



Seminal Microbiota of Idiopathic Infertile Patients and Its Relationship With Sperm DNA Integrity

Sergio Garcia-Segura¹, Javier del Rey¹, Laia Closa^{2,3}, Iris Garcia-Martínez Carlos Hobeich^{3,4}, Ana Belén Castel⁵, Francisco Vidal^{3,4,6}, Jordi Benet⁷, Jordi Ribas-Maynou^{7,8*} and Maria Oliver-Bonet^{1*}

¹Unit of Cell Biology and Medical Genetics, Department of Cell Biology, Physiology and Immunology, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Bellaterra, Spain, ²Histocompatibility and Immunogenetics Laboratory, Banc de Sang i Teixits (BST), Barcelona, Spain, ³Medicina Transfusional, Vall d'Hebron Institut de Recerca (VHIR), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Barcelona, Spain, ⁴Grup de Coagulopaties Congènites, Banc de Sang i Teixits (BST), Barcelona, Spain, ⁵Instituto de Fertilidad, Palma, Spain, ⁶CIBER de Enfermedades Cardiovasculares (CIBERCV), Barcelona, Spain, ⁷Biotechnology of Animal and Human Reproduction (TechnoSperm), Institute of Food and Agricultural Technology, University of Girona, Girona, Spain, ⁸Unit of Cell Biology, Department of Biology, University of Girona, Girona, Spain

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:
Matteo Avella,
Sidra Medicine, Qatar

Reviewed by:
Sundus Javed,
COMSATS University, Islamabad
Campus, Pakistan
Charles Muller,
University of Washington,
United States

*Correspondence:
Jordi Ribas-Maynou
jordi.ribasmaynou@udg.edu
Maria Oliver-Bonet
maria.oliver@uab.cat

Specialty section:
This article was submitted to
Molecular and Cellular Reproduction,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Cell and Developmental
Biology

Received: 05 May 2022
Accepted: 06 June 2022
Published: 28 June 2022

Citation:
Garcia-Segura S, del Rey J, Closa L,
Garcia-Martínez I, Hobeich C,
Castel AB, Vidal F, Benet J,
Ribas-Maynou J and Oliver-Bonet M
(2022) Seminal Microbiota of Idiopathic
Infertile Patients and Its Relationship
With Sperm DNA Integrity.
Front. Cell Dev. Biol. 10:937157.
doi: 10.3389/fcell.2022.937157

The development of new biomarkers for human male infertility is crucial to improve the diagnosis and the prognosis of this disease. Recently, seminal microbiota was shown to be related to sperm quality parameters, suggesting an effect in human fertility and postulating it as a biomarker candidate. However, its relationship to sperm DNA integrity has not been studied yet. The aim of the present study is to characterize the seminal microbiota of a western Mediterranean population and to evaluate its relationship to sperm chromatin integrity parameters, and oxidative stress. For that purpose, 14 samples from sperm donors and 42 samples from infertile idiopathic patients were obtained and were analyzed to assess the composition of the microbiota through full-length 16S rRNA gene sequencing (Illumina MiSeq platform). Microbial diversity and relative abundances were compared to classic sperm quality parameters (macroscopic semen parameters, motility, morphology and concentration), chromatin integrity (global DNA damage, double-stranded DNA breaks and DNA protamination status) and oxidative stress levels (oxidation-reduction potential). The seminal microbiota observed of these samples belonged to the phyla Firmicutes, Proteobacteria, Actinobacteria and Bacteroidetes. The most abundant genera were *Finegoldia*, *Peptoniphilus*, *Anaerococcus*, *Campylobacter*, *Streptococcus*, *Staphylococcus*, *Moraxella*, *Prevotella*, *Ezakiella*, *Corynebacterium* and *Lactobacillus*. To our knowledge, this is the first detection of *Ezakiella* genus in seminal samples. Two clusters of microbial profiles were built based on a clustering analysis, and specific genera were found with different frequencies in relation to seminal quality defects. The abundances of several bacteria negatively correlate with the sperm global DNA fragmentation, most notably *Moraxella*, *Brevundimonas* and *Flavobacterium*. The latter two were also associated with higher sperm motility and *Brevundimonas* additionally with lower oxidative-reduction potential. Actinomycetaceae, *Ralstonia* and *Paenibacillus* correlated with reduced chromatin protamination status and increased double-stranded DNA fragmentation. These effects on DNA integrity coincide in many cases with the metabolism or enzymatic activities of these genera. Significant

differences between fertile and infertile men were found in the relative presence of the Propionibacteriaceae family and the Cutibacterium, Rhodopseudomonas and Oligotropha genera, which supports its possible involvement in male fertility. **Our findings sustain the hypothesis that the seminal microbiome has an effect on male fertility.**

Keywords: seminal microbiome, human fertility, male infertility, sperm dna damage, oxidative stress, next generation sequencing

INTRODUCTION

Infertility is a multiorganism and multifactorial disease affecting millions of humans worldwide. The male counterpart is known to exert an impact in about 50% of couples who fail to conceive after a year of regular unprotected sexual intercourse (de Kretser, 1997; Boivin et al., 2007; Agarwal et al., 2015). Nowadays, diagnostic assessment of male infertility is rather limited, with only the assessment of sperm motility, sperm count or sperm morphology parameters used universally. However, about 25% of infertile men present values within the normal range for these parameters and are thus considered normozoospermic. In these cases, infertility causes usually remain undiagnosed (Poongothai et al., 2009). Therefore, finding new biomarkers for idiopathic male infertility is key to advancing our knowledge of the disease. Biomarkers would, not only lay the groundwork for the development of new therapeutic strategies, but also serve as diagnostic and prognostic tools with predictive value in in vitro fertilization methodologies (Brincat et al., 2015). In an attempt to address this need, several fertility biomarkers have been studied over the last decade (Kovac et al., 2013; Boissière et al., 2017; Martins and Agarwal, 2019; Mehrparavar et al., 2019). Among them, the measurement of oxidative stress and sperm DNA integrity have provided valuable information related to the balance of the seminal redox system and the effect of reactive oxygen species (ROS) on chromatin integrity and other sperm structures such as plasma and mitochondrial membranes (Aitken and De Iuliis, 2010; Ribas-Maynou and Benet, 2019; Agarwal et al., 2020). In this regard, different authors have shown that increased ROS levels and the incidence of DNA damage are factors intimately related to male infertility (Lewis and Simon, 2010; Aitken et al., 2014; Pourmasumi et al., 2017; Agarwal et al., 2019). However, the

association of these biomarkers to success rates after intracytoplasmic sperm injection are still controversial (Ribas-Maynou et al., 2021).

Recent studies focused on different human diseases support the essential role of the microbiome in health-disease status (Shreiner et al., 2015; Young, 2017; Giles and Couper, 2020).


The development of Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) techniques has allowed a deeper analysis of the microbiomes colonizing humans (Malla et al., 2019) and, for this reason, the number of studies analyzing the microbiomes' composition and relation to health and diseases has grown exponentially over the last decade (Laudes et al., 2021). Similarly, seminal microbiota dysbiosis has recently been proposed as a potential cause of male infertility (Altmäe et al., 2019; Koedooder et al., 2019; Lundy et al., 2020; Tomaiuolo et al., 2020; Farahani et al., 2021).

However, the number of published studies addressing this

association is still limited and results show discrepancies regarding microbiome composition, which suggests a very high interindividual variability. Although no definitive consensus has been reached as yet, several authors agree that seminal microbiota is composed of the phyla Firmicutes, Bacteroidetes, Proteobacteria and Actinobacteria (Lundy et al., 2020; Tomaiuolo et al., 2020; Farahani et al., 2021). Specifically, the most commonly identified genera are Lactobacillus, Corynebacterium, Acinetobacter, Prevotella, Enterococcus Veillonella, Streptococcus, Porphyromonas, Staphylococcus and Pelomonas (Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019; Amato et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2020; Bukharin et al., 2021; Lundy et al., 2021; Okwelogu et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2021).

The lack of agreement on the role of the seminal microbiome on male fertility is manifold. Some authors report an increase of species diversity in infertile men's semen (Rehewy et al., 1979; Mändar et al., 2017; Amato et al., 2020; Lundy et al., 2021), while others do not find differences between clinical groups (Jarvi et al., 1996; Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2020). Several studies have found that Lactobacillus, frequently described as the most abundant genus in semen, is less present in men with decreased seminal quality, and it is especially related to motility and viscosity parameters (Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019). However, other studies have reported opposite results, showing an increase of this genus (and others such as Ureaplasma, Finegoldia and Anaerococcus) in asthenozoospermic and azoospermic patients (Hou et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020). A higher consensus exists regarding the genus Prevotella, which has always been associated with a decrease in sperm quality, mainly underlain by a reduction in sperm motility (Weng et al., 2014; Baud et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2020; Lundy et al., 2021). Finally, some genera of Proteobacteria and Actinobacteria have also been directly related to seminal hypozoospermia (Oligoasthenoazoospermia) (Monteiro et al., 2018; Monteiro et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020).

Despite the growing evidence supporting the association between the seminal microbiome and conventional sperm quality parameters, no studies assessing the impact of seminal microbiota on sperm chromatin and oxidative stress have been published so far. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to analyze the seminal microbiota of a western Mediterranean population and evaluate its relationship with sperm chromatin status, oxidative stress and sperm quality.



MATERIALS AND METHODS Sample Collection

Seminal samples were collected from 56 caucasian Mediterranean subjects, which were classified into two groups: 14 control samples from healthy normozoospermic semen donors with

no infectious diagnosis, infertile patients with apparent pathologic factor as a possible cause of the couple's infertility. Individuals under antibiotic therapy for the last 21 days were excluded.

Demographic Supplemental Table S1. A specific semen collection protocol adapted from the World Health Organization (WHO)

procedures included urinating and washing hands and penis with soap and water before masturbation into a sterile container, was


followed. Environmental bacterial contamination collection was performed in a collection room by moving a sterile swab in the air. A seminogram was performed on samples from all groups according to the WHO 2010 guidelines (World Health Organization, 2010).

Samples were obtained after 2–5 days of sexual abstinence from patients attending the Instituto de Fertilidad of Palma (Mallorca, Spain). After liquefaction at room temperature, samples were preserved in a cryoprotective medium, frozen at -20°C in a laboratory and stored in liquid nitrogen at -196°C until further use. Informed consent was obtained from all donors, and the study was

approved by the Parc Taulí Hospital ethics committee according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

Conventional Sperm Quality Assessment: Concentration, Motility, Morphology, pH and Viscosity

Prior to cryopreservation, a basic semen analysis (sperm concentration, motility, morphology, seminal volume and pH) was performed. For concentration and motility, 7 μl of prewarmed (37°C) and liquefied sperm were loaded into a prewarmed 10 micron Leja Chamber (Leja Products B.V., Luzemestraat, Nieuw Vennep, Netherlands). Then, videos were taken at 30 frames per second using the Sperm Class Analyzer (SCA, Microptic, Barcelona, Spain) software coupled to a negative phase contrast microscope (Olympus Provis AX70, Olympus Corporation, Tokio, JP). For each sample, at least 200 spermatozoa in at least five homogeneous fields were evaluated, and the following parameters were recorded: sperm concentration, percentage of motile sperm, percentage of progressively motile sperm, percentage of non-progressive motile sperm and percentage of immotile sperm. For morphology, Sperm Blue (Microptic, Barcelona, Spain) was used to stain sperm cells. Briefly, 10–15 μl were poured onto the slides, covered with a 22 \times 22 mm coverslip and visualized under a morphology module of the SCA software on a brightfield microscope (Olympus Provis AX70). The percentage of abnormal sperm was assessed using Kruger strict criteria, recording alterations in head, midpiece, tail and cytoplasmic droplets. pH indicator strips (MColorpHast, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) were used to determine the sample pH. Seminal viscosity was measured using 20 micron Leja Chambers (Leja Products B.V.), following a protocol previously described by



Rijnders et al., 2007. Briefly, a standard curve relating viscosity and time to fill the chamber was generated using solutions with different known viscosity. Seminal viscosity was then measured by calculating the sample's capillary filling time and results were reported in centipoise (cps).

Oxidative Stress Evaluation (MiOXSYS)

Seminal oxidative stress was assessed by oxidation-reduction potential (ORP) measurement using the MiOXSYS system (Aytu BioScience, Englewood, CO, United States) and following the manufacturer's instructions. Briefly, 30 μ l were loaded onto a cassette and inserted into the apparatus, which provided a relative value indicating static oxidation-reduction potential. Two replicates were conducted per sample, and the obtained average was normalized by sperm concentration (mV/ 10⁶ sperm/ml) to obtain normalized static oxidation-reduction potential (nsORP).

Sperm Chromatin Evaluation

Sperm DNA Integrity

Global sperm DNA fragmentation analysis, including single- and double-stranded DNA breaks, was performed by the TUNEL and Alkaline Comet assays. Double-stranded DNA breaks were also analyzed by Neutral Comet.

For the TUNEL assay, the In Situ Cell Death Detection Kit (Roche Diagnostic GmbH, Penzberg, Germany) was used, following the manufacturer's instructions. Semen samples were washed three times in phosphate buffered saline solution (PBS) before adjusting the sperm concentration to 5 \times 10⁶ cells/ml. Resuspended sperm samples were divided into three 200 μ l tubes (positive control, negative control and test sample), fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde in PBS for 1 h at room temperature and then washed in PBS supplemented with 1% bovine serum albumin (BSA; Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, United States). Sperm cells were permeabilized using 0.1% Triton X-100 in 0.1% sodium

TABLE 1 | Distribution of infertile patients and donors between the two microbiome profiles revealed by the clustering analysis based on the bacterial relative abundance both at the phylum and genus taxonomic levels, using the between-groups linkage method based on the Euclidean distance.

	Phylum level		Genus level	
	Cluster1	Cluster2	Cluster1	Cluster2
Donors	10	4	8	6
Infertile	31	11	27	15
p-value	0.862		0.633	

The p value for the association analysis with the Pearson's Chi-square test is shown. The threshold for statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

citrate for 2 min in ice and then washed in PBS supplemented with 1% BSA. A positive control was prepared by incubating the sample in 100 IU DNase I (Roche Diagnostic GmbH) for 10 min at 37°C while the test sample and the negative control were kept on ice. The positive control and test sample pellets were then incubated in 45µl of labelling solution plus 5µl of terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase (TdT) enzyme (Roche Diagnostic GmbH) for 1 h at 37°C in the dark, while the negative control followed the same procedure, with the omission of the TdT enzyme. Finally, samples were washed twice using 1% BSA in PBS. Pellets were resuspended in 1 ml of PBS and analyzed by flow cytometry. In order to detect the TUNEL-positive cells (TUNEL+; green fluorescent cells), samples were excited with a blue laser (488 nm) and the emitted fluorescence was collected using a 530 ± 30 nm band-pass filter. A total of 10,000 events at 200–300 cells/s were recorded on a flow cytometer (FACSCalibur; Becton Dickinson, NJ, United States), and data were processed using CELLQUEST analysis software (Becton Dickinson). Negative and positive controls were used to establish the threshold values for TUNEL+ cells and, finally, the percentage of TUNEL+ cells was recorded.

The Comet assay was performed in both alkaline and neutral conditions, according to previously described methodology (Casanovas et al., 2019). First, samples were washed and adjusted to 1×10^6 sperm/ml. Sperm cells were mixed with low-melting-point 1% agarose in a 1:2 proportion to achieve a final agarose concentration of 0.66%. Then, a drop of the mix was allowed to gel at 4°C on an agarose-pretreated slide and an 8-mm round coverslip was applied. Sperm nucleus decondensation was effected by incubating the slides in two consecutive lysis solutions: lysis solution one, containing 0.8 M DTT, 0.8 M Tris, 1% SDS, pH = 7.5, for 30 min, and lysis solution two, containing 0.4 M DTT, 0.4 M Tris, 2 M NaCl, 50 mM EDTA, 1% Tween20, pH 7.5, for 30min. Subsequently, for the Alkaline Comet assay slide, a denaturing treatment in an alkaline solution (0.03M NaOH and 1 M NaCl) for 2.5 min at 4°C was performed, followed by electrophoresis at 1 V/Cm for 4 min in 0.03 M NaOH buffer. In parallel, for the Neutral Comet assay slide, electrophoresis was performed for 12.5min at 1V/Cm in TBE buffer with a subsequent wash in 0.9% NaCl solution. Finally, both slides were washed in a neutralization solution (0.04 M Tris-HCl, pH 7.5), dehydrated in ethanol series (70, 90 and 100%) and dried horizontally before staining with DAPI SlowFade Gold anti-fade (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, United States). Samples were analyzed and evaluated under a fluorescence microscope by a single researcher to avoid intra-observer variability. Fragmented and non-fragmented spermatozoa were manually classified, using criteria reported earlier (Ribas-Maynou et al., 2012), and the percentage of sperm cells with DNA fragmentation was recorded. To assess and quantify the incidence of DNA breaks, both alkaline and neutral Comets were captured under the same epifluorescence microscope and analyzed using Komet 7 analysis software (Andor Technologies, Oxford, United Kingdom). The Olive Tail Moment (OTM), calculated as [(Tail mean intensity–Head mean intensity) × Tail DNA/100]

TABLE 2 | Comparative study of seminal and sperm parameters (Mann-Whitney's U) between microbiome profile 1 (P1) and profile 2 (P2) at phylum and genera levels.

	Phylum level			Genera level		
	P1 (n = 41)	P2 (n = 15)	p-value	P1 (n = 35)	P2 (n = 21)	p-value
Volume (ml)	2.93	2.35	0.184	2.90	2.70	0.662
pH	7.23	7.15	0.184	8.20	8.24	0.617
Viscosity (cps)	32.3	5.25	0.055	5.63	5.59	0.626
Sperm concentration (x10 ⁶ sperm/ml)	69.00	88.40	0.483	76.00	54.45	0.399
Sperm motility (%)	19.30	17.00	0.295	177.30	160.50	0.714
Progressive motility (%)	49.50	62.00	0.961	49.17	61.00	0.204
Sperm morphology (%)	32.66	49.58	0.09	38.00	34.99	0.978
Normed SRR (mV/106 sperm)	8.80	9.50	0.221	9.75	8.25	0.298
Alkaline comet (%)	0.74	0.38	0.235	0.60	0.53	0.546
Alkaline OTM	39.00	39.04	0.179	39.00	39.04	0.759
Neutral comet (%)	40.46	41.30	0.858	40.75	41.79	0.879
Neutral OTM	38.00	33.00	0.685	34.33	39.00	0.298
Median of each parameter for each cluster is shown. The threshold for statistical significance was set at	0.87	0.80	0.63	0.86	0.86	0.431
	65.66	65.00	0.767	65.33	66.00	0.472
	0.61	0.58	0.882	0.60	0.58	0.509
			0.218			
			<			

p 0.05.

TABLE 3 | Results from the correlation analyses between alpha diversity and seminal and sperm parameters.

Seminal or sperm parameter (units)	Spearman ρ	p-value
Seminal volume (ml)	-0.056	0.686
Seminal pH	0.198	0.147
Seminal viscosity (cps)	-0.037	0.79
Sperm concentration (M/ml)	0.106	0.45
Total sperm number ($\times 10^6$)	0.072	0.607
Total motility (%)	-0.018	0.897
Progressive motility (%)	0.037	0.795
Sperm morphology (%)	0.089	0.567
Normed sORP (mV/10 ⁶ sperm/ml)	0.08	0.575
CMA3+ cells (%)	-0.003	0.983
TUNEL+ cells (%)	-0.146	0.292
Alkaline comet (%)	-0.143	0.292
Alkaline OTM	-0.064	0.642
Neutral comet (%)	0.320	0.016
Neutral OTM	0.23	0.089

The Spearman Rho (ρ) and the associated p-value are shown. The threshold for statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Values in bold indicate nominally significant associations.

was recorded for each Comet variant as an indicator of DNA damage intensity, in arbitrary units.

Sperm Chromatin Protamination Status (Chromomycin A₃Test)

Sperm chromatin protamination was assessed using the Chromomycin A₃ (CMA3, Sigma-Aldrich) test. Briefly, semen

samples were washed twice in PBS, permeabilized with 0.5% Triton X-100, and resuspended to a sperm concentration of 10⁷ cells/ml. Sperm cells were subsequently spread on a slide and air-dried. The slide was then incubated with 50 μ l of a staining solution containing 250 μ g/ml CMA3, 10 mM MgCl₂, 30 mmol/L citric acid, 140 mmol/L Na₂HPO₄ at room temperature for 20 min in the dark and covered with Parafilm. Finally, the Parafilm was gently removed and sperm cells were counterstained with DAPI SlowFade Gold antifade (Invitrogen), and a coverslip was applied. A total of 400 cells was analyzed under an epifluorescence microscope and evaluated to obtain the percentage of CMA3 positive cells, as described previously (Garcia-Segura et al., 2020).

Microbiome Analysis

Microbiota DNA Extraction

Bacterial DNA isolation from seminal samples was performed with ZymoBIOMICS DNA Microprep kit (Zymo Research, CA, EEUU) following the manufacturer's instructions with slight modifications. In order to lyse cell walls and membranes to allow the release of DNA, a bead beating step in lysis solution was performed. Then, all supernatant was filtered in Zymo-Spin III-F by centrifugation at 8,000g for 1 min and washing repeatedly in a Zymo-Spin IC-Z column to purify DNA before elution. The researcher worked with sterile gloves in a horizontal laminar flow cabinet previously sterilized with DNA-degrading products and UV irradiation. A sterile swab was placed inside the cabinet as a negative environmental control and the




FIGURE 3 | Alpha diversity distribution for microbiota of donors and infertile patients. Y-axis represents the Shannon index of the groups displayed at the X-axis. Thin horizontal lines delimit the 95% confidence interval (CI), whereas the thick horizontal mark denotes the median value.

TABLE 4 | Correlation coefficients for the abundance of identified (A) phylum, (B) family or (C) genera and basic sperm quality parameters.

A PHYLUM	Semen volume (ml)	Sperm concentration ($\times 10^6$)	Total motile sperm (%)	Progressive motility (%)	Normal morphology (%)	pH	Se men viscosity (cps)
			0.019				
Firmicutes	0.067	-0.165		-0.118	-0.183	0.097	-0.163
Proteobacteria	-0.155	0.064	-0.093	-0.062	0.255	0.027	0.124
Actinobacteria	0.035	0.084	0.020	0.225	0.016	-0.201	0.046
Tenericutes	-0.101	0.079	-0.049	0.074	-0.241	-0.106	-0.019
Bacteroidetes	-0.003	-0.041	0.160	0.100	-0.020	0.106	-0.003
Saccharibacteria	0.022	-0.035	-0.099	-0.031	-0.158	0.160	0.057
Deinococcus/Thermus	-0.098	-0.114	0.107	0.112	-0.243	0.187	0.018
Fusobacteriia	-0.206	0.084	-0.019	-0.109	0.124	0.136	-0.168
Spirochaetes	0.065	-0.054	-0.128	-0.209	-0.090	0.095	-0.249
B FAMILY	Semen volume (ml)	Sperm concentration ($\times 10^6$)	Total motile sperm (%)	Progressive motility (%)	Normal morphology (%)	pH	Semen viscosity (cps)
	0.046	-0.069			0.062		
Peptoniphilaceae	0.172	0.012	-0.073	-0.176	-0.139	0.027	-0.168
Camphylobacteraceae	-	0.035	-0.085	-0.193	0.110	-0.078	-0.089
Streptococcaceae	0.077	0.112	-0.059	-0.047	0.351*	0.171	-0.257
Moraxellaceae	0.047	0.094	-0.166	-0.029	-0.057	0.032	0.026
Staphylococcaceae	0.086		-0.05	0.093	0.052	-0.249	-0.088
Prevotellaceae	-0.058	-0.091	0.101	0.004	0.062	0.199	0.045
Corynebacteriaceae	0.041	0.089	-0.133	0.007	0.037	-0.214	-0.161
Peptostreptococcaceae	-0.088	-0.071	-0.004	-0.085	-0.167	0.093	-0.053
Lactobacillaceae	-0.025	0.013	0.196	0.252	-0.024	0.011	-0.097
Veillonellaceae	-0.083	-0.047	0.051	-0.064	-0.141	0.031	-0.173
Mycoplasmataceae	-0.038	0.027	-0.199	-0.097	0.374*	-0.185	-0.179
Oxalobacteraceae	-0.085	0.1	-0.113	-0.051	0.039	0.015	-0.126
Propionibacteriaceae	0.092	-0.156	0.097	0.290*	0.209	-0.052	0.089
Fusobacteriaceae	-0.236	0.164	0.013	-0.102	-0.120	0.090	-0.118
Actinomycetaceae	-0.043	-0.057	0.114	-0.009	-0.026	0.037	-0.172
Burkholderiaceae	0.156	-0.21	0.021	-0.058	-0.064	0.227	-0.061
Bradyrhizobiaceae	0.184	-0.151	-0.033	0.088	0.215	-0.051	0.005
Rhodobacteraceae	0.061	0.119	0.125	0.005	-0.013	0.059	-0.023
Caulobacteraceae	-0.003	0.165	0.196	0.331*	-0.111	-0.157	-0.053
Bacillaceae	0.245	-0.117	0.109	0.003	-0.163	-0.035	-0.228
Porphyromonadaceae	-0.044	-0.002	0.023	0.024	-0.045	0.026	-0.122
Sphingomonadaceae	0.022	-0.062	-0.291*	-0.232	-0.326*	0.128	-0.064
Bifidobacteriaceae	0.09	-0.013	0.293*	0.362**	-0.198	0.001	0.19
Aerococcaceae	0.027	-0.024	0.097	0.027	-0.137	0.179	-0.167
Clostridiaceae	-0.079	-0.179	0.227	0.049	-0.173	0.082	-0.031
Flavobacteriaceae	-0.064	-0.032	0.107	0.173	-0.019	-0.101	-0.031
Neisseriaceae	-0.098	-0.088	-0.062	-0.106	-0.384*	0.345**	-0.14
Deinococcaceae	-0.112	-0.095	0.195	0.179	-0.202	0.042	-0.198
Paenibacillaceae	0.245	-0.336*	0.023	-0.01	-0.091	0.080	-0.1
Bacteroidaceae	-0.049	-0.075	0.098	0.058	0.040	0.046	-0.053
Micrococcaceae	-0.016	-0.019	0.064	0.033	-0.293	0.068	-0.066
Lachnospiraceae	-0.027	-0.341*	0.074	0.1	0.030	0.214	-0.19
Comamonadaceae	0.163	0.01	-0.032	0.01	-0.081	-0.050	-0.071
Enterobacteriaceae	0.162	-0.154	-0.039	0.073	0.137	-0.031	-0.386**
Intrasporangiaceae	0.162	-0.154	-0.039	0.045	-0.140	-0.201	-0.021
Thermotoga bacteriataceae	-0.204	0.024	0.067	0.082	-0.285	-0.005	-0.095
Pasteurellaceae	-0.082	-0.197	0.015	0.104	-0.055	0.029	-0.095
Promicromonosporaceae	0.029	-0.189	0.035		0.145	-0.148	0.016
Methylobacteriaceae	0.158	-0.164	-0.048	-0.039	-0.022	-0.033	-0.309*
Listeriaceae	0.038	-0.043	0.046	-0.093	-0.036	0.152	-0.325*
Erysipelotrichaceae	0.157	0.033	0.09	-0.045	-0.143	0.143	-0.205
Hungateiclostridiaceae	0.003	-0.038	0.201	0.102	-0.088	0.104	-0.158
Tissierellaceae	-0.196	0.089	0.151	0.006	-0.053	-0.160	-0.106
Steroidobacteraceae	-0.035	-0.134	0.031	0.006	0.082	0.237	-0.006
Acidiferrobacteraceae	-0.019	-0.019	0.133	0.11	-0.079	0.056	-0.013
Erwiniaceae	0.199	-0.03	0.108	0.079	-0.092	0.056	-0.051
Enterococcaceae	-0.084	-0.209	-0.038	0.079	-0.092	-0.125	0.092
Spirochaetaceae	-0.07	0.015	-0.063	-0.133		0.086	0.006
	0.077	-0.079	-0.127	-0.238			0.15
							-0.198

(Continued on following page)

TABLE 4 | (Continued) Correlation coefficients for the abundance of identified (A) phylum, (B) family or (C) genera and basic sperm quality parameters.

B FAMILY	Semen volume (ml)	Sperm concentration ($\times 10^6$)	Total motile sperm (%)	Progressive motility (%)	Normal morphology (%)	pH	Semen viscosity (cps)
	0.182		0.027				0.012
Sinobacteraceae		-0.087	-0.056	0.047	-0.007	0.227	0.036
Alteromonadaceae	-0.142	-0.01	0.037	-0.235	-0.049	-0.109	
Thermotoga bacteriales.Family.III.. Incertae.Sedimentis	-0.078	-0.127	0.003	-0.16	-0.195	0.107	-0.013
Leptotrichiaceae	-0.167	-0.094	0.093	-0.021	-0.134	0.291*	-0.053
Atopobiaceae	0.051	-0.076	0.147	0.069	0.030	-0.033	-0.11
Piscirickettsiaceae	0.218	-0.098	Total motile	0.126	-0.069	0.170	0.141
C GENERA	Semen volume (ml)	Sperm concentration ($\times 10^6$)	sperm (%)	Progressive motility (%)	Normal morphology (%)	pH	Semen viscosity (cps)
	0.127	-0.159			0.045		
Finegoldia	-0.190	0.049	-0.088	-0.144	-0.018	-0.099	-0.268
Peptoniphilus	-0.110	0.011	-0.147	-0.306*	0.253	0.127	0.005
Anaerococcus	-0.127	0.017	0.028	0.044	-0.111	0.224	-0.094
Campanobacter	0.104	0.035	-0.086	-0.203	0.113	-0.073	-0.083
Streptococcus	0.067	0.104	-0.064	-0.050	-0.057	0.170	-0.256
Staphylococcus	-0.092	0.142	-0.044	0.095	0.357*	-0.245	-0.09
Moraxella	-0.026		-0.045	0.085	0.043	-0.006	0.049
Prevotella	-0.071	-0.106	0.090	-0.008	-0.053	0.196	0.032
Ezakiella	0.027	-0.036	-0.062	-0.243	0.036	-0.051	0.047
Corynebacterium	-0.026	0.077	-0.142	0.006	-0.142	-0.214	-0.152
Lactobacillus	-0.110	0.027	0.214	0.258	0.272	0.021	-0.08
Ureaplasma	-0.006	0.153	-0.102	-0.063	-0.044	-0.179	-0.119
Dialister	-0.187				0.221		-0.084
Fusobacterium	-0.110	-0.065	0.078	-0.016	-0.054	-0.054	-0.132
Massilia	0.118	0.083	-0.108	-0.107	0.337*	0.084	-0.143
Cutibacterium	0.307*	0.083	-0.108	-0.035	0.231	-0.004	-0.006
Ralstonia	-0.093	-0.078	-0.046	0.189		-0.162	-0.346*
Veillonella	-0.182	-0.322*	0.047	-0.032	-0.116	0.168	-0.005
Mobiluncus	-0.138	0.150	0.094	-0.059	0.119	0.106	-0.013
Parvimonas	0.070	-0.188	0.082	0.003	-0.109	-0.091	-0.055
Murdochella	0.132	0.002	-0.090	-0.117	-0.019	0.000	-0.007
Acinetobacter	-0.069	-0.241	-0.094	-0.112	-0.230	-0.110	-0.156
Gemella	-0.003	-0.085	-0.127	-0.062	0.237	0.070	-0.159
Porphyromonas	-0.088	0.017	-0.026	-0.037	-0.325*	0.085	-0.118
Brevundimonas	-0.110	-0.006	0.031	0.020	-0.160	0.039	-0.034
Paracoccus	-0.153	0.244	0.118	0.266*	0.067	-0.140	0.035
Gardnerella	-0.040	0.047	0.104	0.096	0.184	0.049	-0.002
Clostridium	0.121	0.024	0.227	0.289*	-0.417**	0.028	0.004
Actinomyces	-0.081	-0.168	0.251	0.082	-0.140	0.054	-0.237
Deinococcus	0.284*	-0.179	0.154	0.052	-0.221	-0.012	-0.1
Bacillus	-0.064	-0.095	0.195	0.179	-0.384*	0.042	-0.172
Sphingobium	-0.016	-0.114	0.061	-0.025	-0.104	-0.030	-0.101
Suicoccus	0.117	-0.130	-0.172	-0.215	-0.104	0.214	0.08
Bradyrhizobium	-0.015	0.025	0.113	0.034	0.067	0.240	-0.096
Bacteroides	-0.050				-0.016		
Schaalia	-0.093	-0.153	-0.028	0.020	-0.084	-0.060	-0.066
Neisseria	0.249	-0.075	0.098	-0.122	-0.091	0.089	-0.143
Paenibacillus	0.051	0.014	-0.033	-0.105	0.118	0.332*	-0.034
Aerococcus	0.025	-0.065	-0.081	-0.073	0.001	0.089	-0.290*
Actinotignum	-0.206	-0.328*	-0.048	0.135	-0.228	-0.058	-0.01
Flavobacterium	-0.100	-0.118	0.185	-0.105	-0.262	-0.065	-0.159
Sphingomonas	0.089	0.122	0.118	0.292*	0.052	-0.163	-0.115
Cupriavidus	-0.189	0.100	0.243	0.050	-0.119	0.075	0.003
Fermentimonas	0.131	0.075	0.081	-0.016	0.007	0.115	-0.163
Xylanimonas	-0.266*	-0.109	-0.021	-0.071	0.075	-0.103	-0.325*
Janibacter	0.001	0.110	-0.083	-0.039	-0.160	-0.148	-0.162
Tepidanaerobacter	0.249	-0.164	-0.048	0.030	-0.055	-0.024	-0.045
Bifidobacterium	0.027	0.107	0.038	0.003	0.290	0.002	-0.137
Kocuria	-0.025	-0.258	-0.039	0.157	-0.149	0.009	-0.141
Propionimicrobium	0.094	-0.149	0.138	-0.095	-0.119	-0.097	0.037
Megasphaera	0.272*	0.044	-0.162	-0.013	0.243	0.145	-0.356**
Steroidobacter		-0.057	0.108	-0.041	-0.083	-0.082	-0.051
		-0.231	0.093	0.110	-0.129	0.237	
		-0.019	0.133		-0.053		

(Continued on following page)

TABLE 4 | (Continued) Correlation coefficients for the abundance of identified (A) phylum, (B) family or (C) genera and basic sperm quality parameters.

B FAMILY	Semen volume (ml)	Sperm concentration ($\times 10^6$)	Total motile sperm (%)	Progressive motility (%)	Normal morphology (%)	pH	Semen viscosity (cps)
	0.092		0.180				
Brochothrix	0.008	-0.103	0.021	0.220	-0.039	0.115	-0.111
Rhodopseudomonas		-0.170		0.207	-0.110	-0.004	0.08
Haemophilus	-0.112	-0.134	-0.077	-0.080	-0.221	0.096	-0.183
Enterococcus	-0.033	0.040	-0.048	-0.101	-0.023	-0.216	-0.204
Oligotropha	0.037	-0.028	0.047	0.205	0.024	-0.062	0.076
Glaciecola	-0.125	0.004	0.004	-0.219	-0.022	-0.052	0.105
Filifactor	0.042	-0.090	0.369**	0.256	-0.124	0.102	-0.093
Thermoaerobacterium	-0.061	-0.135	0.051	-0.137	-0.187	0.099	0.022

Labeled in bold are the statistically significant correlations. *Statistically significant correlations ($p < 0.05$) ** Statistically significant correlations ($p < 0.01$).

negative blanks of extraction were also sequenced to observe the kitome.

16S rRNA

Gene Sequencing

To characterize seminal microbiota, all nine hypervariable regions of 16S rRNA gene (V1-V9) were sequenced. The amplicons of the V1-V9 16S rRNA gene regions were obtained by two consecutive PCRs. The universal 16S rRNA primers 27F and 1492R (Lane, 1991) were used in the first PCR with the addition of a specific tag (27F: 5'-TTTCTGTTGGTCTGATA TTGCAGRGTGATYHTGGCTCAG-3'; 1492R: 5'-ACTTGC CTGTCGCTCTATCTTACCTTGTAYGACTT-3', tag underlined). The PCR Mix contained 10.3 μ l nuclease-free water, 4 μ l 5X buffer, 2 μ l 2mM dNTP, 0.8 μ l 10 μ M forward primer, 1.6 μ l 10 μ M reverse primer, 0.3 μ l 2 U/ μ l Phusion Hot Start II Taq HIFI polymerase (Thermo Fisher Scientific; Waltham MA, United States) and 1 μ l DNA template per sample. The reactions were carried out in an Veriti Thermal Cycler (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and set as follows: initial denaturation at 98°C for 15 s, followed by 25 cycles of 15 s at 98°C for 15 s and extension at 72°C for 45 s. The program was completed with a final extension at 72°C for 7 min.

The second PCR was performed using SequelPrep polymerase (Thermo Fisher Scientific) with self-designed primers that targeted the specific tag incorporated in the first PCR. PCR mix per sample was as follows: 4.67 μ l nuclease-free water, 1 μ l 10X buffer, 0.55 μ l 5.5% DMSO, 1 μ l 10X Enhancer, 0.1 μ l 50mM MgCl₂, 1.5 μ l 10 μ M primer mix, 0.18 μ l 5 U/ml SequelPrep polymerase and 1 μ l of a 1:10 dilution of the first PCR's DNA product. The thermocycler was set with an initial denaturation at 94°C for 60 s, followed by 20 cycles of denaturation at 94°C for 30 s, annealing at 62°C for 30 s and extension at 65°C for 75 s. The program ended with a final extension at 65°C for 5 min. Negative PCR blanks products from both amplifications were pooled and sequenced as a kitome control for PCR reagents.

DNA library preparation was performed by enzymatic fragmentation of the PCR product and double indexing using the NGSgo kit (GenDx, Utrecht, Netherlands), according to the GENDX NGSgo workflow (2017, 4th edition). The indexed libraries were pooled, denatured, and diluted to a final concentration of 4 nM. Pooled libraries were sequenced on the

MiSeq system (Illumina, San Diego, CA, United States), according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Bioinformatics Analysis

The quality of paired-end sequencing data in FASTQ file format was evaluated with the CLC Genomics Workbench software (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Subsequently, sequencing data were processed with the FastQC Toolkit (BaseSpace, Illumina) and reads were discarded based on the following criteria: read length <140 bp and Q-Phred score <30. Taxonomic classification of bacterial reads and alpha diversity (Shannon index) of each sample was performed following the DRAGEN Metagenomics pipeline (v3.5) (BaseSpace, Illumina), which uses the Kraken2 algorithm (v2.0) and the corresponding Extended Kraken2 taxonomic database (March 2020) (Wood and Salzberg, 2014). Prior to analysis, human reads were dehosted from each sample using the same application (UCSC HG19Alt-Aware). Raw relative abundances at phyla, families and genera taxonomic levels were formatted using the R environment. Dataset obtained from sequencing and associated metadata, with the results of seminal quality analyses, is available on-line (Garcia-Segura et al., 2022) in the Dipòsit Digital de Documents (DDD) of Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted using the IBM SPSS Statistics 25.0 software (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, United States), and graphs were generated in GraphPad Prism v.8 (GraphPad Software, La Jolla, CA, United States). First, statistical normality of quantitative seminal parameters was checked using the Shapiro-Wilk test. If parametric assumptions were not fitted even after linear transformation ($\arcsin \sqrt{x}$, \sqrt{x}), non-parametric assumptions were necessary to analyze the results. Correlations between quantitative variables were assessed through the non-parametric Spearman test. Differences of microbiological relative abundance (phyla, families and genera) between donors and infertile patients, as well as between samples with altered/normal oxidative stress or chromatin damage, were assessed using the Mann-Whitney U test. Differences regarding the presence or absence of a particular microorganism between clinical conditions, oxidative stress status or presence of chromatin damage were assessed using the Chi-squared test.




FIGURE 4 | Relative abundance for donors and fertile individuals and infertile patients for (A) families, and (B) genera. For each family or genera, the relative abundance and the ROC curve for the prediction of infertility is shown. Lines and bars show average \pm SEM. *Statistically significant differences between the two groups.

To investigate the presence of distinct microbiologic profiles at the phyla, families or genera taxonomic levels, a cluster analysis was conducted considering the relative abundances of identified bacteria in the whole sample, using the between-groups linkage method based on the Euclidean distance. Clustering for families and genera was tested using only taxa with $>1\%$ of abundance. Clustering analysis was performed regardless of fertility status of samples. Differences in sperm quality quantitative parameters and alpha diversity between individuals assigned to each cluster

were compared using the Mann-Whitney U test, and fertility condition was compared using the Chi-squared test. For those genera with a significant association to fertility status, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was run to sort the genera into a single component. The obtained data was rotated with the Varimax procedure (Kaiser, 1959) and a variable with a loading factor higher than 0.6 and lower than 0.3 in the rotated matrix was selected. The component was used to calculate a regression score for each sample to identify the

TABLE 5 | Correlation coefficients for the abundance of identified phylum, family or genera and oxidative stress and chromatin status.

A PHYLUM	Normalized sORP	CMA +3 cells (%)	TUNEL+ (%)	Global DNA breaks intensity (alkaline comet olive tail moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% alkaline comet)	Double strand DNA breaks intensity (neutral comet olive tail moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% neutral comet)
Firmicutes	0.114	-0.014	0.233	0.233	0.2	0.136	-0.177
Proteobacteria	-0.028	-0.098	-0.143	-0.382**	-0.226	-0.022	0.015
Actinobacteria	-0.069	-0.13	0.099	0.053	-0.137	-0.022	-0.046
Tenericutes	-0.09	0.072	0.118	-0.182	-0.254	-0.141	0.204
Bacteroidetes	0.047	-0.004	-0.193	-0.018	-0.042	-0.025	0.203
Saccharibacteria	0.019	0.083	-0.001	-0.109	-0.156	0.04	0.093
Deinococcus/Thermus	0	0.122	0.193	0.194	0.217	-0.17	-0.103
Fusobacteria	-0.09	0.055	-0.106	-0.104	0.004	0.066	0.027
Spirochaetes	0.159	0.183	0.059	0.088	0.196	0.031	-0.045
B FAMILY	Normalized sORP	Sperm with poor protamination CMA3+ (%)	Sperm with DNA breaks TUNEL+ (%)	DNA breaks intensity (Alkaline Comet Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Alkaline Comet)	Double strand DNA breaks intensity (Neutral Comet Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Neutral Comet)
Peptoniphilaceae	0.026	0.035	0.057	0.155	0.263	-0.12	-0.158
Pyrobacteraceae	0.046	0.093	0.003	0.094	0.101	-0.056	0.089
Streptococcaceae	-0.143	-0.056	0.158	0.189	0.06	0.189	-0.147
Staphylococcaceae	-0.093	-0.014	-0.041	-0.248	-0.288*	0.016	-0.004
Prevotellaceae	-0.135	-0.033	-0.019	0.039	-0.02	0.069	0.039
Corynebacteriaceae	0.073	0.143	-0.182	0.091	0.079	-0.047	0.173
Peptostreptococcaceae	-0.156	0.081	0.203	0.225	0.03	-0.153	-0.146
Lactobacillaceae	0.061	0.223	0.185	0.134	0.238	-0.041	-0.12
Veillonellaceae	-0.03	-0.175	0.089	-0.242	-0.285*	0.041	0.115
Oxalobacteriaceae	0.122	0.026	-0.055	0.075	-0.015	-0.105	0.207
Propionibacteriaceae	-0.071	0.069	0.135	-0.078	-0.17	0.259	0.227
Fusobacteriaceae	-0.081	-0.227	-0.092	-0.2	-0.192	0.074	0.074
Actinomycetaceae	0.191	-0.229	-0.177	-0.2	-0.178	0.016	0.149
Burkholderiaceae	-0.141	0.035	-0.119	-0.128	-0.045	0.197	0.007
Bradyrhizobiaceae	-0.014	0.107	0.061	0.153	0.041	0.378**	0.084
Rhodobacteriaceae	0.055	0.107	0.061	0.153	0.041	-0.011	0.144
Caulobacteraceae	0.252	-0.142	0.024	-0.07	0.004	0.242	-0.067
Bacillaceae	-0.003	-0.178	-0.163	0	0.066	0.021	0.015
Sphingomonadaceae	-0.167	0.048	-0.011	-0.317*	-0.256	0.047	0.154
Aerococcaceae	0.161	-0.042	-0.376**	-0.155	-0.207	-0.129	-0.004
Clostridiaceae	0.064	-0.259	0.128	0.193	0.039	0.075	0.164
Flavobacteriaceae	0.128	-0.046	0.015	0.001	-0.134	0.075	0.06
Neisseriaceae	0.093	0.301*	-0.011	-0.124	-0.053	-0.093	0.17
Deinococcaceae	0.001	-0.178	0.079	-0.173	-0.136	0.012	-0.078
Bacteroidaceae	0.11	-0.042	0.188	-0.004	-0.023	-0.038	0.024
Micromonosporaceae	-0.018	0.037	0.06	0.153	0.135	-0.018	0.117
Comamonadaceae	0.003	-0.15	-0.16	-0.089	-0.136	-0.151	-0.011
Thermomonadaceae	-0.045	0.228	0.04	-0.116	-0.058	0.26	0.002
Intrasporangiatae	0.323*	0.027	0.176	0.17	0.179	-0.133	0.290*
Thermoanaerobacteraceae	0.131	-0.390**	-0.121	0.2	-0.037	0.016	0.147
Pasteurellales	0.076	-0.049	-0.085	0.054	-0.021	0.228	0.04
Promicromonosporaceae	0.235	0.058	0.11	0.19	-0.231	0.264*	0.239
	0.167	-0.102	-0.039	0.07	0.043	-0.114	0.165
	0.082	-0.071	0.12	-0.248	-0.017	-0.2	-0.021
	0.032	0.006	-0.082	0.013	-0.033	-0.005	0.057
	0.142	-0.049	-0.07	0.027	-0.033	-0.008	-0.025
	0.213	0	0.104	0.158	-0.01	-0.181	0.163
	0.242	0.078	-0.05	-0.004	0.151		-0.178
		-0.142	0.007	0.212			

(Continued on following page)

TABLE 5 | (Continued) Correlation coefficients for the abundance of identified phylum, family or genera and oxidative stress and chromatin status.

B FAMILY	Norm alized sORP	Sperm with poor prota mination CMA3+ (%)	Sperm with DNA breaks TUNE L+ (%)	DNA breaks intensity (Alkaline Comet Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Alkaline Comet)	Double strand DNA breaks intensity (Neutral Comet Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Neutral Comet)
Methylobacteriaceae	0.15	-0.014	0.11	0.018	-0.036	0.017	0.053
Listeriaceae	-0.207	0.046	0.049	0.009	-0.077		0.102
Erysip elotrichaceae	0.114	0.047	0.07	-0.026	0.012	-0.013	0.056
Hungate iclostridiaceae	-0.039	0.186	0.143	0.063	0.127	-0.083	0.14
Tissierell aceae	0.182	-0.045	0.027	0.086	0.085	0.068	0.152
Steroidobacteraceae	0.016	0.012	-0.011	-0.192	-0.143	0.172	-0.085
Acid iferrobacterac eae	-0.025	0.045	0.096	-0.184	-0.108	0.006	-0.214
Erwiniaceae	0.191	0.135	0.1	0.018	0.144	-0.154	0.012
Enterococcaceae	0.136	-0.005	-0.005	0.246	0.127	0.228	0.304*
Spiroch aetaceae	0.141	0.189	0.063	0.108	0.225	-0.024	-0.096
Sinobacteraceae	0.043	0.01	0.128	-0.081	-0.045	0.058	-0.236
Alterom onadaceae	0.079	0.03		0.033	0.023	-0.041	0.167
Therm oanaerobactera les.Family.III.. Incertae.Sedi s	0.095	0.105	-0.052	0.221	0.218	0.114	0.116
Leptotr ichiaceae	-0.046	0.219	0.085	0.151	0.156	0.024	0.176
Atopobiac eae	0.014	0.084	-0.037	0.015	0.134	-0.038	0.054
Piscirick ettsiaceae	0.068	0.166	0.003	-0.099	-0.043	-0.093	-0.098
			0.095				
C GENERA	Normalized sORP	Sperm with poor prota mination CMA3+ (%)	Sperm with DNA breaks TUNE L+ (%)	DNA breaks intensity (Alkaline Comet Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Alkaline Comet)	Double strand DNA breaks intensity (Neutral Comet Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Neutral Comet)
Finegol dia	0.053	-0.007	0.043	0.088	0.133	0.23	-0.196
Pepto niphilus	-0.016	0.166	0.088	0.046	0.142	0.074	-0.025
Anae rococcus	0.058	0.086	0.019	-0.017	0.206	-0.126	-0.117
Cam pylobacter	0.047	0.119	0.014	0.082	0.109	-0.061	0.071
Streptococcus	-0.146	-0.053	0.156	0.196	0.067	0.01	-0.153
Staphy lococcus	-0.148	-0.02	0.01	0.035	-0.024	0.104	0.036
Moraxel la	-0.075	0.018	-0.045	-0.319*	-0.343**	0.073	-0.033
Prevotel la	0.085	0.131	-0.181	0.084	0.07	-0.072	0.176
Ezakiella	0.03	0.031	-0.039	0.06	0.123	-0.058	0.176
Coryn ebacterium	-0.143	0.083	0.204	0.227	0.027	-0.052	0.04
Lactobacillus	-0.04	-0.157	0.083	-0.252	-0.280*	-0.178	-0.144
Ureap lasma	-0.206	0.064	-0.113	0.006	-0.117	-0.052	0.115
Dialister	0.115	-0.072	-0.1	0.146	-0.117	0.018	0.094
Fusoba cterium	0.115	-0.072	-0.1	-0.132	0.046	0.259	0.186
Massilia	-0.142	0.032	-0.114	-0.197	-0.049	0.178	0.006
Cutibac terium	-0.066	-0.248	-0.098	-0.219	-0.215	0.282*	0.094
Ralston ia	0.113	-0.22	-0.167	-0.098	-0.298*	0.097	0.09
Veillo nella	0.209	-0.326*	-0.08	-0.139	-0.163	0.144	0.148
Mobilun cus	-0.135	0.084	-0.105	0.073	-0.131	0.05	0.204
Parvimon as	0.092	0.002	-0.098	0.216	0.084	-0.063	0.289*
Murdoch iella	0.049	0.162	-0.095	0.241	0.247	0.234	0.132
Acinetob acter	0.249	-0.153	0.083	-0.214	0.282*	0.211	0.012
Gem ella	0.09	0.055	-0.051	0.038	-0.266*	-0.137	0.201
Porphy romonas	-0.117	-0.037	-0.126	0.017	0.031	0.135	0.308*
Brevu ndimonas	0.064	-0.044	0.023	-0.136	-0.127	0.224	0.157
Para coccus	-0.280*	-0.079	-0.365**	-0.174	-0.292*	-0.046	0.274*
Gardne rella	0.025	0.107	-0.115	-0.092	-0.115	0.003	0.013
Clostr idium	0.02	-0.062	0.045	0.16	0.012	0.2	0.178
Actinom yces	0.084	0.058	0.028	0.021	0.139	-0.151	0.022
Deinococcus	0.142	-0.11	0.061	0.17	-0.116	0.087	0.146
Bacill us	-0.045	0.027	0.176	0.192	-0.179		0.002
	0.165	-0.284*	0.058		0.001		0.032

(Continued on following page)

TABLE 5 | (Continued) Correlation coefficients for the abundance of identified phylum, family or genera and oxidative stress and chromatin status.

C GENERA	Normalized sORP	Sperm with poor prota mination CMA3+ (%)	Sperm with DNA breaks TUNE L+ (%)	DNA breaks intensity (Alkaline Comet Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Alkaline Comet)	Double strand DNA breaks intensity (Neutr al Come t Olive Tail Moment)	Percentage of fragmented cells (% Neutral Comet)
Sphin gobium Suicoccu s	0.109	0.218	0.101	-0.029	0.071	0.046	0.084
Bradyrh izobium Bacter oides Scha alia Neisseria	-0.024	-0.054	0.025	0.056	-0.061		0.005
Paen ibacillus Aeroc occus Actinotign um	0.269	-0.164	-0.104	-0.032	0.037	-0.061	-0.151
Flavob acterium Sphin gomonas Cupri avidus	0.131	-0.049	-0.085	0.054	-0.021	-0.133	0.147
Ferm entimonas Xylanim onas Janib acter	-0.053	0.353**	0.086	0.19	0.203	-0.041	-0.146
Tepidanaerobacter	-0.018	0.223	0.037	0.101	-0.062	-0.021	-0.018
Bifidobacteriu m Kocur ia	0.321*	-0.358**	-0.114	0.226	0.012	0.234	0.264*
Propion imicrobium Meg asphaera Steroidobacter	0.096	-0.144	0.206	-0.016	0.018	-0.2	-0.025
Brochoth rix Rhodopse udomonas Haemophil us	-0.029	0.068	0.097	0.002	0.022	-0.048	-0.054
Enterococcus Oligotr opha Glacie cola Filifact or Therm oanaerobacteri um	-0.059	-0.106	-0.015	-0.307*	-0.317*	-0.111	0.049
	-0.054	0.281*	0.067	-0.312*	-0.296*	0.119	0.121
	0.023	-0.156	0.001	-0.123	-0.04	0.378**	0.157
	-0.06	0.094	-0.069	-0.112	-0.138	-0.101	0.179
	0.242	-0.142	0.007	0.212	0.151	-0.181	-0.178
	-0.033	-0.038	0.002	-0.05	-0.144	-0.139	0.129
	0.17	-0.03	0.066	0.156	0.272*	0.053	0.037
	0.14	-0.122	0.048	-0.081	-0.161	0.083	0.096
	0.062	0.137	-0.02	-0.102	-0.154	-0.005	-0.026
	0.297*	-0.053	0.1	0.161	0.092	-0.206	-0.019
	0.016	-0.142	0.15	0.069	0.031	-0.07	-0.085
	-0.038	0.012	-0.011	-0.192	-0.143	0.172	0.031
	0.310*	-0.076	-0.096	-0.045	0.075	-0.047	0.004
	0.169	-0.08	-0.231	-0.241	-0.126	0.032	0.114
	0.098	0.078	0.077	0.053	0.11	0.036	0.288*
	0.279*	-0.036	-0.055	0.279*	0.137	0.229	0.017
	0.036	-0.056	-0.270*	-0.218	0.11	0.025	0.138
	0.002	0.059	-0.061	0.021	0.069	-0.006	0.151
	0.101	-0.017	0.023	0.132	-0.055	-0.079	0.139
		0.107	0.056	0.214	0.206	0.131	

Labeled in bold are the statistically significant correlations. *Statistically significant correlations (p < 0.05) ** Statistically significant correlations (p < 0.01).

predictive value for male infertility. For all statistical tests, the level of significance was set at 95% of the confidence interval (p < 0.05).

RESULTS Seminal Microbiota Composition

After applying the quality criteria, the sequencing of the 16S rRNA in the study samples generated an average of 221,542.88 reads per sample with a mean length of 146.76 bp and an average depth of 21,517.51 defined theoretically as LN/G, where L is the read length, N is the number of reads and G is the gene length (Sims et al., 2014). The percentage of reads that exceeded the established Q-Phred 30 was 87.99%. In contrast, contamination controls (sample collection, DNA extraction and PCR controls) displayed 10-fold fewer DNA copies, with an average of 6,321 reads. Due to this low reads count in the contamination controls, no contamination of the study samples was assumed, so no correction of the relative abundances of the detected bacteria was applied. Bacterial profiles observed in contamination controls are shown in Supplementary Figure S1.

Considering the whole sample, seminal microbiota was mainly composed of four phyla: Firmicutes (~59%), Proteobacteria (~19%), Actinobacteria (~8%) and Bacteroidetes (~5%). A total of 168 genera were identified, among which the most abundant were Finegoldia, Peptoniphilus, Anaerococcus, Campylobacter, Streptococcus, Staphylococcus, Moraxella, Prevotella, Ezakiella, Corynebacterium and Lactobacillus. A total of 11 genera in the Bacteria Kingdom, and the least represented genus showed an abundance of >3%. At the family level, Peptostreptococcaceae and Veillonellaceae were also found among the most abundant, along with the families to which the previous genera belonged (Supplementary Table S2). Of note, these results highlight the great interindividual variability among the relative abundances of these taxa (Figure 1).

Seminal Microbiota Structure: Bacterial Profiles and Diversity

Two bacterial profiles were identified for each taxonomical level (phylum, family and genus) by clustering analysis of whole

sample (Supplementary Table S3). At the phylum level, phylum-profile 1 was dominated mainly by Firmicutes while phylum-profile 2 maintained similar frequencies of Firmicutes and Proteobacteria, with the presence of Tenericutes and Fusobacteria as well (Figure 2A). However, the alpha diversity was not found significantly different between these clusters ($p = 0.760$).

At the family-level, Peptoniphilaceae was predominant in both clusters, but more abundant in the family-profile 1. Family-profile 1 was dominated by Firmicutes, specifically Peptoniphilaceae, and Actinomycetaceae, Prevotellaceae, Proteobacteria, Moraxellaceae, Staphylococcaceae,

Corynebacteriaceae, Oxalobacteriaceae, Propionimicrobiaceae, Burkholderiaceae (Supplementary Table S3). As for the phylum level, no significant differences in alpha diversity were found between these clusters ($p = 0.088$).

At the genus-level, Finegoldia was the most abundant in profile 1, followed by Staphylococcus, Moraxella, Corynebacterium, Ureaplasma, Peptoniphilus and Cutibacterium. In profile 2, shared with Prevotella, Ezakiella, Dialister and Fusobacterium. Genus-profile 1 showed an enrichment of Streptococcus and Lactobacillus when compared to genus-profile 2 (Figure 2B). As in the previous clusterings, alpha diversity was not different between the two clusters ($p = 0.980$).

As for the clinical analysis, no significant differences were found between patients and controls in conventional sperm quality parameters, chromatin status or oxidative stress were found between the microbiome profile 1 and 2 ($p > 0.05$) (Table 2).

The correlation analysis between alpha diversity and seminal quality parameters in all samples revealed a significant association between higher alpha diversity and increased percentage of sperm with double-stranded DNA fragmentation (Neutral Comet assay) (Table 3). However, no significant differences in alpha diversity were observed between infertile patients and the control group (Figure 3).

Impact of Seminal Microbiota on Conventional Semen Quality Parameters

Significant associations of bacterial taxa between the relative parameters, in all samples of our cohort regardless the fertility status (Table 4). Increased seminal volume was found associated with higher abundance of Ralstonia, Bacillus and Steroidobacter, and lower presence of Janibacter. The abundance of the Leptotrichiaceae and Neisseriaceae families (specifically, the Neisseria genus) was found to increase with higher seminal pH. Lower seminal viscosity was

associated with an increase of the Comamonadaceae, Pasteurellaceae and Promicromonosporaceae (especially, the Xylanomonas genus) families, as well as of the Ralstonia, Schaalina, Aerococcus and Megasphaera genera.

Decreased sperm concentration was found to correlate with higher abundance of the Paenibacillaceae (specifically

Paenibacillus) and Lachnospiraceae families, and the Ralstonia genus. Sperm morphology was found associated with an increased presence of Moraxella and Massilia, and a decreased presence of the Deinococcaceae family and the Deinococcus and Gardnerella genera. Finally, total motility was found to increase with the presence of the Filifactor genus, as well as with the family Bifidobacteriaceae and its genus Gardnerella. This genus showed an even more intense association with increased progressive motility. Likewise, the Propionibacteriaceae and Caulobacteraceae families and the Flavobacterium genus were associated with higher progressive motility, whereas the presence of the Peptoniphilus genus correlated with a decreased progressive motility. Finally, the presence of Sphingomonadaceae family also correlated with a decreased total motility.

Impact of Microbiome on Oxidative Stress and Sperm Chromatin

Table 5 shows correlation analysis results between the relative abundance of bacterial taxa, oxidative stress and sperm chromatin parameters, regardless the fertility status. Increased oxidative stress, assessed as higher nsORP, was found to correlate with higher abundance of Oligotropha, Rhodopseudomonas (both genera of the Bradyrhizobiaceae family), Megasphaera and Paenibacillus (also with Paenibacillaceae family). On the other hand, the Brevundimonas genus was associated with lower nsORP. An increased abundance of Sphingomonadaceae (especially with its genus Sphingomonas) and Schaalina was associated with sperm chromatin compaction alterations, whereas the abundance of the Paenibacillaceae family, specifically Paenibacillus, and the Bacillus and Ralstonia genera correlated to better protamination status.

Although the Alkaline assay and the TUNEL assay evaluate the presence of equivalent parameters (i.e. global DNA damage or fragmentation), the microbiome that correlates with one assay differs substantially from that of the other (Table 5). Higher abundances of the Caulobacteraceae family and its genus Brevundimonas was found in samples with lower levels of global sperm DNA fragmentation obtained by the TUNEL assay, as well as the Oligotropha genus. However, Alkaline Comet assay's fragmentation levels was found to increase with higher abundance of Thermoanaerobacteriaceae, Murdochiella, Tepidanaerobacter and Enterococcus, and to decrease with higher abundance of the Moraxellaceae (specially Moraxella genus) and Lactobacillaceae (specially Lactobacillus genus) families and Cutibacterium, Acinetobacter, Brevundimonas, Flavobacterium and Sphingomonas genera. Finally, sperm double-stranded DNA fragmentation assessed by Neutral Comet assay was associated with increased abundance of the Burkholderiaceae family (and its genera Ralstonia and Cupriavidus), and with Paenibacillaceae (and Paenibacillus genus), Enterococcaceae (and Enterococcus genus), Mobiluncus, Brevundimonas and Gemella.

Impact of Seminal Microbiota on Fertility

Regarding the presence/absence of bacteria, results obtained showed that the abundance of the Phylobacteriaceae and Vibrionaceae families was lower in seminal samples from

donors than from infertile patients ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.002$, respectively). The use of these families for the prediction of infertility leads to an odds ratio of 0.052 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.005–0.364) with a sensitivity of 0.038 and a specificity of 0.567 in the case of *Phylobacteriaceae*, and an odds ratio of 0.122 (95% CI: 0.034–0.467) with a sensitivity of 0.094 and a specificity of 0.542 in the case of *Vibrionaceae*.

Comparing the relative abundance of all bacteria between control and infertile groups, results showed that the *Propionibacteriaceae* family presented differences between groups ($p = 0.008$). The evaluation of the abundance of this family as a predictor for fertility presented an area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 0.735 (95% CI: 0.593–0.876), with a cut-off value of 0.78% (Figure 4). Differences between control and infertile groups were also observed in the genera *Oligotropha* ($p = 0.036$) (AUC: 0.660; CI: 0.512 to 0.807; cut off value: 0.001%), *Rhodopseudomonas* ($p = 0.008$) (AUC: 0.711; CI: 0.573 to 0.849; cut off value: 0.001%) and *Cutibacterium* ($p = 0.024$) (AUC: 0.701; CI: 0.551–0.851; cut off value: 0.743%) (Figure 4). In order to test if a combination of the three genera might lead to a higher predictive value for male infertility, a regression variable was generated through the Principal Component Analysis. The regression component was defined by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Regression variable} &= 0.999 \times \text{Oligotropha} \\ &+ 0.999 \times \text{Rhodopseudomonas} \\ &- 0.031 \times \text{Cutibacterium} \end{aligned}$$

The newly-generated regression variable depicted differences between control and infertile individuals ($p = 0.001$), an area under the curve of 0.780, CI: 0.650 to 0.909 for the cut-off value –0.287.

DISCUSSION

Seminal Microbiota

Seminal microbiota has become a research topic of interest thanks to recent findings that link the presence of seminal dysbiosis to male infertility (Altmäe et al., 2019; Koedooder et al., 2019; Lundy et al., 2020; Farahani et al., 2021). However, the limited number of published studies still makes information regarding the seminal microbiome unclear and sometimes even contradictory, perhaps due to methodological variability. One of the factors that influences the information generated so far is which 16S rRNA hypervariable regions were sequenced. It was shown that each of the identified regions (V1–V9) provided different microbial

present study is based on full-length 16S rRNA gene amplification.

The microbiome composition of the samples analyzed in this work comprised the phyla Firmicutes, Proteobacteria, Actinobacteria and Bacteroidetes. This phylum-level composition and its relative abundance was consistent with

previous studies (Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2020; Lundy et al., 2021; Okwelogu et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2021). When analyzing deeper into family and genus levels, *Streptococcus*, *Staphylococcus* and *Dialister* and its family *Veillonellaceae* were found as recurrent genera in our samples, in agreement with previous published works, (Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2020; Bukharin et al., 2021; Lundy et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2021). In the Proteobacteria phylum, the most relevant genera in our analysis were *Campylobacter*, *Moraxella* and *Ralstonia*. *Campylobacter* has been previously described as a member of seminal microbiome (Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019). *Ralstonia* was detected in Chinese populations (Hou et al., 2013; Yao et al., 2021) and the abundance of *Moraxella* was highlighted only by Monteiro (Monteiro et al., 2018). *Corynebacterium* and *Prevotella*, the more representative genera of phyla Actinobacteria and Bacteroidetes respectively, are both among the most recurrent bacteria in the literature (Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019; Amato et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2020; Bukharin et al., 2021; Lundy et al., 2021; Okwelogu et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2021).

However, other genera observed in our samples contrasted with the relative abundances found in previous reports. For the Firmicutes phylum, the three most abundant genera in our sample study, *Fingoldia*, *Peptoniphilus* and *Anaerococcus*, have also been described in several previous studies as highly abundant in seminal microbiota, although none of them has been previously characterized as the most abundant genera (Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019; Yao et al., 2021). The relative abundance of *Lactobacillus*, found in most of our samples, is lower than the abundance found in previous works (Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019; Amato et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2020; Okwelogu et al., 2021), a fact also reported by Monteiro et al. and Lundy et al. (Monteiro et al., 2018; Lundy et al., 2021) (Figure 1). Finally, to our knowledge this is the first time that the genus *Ezakiella* has been detected in seminal samples.

The genera identified so far in the seminal microbiome have a common characteristic: they all include bacteria that live in conditions of very low oxygen levels, whether they are strictly anaerobic, microaerophilic, or facultatively anaerobic (William B. Whitman, 2015). They are common in epithelial and mucous membranes, so can often be found on the skin or in the gastrointestinal and genitourinary tracts. Some have been described as opportunistic pathogens, and all except the genera *Campylobacter* and *Prevotella* are gram-positive. Some have been described in female genital microbiota, being the predominant taxonomic group in the vaginal tract *Lactobacillus*, although *Peptoniphilus*, *Anaerococcus*, *Ezakiella*, *Dialister*, *Fingoldia* (Ravel et al., 2011; Gajer et al., 2012; Human Microbiome Project Consortium, 2012; Mändar et al., 2015; Diop et al., 2017; Koedooder et al., 2019).

In terms of phylum, family and genus with similar characteristics, the bacteria found in our samples can be structured in two profiles. One of the profiles presented a prevalence of Firmicutes, where *Finiegoldia* predominated, while the other had similar frequencies of Firmicutes and Proteobacteria, predominantly *Peptoniphilus*, and the cluster related with sperm quality parameters or clinical groups. Thus, two subgroups of individuals exist, in terms of microbiota that may be due to aspects other than fertility. Several studies point out that other bacterial communities inhabiting different organs are affected by diet (Bibbò et al., 2016; Kolodziejczyk et al., 2019; Barrientos-Durán et al., 2020; Dall'Asta et al., 2021). In addition, the fact that there are bacteria in semen which have also been observed in the vaginal tract could be evidence of a possible relationship between male and female microbiota, and would make a study of interactions between the couple an interesting one, as suggested by Mändar et al. (2015). Cluster analyses carried out so far have observed some coincident profiles, such as those characterized by *Prevotella*- or *Lactobacillus*-enrichment (Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Baud et al., 2019), but none of them were observed in this study.

No differences in alpha diversity were observed between clusters or clinical groups in our cohort. The Mändar group reported higher species diversity in male reproductive disease, while the Chen group reported a reduction in diversity in azoospermic patients (Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018). Despite this, not all authors conducted a study of bacterial diversity, so information is still limited.

Impact of Seminal Microbiota on Sperm Quality Parameters

As shown by this study, and by previous studies, the most common bacterial phylum in seminal fluid is Firmicutes (Hou et al., 2013; Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019; Amato et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2020; Bukharin et al., 2021; Lundy et al., 2021; Okwelogu et al., 2021; Yao et al., 2021). Some of the most representative taxa are good candidates to play a role in maintaining or affecting the patient's fertility capacity. Our results show that the genus *Peptoniphilus*, for example, correlates with a decrease in progressive sperm motility, thus suggesting a negative impact on this sperm characteristic. We observed that the Bacilli group contains genera that present the strongest correlations with fertility traits: some genera of the Bacillaceae and the Paenibacillaceae families have been linked to poor sperm quality, with negative impact on morphology, concentration, and higher levels of double-stranded DNA fragmentation and oxidative stress. Reports on *Lactobacillus*, perhaps the most documented genus of the Bacilli group, show conflicting results regarding its role in seminal quality. Some authors have found a decrease in the amount of *Lactobacillus* in infertile men with sperm motility problems or seminal hyperviscosity (Weng et al., 2014; Mändar et al., 2017; Monteiro et al., 2018; Baud et al., 2019). In contrast, other authors

have described an increased presence of this genus in asthenozoospermic and azoospermic patients (Hou et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2020). In our cohort, samples with a high relative abundance of these bacteria showed a reduction in global sperm DNA fragmentation, suggesting a possible protective effect of *Lactobacillus* on DNA integrity. The mechanism by which this genus could act as a DNA integrity protector is not known. It has been suggested that the production of short-chain fatty acids (SCFA) by *Lactobacillus* prevents sperm lipid peroxidation by ROS (Barbonetti et al., 2011; Markowiak-Kopeć and Śliżewska, 2020), and contributes to the seminal plasma antioxidant defense.

Another Firmicutes that negatively correlates with sperm DNA integrity is *Megasphaera*. The presence of this genus is increased in infertile individuals and also in samples with high oxidative stress. *Megasphaera* members are known to produce acyl-CoA dehydrogenases (DuPlessis et al., 1998) which could increase ROS levels in seminal plasma and the risk of sperm DNA damage. Finally, an increased presence of *Enterococcus* has been observed in samples with a high degree of global and double-stranded DNA fragmentation. Other research groups have linked the presence of *Enterococcus* in seminal plasma with high levels of sperm DNA damage, in bacteriospermia patients and in vitro studies (Zeyad et al., 2018; Duracka et al., 2019).

Comamonadaceae, *Megasphaera*, *Ralstonia* and *Schaalia* are the taxa that have shown a large negative correlation with seminal viscosity. These bacteria might benefit from a more liquid medium, which would allow for higher mobility and would make resource availability easier, giving them a proliferative advantage. Alternatively, some of these genera might act the production of viscosity by these enzymes, which would degrade seminal fluid proteins and promote their liquefaction (Kershaw-Young et al., 2013; da Fonseca Junior et al., 2020; Rateb, 2021).

As for possible beneficial relationships between host and seminal microbiome, the Proteobacteria phylum correlates with *Moraxella* family, specifically represented in our samples, have been found in high proportions in samples of donors, and in samples with low levels of global DNA fragmentation and better sperm morphology. Beneficial effects of *Moraxella* have also been observed in both respiratory and intestinal tracts, where stable colonies of this genus have been associated with good health and its deregulation has been linked to pathogenic effects (Clemente et al., 2012; Biesbroek et al., 2014; Bosch et al., 2017; van den Munckhof et al., 2020).

According to our data, the family Burkholderiaceae, mainly represented by *Ralstonia*, is also associated with a favorable semen viscosity, sperm morphology and DNA protamination, suggesting a beneficial effect. In contrast, Yang and others identified an abundant presence of *Ralstonia* in asthenozoospermic patients (Yang et al., 2020), suggesting a sperm motility relationship between this genus and effects of this genus on male fertility.

Another Proteobacteria with potentially beneficial results is *Brevundimonas*, a genus that has been observed most abundantly in individuals with low oxidative stress, high progressive sperm motility and low levels of global DNA fragmentation. These parameters are all intrinsically related to each other and, as suggested by several authors, this could imply a cause-effect mechanism (Taha et al., 2012; Peluso et al., 2013; Ribas-Maynou and Benet, 2019). The catalase activity and carotenoid production observed in *Brevundimonas* could contribute to the reduction of seminal oxidative stress (Vancanneyt et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2020), through a decrease in cell membrane damage caused by lipid peroxidation. If this peroxidation occurs, DNA would be more exposed to oxidative stress, and extensive DNA damage would be generated. Moreover, the cell membrane might become damaged, affecting sperm viability. Similar results are found in *Flavobacterium*, the only bacterial genus in the phylum Bacteroidetes which, according to our analysis, has a potential relationship with fertility.

Finally, within the phylum Actinobacteria, *Gardnerella* and its family Bifidobacteriaceae are associated with better sperm motility, both total and progressive. The relationship between this taxon and sperm motility was also observed by Weng and others (Weng et al., 2014), and may be due to the Bifidobacteriaceae antioxidant effect (Valente et al., 2019). Propionibacteriaceae bacteria, although increased in infertile patients, has been shown to be associated with sperm motility and low levels of global DNA fragmentation. In contrast, *Schaalia* and *Mobiluncus*, from Actinomycetaceae family, appears to be at increased levels in patients with poor sperm chromatin protamination and high levels of double-stranded DNA fragmentation. In fact, Actinomycetaceae has been shown to produce isoprenoids (Kawasaki et al., 2003), induce apoptosis in sperm cells (Kawachi et al., 1999). More studies are needed to better determine the possibility of this effect on sperm cells.

Impact of Seminal Microbiota on Fertility Prognosis

In order to assess whether the observed microbiota can predict male infertility and become a potential biomarker, the presence or absence and differential abundance of identified bacteria was analyzed. Our data suggest that the presence of the Phyllobacteriaceae and Vibrionaceae families are more frequently associated with infertility. In addition, the proportion of the family Propionibacteriaceae was different between the control and patient groups, with a greater abundance in the latter at a significance below 0.01. Its predictive capacity has an AUC of 0.73, considering infertile those individuals who exceed the cut-off point of 0.78% relative abundance. We can also highlight three genera with similar characteristics: *Oligotropha* and *Rhodopseudomonas*, both with a cut-off value of 0.001%, and *Cutibacterium*, with a cut-off value of 0.74%. On their own, these bacteria may predict the fertility potential of an individual, but their low cut-off values suggest that utility may be limited. For this reason, a combination of the three genera's abundances in a principal component analysis was expected to open

the way for predictive models based on multiple specific bacterial profiles. Accordingly, in our analyses, the AUC value for such a combination was superior to those for the separate genera.

CONCLUSION

Seminal microbiota analysis based on the amplification of the full-length 16S rRNA gene is a methodology that allows the identification of the most abundant bacterial groups in seminal plasma. In agreement with previous studies, seminal microbiota found in this study consisted mainly of bacteria belonging to four phyla: Firmicutes, Proteobacteria, Actinobacteria and Bacteroidetes. The bacterial genera found were *Finegoldia*, *Peptoniphilus*, *Anaerococcus*, *Campylobacter*, *Streptococcus*, *Staphylococcus*, *Moraxella*, *Prevotella*, *Corynebacterium* and *Lactobacillus*. This methodology also allowed us to identify genera not previously described in the seminal microbiome, such as *Ezakiella*, a component in vaginal microbiota.

Our findings and those of other research groups provide evidence for the role of seminal microbiota in male fertility. Despite having a low biomass, some of these bacteria show a consistent relationship with their metabolic or enzymatic activity, as well as correlations with several interrelated parameters, such as oxidative stress, DNA fragmentation and sperm motility. The mechanisms by which they interfere with these seminal and spermatogenic parameters are still unknown in most cases, but may be related to their metabolism or enzymatic activities. Further studies are needed to determine the true effect of each of the identified bacteria and the possible clinical applications that may improve semen quality and pregnancy expectations.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The datasets presented in this study can be found in online repositories. The names of the repository/repositories and accession number(s) can be found in the article/ Supplementary Material.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by Parc Taulí Hospital ethics committee, Consorci Corporació Sanitària Parc Taulí de Sabadell. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SG-S, JdR, FV, JB, and MO-B conceived the experimental design. SG-S, ABC, and MO-B collected seminal samples. SG-S processed the samples to assess sperm quality. JR-M processed Comet assay. SG-S, JdR, and LC extracted, amplified and sequenced the bacterial DNA. SG-S, IG-M, and CH processed and analyzed

sequencing data. SG-S wrote the original manuscript. JR-M, JB, and MO-B critically revised the manuscript. JdR, LC, IG-M, CH, FV, JB, JR-M, and MO-B reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

This research was funded by the European Regional Development Fund and Instituto de Salud Carlos III (Economy, Industry and Competitiveness Ministry, Madrid, Spain; Project PI14/00119) and Generalitat de Catalunya (2017SGR1796). Supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation scheme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 801342 (Tecniospring INDUSTRY; TECSPP-19-1-0003, to JR-M).

REFERENCE S

- Agarwal, A., Parekh, N., Panner Selvam, M. K., Henkel, R., Shah, R., Homa, S. T., et al. (2019). Male Oxidative Stress Infertility (MOSI): Proposed Terminology and Clinical Practice Guidelines for Management of Idiopathic Male Infertility. *World J. Mens. Health* 37, 296–312. doi:10.5534/wjmh.190055
- Agarwal, A., Majzoub, A., Baskaran, S., Panner Selvam, M. K., Cho, C. L., Henkel, R., et al. (2020). Sperm DNA Fragmentation: A New Guideline for Clinicians. *World J. Mens. Health* 38, 412. doi:10.5534/WJMh.200128
- Agarwal, A., Mulgund, A., Hamada, A., and Chyatte, M. R. (2015). A Unique View on Male Infertility Around the Globe. *Reprod. Biol. Endocrinol.* 13, 37. doi:10.1186/s12958-015-0032-1
- Aitken, R. J., and De Iulius, G. N. (2010). On the Possible Origins of DNA Damage in Human Spermatozoa. *Mol. Hum. Reprod.* 16, 3–13. doi:10.1093/molehr/gap059
- Aitken, R., Smith, T., Jobling, M., Baker, M., and De Iulius, G. (2014). Oxidative Stress and Male Reproductive Health. *Asian J. Androl.* 16, 31–38. doi:10.4103/1008-682X.122203
- Altmäe, S., Fransasiak, J. M., and Mändar, R. (2019). The Seminal Microbiome in Health and Disease. *Nat. Rev. Urol.* 16, 703–721. doi:10.1038/s41585-019-0250-y
- Amato, V., Papaleo, E., Pasciuta, R., Viganò, P., Ferrarese, R., Clementi, N., et al. (2020). Differential Composition of Vaginal Microbiome, but Not of Seminal Microbiome, Is Associated with Successful Intrauterine Insemination in Couples with Idiopathic Infertility: A Prospective Observational Study. *Open Forum Infect. Dis.* 7, ofz525. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofz525
- Barbonetti, A., Cinque, B., Vassallo, M. R. C., Mineo, S., Francavilla, S., Cifone, M. G., et al. (2011). Effect of Vaginal Probiotic Lactobacilli on In Vitro-induced Sperm Lipid Peroxidation and its Impact on Sperm Motility and Viability. *Fertil. Steril.* 95, 2485–2488. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2011.03.066
- Barrientos-Durán, A., Fuentes-López, A., de Salazar, A., Plaza-Díaz, J., and García, F. (2020). Reviewing the Composition of Vaginal Microbiota: Inclusion of Nutrition and Probiotic Factors in the Maintenance of Eubiosis. *Nutrients* 12, 419. doi:10.3390/NU12020419
- Baud, D., Pattaroni, C., Vulliamoz, N., Castella, V., Marsland, B. J., and Stojanov, M. (2019). Sperm Microbiota and its Impact on Semen Parameters. *Front. Microbiol.* 10, 234. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2019.00234
- Bibbò, S., Ianiro, G., Giorgio, V., Scaldaferrri, F., Masucci, L., Gasbarrini, A., et al. (2016). The Role of Diet on Gut Microbiota Composition. *Eur. