (water fleas) exhibit observable and quantifiable phenotypic changes in 117 response to environmental fluctuations that are crucial to population dynamics, including alterations in survival rates, morphology, and reproductive strategies (Boersma et al., 1998). The interaction 118 119 between Daphnia and harmful algal blooms (HABs) of the cyanobacterium Microcystis-a global 120 environmental challenge (Harke et al., 2016)-is both important for host fitness and environmental 121 health (Hairston et al., 2001; Isanta-Navarro et al., 2021; Shahmohamadloo, Poirier, et al., 2020; 122 Shahmohamadloo, Simmons, et al., 2020). Microbiome transplant experiments have demonstrated 123 that both host genotype and gut microbiota can mediate tolerance in *Daphnia* to *Microcystis* (Macke et 124 al., 2017); host genotypic variation in tolerance disappears when Daphnia are made germ-free and 125 inoculated with a standardized microbiome (Macke et al., 2017). In another reciprocal transplant experiment, Daphnia performed better when receiving a microbiome from their source region when 126 127 exposed to toxic Microcystis, indicating microbiome-mediated local adaptation in stress tolerance 128 (Houwenhuyse et al., 2021). This effect was most pronounced when donor microbiomes were pre-129 exposed to toxic cyanobacteria, and it also depended on the pond and genotype of the Daphnia 130 (Houwenhuyse et al., 2021). More broadly, the Daphnia microbiome exhibits considerable plasticity in 131 both diversity and composition, influenced by the environmental bacterial community and host 132 genotype, among other potential environmental drivers (Callens et al., 2020; Hegg et al., 2021; 133 Houwenhuyse et al., 2021).

134

135 Prior work on *Daphnia-Microcystis* interactions has been instrumental in revealing the mechanisms by

136 which microbiomes can impact hosts, but understanding the implications of these interactions for

137 host plasticity and population dynamics requires different approaches. First, determining the extent

138 of Daphnia microbiome shifts, and whether these shifts are repeated and deterministic, is critical to

139 understanding how robust the effects of microbiome changes may be on host phenotypes (Härer &

Rennison, 2022; Stuart et al., 2017). Second, explicitly testing whether the magnitude or direction of
microbiome shifts are correlated with overall phenotypic plasticity is key to understanding the
contribution of microbiome change to host phenotypic response (Kolodny & Schulenburg, 2020).
Finally, measuring the magnitude of an observed shift on host fitness due specifically to microbiome
alteration is critical in evaluating the microbiome rescue hypothesis (Mueller et al., 2020; Shade, 2023).
Doing so requires measurements of the relationship between microbiome shifts and parameters

146 central to population dynamics. Together these data can provide a test of the role of microbiome shifts

147 in host phenotypic plasticity and population dynamics in changing environments.

148

149 To address key questions regarding the role of the microbiome in facilitating host plasticity and rescue, 150 we conducted an algal toxicity and microbiome study on 20 genetically distinct clones of Daphnia magna 151 collected from a single lake. We first catalog the impacts of Microcystis exposure on Daphnia phenotypes 152 and population growth rate for each genotype. We then tested the following questions: 1) What is the 153 magnitude of Daphnia phenotypic response to Microcystis exposure? 2) Does Microcystis exposure alter Daphnia microbiome composition and abundance and, if so, are these changes parallel and 154 155 deterministic across different genotypes, under varying treatments? 3) Is the magnitude and/or direction of shifts in the microbiome in response to *Microcystis* correlated with the magnitude of 156 157 adaptive phenotypic plasticity in Daphnia? To answer these questions, we conducted a 21-d chronic 158 toxicity exposure experiment across two common gardens (non-toxic, Chlorella-only; and toxic, 3:1 159 ratio of Chlorella to Microcystis) using 20 D. magna clones. Clonal replication allows for an assessment of 160 the effects of microbiome shifts across multiple genetic backgrounds and enables projections of 161 population-level responses. We use these fitness-associated phenotypes in each of 20 clones to 162 parameterize population projection models and test for the effects of shifts in the microbiome on host 163 plasticity.

164

165 Methods

- 166
- 167 Daphnia magna field collection and culturing
- 168

169 In late spring and early summer, 20 genotypes of D. magna were obtained from 'Langerodevijver' 170 (LRV; 50° 49' 42.08", 04° 38' 20.60"), a small lake situated within the nature reserve of Doode Bemde, 171 Vlaams-Brabant, Belgium (Orsini et al., 2012). LRV, with a surface area of 140,000 m² and a maximum 172 depth of 1 m, features a single basin and experiences seasonal HABs of Microcystis, a common 173 occurrence in lakes worldwide. Additionally, LRV harbors a large population of D. magna. Parthenogenetic lines of each genotype were maintained for over five years (approximately 300 174 175 generations) in continuous cultures at 20 °C, utilizing UV-filtered dechlorinated municipal tap water enriched with 2 mg C L⁻¹ of the green alga C. vulgaris (strain CPCC 90; Canadian Phycological Culture 176 177 Centre, Waterloo, ON, Canada). Culturing of C. vulgaris was carried out using COMBO medium 178 (Kilham et al., 1998). Filters with a pore size of 0.22 µm were placed at both the input and output of 179 the aeration system to prevent any bacterial contamination.

- 180
- 181 Microcystis aeruginosa culturing
- 182
- 183 In accordance with our previously outlined methodology (Shahmohamadloo et al., 2019), M. aeruginosa
- 184 (strain CPCC 300; Canadian Phycological Culture Centre, Waterloo, ON, Canada) was cultivated in
- 185 BG-11 media and maintained in a growth chamber under sterile conditions at a constant temperature
- 186 of 21 \pm 1 °C, illuminated with cool-white fluorescent light at an intensity of 600 \pm 15 lx, and subjected
- 187 to a photoperiod of 16:8 h light:dark. The culture was allowed to grow undisturbed for at least one

- month before being prepared for the 21-d chronic study. *M. aeruginosa* CPCC 300 is known to produce microcystin-LR (CAS: 101043-37-2, $C_{49}H_{74}N_{10}O_{12}$) and its desmethylated form [D-Asp³]-microcystin-LR (CAS: 120011-66-7, $C_{48}H_{72}N_{10}O_{12}$), which are prevalent in freshwater ecosystems and exhibit toxicity to zooplankton (Chorus & Welker, 2021; Harke et al., 2016).
- 192

193 To facilitate testing on *D. magna*, an aliquot of the stock was inoculated into 100% COMBO medium 194 two weeks prior to test initiation, where it was cultured until reaching a cell density of $1.25 \pm 0.02 \times$ 195 10^7 cells mL⁻¹. This medium was chosen because it supports the growth of both algae and 196 cyanobacteria while remaining non-hazardous to zooplankton (Kilham et al., 1998). Filters with a pore 197 size of 0.22 µm were placed at both the input and output of the aeration system to prevent any bacterial 198 contamination.

