

**Jihočeská univerzita v Českých Budějovicích**  
**Přírodovědecká fakulta**

**Srovnání molekulárně diagnostických přístupů pro detekci  
a diferenciaci střevního prvoka *Blastocystis* sp. u lidí**

**Rigorózní práce**  
**Martina Šloufová**

České Budějovice 2022

## **Rigorózní práce**

**Šloufová M., 2022.** Srovnání molekulárně diagnostických přístupů pro detekci a diferenciaci střevního prvoka *Blastocystis* sp. u lidí. [Comparison of molecular diagnostic approaches for the detection and differentiation of the intestinal protist *Blastocystis* sp. in humans] 16 pp., Faculty of Science, University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice.

## **Annotation:**

*Blastocystis* is the most commonly found intestinal protist in the world. Accurate detection and differentiation of *Blastocystis* including its subtypes (arguably species) is essential for understanding its epidemiology and role in human health. We compared the sensitivity of conventional PCR (cPCR) and qPCR in a set of 288 DNA samples obtained from stool samples of gut-healthy individuals and subtype diversity as detected by next-generation sequencing (NGS) versus Sanger sequencing.

## **Prohlášení:**

Prohlašuji, že jsem autorem této kvalifikační práce a že jsem ji vypracovala pouze s použitím pramenů a literatury uvedených v seznamu použitých zdrojů.

V Českých Budějovicích dne 13. 5. 2022

.....

## **Comparison of molecular diagnostic approaches for the detection and differentiation of the intestinal protist *Blastocystis* sp. in humans**

Martina Šloufová<sup>1,2</sup>, Zuzana Lhotská<sup>1,2</sup>, Milan Jirků<sup>1</sup>, Klára J. Petrželková<sup>1,3</sup>, C. Rune Stensvold<sup>4</sup>, Ondřej Cinek<sup>5</sup>, Kateřina Jirků Pomajbíková<sup>1,2\*</sup>

### **Authors` affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Parasitology, Biology Centre, the Czech Academy of Sciences, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

<sup>2</sup>Department of Medical Biology, Faculty of Science, University of South Bohemia, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Vertebrate Biology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Květná 8, 603 65 Brno, Czech Republic

<sup>4</sup>Department of Bacteria, Parasites and Fungi, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>5</sup>Department of Pediatrics, 2<sup>nd</sup> Faculty of Medicine, Charles University and Motol University Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic

### **\*Correspondence:**

Kateřina Jirků Pomajbíková; Institute of Parasitology, Biology Centre, the Czech Academy of Sciences, Branišovská 31, 370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic; email: pomajbikova@paru.cas.cz, phone: +420387775420

**Abstract:**

*Blastocystis* is the most commonly found intestinal protist in the world. Accurate detection and differentiation of *Blastocystis* including its subtypes (arguably species) is essential for understanding its epidemiology and role in human health. We compared the (i) sensitivity of conventional PCR (cPCR) and qPCR in a set of 288 DNA samples obtained from stool samples of gut-healthy individuals and (ii) subtype diversity as detected by next-generation sequencing (NGS) versus Sanger sequencing. Real-time PCR resulted in more positive samples than cPCR, revealing high fecal load of *Blastocystis* based on the quantification curve in most samples. In subtype detection, NGS was largely in agreement with Sanger sequencing but showed higher sensitivity for mixed subtype colonization within one host. This fact together with using of the combination of qPCR and NGS and obtaining information on the fecal protist load will be beneficial for epidemiological and surveillance studies.

**Key words:**

*Blastocystis*; conventional-PCR; qPCR; sensitivity; quantification; NGS;

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 *Blastocystis* sp. is a unicellular eukaryote colonizing the gastrointestinal tract of humans and various  
3 other species. Although discovered more than a century ago, its role in human health and disease has  
4 not been fully understood. Knowledge gaps remain in its epidemiology and interaction with the host,  
5 as well as factors affecting host colonization [1-3]. *Blastocystis* may be the most common intestinal  
6 human protist in the world, colonizing more than 1 billion people [4]. In some cohorts, the prevalence  
7 of *Blastocystis* sp. may reach 100% [5]. Based on small ribosomal subunit (SSU *rRNA*) gene analysis,  
8 at least 22 subtypes (ST) exist across mammalian and avian hosts [6]. Among these subtypes, ST1–  
9 ST9 and ST12 have been found in humans, with ST1–ST4 being commonly detected [3].

