

Microbial community in resistant and susceptible Churra sheep infected by *Teladorsagia circumcincta*

Verónica Castilla Gómez de Agüero

Instituto de Ganadería de Montaña, CSIC-Universidad de León

Cristina Esteban-Blanco

Universidad de León

Héctor Argüello

Universidad de León

Elora Valderas-García

Instituto de Ganadería de Montaña, CSIC-Universidad de León

Sonia Andrés

Instituto de Ganadería de Montaña, CSIC-Universidad de León

Juan José Arranz

Universidad de León

Beatriz Gutiérrez-Gil

Universidad de León

María Martínez-Valladares (✉ mmarva@unileon.es)

Instituto de Ganadería de Montaña, CSIC-Universidad de León

Article

Keywords:

Posted Date: June 13th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1670936/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Gastrointestinal nematodes (GIN) are a major threat to health and welfare in small ruminants worldwide. *Teladorsagia circumcincta* is a nematode that inhabits the abomasum of sheep, especially in temperate regions, causing important economic losses. Given that *T. circumcincta* and microbiome share the same niche, interactions between them and the host are expected. Although it is known that within a sheep breed there are animals that are more resistant than others to infection by GIN, it is not known if the microbiome influences the phenotype of these animals. Under this condition, 12 sheep were classified according to their cumulative faecal egg count (cFEC) at the end of a first experimental infection, 6 as resistant group (RG) and 6 as susceptible group (SG) to *T. circumcincta* infection. Then, all sheep were experimentally infected with 70,000 L3 of *T. circumcincta* and at day 7 days post-infection were euthanized. At necropsy, gastric mucosa and gastric content from abomasum were collected to extract bacterial DNA and sequence V3-V4 region from 16S rRNA gene using Illumina technology. After bioanalysis performed, results showed that α -diversity and β -diversity remained similar in both groups. However, resistant phenotype sheep showed a higher number of bacteria butyrate-fermenting species as *Clostridium sensu stricto-1* (abundance in RG: 1.29% and in SG: 0.069%; $p = 0.05$), and *Turicibacter* (abundance in RG: 0.31% and in SG: 0.027%; $p = 0.07$) in gastric content but also *Serratia* spp in gastric mucosa (abundance in RG: 0.12% and in SG: 0.041%; $p = 0.07$). A trend towards a significant negative correlation between cFEC and *Clostridium sensu stricto-1* abundance in gastric content was detected ($r = -0.537$; $p = 0.08$). These data suggest that microbiome composition could be another factor that influence in the development of the resistant phenotype modifying the interaction with the host and the in last instance affecting the individual risk of infection.

Introduction

Infections caused by gastrointestinal nematodes (GIN) are one of the most important diseases in grazing ruminants in temperate regions of the world¹⁻³. The economic importance of these infections is related to reduced weight gain, milk and meat production and reproduction; it was estimated that GIN infection could have cost to European Union-28 €2.1 bn in 2018^{4,5}. GIN infections have been regularly controlled with anthelmintic drugs, mainly with benzimidazoles due to their good quality-cost relationship, combined with pasture management^{6,7}. But, these drugs were used in the wrong way for decades -overused, misused, or applied incorrectly- causing the appearance of anthelmintic resistance (AR) and favoring the survival of parasites with resistant genotype⁸. Since in 1960s the first report about benzimidazole resistance was published, many farms has been informed as resistant; besides, last year farms with multi-resistant parasites are becoming increasing common⁹⁻¹². This situation has generated the need to change the approach for GIN control with new strategies such as the development of vaccines against helminths, biological control with anthelmintic active compounds from plants and fungus, pasture management or the development of breeding programs for worm resistance^{8,13-15}.

Under this circumstance, the interest in selecting animals with resistant phenotype to GIN infection, especially sheep, has increased within last years. ¹⁶ defined resistance as the ability of a host to suppress the establishment and/or subsequent development of a roundworm infection. Therefore, according to this concept, authors described resistant phenotype as those host that present low worm burden despite grazing pastures contaminated with infective larva. The most frequent method to measure the parasite burden is counting the number of worm eggs in faeces, being expressed as the faecal egg counts (FEC)¹⁷.

Besides, it has been shown that there are sheep breeds that are more resistant to GINs infection than other breeds, such as Canaria Hair, Barbados Blackbelly and Red Maasai, but at the same time within a particular breed there are individuals that are more resistant than others, such as within the Churra breed ^{16,18-20}. Genetic resistance to GIN have been associated with a protective immune response that is mediated by humoral (titre of antibodies, mainly IgA and IgE) and cellular response (eosinophils, T cells, globule leukocytes or mast cells) ²⁰⁻²³. However, these studies have not considered an important component of the host that is in direct contact with gastrointestinal parasites and therefore could influence the worm burden, the gastrointestinal microbiota.