199

201

200 Gut microbiome experiment

We evaluated shifts in the microbiome to *M. aeruginosa* using 20 genotypes of *D. magna*. Phenotypic responses measured include survival, reproduction (number of offspring produced), and the timing and number of broods.

205

206 In preparation for this investigation, we individually housed one adult female D. magna per genotype 207 in separate 50-mL glass tubes containing COMBO medium and C. vulgaris at a concentration of 2 mg 208 C L-1. Daily monitoring was conducted to observe reproduction. Neonates of D. magna born within 209 24 h were gathered from each genotype and individually placed into 50-mL glass tubes, following the 210 previously described procedure. This process resulted in 10 replicates per genotype and a total of 200 211 tubes. These 200 D. magna, representing 20 genotypes, served as the founding mothers for this study. 212 All D. magna were maintained under constant environmental conditions, including a temperature of 213 21 \pm 1 °C, cool-white fluorescent light at an intensity of 600 \pm 15 lx, and a photoperiod of 16:8 h 214 light:dark.

215

216 A 21-day chronic toxicity study was performed following previously described methods 217 (Houwenhuyse et al., 2021; OECD, 2012). D. magna neonates from each of the 20 genotypes, born 218 within a 24-hour period, were collected. Groups of 15 neonates were placed in 1-L glass jars containing 219 750 mL of UV-filtered water, with triplicates for each genotype. Each jar was then assigned to its 220 respective feeding treatment. Two common gardens were included: Chlorella-only (non-toxic diet) and 221 3:1 Chlorella: Microcystis (toxic diet). Following these ratios, all D. magna were fed 2 mg C L⁻¹, corresponding to 3×10^6 cells total, consistent with previous studies exposing daphnids to dietary 222 223 combinations of green algae and cyanobacteria (Isanta-Navarro et al., 2021; Rohrlack et al., 2005; 224 Shahmohamadloo, Poirier, et al., 2020). In total, 1,800 animals were used for this study (i.e., 3 replicates 225 per genotype, 900 animals per treatment).

226

As this was a semi-static test, solutions were refreshed $3 \times \text{per}$ week on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. This process involved transferring *D. magna* from the old to the new glass jar and providing *D. magna* with a food supply consisting of 3×10^6 cells (i.e., the 3:1 treatment received 2×10^6 *C. vulgaris* cells and 1×10^6 *M. aeruginosa* cells, corresponding to 2 mg C L⁻¹). Throughout this period, daily survival rates, reproductive output, and the timing and number of broods were recorded to evaluate

- potential interactions between genotype and treatment effects. The study was conducted under 400-
- 233 800 lx cool-white fluorescent light at a temperature of 20 ± 1 °C with a 16:8 light:dark cycle.
- 234

At 21 days, *D. magna* replicates were transferred to sterile-filtered tap water for 24 h to eliminate food particles from the gut and environmental bacteria from the carapace and filter apparatus (Houwenhuyse et al., 2021). Subsequently, *D. magna* guts were extracted using dissection needles under a stereomicroscope and transferred into an Eppendorf tube filled with 10 μ L sterile milliQ water, after which they were stored in -80 °C for future DNA extraction.

240

241 Library preparation and sequencing

242

243 To analyze the gut microbial communities of *D. magna* at the conclusion of the 21-d experiment, DNA extractions were performed using the NucleoSpin Soil DNA kit (Macherey-Nagel, Düren, Germany). 244 245 Prior to bead beating samples according to kit instructions, each D. magna gut was pressed using a stainless steel probe. DNA was eluted using 50 µL of 5 mM Tris/HCl at pH 8.5. Subsequent DNA 246 247 quantification was conducted with 5 µL per sample of eluted DNA on a Qubit (Invitrogen, 248 Massachusetts, United States) using a dsDNA broad-range assay. Samples that had low DNA 249 concentrations were vacufuged before sequencing to increase concentration. Isolated DNA was 250 quantified (Equalbit 1x dsDNA HS Assay kit) and amplified using primers covering the V3-V4 251 hypervariable 16s rRNA region. Library quality was assessed and libraries were dual indexed before 252 Equimolar pooling based on QC values. Pooled libraries were sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq with 253 a 250 bp read length configuration to a depth of 0.3M reads for each sample.

254

255 Data were imported using demux single end forward reads with initialization of primer trimming followed by high-resolution DADA2 (Callahan et al., 2016) filtering at truncation quality 20 (if 256 257 nucleotide of quality 20 is detected, the sequence from then on is truncated). Reads were then filtered 258 using default QIIME2 parameters (Bolyen et al., 2018). We retained an average of 16941 reads per sample (Quantile range: 1% = 7237, 25% = 14943, 50% = 17006, 75% = 19835, 100% = 25629). 259 260 Taxonomy was assigned using greenegene full length 16s rRNA backbone database with a scikit-learn 261 naive Bayes machine-learning classifier (Bokulich et al., 2018). Before transitioning into the phyloseq 262 package in R (R Core Team, 2022), we generated an unrooted phylogenetic tree to improve the 263 accuracy of the downstream analysis. In *phyloseq*, the combined dataset was first filtered by taxa that 264 were represented with less than 5 total taxonomy classifications in the whole sample set, then rarefied 265 at a depth of 20,000 ASV. Data was aggregated to bacterial class for analyses of relative abundance 266 and differential abundance analysis graphs (Figure 3).

267

268 Water sampling for analysis

269

270 Water samples were collected from each treatment at the beginning of the test, during solution 271 changes, and at the conclusion to measure cell concentrations and standard water parameters. These 272 samples were quick-frozen at -80 °C and subsequently analyzed for cyanobacterial toxins, which have 273 been reported previously (Shahmohamadloo et al., 2023). Briefly, water parameters recorded before 274 and after solution renewals remained within the specified test criteria. No indications of hypoxiainduced stress on D. magna behavior were observed. Mortality and immobilization were initially 275 276 detected within 48 hours after exposure to the toxic treatments and persisted throughout the 21-d test 277 period. This outcome was anticipated, given that the selected toxic concentrations can range from 278 sublethal (Shahmohamadloo, Poirier, et al., 2020) to lethal (Ferrão-Filho et al., 2000; Lürling & van 279 der Grinten, 2003) in Daphnia laboratory assays, and are commonly encountered in freshwater 280 ecosystems affected by HABs (Chorus & Welker, 2021).