10 Despite the numerous surveys on *Blastocystis* sp., no consensus has been reached on the  
11 choice of method(s) for detection and differentiation of the protist (reviewed in Skotarczak [7]).  
12 Moreover, in spite of the development of molecular approaches, traditional microscopic examination  
13 of ova and parasites (O&P) and xenic culturing is still commonly used in laboratories to detect  
14 *Blastocystis* [8]. However, these methods require specialized technicians [8], they are less sensitive,  
15 and do not provide subtype information [9-11]. Nevertheless, accurate detection and distinction of  
16 *Blastocystis* subtypes is essential for understanding the transmission and the role of this protist in  
17 human health. Due to their high sensitivity and specificity, molecular methods such as conventional  
18 PCR (cPCR) or real-time PCR (qPCR) are often used [7,12,13]. In addition, next-generation  
19 sequencing (NGS) is gaining prominence in detection *Blastocystis* and its subtypes [14-16].

20 The aim of this study was to compare (i) the sensitivity of cPCR and qPCR on a set of DNA  
21 samples obtained from stool samples of individuals with no gastrointestinal symptoms and (ii) subtype  
22 diversity detected by cPCR and Sanger sequencing versus NGS.

## 23 MATERIAL AND METHODS

24 In this study, we used 288 DNA samples obtained from fresh stool samples from a cohort created  
25 during a previous survey on the prevalence and diversity of *Blastocystis* in a gut-healthy human  
26 population in the Czech Republic (for more details on the collection and DNA extraction see Lhotská  
27 et al. [11]). We also used data on the positivity rate of *Blastocystis* sp. resulted from cPCR [11] for  
28 comparison with qPCR results obtained in the present study. Here, we applied the diagnostic qPCR  
29 protocol published in the study by Stensvold et al. [12]. The primers target the SSU rDNA fragment of  
30 118 bp, which is detected by a Taqman probe. Samples were processed using a LightCycler LC 480 I  
31 (Roche, Basel, Switzerland) with a 96-well block. The cycling conditions consisted of primary  
32 denaturation (95 °C/10 min) and 37× (95 °C/15 s, 60 °C/30 s, 72 °C/30 s). The results of qPCR on  
33 *Blastocystis* were then compared with the results of conventional PCR (from Lhotská et al. [11]) using  
34 McNemar's test with Yates's correction (0.5). Statistical analysis was performed using the software  
35 SciStatCalc 2013 (<https://scistatcalc.blogspot.com/2013/11/mcnemars-test-calculator.html> ).

36 Positive samples from qPCR were subjected to amplicon NGS to determine *Blastocystis*  
37 subtypes: an informative fragment of SSU rDNA (~450 bp) was amplified, indexed and sequenced on  
38 a MiSeq instrument with the Reagent Kit v2, 2×250 bp (Illumina); this was performed according to the  
39 method by Maloney et al. (2019) [17] with minor modifications in Cinek et al. [15] (for more detail  
40 see Supplementary data 1). These results were compared with the results on subtype diversity  
41 described in Lhotská et al. [11] based on Sanger sequencing. Fecal protist load was estimated based on  
42 a quantification curve generated from a dilution series of cultured *Blastocystis* ST3, which was set in  
43 the range of  $10^0$  to  $10^5$  cells per one qPCR reaction:  $10^0$ – $10^1$  - mild fecal protist load;  $10^2$ – $10^3$  -  
44 moderate fecal protist load;  $10^4$ – $10^5$  - high fecal protist load (Supplementary data 2). *Blastocystis* cells  
45 counts from culture were calculated using a Bürker's chamber and then serially diluted to obtain  
46 aliquots containing  $10^0$ ,  $10^1$ ,  $10^2$ ,  $10^3$ ,  $10^4$ , and  $10^5$  cells, which were subsequently subjected to DNA  
47 extraction according to Lhotská et al. [11]. All negative samples were checked for PCR inhibition  
48 using addition of foreign DNA (obtained from tissue of experimental rats) and a specific qPCR  
49 protocol (commercial primers and Taqman probe for detection of the rat gene for beta-2  
50 microglobulin; ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA).

## 51 RESULTS

52 In this study, the prevalence of *Blastocystis* was determined by qPCR and subsequently compared with  
53 the results from cPCR obtained in our previous study Lhotská et al. [11]. In the set of 288 stool  
54 samples from the gut-healthy volunteers, the qPCR revealed a prevalence of 29% (83/288; Table 1)  
55 compared to cPCR with the prevalence 24% (71/288). Real-time PCR revealed 12 more positive  
56 samples (Table 1), our results indicate that qPCR is a more sensitive method for detecting *Blastocystis*  
57 in stool samples than cPCR ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $\chi^2 = 8.26$ ; Table 2). There was a discrepancy between these  
58 methods for two samples that qPCR evaluated as negative and cPCR as positive (Table 1). No internal  
59 inhibition was detected in any of the samples.