All mammals are colonized by wide diversity of microorganisms that live in symbiosis in the mucosal surfaces of the host ^{24,25}. Microbiota is mainly compound by microorganism that produce beneficial relationship host-bacteria, providing nutrients, metabolizing them and defending against colonization by **pathogens**^{26,27}. However, occasionally harmful organisms, such as GIN, colonize the gastrointestinal tract provoking damages whose severity depends to the burden of the infection, the localization or the parasite specie, among others ²⁸. As GIN and bacteria share the habitat, it is expected that interact among them and with the host. Although it is known that parasitic infections are associated with profound changes in the structure and function of the host gut microbiome, in veterinary medicine this knowledge is limited and most of the studies have been conducted in human and rodent models ^{24,28-30}.

Understanding the composition of microbiome in presence of GIN is fundamental to develop a better knowledge about the pathogenesis of the infection. However, in order to determine if microbiota influences GIN infection control, in this study we have described the composition and diversity of the microbiome in Churra breed sheep classified as resistant or susceptible to the infection by the GIN *Teladorsagia circumcincta*. For that, the microbiome present in gastric mucosa and gastric content from 12 ewes experimentally infected *with T. circumcincta* have been sequenced and characterized.

Results

Total bacteria DNA

The number of copies in gastric mucosa was 100-1,300 and between 840,000- 9,000,000 for gastric content without significant differences between groups.

Taxonomic profile analysis and microbiota

The sequencing of the V3-V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene performed for the 12 sheep gastric mucosa samples generated an average of 1,169,865,8 raw reads, while the gastric content generated a total of 231,472.6 raw. After removing host genome contamination, we retained an average of 413,853.9 sequences for abomasal mucosa and 174,316.8 sequences for gastric content. Retained reads were used for the subsequent analyses. Then the DADA2 analysis performed for the 12 ewes analyzed in this work identified 11,217 ASVs for abomasal mucosa and 8,514 ASVs for gastric content. The sampling depth was set to 1500.

In total, 23 phyla were identified in both types of samples, 1 from Archaea domain and 22 from Bacteria domain. The most abundant phyla in gastric mucosa, representing approximately 96% of the total, were Bacteroidetes (48.23%), Firmicutes (29.60%), Actinobacteria (9.27%), Verrucomicrobia (2.72%), Proteobacteria (2.50%), Fibrobacteres (2.26%), and Spirochaetes (2.20%). No significant differences were found in phyla abundances between resistant and susceptible groups in these gastric mucosa samples. While, in gastric content the most abundant phyla, which accounted approximately 94%, were Bacteroidetes (43.15%), Firmicutes (28.60%), Actinobacteria (14.13%), Fibrobacteres (2.89%), Spirochaetes (2.35%), Kiritimatiellaeota (2.06%) and Proteobacteria (1.38%). Differences approaching significance ($p = 0.09$) were found in the gastric content for Actinobacteria phylum between resistant and susceptible animals, showing an abundance of 10.2% in RG and 18.2% in SG.

The most abundant genus in gastric mucosa was *Prevotella* with accounted 15%, followed by *Rikenellaceae* RC9 (8.96%) and *Aeriscardovia* (8.70%) among other. In gastric content, *Prevotella*, with 14% of abundance, was followed by *Aeriscardovia* (13.42%) and *Rikenellaceae* RC9 (8.17%). Regarding the differences in genus abundance between groups, *Serratia* spp genus showed differences approaching significance ($p = 0.07$) (RG 0.12% and SG 0.041%) in gastric mucosa. In gastric content, significant differences were found for *Clostridium sensu stricto-1* ($p = 0.05$) (RG 1.29% and SG 0.069%) and close to significance for *Turicibacter* ($p = 0.07$) (RG 0.31% and SG 0.027%). The Spearman correlation coefficient between cFEC measured at the end of the first infection and the abundance of *C. sensu stricto-1* ($r = -0.537$; $p = 0.08$) in gastric content showed an approaching significance negative correlation; no correlations whereas found for other species between *Serratia* spp and cFEC (Table 1, Figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3).

Table 1

Principal taxa in gastric mucosa and gastric content samples between RG and SG in *T. circumcincta* sheep.infected

	Phylo	Clase	Order	Family	Gender					
					Gender	Without groups	RG	SG		
Gastric Mucosa					Prevotella	15.01%	15.70%	14.30%		
					Prevotella UCG. 001	1.76%	1.75%	1.87%		
					Prevotella NK3B31 Group	0.59%	0.49	0.70%		
				Prevotellaceae	Prevotella UCG.003	1.66%	1.65%	9.11%		
					Rikenellaceae RC9 gut groups	8.96%	8.80%	9.11%		
		Bacteroidota	Barterodia	Bacteroidales	SP3-e08	1.40%	0.71%	2.19%		
		Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Bifidobacteriales	Bifidobacteriaceae	Aeriscardovia	8.71%	7.19%	10.22%	
					Butyrivibrio	0.73%	0.81%	0.65%		
					Pseudobutyrvibrio	0.50%	0.52%	0.48%		
					Ruminococcaceae	Ruminococcus	1.94%	2.00%	1.88%	
					Christensenellaceae	Christensenella R7	1.93%	2.16%	1.70%	
					Acidaminococcaceae	Succiniciastrium	1.8%	1.94%	1.74%	
					Clostridiaceae	Clostridium sensu stricto-1	0.87%	1.26%	0.48%	
				Clostridiales	Veilonellaceae	Quinella	0.59%	0.59%	0.59%	
						NK4A214 group	2.49%	2.62%	2.32%	
						UCG-005	1.29%	1.49%	1.08%	
		Firmicutes	Clostridia	Oscillospirales	Oscillospiraceae	Papillibacter	0.95%	0.82%	1.09%	
		Fibrobacteres	Fibrobacteria	Fibrobacterales	Fibrobacteraceae	Fibrobacter	2.22%	2.16%	2.27%	
	Spirochaetes	Spirochaetes	Spirochaetales	Spirochaetaceae	Treponema	1.59%	1.85%	1.32%		
Gastric Content					Prevotella	14.00%	15.00%	13.00%		
					Prevotella UCG. 001	2.20%	2.17%	2.47%		
					Prevotella UCG.003	2.08%	2.17%	1.99%		
					Rikenellaceae	Rikenellaceae RC9 gut groups	9.67%	10.40%	8.95%	
					Christensenellaceae	Christensenella R7	3.10%	3.48%	2.71%	
						Ruminococcus	1.81%	1.68%	2.02%	
						NK4A214 group	1.70%	1.58%	2.05%	
						Ruminococcus UCG-014	1.39%	1.63%	1.13%	
						Clostridiaceae	Clostridium sensu stricto-1	0.61%	1.14%	0.70%
						Succiniciastrium	1.65%	1.46%	1.90%	
						Bifidobacteriaceae	Aeriscardovia	13.55%	9.55%	17.55%
						Fibrobacteraceae	Fibrobacter	2.85%	2.78%	2.93%
						Spirochaetaceae	Treponema	1.87%	1.98%	1.92%
		Firmicutes	Negativicutes	Acidaminococcales	Acidaminococcaceae	Succiniciastrium	1.65%	1.46%	1.90%	
		Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Bifidobacteriales	Bifidobacteriaceae	Aeriscardovia	13.55%	9.55%	17.55%	
		Fibrobacteres	Fibrobacteria	Fibrobacterales	Fibrobacteraceae	Fibrobacter	2.85%	2.78%	2.93%	
		Spirochaetes	Spirochaetes	Spirochaetales	Spirochaetaceae	Treponema	1.87%	1.98%	1.92%	

Alpha and Beta diversity

No significant differences between resistant and susceptible animals were observed in alpha diversity by any of the estimators used in the study. However, the gastric mucosa presented p values lower than gastric content (Table 2, Table 3 and Figure 4) (Chao index: $p = 0.260$; Shannon index: $p = 0.243$; and Simpson index: $p = 0.271$). Beta-analysis showed a trend to clustering for resistant animal samples from gastric mucosa; however no trend was detected for gastric content.

Table 2

Estimation of evenness and richness (Chao, Shannon and Simpson indexes) in gastric mucosa and gastric content samples during *T. circumcincta* infection. No significant differences between resistant and susceptible animals were observed.

Sample_ID	Phenotype	Type of Sample	Chao 1	Shannon	Simpson
1	Resistant	Gastric Mucosa	380,000	5,619	0,995
2	Resistant	Gastric Mucosa	1534,286	6,971	0,999
6	Susceptible	Gastric Mucosa	592,167	6,109	0,997
7	Resistant	Gastric Mucosa	933,625	6,462	0,998
8	Resistant	Gastric Mucosa	1648,625	7,114	0,999
9	Susceptible	Gastric Mucosa	1351,964	6,677	0,998
11	Susceptible	Gastric Mucosa	609,000	6,088	0,997
14	Susceptible	Gastric Mucosa	1097,000	6,723	0,998
15	Resistant	Gastric Mucosa	1131,000	6,556	0,997
17	Susceptible	Gastric Mucosa	137,000	4,668	0,989
19	Susceptible	Gastric Mucosa	236,000	5,208	0,993
21	Resistant	Gastric Mucosa	470,167	5,836	0,996
1	Resistant	Gastric Content	365,429	5,525	0,994
2	Resistant	Gastric Content	392,000	5,679	0,996
6	Susceptible	Gastric Content	1023,000	6,705	0,999
7	Resistant	Gastric Content	1020,333	6,708	0,999
8	Resistant	Gastric Content	1229,038	6,880	0,999
9	Susceptible	Gastric Content	790,000	6,286	0,997
11	Susceptible	Gastric Content	342,000	5,575	0,995
14	Susceptible	Gastric Content	366,000	5,541	0,995
15	Resistant	Gastric Content	283,000	5,390	0,994
17	Susceptible	Gastric Content	390,231	5,599	0,995
19	Susceptible	Gastric Content	1024,176	6,664	0,998
21	Resistant	Gastric Content	380,000	5,668	0,996

Table 3

p values between RG and SG for each estimator and each sample.