281

282 Statistical analysis

283

All analyses were completed in R version 4.2.2 (R Core Team, 2022). To test the magnitude of clonal 284 285 variation across treatments, we used a Linear Mixed Effects (LME) model for each D. magna phenotypic response with 'clone' treated as a random effect and 'treatment' treated as a fixed effect. 286 287 We constructed Leslie matrices for each clone in the toxic and non-toxic exposure treatments. The 288 population growth rate (λ) and exponential rate of increase (*r*) based on the Euler-Lotka equation were 289 additionally calculated to estimate the reproductive output of D. magna that were exposed to toxic and 290 non-toxic diets. These calculations were constructed using the full 21-d data on D. magna. The 291 difference in neonate production between toxic and non-toxic diets were calculated for each 'clone' 292 and 'treatment' combination and plotted.

293

294 Downstream microbiome analyses were conducted in the *phyloseq* package in R. We calculated 295 Shannon diversity index and tested for the effects of algal treatment and clone on α -diversity using the Ime4 package in R. Bray-Curtis and Weighted Unifrac B-diversity metrics were used to assess the 296 297 multivariate effects of algal treatment and clone in a permutational multivariate analysis 298 (PERMANOVA) adonis2 function from the vegan package in R. ß-diversity distance matrices were 299 treated as response variables with 'treatment' + 'clone' treated as fixed effects and the number of sampled guts in each replicate treated as a random effect. To identify bacterial differences on the 300 301 family level between samples associated with algal treatment, we used a differential abundance analysis 302 from the DESeq2 package in R, where ASVs representing less than 1% of the reads were discarded 303 and p-values were adjusted using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995). To 304 support our findings from DESeq2, we additionally employed the phylofactor package in R as an 305 alternative which utilizes phylogenetic data to assess the differences in microbial community 306 composition (Washburne et al., 2017).

307

We tested for relationships between shifts in the gut microbiome composition and host plasticity across algal treatments. We used the *multivarvector* package in R (Härer & Rennison, 2022) to generate multivariate vectors and angles by connecting the population means of Principal Component Analysis (PCA) scores with clones across different algal treatments (20 total vectors and angles) as an empirical measure of microbiome shifts in response to *Microcystis* exposure. The relationship between the magnitude of plasticity in microbial composition and host performance, *r* and delta mean neonate production, was assessed using the goodness of fit of \mathbb{R}^2 extracted from a linear model.

315

To assess the degree of parallelism in the microbiome shift associated with algal treatment, we used *multivarvector* package, generating the angular value of the parallelism of replicates given toxic and nontoxic diets to then assess the parallel, non-parallel, or anti-parallel relationships of our data. In addition to *multivarvector*, we implemented betadisper from *vegan* to assess the multivariate homogeneity of groups dispersions on our ß-diversity metrics.

- 321322 Results
- 323

324 Daphnia magna plasticity in life-history traits and population projection

325

Exposure to the toxic diet (3:1 Chlorella:Microcystis) had widespread plastic effects on *Daphnia*, including a significant decrease in survival ($F_{1,19} = 10.81$, p = 0.0039; Figure 1a). *Daphnia* from the non-toxic diet had a 81.5 \pm 1.3% survival rate compared to *Daphnia* from the toxic diet who had a

 $329 \quad 68.13 \pm 3.2\%$ survival rate to the cessation of the study at 21 days. Similarly, we observed a significant

effect on neonate production per *Daphnia* ($F_{1,19} = 19.56$, p = 0.00029; Figure 1b); *Daphnia* reared on non-toxic diets produced 4.76 \pm 0.29 neonates per *Daphnia* compared to 3.02 \pm 0.23 neonates per *Daphnia* for those reared on toxic diets. Lastly, we observed a significant delay in time to first brood ($F_{1,19} = 6.66$, p = 0.018; Figure 1c); *Daphnia* reared on non-toxic diets reproduced at 9.52 \pm 0.15 days compared to 10.53 \pm 0.26 days for those reared on toxic diets. We did not observe significant effects on the total number of broods per *Daphnia* ($F_{1,19} = 0.25$, p = 0.62) by 21 days.

336

337 To make inferences on the effects of *Microcystis* exposure on population dynamics we constructed 338 Leslie matrices for each clone on both non-toxic and toxic diets. We then calculated the exponential 339 rate of increase (r) for each Daphnia clonal population on each diet and the mean difference in r340 between toxic and non-toxic for each 'clone' and 'treatment' combination to determine whether 341 *Microcystis* exposure would have a net positive (r > 0), neutral (r = 0), or negative (r < 0) effect relative 342 to rearing on a control diet (Figure 1d). *Microcystis* exposure negatively impacted 13/20 clones and had 343 positive effects on 7/20 clones (Figure 1d). The mean difference in population growth rate between toxic (2.38) and non-toxic (2.88) for all clones was -0.49, indicating the overall effect of Microcystis 344 345 exposure on Daphnia population growth was negative.





Figure 1. Phenotypic variation among the 20 *Daphnia magna* clones at the end of the 21-d gut microbiome chronic experiment across two treatments: non-toxic diet (Chlorella-only) and toxic diet (3:1 Chlorella:Microcystis). Phenotypes measured were a) survival (%), b) mean number of neonates produced per *D. magna*, and c) mean time to first brood per *D. magna* (d). Panel d) is the exponential rate of population change (*r*) between treatments across each of 20 *D. magna* clonal populations at the end of the 21-d gut microbiome chronic experiment. A positive population growth response is r > 0whereas a negative population growth response is r < 0.

355

356 Testing for effects of toxic exposure on Daphnia microbiomes

357

358 We found no significant effect of algal treatment ($F_{38} = 0.763$, P = 0.388) or *Daphnia* clone ($F_{38} = 0.265$, P = 0.609) on microbiome α -diversity (Figure 2). Effects of algal treatment and clone were 360 likewise modest on β-diversity; we observed no significant effect of algal treatment ($F_1 = 1.53$, P =

361 0.195) or clone ($F_{19} = 1.22$, P = 0.173) using Weighted UniFrac (Figure 3a) and a marginally significant 362 effect of clone ($F_{19} = 1.17$, P = 0.049), but not algal treatment ($F_1 = 0.96$, P = 0.505), when assessed 363 using Bray-Curtis (Figure 3b). Using a permutation test for homogeneity of multivariate dispersions, 364 we likewise saw no significant difference in variance in community composition associated with algal 365 treatments (Weighted UniFrac: $F_1 = 0.601$, P = 0.443; and Bray-Curtis: $F_1 = 0.009$, P = 0.152). 366



367



372

Although ß-diversity metrics demonstrated no significant community wide differences in microbiome
 composition, there were particular microbial groups that differed in their abundance across algal diets.
 A *DESeq2* based analysis of differential read abundance found five differentially abundant bacterial

