



AMERICAN
SOCIETY FOR
MICROBIOLOGY

Microbiology Spectrum

Early queen development in honey bees: Social context and queen breeder source affect gut microbiota and associated metabolism

Kirk Anderson, Duan Copeland, and Brendon Mott

Corresponding Author(s): Kirk Anderson, USDA-ARS

Review Timeline:

Submission Date:	January 29, 2022
Editorial Decision:	April 19, 2022
Revision Received:	June 3, 2022
Accepted:	June 5, 2022

Editor: Daifeng Cheng

Reviewer(s): Disclosure of reviewer identity is with reference to reviewer comments included in decision letter(s). The following individuals involved in review of your submission have agreed to reveal their identity: Peng He (Reviewer #2)

Transaction Report:

(Note: With the exception of the correction of typographical or spelling errors that could be a source of ambiguity, letters and reports are not edited. The original formatting of letters and referee reports may not be reflected in this compilation.)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1128/spectrum.00383-22>

April 19, 2022

Dr. Kirk E Anderson
USDA-ARS
PWA-CHBRC
2000 E. Allen Rd.
Tucson, AZ 85719

Re: Spectrum00383-22 (Early queen development in honey bees: Social context and queen breeder source affect gut microbiota and associated metabolism)

Dear Dr. Kirk E Anderson:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Microbiology Spectrum. When submitting the revised version of your paper, please provide (1) point-by-point responses to the issues raised by the reviewers as file type "Response to Reviewers," not in your cover letter, and (2) a PDF file that indicates the changes from the original submission (by highlighting or underlining the changes) as file type "Marked Up Manuscript - For Review Only". Please use this link to submit your revised manuscript - we strongly recommend that you submit your paper within the next 60 days or reach out to me. Detailed instructions on submitting your revised paper are below.

Link Not Available

Below you will find instructions from the Microbiology Spectrum editorial office and comments generated during the review.

ASM policy requires that data be available to the public upon online posting of the article, so please verify all links to sequence records, if present, and make sure that each number retrieves the full record of the data. If a new accession number is not linked or a link is broken, provide production staff with the correct URL for the record. If the accession numbers for new data are not publicly accessible before the expected online posting of the article, publication of your article may be delayed; please contact the ASM production staff immediately with the expected release date.

The ASM Journals program strives for constant improvement in our submission and publication process. Please tell us how we can improve your experience by taking this quick [Author Survey](#).

Sincerely,

Daifeng Cheng

Editor, Microbiology Spectrum

Journals Department
American Society for Microbiology
1752 N St., NW
Washington, DC 20036
E-mail: spectrum@asmusa.org

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer #2 (Comments for the Author):

Copeland et al. examined gene expression of oxidative stress and immunity and performed high-throughput sequencing of the gut microbiome across four queen alimentary tract niches. The study is well-designed and the writing is easy to follow. However, some my concerns and errors should be clarified.

Major ones:

1. Why did you select fat body to investigate the immune genes? Any other insect-related papers?
2. Why did you focus on immune genes only? Have you found any other different expression genes?

Minors:

1. Line 154, why did you select 3 weeks as the checkpoint?
2. Line 187, the @ should be the superscript. Check others.
3. Line 197, give the concentrations of primers and templates.
4. Line 214, Bio-Rad. Check others.
5. Line 219, Only single reference gene is not commonly used in today's qPCR assays. Please see the MIQE of qPCR: The MIQE guidelines: minimum information for publication of quantitative real-time PCR experiments. Clin. Chem. 2009, 55 (4), 611-22.

Staff Comments:

Preparing Revision Guidelines

To submit your modified manuscript, log onto the eJP submission site at <https://spectrum.msubmit.net/cgi-bin/main.plex>. Go to Author Tasks and click the appropriate manuscript title to begin the revision process. The information that you entered when you first submitted the paper will be displayed. Please update the information as necessary. Here are a few examples of required updates that authors must address:

- Point-by-point responses to the issues raised by the reviewers in a file named "Response to Reviewers," NOT IN YOUR COVER LETTER.
- Upload a compare copy of the manuscript (without figures) as a "Marked-Up Manuscript" file.
- Each figure must be uploaded as a separate file, and any multipanel figures must be assembled into one file.
- Manuscript: A .DOC version of the revised manuscript
- Figures: Editable, high-resolution, individual figure files are required at revision, TIFF or EPS files are preferred

For complete guidelines on revision requirements, please see the journal Submission and Review Process requirements at <https://journals.asm.org/journal/Spectrum/submission-review-process>. **Submissions of a paper that does not conform to Microbiology Spectrum guidelines will delay acceptance of your manuscript. "**

Please return the manuscript within 60 days; if you cannot complete the modification within this time period, please contact me. If you do not wish to modify the manuscript and prefer to submit it to another journal, please notify me of your decision immediately so that the manuscript may be formally withdrawn from consideration by Microbiology Spectrum.