Variables	Estimator		
	Chao1	Shannon	Simpson
Differences RG vs SG (gastric mucosa)	0,260	0,243	0,271
Differences RG vs SG (gastric content)	0,872	0,870	1,000

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Discussion

This study characterizes for first time the microbiome composition in gastric mucosa and content of Churra breed ewes with resistant and susceptible phenotype to the infection by *T. circumcincta*. The aim was to determinate if the microbiota could influence the resistant phenotype to the infection by *T. circumcincta* in Churra sheep.

Microbial diversity is evaluated using α -diversity indices such a richness or abundance of species from each community. Dissimilarities between communities are studied using β -diversities based on their ordination. In our study, neither gastric content microbiome nor gastric mucosa microbiome showed significant differences between groups in any α -diversity indices studied. On the contrary of our data, ³¹ reported significant differences in various microbial alpha-diversity indices between infected and non-infected group at 7 days post infection (dpi) by *Haemonchus contortus*. These differences could be due to all the animals of our study were infected. ³² studied abomasal microbiota composition in naive and immune calves infected with *Ostertagia ostertagi* to described and understand mechanism related with protective immunity. The authors suggested that unlike naive animals, the *O. Ostertagi* infection in immune cattle induced a minimal disruption in the abomasal microbiota and this may contribute to the development of long-term protective immunity.

In recent years, several studies have focused on the impact that GINs produced on host's microbiome composition and how affects the parasite establishment and control of the infection comparing non-infected and infected animals ³³⁻³⁵. It have been reported that GINs infections involve a change in the structure in the host digestive microbiome, inducing different physiological changes depending on the parasite specie or host ^{26,33,34,36-38}. The microbiome composition of abomasum from non-infected sheep is mainly represented by Bacteroidetes ($\approx 65\%$) and Firmicutes ($\approx 25\%$) phyla, but 7 days post-infection with *H. contortus*, Bacteroidetes increased ($\approx 71\%$) and Firmicutes decreased ($\approx 18\%$)³¹. In our study, Bacteroidetes (RG 46%; SG 49%) abundance in gastric mucosa was higher than Firmicutes (RG 33%; SG 25%) for both groups. Nevertheles, SG showed higher Bacteroidetes: Firmicutes ratio although differences were not statistically significant, probably because all animals were infected, as stated above. .³⁹ sequenced gastric content from Merino sheep naturally infected with *H. contortus* field strains reporting higher relative abundance in Firmicutes (45%) than Bacteroidetes (26%). These results differ with most of studies and our own results, where Bacteroidetes (RG 46%; SG 40%) was more abundant than Firmicutes

(RG 30%; SG 26%). Authors explained these variations in microbiome composition by factors that affect microbiome, as parasite burden, breed type, diets and different environmental condition. Besides, the relative abundance of Actinobacteria phylum in gastric content, which represented the 14.13% of the total bacteria, showed slight differences ($p = 0.078$) between resistant (10.2%) and susceptible (18.2%) sheep.

At genus level, *Prevotella* has been described as the most affected by GINs infections caused by *H. contortus*, *Trichostrongylus colubriformis* and *T. circumcincta* in sheep and goats. An increase in relative abundance in obligate anaerobes taxa, as Prevotellaceae family in lambs, sheep and goats infected with *H. contortus*, *T. colubriformis* and *T. circumcincta* was detected in infected animals compared with non-infected animals⁴⁰⁻⁴³. It could be explain by the *Prevotellarole* in protein degradation and energy host metabolism compensation^{40,44}. Although in this study *Prevotella* was the most abundant genus, 15% in gastric mucosa and 14% in gastric content, no differences were shown between resistant and susceptible sheep in none sample presumably because all animals were infected.

Butyrate is a short-chain fatty acid (SCFA) that is formed during the microbial fermentation of dietary fiber of ruminants. This metabolite is present in low concentrations, and it seems to be involved not only in nutrition, but also as a potent inhibitor of intestinal inflammation.⁴³ detected a decrease in metabolic pathways genes related to butyrate after an infection with *H. contortus* and *T. circumcincta* in lambs. Besides, this decrease in butyrate metabolism was following by the abundance reduction in some butyrate-producers bacteria species. On the other hand,⁴⁰ supposed that nematode infection modulates the gut butyrate biosynthesis by altering the abundance of butyrate-producing bacteria and they detected significant differences between non-infected and *H. contortus* infected goats in the relative abundance of the genus *Butyrivibrio* in rumen, which is a bacteria butyrate producer. In our study, we did not found differences in *Butyrivibrio* genus in gastric content, but we found significant differences others butyrate-producers bacteria as *C.sensu stricto-1* ($p= 0.05$; RG 1.29% and SG 0.069%) and close to the significance limit with *Turicibacter* ($p= 0.074$; RG 0.31% and SG 0.027%) between RG and SG in gastric content, been RG which account higher percentage⁴⁵. Besides, this microorganism showed an approaching significant negative correlation with cFEC ($r= -0.537$; $p= 0.08$). Therefore, association support the hypothesis about animals with lower FEC has higher *C. sensu strict-1* abundance.

The production of natural compounds with nematicidal activity synthesized by microorganisms is being a new focus in GINs infections chemical control investigation.⁴⁶ demonstrated that *Serratia* spp produces volatile compounds with 100% in vitro nematicidal activity against plant nematodes.⁴⁷ tasted in vitro isolated chitinases produced by *Serratia* sp. against *H. contortus* L3 obtaining 100% of larvicida activity, presumably because nematodes cuticle and eggs is constituted by chitin, been eggs who have higher levels⁴⁸. *Serratia* spp was identified in gastric mucosa in our study, being the resistant group (0.12%) who had a higher abundance in comparison with the susceptible group (0.041%) ($p= 0.07$). This data may support the hypothesis that *Serratia* spp produces nematicidal compounds that collaborate in the control of the infection.

As a conclusion, our results suggest that resistant or susceptible phenotype to *T. circumcincta* infection could influence the microbiome composition, modifying the interaction with the host and in the last instance affecting the individual risk.

Methods

Ethical approval

All procedures involving animals in this study was performed in accordance to Spanish regulations regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific proposes (Royal Decree 53/2013), under the supervision of the Ethical and Animal Welfare Committee of University of León to after the approval of the competent body, Junta de Castilla y León.

All methods are reported in accordance with ARRIVE guidelines.

Animals and experimental design

In a previous study, 12 Churra ewes were experimentally infected with 50,000 *T. circumcincta* third-stage larvae (L3). At day 30 post-infection (pi) they were classified based on their cumulative FEC (cFEC), 6 as resistant group (RG), with a cFEC mean of 308 ± 338 egg per gram (epg) and 6 as susceptible group (SG), with a cFEC mean of 5594 ± 2661 epg. Then, the same ewes were infected again but in this case with 70,000 *T. circumcincta* L3; at day 7 pi, all animals were humanly euthanized ⁴⁹.

Gastric content and abomasal tissue recovery

After sheep necropsy, the omaso and pylorus were tied using suture thread and immediately the abomasum was removed from all sheep. Abomasums were opened along the curvature and the inner surface was washed with tap water. Gastric content was collected and stored at -20° C until use. Then, portions from abomasum folds were cut and stored at -20 ° C until use ³¹.

Microbial DNA extraction

Microbial DNA was extracted from abomasal gastric mucosa and gastric content from each animal. Abomasum portions were scraped to obtain the gastric mucosa sample using a sterile slide without excessive pressure keeping the samples on ice to avoid DNA degradation. Microbial genomic DNA was extracted using Purelink Genomic DNA mini-kit (Invitrogen; REF K182000)³⁴.

Gastric content was lyophilized and homogenised. Then genomic DNA was extracted using QIAampPowerFecal Pro DNA Kit (Qiagen; REF 51805)⁵⁰.

Both kits were used in accordance with manufacturer's instructions. After microbial DNA extraction, DNA was quantified using Nanodrop® ND-1000 Spectrophotometer.

Total bacteria DNA

Total bacteria DNA was measured in all samples by quantitative real time PCR using forward primer (5'-GTG STG CAY GGY TGT CGT CA-3') and reverse primer (5'-ACG TCR TCC MCA CCT TCC TC-3') to calculate the number of copies in each samples, as previously described by⁵¹.

After extraction and quantification, samples were sent to amplify 16S rRNA hypervariable V3–V4 region. The sequencing was carried out by Teagasc Sequencing Centre (Moorepark, Fermoy, Ireland) service using 2 × 301bp paired-end sequencing with Illumina MiSeq platform (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA).