9 of 19

- families (Figure 2c): Spirosomaceae (log2FC = -25.57, P < 0.001), Sphingomonadaceae (log2FC = -23.02, P <0.001), Rhodobacteraceae (log2FC = 23.03, P < 0.001), Pseudomonadaceae (log2FC = 23.57, P < 0.001), and Burkholderiaceae (log2FC = 23.67, P < 0.001). A Phylofactor based analysis identified only Spirosomaceae (F_2 = 11.28, P = 0.001) as a differentially abundant taxa.
- 380

To determine whether diet treatments produced parallel shifts in microbiome composition, we employed *multivarvector* (Härer & Rennison, 2022). Treating each clone as a unique contrast, we found the shift in microbiome composition associated with non-toxic and toxic diet exposure was nonparallel (student's t-test with a null hypothesis of 90° (non-parallel) for both Weighted UniFrac (t₁₉ = -0.231, df = 19, P = 0.82, Mean = 89.73) and Bray-Curtis (t₁₉ = 0.34, df = 19, P = 0.74, Mean = 90.14) indicated a non-parallel relationship).

387



Figure 3. Principal Component of Analysis (PCoA) in a) Weighted UniFrac, and b) Bray-Curtis distances in relation to the gut microbiome across the 20 *Daphnia magna* clones subjected to non-toxic (Chlorella-only; \blacktriangle) and toxic (3:1 Chlorella:Microcystis; \bullet) treatments. Each clone is connected by a line to show the shift in host response across treatments.

393

394 Magnitude of microbial plasticity and degree of parallelism

395

We next tested whether the magnitude of microbiome shifts that occurred with exposure to toxic diets, as calculated in multivariate space, was associated with the magnitude of host plasticity across diets. To do so, we tested for a correlation between the magnitude of the microbiome shift in multivariate space and the magnitude of change in *r* across diet treatments for each of the 20 clones. We observed no significant relationship between the degree of shifts in the microbiome and the difference in *r* across diet treatments in either Weighted Unifrac (F₁₈ = 0.083, P = 0.776, R² = 0.005; Figure 4a) or Bray Curtis (F₁₈ = 0.009, P = 0.923, R² = 0.0005; Figure 4b).





Figure 4. Magnitude of microbial plasticity in a) Weighted UniFrac, and b) Bray-Curtis distances in relation to the difference in difference in population growth rates (*r*) across the 20 *Daphnia magna* clones subjected to non-toxic (Chlorella-only) and toxic (3:1 Chlorella:Microcystis) treatments. The mean vector is represented by the bluegreen line.

409410 **Discussion**

411

412 Relationship between phenotypic responses, shifts in the microbiome, and population-level effects

413

414 Overall patterns of host phenotypic plasticity associated with Microcystis dietary exposure were 415 considerable, with mean shifts in survival, number of offspring produced, and time to first brood generally trending toward a negative response across the 20 Daphnia clones (Figure 1a-c). When these 416 417 phenotypes were combined to parameterize a population projection, dietary exposure to Microcystis produced considerable clonal variation and led to an overall decrease in population growth rates 418 419 (Figure 1d). This response aligns with prior work (Shahmohamadloo et al., 2024), which has shown significant mortality in Daphnia due to Microcystis (Chislock et al., 2013; Harke et al., 2016; Isanta-420 421 Navarro et al., 2021; Shahmohamadloo, Poirier, et al., 2020), along with evidence of adaptive 422 responses to Microcystis blooms (Chislock et al., 2013; Hairston et al., 2001; Sarnelle & Wilson, 2005).

- 423
- 424 In contrast to these pronounced effects on host phenotypic plasticity, Microcystis exposure produced
- 425 only modest shifts in the microbiome (Figure 2a-c), with no parallel changes across Daphnia clones
- 426 (Figure 3). Furthermore, the magnitude of microbiome shifts was not correlated with the magnitude
- 427 of phenotypic plasticity observed across clones (Figure 4). These findings stand in stark contrast to
- 428 prior work focused on axenic rearing and microbiome transplants which has suggested the select few
- 429 community members that do dominate the Daphnia gut microbiome (Freese & Schink, 2011)-of
- 430 which we identified five microbial families that significantly differed (Figure 2c)—have a prominent
- 431 influence on host fitness including survival, growth, and reproduction when diets feature Microcystis

432 (Callens et al., 2018; Macke et al., 2017; Peerakietkhajorn et al., 2016; Sison-Mangus et al., 2015). Our
433 results, however, suggest that exposure to a common environmental stressor did not lead to
434 microbiome-mediated plasticity with adaptive phenotypic or positive demographic effects that could
435 stabilize population growth rates and decrease extinction risk.

436

437 Microbiomes and adaptive plasticity revisited

438

439 The role of the microbiome in host responses to environmental stress has been a topic of considerable 440 interest (Henry et al., 2021; Kolodny & Schulenburg, 2020; Rocca et al., 2018; Zilber-Rosenberg & 441 Rosenberg, 2008). Spurred by early work documenting shifts in microbiome composition associated 442 with environmental stress (Engel et al., 2012; Motta et al., 2018), there has been considerable speculation about the role of the microbiome in host acclimation and adaptation (Mueller et al., 2020; 443 444 Rudman et al., 2019). Our findings raise questions about the circumstances and generality of 445 microbiomes as a mechanism underlying adaptive plasticity in hosts. We show that the Daphnia microbiome only exhibits significant shifts in the abundance of five bacterial families. Though it has 446 447 been proposed that shifts in microbiome composition play a crucial role in influencing the fitness of hosts and stabilizing growth rates to reduce the probability of extinction (Kolodny & Schulenburg, 448 449 2020; Mueller et al., 2020; Shade, 2023), we find no correlation between the degree of shift in the microbiome and host adaptive plasticity (Figure 3) or population growth rate (Figure 1d). 450

451

452 Prior work demonstrating a role of adaptive plasticity has largely studied the contribution of 453 microbiomes without host genetic diversity (Baldassarre et al., 2022) or through complete microbiome 454 transplants (Callens et al., 2018, 2020; Houwenhuyse et al., 2021; Macke et al., 2017, 2020). While this 455 work illustrates how influential host-microbiome interactions can be in specific and tightly controlled 456 circumstances, these types of approaches could lead to overestimates of the importance of shifts in 457 the microbiome for host phenotypic responses in more natural settings (Hegg et al., 2021).

458

459 An important caveat of our work is that it was conducted under laboratory conditions, where D. magna gut bacterial communities can differ significantly from those in natural environments. Recent work 460 461 shows that microbiome diversity and composition can change rapidly after transfer to the lab, with 462 ongoing shifts even after two years (Houwenhuyse et al., 2023). Despite these differences, key bacterial classes (Hegg et al., 2021; Houwenhuyse et al., 2023) Burkholderiaceae, Pseudomonadaceae, and 463 464 Sphingomonadaceae were dominant across field and lab rearing environments and present in high 465 abundances in our study. Our test tests for parallelism (Figure 4) revealed that their relative abundances were not repeatedly changed by exposure to Microcystis, aligning with prior work under 466 467 semi-natural conditions showing no evidence that natural variation in microbiome diversity or composition was associated with tolerance to cyanobacteria (Hegg et al., 2021). Future work that 468 469 extends our general experimental framework to field conditions is needed to determine whether hosts 470 can modulate microbiome composition through horizontal acquisitions, thereby producing adaptive 471 plasticity and positive effects on population growth.

472

While it is possible that certain traits or environments might benefit from microbiome-mediate rescue
(Mueller et al., 2020; Shade, 2023) or 'microbiome flexibility' (Voolstra & Ziegler, 2020), our findings

475 suggest this was not the case here. Moreover, field exposures similarly recover limited evidence for

476 Daphnia microbiome shifts in response to Microcystis, which does not indicate a strong pathway for

- 477 adaptive plasticity via microbiome shifts or microbiome rescue (Hegg et al., 2021). Although concepts
- 478 like microbiome plasticity and rescue were initially motivated by findings in organisms with strong

host-microbiome symbiosis, the authors explicitly posited that these phenomena are likely to be broadand widespread (Mueller et al., 2020; Shade, 2023).

481

482 In the absence of microbiome rescue or flexibility operating to reduce phenotype-environment 483 mismatches, other mechanisms, such as phenotypic plasticity and adaptation from standing genetic 484 variation, play crucial roles in shaping the phenotypic diversity observed in natural populations (Barrett 485 & Schluter, 2008; Rennison et al., 2019; Rudman et al., 2022; West-Eberhard, 2003). These mechanisms shape the phenotypic response of organisms to environmental challenges (Ghalambor et 486 487 al., 2007; Price et al., 2003; West-Eberhard, 2003). It is plausible that microbiome-driven adaptive 488 plasticity is also a component of adaptive plasticity but operates on longer timescales (Kolodny & 489 Schulenburg, 2020) or requires transgenerational effects (Baldassarre et al., 2022), as suggested by the microbiota-mediated transgenerational acclimatization concept (Webster & Reusch, 2017). These 490 491 effects might be limited to systems with high microbiome heritability (Doolittle & Booth, 2017) and 492 may not be as general as initially proposed. Advancing microbiome studies beyond tightly controlled mechanistic investigations to include genetically, environmentally, and phenotypically diverse 493 494 populations will be critical for understanding the role of microbiomes in organismal responses to environmental change (Greyson-Gaito et al., 2020). 495

496

497 Quantitative and qualitative replication of host-microbiome studies

498

Despite observing significant shifts in *Daphnia* life-history traits and population growth associated with *Microcystis* exposure, we observed no community-level differences in gut microbiome composition between *Daphnia* reared on toxic and non-toxic diets. This result aligns with findings from outdoor mesocosms, which demonstrated that despite significant seasonal changes in *D. magna* gut microbiome diversity and composition there was surprisingly no evidence linking natural variation in microbiome diversity or composition with exposure to *Microcystis* (Hegg et al., 2021).

505

506 Our results suggest that earlier mechanistic studies—which used axenic cultures and reciprocal 507 microbiome transplants to test the effects of microbiome composition on *Microcystis* toxin tolerance 508 (Houwenhuyse et al., 2021; Macke et al., 2017, 2020)-may not adequately capture the dynamics of 509 host-microbiome interactions in natural settings, and prompts further investigation into the ecological 510 relevance of such mechanistic findings (Greyson-Gaito et al., 2020). These differences highlight major 511 questions about reproducibility and repeatability in microbiome research, due both to underlying 512 stochasticity and inherent differences between experimental environments (Schloss, 2018). In planning this study, we consulted authors on the prior work and they generously shared 513 514 methodological details which we made efforts to replicate. However, there are experimental differences that could contribute to the considerable variation seen between studies. These include: 515 516 previous studies did not detail the concentration of *Microcystis* cells or amount of microcystin toxins, 517 and hence exposures may not have been comparable (Orr et al., 2018); biological variation in Daphnia 518 test populations and Microcystis strains; and inherent differences in lab microbiomes. Whether these 519 differences are sufficient to lead to qualitatively different conclusions about the role of microbiome 520 composition in host fitness is beyond our scope to determine. The differences observed highlight the 521 need to consider not only genetic and environmental factors but also methodological consistency 522 when interpreting microbiome research results. Given the observed differences between studies and the inherent repeatability challenges in microbiome research, our findings should be interpreted within 523 524 the context of these broader uncertainties. While our results contribute valuable insights, they also 525 underscore the importance of continued investigation and methodological rigor in this field. 526

527 Broader implications

528

529 Our findings provide an empirical test of the contribution of the microbiome to host plasticity and 530 population dynamics. Although significant phenotypic changes were observed in Daphnia exposed to 531 *Microcystis*, there was no correlation between this response and the degree of change in the composition 532 of the microbiome or any pattern observed indicative of microbiome-mediated rescue. These results 533 suggest that the microbiome's role in host plasticity may be more context-dependent than previously 534 thought. However, given the scope of this single study, further research is needed to explore how 535 shifts in the microbiome influence reaction norms in fitness associated phenotypes across species and 536 environmental contexts. Future studies in natural conditions, where hosts can acquire a wider range 537 of microbes, will be critical to developing a more comprehensive understanding of how hostmicrobiome interactions shape natural populations. Such investigations may help resolve longstanding 538 539 questions about the microbiome's potential to direct host evolution and serve as a mechanism of 540 rescue in populations facing novel environmental challenges. 541