60 We established a quantification curve ( $10^0$ - $10^5$  of cells / 1 qPCR reaction) to evaluate the  
61 *Blastocystis* fecal load in positive samples and to extrapolate different colonization intensities from ct  
62 values (ct values are displayed for each sample in Table 1). In more than half of the samples positive  
63 in qPCR (52/83), colonization intensities reached  $10^5$  or more, with the range of ct values ranging  
64 from 15 to 20 (Table 3). Fecal protist load  $10^3$ - $10^4$  (range of ct values between 21 and 27) was found  
65 in 13 samples, and  $10^1$ - $10^2$  (range of ct values between 28 and 32) in 18 samples (Table 3). In the  
66 samples positive only in qPCR (n=12), a very low fecal protist load was found, i.e.,  $10^1$ - $10^2$  (Table 3).

67 Subtype diversity for all 83 qPCR-positive samples was evaluated by NGS, which detected  
68 subtypes in 69 samples (69/83; Table 1 and 4). In case of the presence of one subtype in a sample the  
69 NGS results were consistent with our previous results based on Sanger sequencing [11]. Indeed, the  
70 great benefit of the NGS appears to be in an ability detecting mixed colonizations of different subtypes  
71 in one sample. Mixed colonizations were found in five more cases compared to Sanger sequencing,

72 specifically the subtype colonization mix: ST1+ST7, ST1+ST3, ST2+ST3 (2×), ST3+ST7 (Table 4).  
73 In the case of 12 samples positive only in qPCR with low fecal protist load, NGS detected subtypes in  
74 only five samples, namely ST2, ST5, ST3 (2×) and ST4 (Table 4).

## 75 **DISCUSSION**

76 To compare the sensitivity between the two PCR-based approaches for detection of *Blastocystis*, we  
77 used a dataset of 288 human stool samples obtained in the study by Lhotská et al. [11]. Revealing 12  
78 more positive samples, qPCR was the most sensitive method for detection of *Blastocystis*. The overall  
79 prevalence of *Blastocystis* by qPCR and cPCR was 29% and 24% (Lhotská et al. [11]), respectively.  
80 Surprisingly, it appears that this is the very first study comparing the sensitivity between commonly  
81 used cPCR protocol [18] and qPCR [12] for the detection of *Blastocystis* sp. Previously some studies  
82 showed higher sensitivity of qPCR in comparison with classical methods such as direct-light  
83 microscopy or xenic *in vitro* culture [12,13,19]. The study by Nourison et al. [13] compared four  
84 qPCR protocols for detection of *Blastocystis* sp. and found that they differed in specificity and  
85 sensitivity. Furthermore, the authors recommend the qPCR protocol Stensvold et al. [12] for  
86 diagnostic purposes and to add another method for subtype identification.

87         Despite higher sensitivity, qPCR scored two samples as negative, while conventional PCR  
88 scored them positive; these two samples were positive for ST3 and ST8. The two false-negative results  
89 by qPCR might be due to the degradation of DNA in the samples due to long-term storage and  
90 repeated freeze-thawing cycles of their aliquots. These DNA samples were tested again by cPCR, one  
91 sample appears to be negative and one (ST8) showed much less intensive amplicon in the  
92 electrophoresis. Alternatively, the qPCR protocol might have limited sensitivity for example for ST8,  
93 which was not used in the validation panel by Stensvold et al. [12], who developed the method.  
94 However, the applicability of the primers and probe was validated *in silico* using the alignment in the  
95 article's Fig 1 with a 100% match to ST8, so this means that, at least in theory, the assay should be  
96 able to pick up this subtype. In addition, no inhibition was revealed in any sample during inhibition  
97 control using the foreign DNA.

98         The advantage of qPCR-based diagnostic approach is the ability to estimate the fecal load of  
99 *Blastocystis* in colonized humans based on an established quantitative curve. Our results in individuals  
100 with healthy intestine (i.e., without inflammatory diseases) showed a high fecal *Blastocystis* load in  
101 more than half of the samples. This fecal load ranged in values of order from  $10^5$  to  $10^6$  cells per one  
102 qPCR reaction. In the 12 samples scored as positive only by qPCR, low fecal protist load was detected  
103 ( $10^1$ – $10^2$  cells per sample). A very recent study by Cinek et al. [15] quantified *Blastocystis* in feces of  
104 asymptomatic children and adolescents as one of the few. However, more studies on both healthy  
105 humans and patients with inflammatory or functional bowel diseases are warranted [20]. A  
106 comparison of fecal *Blastocystis* loads between healthy and sick individuals could fundamentally  
107 contribute to understanding the role of *Blastocystis* sp. in the human gut ecosystem and could be

108 important for experimental studies testing the effect of *Blastocystis* sp. on gut inflammation [21]. It is  
109 important to note that the quantification curve for assessing fecal *Blastocystis* load might be biased by  
110 different copy number of the SSU rRNA gene in individual subtypes and life stages of *Blastocystis*.  
111 This could slightly reduce the accuracy of quantification data. However, such data for *Blastocystis* and  
112 its subtypes are not yet available. Nevertheless, an approximate determination of *Blastocystis* fecal  
113 load can reveal trends between different human cohorts.