Bioinformatic processing and statistical analysis

After quality control, the sequencing raw data was aligned against the sheep reference genome(Oar_rambouillet_v1.0,https://www.ensembl.org/Ovis_aries_rambouillet/Info/Index) to remove host DNA sequences. The retained sequences from the Fastq file were filtered and trimmed to 280 (forward) and 210 bp (reverse) using the filter and Trimm function of the DADA2 package 52. The paired reads were assembled into Amplicon Sequences Variants (ASV) and their taxonomic assignment was performed using the SILVA nr v.138 database 53. Richness analyses were performed in R V4.1. ASVs and variables (phenotype and type of sample) were included in the estimation of alpha diversity index (Chao1 Rarefied Species, Shannon's Diversity index and Simpson Dominance index) using Phyloseq package from R. Normality was check using Shapiro-Wilk test and the homogenized of the variance was tested with Levene's test. The differences between groups were estimated using Kruskal-Wallis. Beta diversity was plotted using Non-linear Multi-Dimensional Scaling (NMDS) to explore the dissimilarities between pairs of samples using Bray-Curtis dissimilarity index, and Unweighted Unifrac index using Vegan package from R software. The Vegan envfit function was used to evaluate if the factors of study (phenotype and sample type) where associated to the NMDS ordinations; the significance of the fitted factors was estimated by using 999 permutations.

Relative abundances were calculated for each sample. Normality was check using Shapiro-Wilk test. Then, differences between groups were estimated using U-Mann-Whitney. Correlation between cFEC levels and relative abundance of bacterial species was measured by Spearman coefficient. The level of significance was determinate at $p < 0.05$ and p values between 0.05-0.1 were considered approaching significance.

Declarations

Author contributions statement

VCGA was funded by Junta de Castilla y León (JCyL) (LE082-18), EVG by (FPU17/00627), MMV by the Spanish "Ramon y Cajal" Programme (Ministerio de Economía y competitividad; MMV, RYC-2015-18368, HA by Beatriz Galindo programme (BEAGAL-18-106),

Author contributions

MMV, BGG and JJA participated in the experimental design. VCGA and CEB conducted the experiments. VCGA, CEB, HA analyzed the results. VCGA, MMV wrote the manuscript, CEB, HA, JJA, BGG and SALL contributed to the writing of the manuscript. All authors revised the manuscript and critically commented on it.

References

1. Stear, M. J., Doligalska, M. & Donskow-Schmelter, K. Alternatives to anthelmintics for the control of nematodes in livestock. *Parasitology***134**, 139–151 (2007).
2. Halliday, A. M. & Smith, W. D. Attempts to immunize sheep against *Teladorsagia circumcincta* using fourth-stage larval extracts. *Parasite Immunology***33**, 554–560 (2011).
3. Mavrot, F., Hertzberg, H. & Torgerson, P. Effect of gastro-intestinal nematode infection on sheep performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Parasites and Vectors***8**, 1–11 (2015).
4. Charlier, J., van der Voort, M., Kenyon, F., Skuce, P. & Vercruysse, J. Chasing helminths and their economic impact on farmed ruminants. *Trends in Parasitology***30**, 361–367 (2014).
5. Charlier, J. *et al.* Initial assessment of the economic burden of major parasitic helminth infections to the ruminant livestock industry in Europe. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine***182**, 105103 (2020).
6. McNeilly, T. N., Devaney, E. & Matthews, J. B. *Teladorsagia circumcincta* in the sheep abomasum: Defining the role of dendritic cells in T cell regulation and protective immunity. *Parasite Immunology***31**, 347–356 (2009).
7. Martínez-Valladares, M. *et al.* *Teladorsagia circumcincta* beta tubulin: The presence of the E198L polymorphism on its own is associated with benzimidazole resistance. *Parasites and Vectors***13**, 1–12 (2020).
8. Waller, P. J. From discovery to development: Current industry perspectives for the development of novel methods of helminth control in livestock. *Veterinary Parasitology***139**, 1–14 (2006).
9. Cezar, A. S. *et al.* Multiple resistance of gastrointestinal nematodes to nine different drugs in a sheep flock in southern Brazil. *Veterinary Parasitology***173**, 157–160 (2010).
10. Papadopoulos, E., Gallidis, E. & Ptochos, S. Anthelmintic resistance in sheep in Europe: A selected review. *Veterinary Parasitology***189**, 85–88 (2012).
11. Kaplan, R. M. & Vidyashankar, A. N. An inconvenient truth: Global worming and anthelmintic resistance. *Veterinary Parasitology***186**, 70–78 (2012).
12. Dey, A. R., Begum, N., Anisuzzaman, Alim, M. A. & Alam, M. Z. Multiple anthelmintic resistance in gastrointestinal nematodes of small ruminants in Bangladesh. *Parasitology International***77**, 102105 (2020).
13. Leathwick, D. M. *et al.* Managing anthelmintic resistance: Untreated adult ewes as a source of unselected parasites, and their role in reducing parasite populations. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal***56**, 184–195 (2008).

14. Matthews, J. B., Geldhof, P., Tzelos, T. & Claerebout, E. Progress in the development of subunit vaccines for gastrointestinal nematodes of ruminants. *Parasite Immunology***38**, 744–753 (2016).
15. Szewc, M., De Waal, T. & Zintl, A. Biological methods for the control of gastrointestinal nematodes. *Veterinary Journal***268**, 105602 (2021).
16. Bisset, S. A., Morris, C. A., McEwan, J. C. & Vlassof, A. Breeding sheep in New Zealand that are less reliant on anthelmintics to maintain health and productivity. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal***49**, 236–246 (2001).
17. Dominik, S. Quantitative trait loci for internal nematode resistance in sheep: a review. *Genetics Selection Evolution***37**, S83 (2005).
18. Martínez-Valladares, M., Vara-Del Río, M. P., Cruz-Rojo, M. A. & Rojo-Vázquez, F. A. Genetic resistance to *Teladorsagia circumcincta*: IgA and parameters at slaughter in Churra sheep. *Parasite Immunology***27**, 213–218 (2005).
19. González, J. F. *et al.* Fecundity in adult *Haemonchus contortus* parasites is correlated with abomasal tissue eosinophils and $\gamma\delta$ T cells in resistant Canaria Hair Breed sheep. *Veterinary Parasitology***178**, 286–292 (2011).
20. Castilla-Gómez de Agüero, V. *et al.* Differences within Churra breed sheep in the early immune response to the infection by *Teladorsagia circumcincta*. *Parasitology Research***120**, 1115–1120 (2021).
21. Ahmed, A. M. *et al.* Breed differences in humoral and cellular responses of lambs to experimental infection with the gastrointestinal nematode *Teladorsagia circumcincta*. *Veterinary Research***46**, 1–9 (2015).
22. Hernández, J. N. *et al.* Potential role for mucosal IgA in modulating *Haemonchus contortus* adult worm infection in sheep. *Veterinary Parasitology***223**, 153–158 (2016).
23. Aboshady, H. M., Stear, M. J., Johansson, A., Jonas, E. & Bambou, J. C. Immunoglobulins as Biomarkers for Gastrointestinal Nematodes Resistance in Small Ruminants: A systematic review. *Scientific Reports***10**, 1–14 (2020).
24. El-Ashram, S. & Suo, X. Exploring the microbial community (microflora) associated with ovine *Haemonchus contortus* (macroflora) field strains. *Scientific Reports***7**, 1–13 (2017).
25. Sinnathamby, G. *et al.* The bacterial community associated with the sheep gastrointestinal nematode parasite *Haemonchus contortus*. *PLoS ONE***13**, 1–25 (2018).
26. Round, J. L. & Mazmanian, S. K. The gut microbiota shapes intestinal immune responses during health and disease. *Nature Reviews Immunology***9**, 313–323 (2009).
27. Mizrahi, I. & Jami, E. Review: The compositional variation of the rumen microbiome and its effect on host performance and methane emission. *Anima***12**, S220–S232 (2018).
28. Peachey, L. E., Jenkins, T. P. & Cantacessi, C. This Gut Ain't Big Enough for Both of Us. Or Is It? Helminth–Microbiota Interactions in Veterinary Species. *Trends in Parasitology***33**, 619–632 (2017).