542 References

- 543
- Adamovsky, O., Buerger, A. N., Wormington, A. M., Ector, N., Griffitt, R. J., Bisesi, J. H., Jr, &
 Martyniuk, C. J. (2018). The gut microbiome and aquatic toxicology: An emerging concept for
 environmental health. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry / SETAC*, *37*(11), 2758–2775.
- Akbar, S., Gu, L., Sun, Y., Zhang, L., Lyu, K., Huang, Y., & Yang, Z. (2022). Understanding hostmicrobiome-environment interactions: Insights from Daphnia as a model organism. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 808, 152093.
- Baldassarre, L., Ying, H., Reitzel, A. M., Franzenburg, S., & Fraune, S. (2022). Microbiota mediated
 plasticity promotes thermal adaptation in the sea anemone Nematostella vectensis. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 3804.
- Barrett, R. D. H., & Schluter, D. (2008). Adaptation from standing genetic variation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 23(1), 38–44.
- Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Leadley, P., Thuiller, W., & Courchamp, F. (2012). Impacts of climate
 change on the future of biodiversity. *Ecology Letters*, 15(4), 365–377.
- Bell, G., & Collins, S. (2008). Adaptation, extinction and global change. *Evolutionary Applications*, 1(1),
 3–16.
- Bell, G., & Gonzalez, A. (2009). Evolutionary rescue can prevent extinction following environmental
 change. *Ecology Letters*, 12(9), 942–948.
- Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful
 Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical Methodology*,
 57(1), 289–300.
- Berg, G., Rybakova, D., Fischer, D., Cernava, T., Vergès, M. C., Charles, T. C., Chen, X., Cocolin, L.,
 Eversole, K., Corral, G., Kazou, M., Kinkel, L., Lange, L., Lima, N., Loy, A., Macklin, J., Maguin,
 E., Mauchline, T., Mcclure, R., ... Schloter, M. (2020). Microbiome definition re-visited: old
 concepts and new challenges. *Microbiome*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-020-00875-0
- Boersma, M., Spaak, P., & De Meester, L. (1998). Predator-mediated plasticity in morphology, life
 history, and behavior of Daphnia: the uncoupling of responses. *The American Naturalist*, 152(2),
 237–248.
- Bokulich, N. A., Kaehler, B. D., Rideout, J. R., Dillon, M., Bolyen, E., Knight, R., Huttley, G. A., &
 Gregory Caporaso, J. (2018). Optimizing taxonomic classification of marker-gene amplicon
 sequences with QIIME 2's q2-feature-classifier plugin. *Microbiome*, 6(1), 90.

- Bolnick, D. I., Snowberg, L. K., Hirsch, P. E., Lauber, C. L., Knight, R., Caporaso, J. G., & Svanbäck,
 R. (2014). Individuals' diet diversity influences gut microbial diversity in two freshwater fish
 (threespine stickleback and Eurasian perch). *Ecology Letters*, 17(8), 979–987.
- Bolyen, E., Rideout, J. R., Dillon, M. R., Bokulich, N. A., Abnet, C., Al-Ghalith, G. A., Alexander, H.,
 Alm, E. J., Arumugam, M., Asnicar, F., Bai, Y., Bisanz, J. E., Bittinger, K., Brejnrod, A., Brislawn,
 C. J., Titus Brown, C., Callahan, B. J., Caraballo-Rodríguez, A. M., Chase, J., ... Gregory
- 580 Caporaso, J. (2018). *QIIME 2: Reproducible, interactive, scalable, and extensible microbiome data science*
- 581 (No. e27295v2). PeerJ Preprints. https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27295v2
- Bourne, D. G., Morrow, K. M., & Webster, N. S. (2016). Insights into the Coral Microbiome:
 Underpinning the Health and Resilience of Reef Ecosystems. *Annual Review of Microbiology*, 70, 317–340.
- Callahan, B. J., McMurdie, P. J., Rosen, M. J., Han, A. W., Johnson, A. J. A., & Holmes, S. P. (2016).
 DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nature Methods*, *13*(7),
 581–583.
- Callens, M., De Meester, L., Muylaert, K., Mukherjee, S., & Decaestecker, E. (2020). The
 bacterioplankton community composition and a host genotype dependent occurrence of taxa
 shape the Daphnia magna gut bacterial community. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, *96*(8).
 https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiaa128
- 592 Callens, M., Watanabe, H., Kato, Y., Miura, J., & Decaestecker, E. (2018). Microbiota inoculum
 593 composition affects holobiont assembly and host growth in Daphnia. *Microbiome*, 6(1), 56.
- Chislock, M. F., Sarnelle, O., Jernigan, L. M., & Wilson, A. E. (2013). Do high concentrations of
 microcystin prevent Daphnia control of phytoplankton? *Water Research*, 47(6), 1961–1970.
- 596 Chorus, I., & Welker, M. (2021). Toxic Cyanobacteria in Water: A Guide to Their Public Health Consequences,
 597 Monitoring and Management (2nd Edition). CRC Press.
- Decaestecker, E., Van de Moortel, B., Mukherjee, S., Gurung, A., Stoks, R., & De Meester, L. (2024).
 Hierarchical eco-evo dynamics mediated by the gut microbiome. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*,
 39(2), 165–174.
- Doolittle, W. F., & Booth, A. (2017). It's the song, not the singer: an exploration of holobiosis and
 evolutionary theory. *Biology & Philosophy*, 32(1), 5–24.
- Engel, P., Martinson, V. G., & Moran, N. A. (2012). Functional diversity within the simple gut
 microbiota of the honey bee. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109(27), 11002–11007.
- Ferrão-Filho, A. S., Azevedo, S. M. F. O., & DeMott, W. R. (2000). Effects of toxic and non-toxic
 cyanobacteria on the life history of tropical and temperate cladocerans. *Freshwater Biology*, 45(1),
 1–19.
- Flandroy, L., Poutahidis, T., Berg, G., Clarke, G., Dao, M.-C., Decaestecker, E., Furman, E., Haahtela,
 T., Massart, S., Plovier, H., Sanz, Y., & Rook, G. (2018). The impact of human activities and
 lifestyles on the interlinked microbiota and health of humans and of ecosystems. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *627*, 1018–1038.
- Freese, H. M., & Schink, B. (2011). Composition and stability of the microbial community inside the
 digestive tract of the aquatic crustacean Daphnia magna. *Microbial Ecology*, 62(4), 882–894.
- Ghalambor, C. K., McKAY, J. K., Carroll, S. P., & Reznick, D. N. (2007). Adaptive versus nonadaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new
 environments. *Functional Ecology*, 21(3), 394–407.
- 618 Gould, A. L., Zhang, V., Lamberti, L., Jones, E. W., Obadia, B., Korasidis, N., Gavryushkin, A.,
- 619 Carlson, J. M., Beerenwinkel, N., & Ludington, W. B. (2018). Microbiome interactions shape host
- fitness. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 115(51), E11951–
 E11960.

- Greyson-Gaito, C. J., Bartley, T. J., Cottenie, K., Jarvis, W. M. C., Newman, A. E. M., & Stothart, M.
 R. (2020). Into the wild: microbiome transplant studies need broader ecological reality. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences / The Royal Society*, 287(1921), 20192834.
- Hairston, N. G., Jr, Holtmeier, C. L., Lampert, W., Weider, L. J., Post, D. M., Fischer, J. M., Cáceres,
 C. E., Fox, J. A., & Gaedke, U. (2001). Natural selection for grazer resistance to toxic
 cyanobacteria: evolution of phenotypic plasticity? *Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution*,
 55(11), 2203–2214.
- Härer, A., & Rennison, D. J. (2022). Quantifying (non)parallelism of gut microbial community change
 using multivariate vector analysis. *Ecology and Evolution*, *12*(12), e9674.
- Harke, M. J., Steffen, M. M., Gobler, C. J., Otten, T. G., Wilhelm, S. W., Wood, S. A., & Paerl, H. W.
 (2016). A review of the global ecology, genomics, and biogeography of the toxic cyanobacterium,
 Microcystis spp. *Harmful Algae*, *54*, 4–20.
- Hegg, A., Radersma, R., & Uller, T. (2021). A field experiment reveals seasonal variation in the
 Daphnia gut microbiome. *Oikos*, 130(12), 2191–2201.
- Hendry, A. P., & Kinnison, M. T. (1999). Perspective: The Pace of Modern Life: Measuring Rates of
 Contemporary Microevolution. *Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution*, 53(6), 1637–1653.
- Henry, L. P., Bruijning, M., Forsberg, S. K. G., & Ayroles, J. F. (2021). The microbiome extends host
 evolutionary potential. *Nature Communications*, *12*(1), 5141.
- Hoffmann, A. A., & Sgrò, C. M. (2011). Climate change and evolutionary adaptation. *Nature*, 470(7335), 479–485.
- Houwenhuyse, S., Callens, M., Bulteel, L., & Decaestecker, E. (2023). Comparison between the gut
 bacterial community of laboratory cultured and wild Daphnia. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 99(11).
 https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiad116
- Houwenhuyse, S., Stoks, R., Mukherjee, S., & Decaestecker, E. (2021). Locally adapted gut
 microbiomes mediate host stress tolerance. *The ISME Journal*, 15(8), 2401–2414.
- Isanta-Navarro, J., Hairston, N. G., Jr, Beninde, J., Meyer, A., Straile, D., Möst, M., & Martin Creuzburg, D. (2021). Reversed evolution of grazer resistance to cyanobacteria. *Nature Communications*, 12(1), 1945.
- Kikuchi, Y., Hayatsu, M., Hosokawa, T., Nagayama, A., Tago, K., & Fukatsu, T. (2012). Symbiont mediated insecticide resistance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109(22), 8618–8622.
- Kilham, S. S., Kreeger, D. A., Lynn, S. G., Goulden, C. E., & Herrera, L. (1998). COMBO: a defined
 freshwater culture medium for algae and zooplankton. *Hydrobiologia*, *377*(1), 147–159.
- Kolodny, O., & Schulenburg, H. (2020). Microbiome-mediated plasticity directs host evolution along
 several distinct time scales. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 375(1808), 20190589.
- Lavergne, S., Mouquet, N., Thuiller, W., & Ronce, O. (2010). Biodiversity and Climate Change:
 Integrating Evolutionary and Ecological Responses of Species and Communities. *Annual Review of.* https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102209-144628
- Lürling, M., & van der Grinten, E. (2003). Life-history characteristics of Daphniaexposed to dissolved
 microcystin-LR and to the cyanobacteriumMicrocystis aeruginosawith and without microcystins.
 Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry / SETAC, 22(6), 1281–1287.
- Macke, E., Callens, M., De Meester, L., & Decaestecker, E. (2017). Host-genotype dependent gut
 microbiota drives zooplankton tolerance to toxic cyanobacteria. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 1608.
- Macke, E., Callens, M., Massol, F., Vanoverberghe, I., De Meester, L., & Decaestecker, E. (2020). Diet
 and Genotype of an Aquatic Invertebrate Affect the Composition of Free-Living Microbial
- 668 Communities. Frontiers in Microbiology, 11, 380.

- Mason, C. J. (2020). Complex Relationships at the Intersection of Insect Gut Microbiomes and Plant
 Defenses. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 46(8), 793–807.
- Merilä, J., & Hendry, A. P. (2014). Climate change, adaptation, and phenotypic plasticity: the problem
 and the evidence. *Evolutionary Applications*, 7(1), 1–14.
- Moran, N. A., & Baumann, P. (2000). Bacterial endosymbionts in animals. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*, 3(3), 270–275.
- Motta, E. V. S., Raymann, K., & Moran, N. A. (2018). Glyphosate perturbs the gut microbiota of
 honey bees. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 115(41),
 10305–10310.
- Mueller, E. A., Wisnoski, N. I., Peralta, A. L., & Lennon, J. T. (2020). Microbial rescue effects: How
 microbiomes can save hosts from extinction. *Functional Ecology*, *34*(10), 2055–2064.
- 680 OECD. (2012). Test No. 211: Daphnia magna Reproduction Test, OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals,
 681 Section 2. OECD Publishing.
- Orr, P. T., Willis, A., & Burford, M. A. (2018). Application of first order rate kinetics to explain
 changes in bloom toxicity—the importance of understanding cell toxin quotas. *Journal of Oceanology and Limnology*, 36(4), 1063–1074.
- Orsini, L., Spanier, K. I., & DE Meester, L. (2012). Genomic signature of natural and anthropogenic
 stress in wild populations of the waterflea Daphnia magna: validation in space, time and
 experimental evolution. *Molecular Ecology*, *21*(9), 2160–2175.
- Peerakietkhajorn, S., Kato, Y., Kasalický, V., Matsuura, T., & Watanabe, H. (2016). Betaproteobacteria
 Limnohabitans strains increase fecundity in the crustacean Daphnia magna: symbiotic
 relationship between major bacterioplankton and zooplankton in freshwater ecosystem. *Environmental Microbiology*, 18(8), 2366–2374.
- Petersen, C., Hamerich, I. K., Adair, K. L., Griem-Krey, H., Torres Oliva, M., Hoeppner, M. P.,
 Bohannan, B. J. M., & Schulenburg, H. (2023). Host and microbiome jointly contribute to
 environmental adaptation. *The ISME Journal*, *17*(11), 1953–1965.
- Price, T. D., Qvarnström, A., & Irwin, D. E. (2003). The role of phenotypic plasticity in driving genetic
 evolution. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences / The Royal Society*, 270(1523), 1433–1440.
- 697 R Core Team. (2022). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.
- Rennison, D. J., Rudman, S. M., & Schluter, D. (2019). Genetics of adaptation: Experimental test of
 a biotic mechanism driving divergence in traits and genes. *Evolution Letters*, *3*(5), 513–520.
- Rocca, J. D., Simonin, M., Blaszczak, J. R., Ernakovich, J. G., Gibbons, S. M., Midani, F. S., &
 Washburne, A. D. (2018). The Microbiome Stress Project: Toward a Global Meta-Analysis of
 Environmental Stressors and Their Effects on Microbial Communities. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *9*,
 3272.
- Rohrlack, T., Christoffersen, K., Dittmann, E., Nogueira, I., Vasconcelos, V., & Börner, T. (2005).
 Ingestion of microcystins byDaphnia: Intestinal uptake and toxic effects. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 50(2), 440–448.
- Rudman, S. M., Greenblum, S., Hughes, R. C., Rajpurohit, S., Kiratli, O., Lowder, D. B., Lemmon, S.
 G., Petrov, D. A., Chaston, J. M., & Schmidt, P. (2019). Microbiome composition shapes rapid
 genomic adaptation of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*United States of America, 116(40), 20025–20032.
- Rudman, S. M., Greenblum, S. I., Rajpurohit, S., Betancourt, N. J., Hanna, J., Tilk, S., Yokoyama, T.,
 Petrov, D. A., & Schmidt, P. (2022). Direct observation of adaptive tracking on ecological time
 scales in Drosophila. *Science*, *375*(6586), eabj7484.
- Sarnelle, O., & Wilson, A. E. (2005). Local adaptation of Daphnia pulicariato toxic cyanobacteria.
 Limnology and Oceanography, 50(5), 1565–1570.

- Schloss, P. D. (2018). Identifying and Overcoming Threats to Reproducibility, Replicability,
 Robustness, and Generalizability in Microbiome Research. *mBio*, 9(3).
 https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00525-18
- Shade, A. (2023). Microbiome rescue: directing resilience of environmental microbial communities.
 Current Opinion in Microbiology, 72, 102263.
- Shahmohamadloo, R. S., Fryxell, J. M., & Rudman, S. M. (2024). Transgenerational epigenetic
 inheritance increases trait variation but is not adaptive. *bioRxiv : The Preprint Server for Biology*.
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.15.589575
- Shahmohamadloo, R. S., Ortiz Almirall, X., Holeton, C., Chong-Kit, R., Poirier, D. G., Bhavsar, S. P.,
 & Sibley, P. K. (2019). An efficient and affordable laboratory method to produce and sustain high
 concentrations of microcystins by Microcystis aeruginosa. *MethodsX*, *6*, 2521–2535.
- Shahmohamadloo, R. S., Poirier, D. G., Ortiz Almirall, X., Bhavsar, S. P., & Sibley, P. K. (2020).
 Assessing the toxicity of cell-bound microcystins on freshwater pelagic and benthic invertebrates.
 Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 188, 109945.
- Shahmohamadloo, R. S., Rudman, S. M., Clare, C. I., Westrick, J. A., De Meester, L., & Fryxell, J. M.
 (2023). Intraspecific genetic variation is critical to robust toxicological predictions in Daphnia. In *bioRxiv* (p. 2023.06.06.543817). https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.06.543817
- Shahmohamadloo, R. S., Simmons, D. B. D., & Sibley, P. K. (2020). Shotgun proteomics analysis
 reveals sub-lethal effects in Daphnia magna exposed to cell-bound microcystins produced by
 Microcystis aeruginosa. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. Part D, Genomics & Proteomics, 33*,
 100656.
- Sison-Mangus, M. P., Mushegian, A. A., & Ebert, D. (2015). Water fleas require microbiota for
 survival, growth and reproduction. *The ISME Journal*, 9(1), 59–67.
- Stuart, Y. E., Veen, T., Weber, J. N., Hanson, D., Ravinet, M., Lohman, B. K., Thompson, C. J.,
 Tasneem, T., Doggett, A., Izen, R., Ahmed, N., Barrett, R. D. H., Hendry, A. P., Peichel, C. L.,
 & Bolnick, D. I. (2017). Contrasting effects of environment and genetics generate a continuum
 of parallel evolution. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1(6), 158.
- 743 Urban, M. C., Bocedi, G., Hendry, A. P., Mihoub, J.-B., Pe'er, G., Singer, A., Bridle, J. R., Crozier, L. 744 G., De Meester, L., Godsoe, W., Gonzalez, A., Hellmann, J. J., Holt, R. D., Huth, A., Johst, K., Krug, C. B., Leadley, P. W., Palmer, S. C. F., Pantel, J. H., ... Travis, J. M. J. (2016). Improving 745 746 the forecast for biodiversity under climate change. Science, *353*(6304). 747 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad8466
- Voolstra, C. R., & Ziegler, M. (2020). Adapting with Microbial Help: Microbiome Flexibility Facilitates
 Rapid Responses to Environmental Change. *BioEssays: News and Reviews in Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology*, 42(7), e2000004.
- Wang, G.-H., Berdy, B. M., Velasquez, O., Jovanovic, N., Alkhalifa, S., Minbiole, K. P. C., & Brucker,
 R. M. (2020). Changes in Microbiome Confer Multigenerational Host Resistance after Sub-toxic
 Pesticide Exposure. *Cell Host & Microbe*, 27(2), 213–224.e7.
- Wang, J., Kalyan, S., Steck, N., Turner, L. M., Harr, B., Künzel, S., Vallier, M., Häsler, R., Franke, A.,
 Oberg, H.-H., Ibrahim, S. M., Grassl, G. A., Kabelitz, D., & Baines, J. F. (2015). Analysis of
 intestinal microbiota in hybrid house mice reveals evolutionary divergence in a vertebrate
 hologenome. *Nature Communications*, *6*, 6440.
- Washburne, A. D., Silverman, J. D., Leff, J. W., Bennett, D. J., Darcy, J. L., Mukherjee, S., Fierer, N.,
 & David, L. A. (2017). Phylogenetic factorization of compositional data yields lineage-level
 associations in microbiome datasets. *PeerJ*, 5, e2969.
- Webster, N. S., & Reusch, T. B. H. (2017). Microbial contributions to the persistence of coral reefs.
 The ISME Journal, *11*(10), 2167–2174.
- 763 West-Eberhard, M. J. (2003). Developmental Plasticity and Evolution. Oxford University Press.

- 764 White, J., Amato, K. R., Decaestecker, E., & McKenzie, V. J. (2023). Editorial: Impact of
- anthropogenic environmental changes on animal microbiomes. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*,
 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2023.1204035
- Zilber-Rosenberg, I., & Rosenberg, E. (2008). Role of microorganisms in the evolution of animals and
 plants: the hologenome theory of evolution. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*, *32*(5), 723–735.