If your manuscript is accepted for publication, you will be contacted separately about payment when the proofs are issued; please follow the instructions in that e-mail. Arrangements for payment must be made before your article is published. For a complete list of **Publication Fees**, including supplemental material costs, please visit our [website](#).

Corresponding authors may [join or renew ASM membership](#) to obtain discounts on publication fees. Need to upgrade your membership level? Please contact Customer Service at Service@asmusa.org.

Thank you for submitting your paper to Microbiology Spectrum.

Re: Spectrum00383-22 (Early queen development in honey bees: Social context and queen breeder source affect gut microbiota and associated metabolism)

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer #2 (Comments for the Author):

Copeland et al. examined gene expression of oxidative stress and immunity and performed high-throughput sequencing of the gut microbiome across four queen alimentary tract niches. The study is well-designed and the writing is easy to follow. However, some my concerns and errors should be clarified.

REPLY: Thank you for the accolades, we have revised the manuscript for clarity.

Major ones:

1. Why did you select fat body to investigate the immune genes? Any other insect-related papers?

REPLY: Clarified. The fat body is analogous to the mammalian liver, and its function (including the expression of immune genes) is highly dependent on nutrition, which may differ between our treatment conditions: high metabolic demand and low metabolic demand environments. Most of the immune proteins present in the hemolymph are synthesized in the fat body. We also tested gene expression in four separate gut tissues; mouthparts, midguts, ileums, and rectums, and much of this gene expression was significant between time one and two but only a few genes differed by treatment. Specifically, in the midgut and ileum there was a significant increase in expression of oxidative stress and AMP genes from time zero to time one regardless of treatment. Other gene expression in gut tissues are consistent with LMD (queen bank) queens experiencing more oxidative stress relative to HMD (colony) and time zero queens.

2. Why did you focus on immune genes only? Have you found any other different expression genes?

REPLY: Clarified. We were interested in the relationship of the gut microbiome with early immune training in queen phenotypes. We hypothesized that early immune training may be disrupted by the queen bank environment. We also ran a variety of genes involved with oxidative stress and two genes associated with nutritional status.

Minors:

1. Line 154, why did you select 3 weeks as the checkpoint?

REPLY: Now clarified in the methods. We chose (predicted) this time period based on our past work with queen microbial succession wherein we examined 4-6 month old and 16-18 month old queens (Anderson et al. 2018), and another paper highlighting the queen mating process (Tarpy et al. 2014). Collectively these papers indicate that establishment/succession can happen relatively quickly. It also represents enough time for the metabolic pressures and microbiota associated with each social environment to acclimate or establish.

2. Line 187, the ® should be the superscript. Check others.

REPLY: Thank you, we have made this correction.

3. Line 197, give the concentrations of primers and templates.

REPLY: Thank you, we now provide this information. Each primer=0.5ul / 12ul * 10uM =416nM each. Templates were not quantified, because we eluted both DNA and RNA into a single reaction mix, and the spectrophotometer cannot distinguish between RNA and DNA at 260nm. For DNA-based qPCR (most BactQuant, FungiQuant, etc.), we use a 10% dilution of the extraction for Bactquant, but run FungiQuant with the undiluted 100% template.

To create cDNA, we placed 8ul of extracted nucleotides (RNA/DNA) into to 10ul DNase I treatment (1ul buffer, 1ul enzyme). We then used all 10ul from the DNase treatment in a 20ul cDNA reaction (per ThermoFisher). Following enzyme activity, we diluted the 20ul cDNA reaction with 180ul H₂O. RNA yields averaged ~5ng/ul, 8ul=40ng total RNA in our cDNA reactions.

4. Line 214, Bio-Rad. Check others.

REPLY: Corrected throughout.

5. Line 219, Only single reference gene is not commonly used in today's qPCR assays. Please see the MIQE of qPCR: The MIQE guidelines: minimum information for publication of quantitative real-time PCR experiments. Clin. Chem. 2009, 55 (4), 611-22.

REPLY: Yes, we routinely run both B-actin and an RDP gene, but seems we only ran B-actin in this case.