29. Jenkins, T. P. *et al.* Infections by human gastrointestinal helminths are associated with changes in faecal microbiota diversity and composition. *PLoS ONE***12**, 1–18 (2017).
30. Liu, F. *et al.* Gut microbial signatures associated with moxidectin treatment efficacy of *Haemonchus contortus* in infected goats. *Veterinary Microbiology***242**, (2020).
31. El-Ashram, S. *et al.* Microbial community and ovine host response varies with early and late stages of *Haemonchus contortus* infection. *Veterinary Research Communications***41**, 263–277 (2017).
32. Li, R. W., Wu, S., Li, W., Huang, Y. & Gasbarre, L. C. Metagenome Plasticity of the Bovine Abomasal Microbiota in Immune Animals in Response to *Ostertagia Ostertagi* Infection. **6**, (2011).
33. Li, R. W. *et al.* Alterations in the porcine colon microbiota induced by the gastrointestinal nematode *Trichuris suis*. *Infection and Immunity***80**, 2150–2157 (2012).
34. Argüello, H. *et al.* Early *Salmonella Typhimurium* infection in pigs disrupts Microbiome composition and functionality principally at the ileum mucosa. *Scientific Reports***8**, 1–12 (2018).
35. Mamun, M. A. Al *et al.* Variation in gut bacterial composition is associated with *Haemonchus contortus* parasite infection of sheep. *Animal Microbiome***2**, 1–14 (2020).
36. Houlden, A. *et al.* Chronic *Trichuris muris* infection in C57BL/6 mice causes significant changes in host microbiota and metabolome: Effects reversed by pathogen clearance. *PLoS ONE***10**, (2015).
37. Peachey, L. E. *et al.* The relationships between faecal egg counts and gut microbial composition in UK Thoroughbreds infected by cyathostomins. *International Journal for Parasitology***48**, 403–412 (2018).
38. Afrin, T. *et al.* Sequential Changes in the Host Gut Microbiota during Infection with the Intestinal Parasitic Nematode *Strongyloides venezuelensis*. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology***9**, 1–11 (2019).
39. Mafuna, T. *et al.* Bacterial profiling of *Haemonchus contortus* gut microbiome infecting Dohne Merino sheep in South Africa. *Scientific Reports***11**, 1–11 (2021).
40. Li, R. W. *et al.* The effect of helminth infection on the microbial composition and structure of the caprine abomasal microbiome. *Scientific Reports***6**, 1–10 (2016).
41. Cortés, A. *et al.* Infection with the sheep gastrointestinal nematode *Teladorsagia circumcincta* increases luminal pathobionts. *Microbiome***8**, 1–15 (2020).
42. Corrêa, P. S. *et al.* Tannin supplementation modulates the composition and function of ruminal microbiome in lambs infected with gastrointestinal nematodes. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology***96**, (2020).
43. Correa, P. S. *et al.* The effect of *Haemonchus contortus* and *Trichostrongylus colubriformis* infection on the ruminal microbiome of lambs. *Experimental Parasitology***231**, 108175 (2021).
44. Jouany, J. P. Conference: Altering Ruminant Nitrogen Metabolism to Improve Protein utilization Effect of Rumen Protozoa on Nitrogen Utilization by Ruminants. *Nutrition* 1335–1346 (1996).
45. Appert, O. *et al.* Initial butyrate producers during infant gut microbiota development are endospore formers. *Environmental Microbiology***22**, 3909–3921 (2020).

46. Gu, Y. Q., Mo, M. H., Zhou, J. P., Zou, C. S. & Zhang, K. Q. Evaluation and identification of potential organic nematicidal volatiles from soil bacteria. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry***39**, 2567–2575 (2007).
47. Méndez-Santiago, E. W. *et al.* *Serratia* sp., an endophyte of Mimosa pudica nodules with nematicidal, antifungal activity and growth-promoting characteristics. *Archives of Microbiology***203**, 549–559 (2021).
48. Veronico, P. *et al.* Nematode chitin synthases: Gene structure, expression and function in *Caenorhabditis elegans* and the plant parasitic nematode *Meloidogyne artiellia*. *Molecular Genetics and Genomics***266**, 28–34 (2001).
49. Chitneedi, P. K., Suárez-Vega, A., Martínez-Valladares, M., Arranz, J. J. & Gutiérrez-Gil, B. Exploring the mechanisms of resistance to *Teladorsagia circumcincta* infection in sheep through transcriptome analysis of abomasal mucosa and abomasal lymph nodes. *Veterinary Research***49**, 1–11 (2018).
50. Walshe, N. *et al.* Outbreak of acute larval cyathostominosis – A “perfect storm” of inflammation and dysbiosis. *Equine Veterinary Journal***53**, 727–739 (2021).
51. Maeda, H. *et al.* Quantitative real-time PCR using TaqMan and SYBR Green for *Actinobacillus actinomycetemcomitans*, *Porphyromonas gingivalis*, *Prevotella intermedia*, tetQ gene and total bacteria. *FEMS Immunology and Medical Microbiology***39**, 81–86 (2003).
52. Ombrello, A. K. Dada2. *Encyclopedia of Medical Immunology***13**, 1–7 (2020).
53. Quast, C. *et al.* The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: Improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids Research***41**, 590–596 (2013).

Figures





Figure 1

Relative percentage of abundance for the main taxa for phylum and genus level in resistant and susceptible groups.



Boxplot showing significant or slight significant differences for RG and SG in gastric content (*Clostridium sensu stricto-1*; $p=0.08$ and *Turicibacter*, $p= 0.07$), and gastric mucosa (*Serrata* spp ; $p= 0.05$). Significant differences are indicated by ** ($p<0.05$) and slight significant differences by * (p between 0.05-0.01).




Figure 3

Slight significant negative correlation between cFEC at the end of the first infection and *Clostridium sensu stricto -1* abundance. $Rho = - 0.537$ and $p = 0.08$.




Figure 4

Estimation of richness (Shannon and Chao indexes) and evenness (Simpson index) in gastric mucosa (A) and gastric content (B) in RG (green) and SG (pink) experimentally infected with *T. circumcincta*. Not significance differences detected between groups.

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.