114 In epidemiological studies on *Blastocystis* sp. in humans, the identification of its subtypes  
115 plays an important role [11,22-24]. Because different *Blastocystis* subtypes colonize different hosts  
116 and apparently differ in geographical distribution, surveys aimed at subtype determination might help  
117 reveal transmission pathways and potential sources of specific subtypes in a particular area. To date,  
118 most studies used Sanger sequencing for subtype identification [11,25,26] which may have limitations  
119 in detecting mixed subtype colonizations. Here, we subjected all 83 qPCR-positive samples to NGS  
120 analysis to determine subtypes. We found that subtype diversity was largely consistent with the results  
121 of Sanger sequencing by Lhotská et al. [11], in which Sanger sequencing was used. In 12 samples  
122 identified as positive only by qPCR, the NGS revealed subtypes only in five samples (ST2, ST5, 2×  
123 ST3, and ST4; Table 4) which was probably caused by low fecal load of *Blastocystis* (i.e.,  $10^1$ - $10^2$ ).  
124 Remaining seven samples were confirmed by Sanger sequencing from qPCR amplicons (118 bp),  
125 however, without information about subtypes.

126 Although epidemiological studies usually describe colonization of an individual with only one  
127 subtype of *Blastocystis* sp. [11,23,27], mixed subtype colonization appears to be more common  
128 [7,14,28]. This situation is in part caused by limitations of some of the current molecular tools, which  
129 preferentially amplify the predominant subtypes present in a sample [17]. Here, the NGS-based  
130 approach showed higher sensitivity in determining mixed subtype colonization than a combination of  
131 methods, such as conventional PCR and Sanger sequencing (for more details see Lhotská et al. [11]).  
132 While Lhotská et al. [11] revealed a single case of mixed infection, NGS detected five more cases of  
133 mixed colonisation, specifically ST1+ST7, ST1+ST3, ST2+ST3 (2×) and ST3+ST7.

134 From a diagnostic point-of-view, our results support the fact that qPCR is the most suitable  
135 method for detecting the presence of *Blastocystis*. NGS alone cannot achieve the qPCR sensitivity,  
136 mainly due to the known signal crosstalk between individual samples in a sequencing run [e.g., 29].  
137 Although this issue can be alleviated by using unique dual indexing, it cannot be eliminated, so very  
138 low read counts do not necessarily indicate presence of the organism. Thus, the role of NGS in the  
139 *Blastocystis* diagnostics is primarily in the determination of its subtypes and disentangling mixed  
140 colonizations. Of the 83 total qPCR-positive samples, the NGS revealed subtypes in 69 samples.

141 **Conclusion:** To understand the epidemiology of *Blastocystis* sp. it is necessary to establish a gold  
142 standard method for detection and subtype differentiation. A review of the *Blastocystis* literature so far  
143 suggests that detection and differentiation has not yet been harmonized [7]. The findings of the present



144 study showed that qPCR is a suitable tool for the highly sensitive detection of *Blastocystis* sp., and the  
145 NGS approach enables accurate assessment of the subtype diversity, in particular, mixed subtype  
146 colonization. We believe that the combination of these two approaches will be beneficial for future  
147 epidemiological surveys and surveillance studies on *Blastocystis*.

148 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Authors declare no conflict of interest.

149

150 **ETHICS STATEMENT:** The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by  
151 Ethics Committee of the Biology Center of the Czech Academy of Sciences (reference number:  
152 1/2017). Written informed consent to participate in this study was provided by the participants' legal  
153 guardian/next of kin. All data were anonymized and processed according to valid laws of the Czech  
154 Republic (e.g., Act no. 101/2000 Coll and subsequent regulations). In case of the rat tissue used for  
155 testing of the internal inhibition, we used samples from the experiment approved by the Committee on  
156 the Ethics of Animal Experiments of the Biology Centre of the Czech Academy of Sciences (České  
157 Budějovice, permit no. 33/2018) and by the Resort Committee of the Czech Academy of Sciences  
158 (Prague, Czech Republic) according to strict accordance with Czech legislation (Act No. 166/1999  
159 Coll. on veterinary care and on changes of some related laws, and Act No. 246/1992 Coll. on the  
160 protection of animals against cruelty), as well as the legislation of the European Union.

161

162 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** We thank to Oldřiška Kadlecová, Andrea Kašparová, Kristýna Brožová,  
163 and Kateřina Poláčková for laboratory assistance. This work was financially supported by the grants  
164 from the Human Frontiers Science Programme (RGY0078/2015) and from the Czech Science  
165 Foundation (22-04837S) to K.J.Pomajbíková, by the grant from the Student Grant Agency (SGA) at  
166 the Faculty of Science of the University of South Bohemia to MŠ (in 2021), and by the Ministry of  
167 Health of the Czech Republic, a project for the conceptual development of research organization,  
168 University Hospital Motol, Prague (00064203) to OC.

169

## 170 **REFERENCES:**

- 171 **1. Lukeš J, Stensvold CR, Jirků-Pomajbíková K, Wegener Parfrey L. 2015.** Are human intestinal  
172 eukaryotes beneficial or commensals? PLoS Pathogens, 11, e1005039.
- 173 **2. Chabé M, Lokmer A, Ségurel L. 2017.** Gut protozoa: friends or foes of the human gut  
174 microbiota? Trends in Parasitology, 33, 925–934.
- 175 **3. Stensvold CR, Tan KSW, Clark CG. 2020.** *Blastocystis*. Trends in Parasitology, 36, 315–316.
- 176 **4. Andersen LOB, Stensvold CR. 2016.** *Blastocystis* in health and disease: are we moving from a  
177 clinical to a public health perspective? Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 54, 524–528.
- 178 **5. El Safadi D, Gaayeb L, Meloni D, Cian A, Poirier P, Wawrzyniak I, Delbac F, Dabboussi F,**

- 179 **Delhaes L, Seck M, Hamze M, Riveau G, Viscogliosi E. 2014.** Children of senegal river basin  
180 show the highest prevalence of *Blastocystis* sp. ever observed worldwide. BMC Infection Diseases,  
181 14, 399.
- 182 **6. Stensvold CR, Clark CG. 2020.** Pre-empting pandora's box: *Blastocystis* subtypes revisited.  
183 Trends in Parasitology, 36, 229–232.
- 184 **7. Skotarczak B. 2018.** Genetic diversity and pathogenicity of *Blastocystis*. Annals of Agricultural  
185 and Environmental Medicine, 25, 411–416.
- 186 **8. McHardy IH, Wu M, Shimizu-Cohen R, Roger Couturier M, Humphries RM. 2014.** Detection  
187 of intestinal protozoa in the clinical laboratory. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 52, 712–720.
- 188 **9. Stensvold CR, Arendrup MC, Jespersgaard C, Mølbak K, Nielsen HV. 2007.** Detecting  
189 *Blastocystis* using parasitologic and DNA-based methods: a comparative study. Diagnostic  
190 Microbiology and Infectious Disease, 59, 303–307.
- 191 **10. Tan KSW. 2008.** New insights on classification, identification, and clinical relevance of  
192 *Blastocystis* spp. Clinical Microbiology Reviews, 21, 639–665.
- 193 **11. Lhotská Z, Jirků M, Hložková O, Brožová K, Jirsová D, Stensvold CR, Kolísko M, Jirků-  
194 Pomajbíková K. 2020.** A study on the prevalence and subtype diversity of the intestinal protist  
195 *Blastocystis* sp. in a gut-healthy human population in the Czech republic. Frontiers in Cellular and  
196 Infectious Microbiology, 10, 544335.
- 197 **12. Stensvold CR, Ahmed UN, Andersen LOB, Nielsen HV. 2012.** Development and evaluation of  
198 a genus-specific, probe-based, internal-process-controlled real-time PCR assay for sensitive and  
199 specific detection of *Blastocystis* spp. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 50, 1847–1851.
- 200 **13. Nourrisson C, Brunet J, Flori P, Moniot M, Bonnin V, Delbac F, Poirier P. 2020.** Comparison  
201 of DNA extraction methods and real-time PCR assays for the detection of *Blastocystis* sp. in stool  
202 specimens. Microorganisms, 8, 1768
- 203 **14. Rojas-Velázquez L, Maloney JG, Molokin A, Morán P, Serrano-Vázquez A, González E,  
204 Pérez-Juárez H, Ximénez C, Santin M. 2019.** Use of next-generation amplicon sequencing to  
205 study *Blastocystis* genetic diversity in a rural human population from Mexico. Parasites and  
206 Vectors, 12, 566.
- 207 **15. Cinek O, Polačková K, Odeh R, Alassaf A, Kramná L, Ibekwe MAU, Majaliwa ES, Ahmadov  
208 G, Elmahi BME, Mekki H, Oikarinen S, Lebl J, Abdullah MA. 2021.** *Blastocystis* in the faeces  
209 of children from six distant countries: prevalence, quantity, subtypes and the relation to the gut  
210 bacteriome. Parasites and Vectors, 14, 399.
- 211 **16. Stensvold CR, Jirků Pomajbíková K, Wegener Tams K, Jokelainen P, Berg RPKD, Marving  
212 E, Petersen RF, Andersen LOB, Angen O, Nielsen HV. 2021.** Parasitic intestinal protists of  
213 zoonotic relevance detected in pigs by metabarcoding and real-time PCR. Microorganisms, 9:1189.
- 214 **17. Maloney JG, Molokin A, Santin M. 2019.** Next generation amplicon sequencing improves  
215 detection of *Blastocystis* mixed subtype infections. Infection, Genetics and Evolution, 73,119–125.

- 216 **18.Scicluna SM, Tawari B, Clark CG. 2006.** DNA barcoding of *Blastocystis*. *Protist*, 157, 77–85.
- 217 **19. Poirier P, Wawrzyniak I, Albert A, El Alaoui H, Delbac F, Livrelli V. 2011.** Development and  
218 evaluation of a real-time PCR assay for detection and quantification of *Blastocystis* parasites in  
219 human stool samples: prospective study of patients with hematological malignancies. *Journal of*  
220 *Clinical Microbiology*, 49, 975–983.
- 221 **20. Nourrisson C, Scanzi J, Pereira B, NkoudMongo C, Wawrzyniak I, Cian A, Viscogliosi E,**  
222 **Livrelli V, Delbac F, Dapoigny M, Poirier P. 2014.** *Blastocystis* is associated with decrease of  
223 fecal microbiota-protective bacteria: comparative analysis between patients with irritable bowel  
224 syndrome and control subjects. *PLoS One*, 9, e111868.
- 225 **21. Billy V, Lhotská Z, Jirků M, Kadlecová O, Frgelevocá L, Wegener Parfrey L, Jirků-**  
226 **Pomajbíková K. 2021.** *Blastocystis* colonization alters the gut microbiome and, in some cases,  
227 promotes faster recovery from induced colitis. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 12, 641483.
- 228 **22.El Safadi D, Cian A, Nourrisson C, Pereira B, Morelle C, Bastien P, Bellanger AP, Botterel F,**  
229 **Candolfi E, Desoubeaux G, Lachaud L, Morio F, Pomares C, Rabodonirina M, Wawrzyniak**  
230 **I, Delbac F, Gantois N, Certad G, Delhaes L, Poirier P, Viscogliosi E. 2016.** Prevalence, risk  
231 factors for infection and subtype distribution of the intestinal parasite *Blastocystis* sp. from a large-  
232 scale multi-center study in France. *BMC Infection Diseases*, 16, 451.
- 233 **23. Seyer A, Karasartova D, Ruh E, Güreşer AS, Turgal E, Imir T, Taylan-Ozkan A. 2017.**  
234 Epidemiology and prevalence of *Blastocystis* spp. in North Cyprus. *American Journal of Tropical*  
235 *Medicine and Hygiene*, 96, 1164–1170.
- 236 **24.Popruk S, Adao DEV, Rivera WL. 2021.** Epidemiology and subtype distribution of *Blastocystis*  
237 in humans: a review. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, 95, 1–14.
- 238 **25. Haghghi L, Talebnia SE, Mikaeili F, Asgari Q, Gholizadeh F, Zomorodian K. 2020.**  
239 Prevalence and subtype identification of *Blastocystis* isolated from human in Shiraz city, southern  
240 Iran. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health*, 8, 840–844.
- 241 **26.Scanlan PD, Stensvold CR, Cotter PD. 2015.** Development and application of a *Blastocystis*  
242 subtype-specific PCR assay reveals that mixed-subtype infections are common in a healthy human  
243 population. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 81, 4071–4076.
- 244 **27. Scanlan PD, Knight R, Song SJ, Ackermann G, Cotter PD. 2016.** Prevalence and genetic  
245 diversity of *Blastocystis* in family units living in the United States. *Infection, Genetics and*  
246 *Evolution*, 45, 95–97.
- 247 **28.Vega L, Herrera G, Munoz M, Patarroyo MA, Maloney JG, Santin M, Ramírez JD. 2021.** Gut  
248 microbiota profiles in diarrheic patients with co-occurrence of *Clostridioides difficile* and  
249 *Blastocystis*. *PLoS One*, 16, e0248185.
- 250 **29.MacConaill LE, Burns RT, Nag A, Coleman HA, Slevin MK, Giorda K, Light M, Lai K,**  
251 **Jarosz M, McNeil MS, Ducar MD, Meyerson M, Thorner AR. 2018.** Unique, dual-indexed  
252 sequencing adapters with UMIs effectively eliminate index cross-talk and significantly improve

253 sensitivity of massively parallel sequencing. *BMC Genomics*, 19:30.

254

**Table 1. Comparison of the sensitivity of conventional PCR and qPCR from the entire dataset of human samples (n=288).** In addition, we also evaluated the success of *Blastocystis* detection by Next-generation sequencing (NGS) only in a set of qPCR-positive samples (n=83).

# sample	methods				# sample	methods			
	PCR	qPCR	Ct value	NGS		PCR	qPCR	Ct value	NGS
<b>B1</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B2</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B13</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B19</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B24</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B115</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B59</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B126</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B68</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B184</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B195</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B220</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B201</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B374</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B226</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B417</b>	+	+	19	+
<b>B235</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B86</b>	+	+	20	+
<b>B312</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B292</b>	+	+	20	+
<b>B339</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B277</b>	+	+	21	-
<b>B371</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B303</b>	+	+	21	+
<b>B373</b>	+	+	15	+	<b>B380</b>	+	+	21	+
<b>B9</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B300</b>	+	+	22	+
<b>B37</b>	+	+	16	-	<b>B375</b>	+	+	22	+
<b>B42</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B418</b>	+	+	22	+
<b>B45</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B424</b>	+	+	22	+
<b>B49</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B431</b>	+	+	23	+
<b>B120</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B33</b>	+	+	24	+
<b>B225</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B36</b>	+	+	24	+
<b>B327</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B313</b>	+	+	24	+
<b>B343</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B365</b>	+	+	24	+
<b>B352</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B55</b>	+	+	26	+
<b>B364</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B144</b>	-	+	28	+
<b>B412</b>	+	+	16	+	<b>B345</b>	+	+	28	+
<b>B15</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B405</b>	+	+	29	+
<b>B30</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B356</b>	+	+	30	-
<b>B65</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B372</b>	-	+	31	+
<b>B82</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B10</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B99</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B35</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B113</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B38</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B185</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B41</b>	-	+	32	+
<b>B336</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B50</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B341</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B54</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B353</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B62</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B363</b>	+	+	17	+	<b>B114</b>	-	+	32	+
<b>B31</b>	+	+	18	-	<b>B189</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B224</b>	+	+	18	+	<b>B240</b>	-	+	32	+

<b>B231</b>	+	+	18	+	<b>B248</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B393</b>	+	+	18	-	<b>B398</b>	-	+	32	-
<b>B397</b>	+	+	18	+	<b>B425</b>	+	+	32	+
<b>B413</b>	+	+	18	+					

**TABLE 2. Comparison of results of qPCR (Stensvold et al., 2012) and conventional PCR (Scicluna et al., 2006) in detection of *Blastocystis* sp. using McNemar test ( $p < 0.004$ ;  $\chi^2 = 8.265$ ).**

		qPCR		
		positive	negative	
cPCR	positive	69	2	71 (25 %)
	negative	14	203	217 (75 %)
		83 (29 %)	205 (71 %)	288

**TABLE 3. Evaluation of fecal load of *Blastocystis* sp. in human samples based on the established quantification curve (set in the range of  $10^0$  to  $10^5$  cells per 1 qPCR reaction).**

Estimated fecal protist load <sup>1</sup>	Number of samples/Number of positive samples	Ct value range
$10^1$ - $10^2$	18/83	28-32
$10^3$ - $10^4$	13/83	21-27
$10^5$ - $10^6$	52/83	15-20

<sup>1</sup>Number of cells per 1 qPCR reaction.

**TABLE 4. Comparison of *Blastocystis* subtype data in a set of 83 qPCR-positive samples obtained by Sanger sequencing (results obtained in previous study Lhotská et al., 2020) and next-generation sequencing (NGS).**

# sample	subtype		# sample	subtype	
	Sanger sequencing	NGS		Sanger sequencing	NGS
<b>B1</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B225</b>	ST1	ST1
<b>B2</b>	ST1	ST1	<b>B226</b>	ST1	ST1
<b>B9</b>	ST1	ST1	<b>B231</b>	ST3	ST3 + ST1
<b>B10</b>	-	-	<b>B235</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B13</b>	ST1	ST1	<b>B240</b>	-	ST3
<b>B15</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B248</b>	-	-
<b>B19</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B277</b>	ST7	-
<b>B24</b>	ST6	ST6	<b>B292</b>	ST7	ST7
<b>B30</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B300</b>	ST4	ST4
<b>B31</b>	ST3	-	<b>B303</b>	ST7	ST7
<b>B33</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B312</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B35</b>	-	-	<b>B313</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B36</b>	ST1	ST1	<b>B327</b>	ST2	ST2
<b>B37</b>	ST2	-	<b>B336</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B38</b>	-	-	<b>B339</b>	ST1	ST1
<b>B41</b>	-	ST3	<b>B341</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B42</b>	ST1	ST1	<b>B343</b>	ST5	ST5
<b>B45</b>	ST1	ST1 + ST7	<b>B345</b>	ST6	ST6
<b>B49</b>	ST1	ST1	<b>B352</b>	ST3	ST3 + ST2
<b>B50</b>	-	-	<b>B353</b>	ST1 + ST3	ST1 + ST3
<b>B54</b>	-	-	<b>B356</b>	ST3	-
<b>B55</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B363</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B59</b>	ST4	ST4	<b>B364</b>	ST3	ST3 + ST2
<b>B62</b>	-	-	<b>B365</b>	ST7	ST7 + ST3
<b>B65</b>	ST4	ST4	<b>B371</b>	ST4	ST4
<b>B68</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B372</b>	-	ST4
<b>B82</b>	ST2	ST2	<b>B373</b>	ST4	ST4
<b>B86</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B374</b>	ST2	ST2
<b>B99</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B375</b>	ST1	ST1
<b>B113</b>	ST2	ST2	<b>B380</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B114</b>	-	ST2	<b>B393</b>	ST7	-
<b>B115</b>	ST7	ST7	<b>B397</b>	ST2	ST2
<b>B120</b>	ST1	ST1	<b>B398</b>	-	-
<b>B126</b>	ST6	ST6	<b>B405</b>	ST6	ST6
<b>B144</b>	-	ST5	<b>B412</b>	ST2	ST2
<b>B184</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B413</b>	ST4	ST4
<b>B185</b>	ST6	ST6	<b>B417</b>	ST2	ST2

<b>B189</b>	-	-	<b>B418</b>	ST2	ST2
<b>B195</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B424</b>	ST3	ST3
<b>B201</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B425</b>	ST2	ST2
<b>B220</b>	ST3	ST3	<b>B431</b>	ST4	ST4
<b>B224</b>	ST1	ST1			

---



### **SUPPLEMENTARY DATA 1: Detailed description of the Next-generation sequencing protocol for *Blastocystis*.**

Positive samples from qPCR were subjected to NGS to determine *Blastocystis* subtypes according to the method by Maloney et al. (2019). Briefly, amplicons of an informative region (~450 bp) of the SSU rDNA gene were generated using overhang primers, purified, and provisioned with indices and sequencing adaptors using a limited number of PCR cycles with combinatorial indices (Nextera XT Index Kit v2 Set A and D, Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA). The amplicon libraries were purified and equalized using on the SequelPrep plates (Thermo, Waltham, MA, USA), pooled, supplemented with 20% PhiX control to balance the amplicon signal, and sequenced on a MiSeq instrument with the Reagent Kit v2, 2x250 bp (Illumina). The ensuing sequences were downloaded from BaseSpace as demultiplexed fastq files, and processed using the USEARCH10 program (Edgar et al. 2010): primers were trimmed, reads were filtered for quality, and unique sequences defined as zero-radius operational taxonomic units, denoised, their frequencies were tabulated, off-target amplicons were removed and subtypes of *Blastocystis* identified by clustering with a reference set of representative sequences as described in Cinek et al. (2021).

#### **References:**

- Maloney JG, Molokin A, Santin M. 2019. Next generation amplicon sequencing improves detection of *Blastocystis* mixed subtype infections. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, 73,119–125.
- Edgar RC. 2010. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST. *Bioinformatics*, 26, 2460-1.
- Cinek O, Polačková K, Odeh R, Alassaf A, Kramná L, Ibekwe MAU, Majaliwa ES, Ahmadov G, Elmahi BME, Mekki H, Oikarinen S, Lebl J, Abdullah MA. 2021. *Blastocystis* in the faeces of children from six distant countries: prevalence, quantity, subtypes and the relation to the gut bacteriome. *Parasites and Vectors*, 14, 399.

**SUPPLEMENTARY DATA 2: Quantification curve used in qPCR diagnostic protocol for evaluation of the fecal *Blastocystis* load in human DNA samples** (in LightCycler LC 480 I; Roche, Basel, Switzerland). The curve was set in the range of  $10^0$  to  $10^5$  cells per 1 qPCR reaction based on the *Blastocystis* ST3 culture.

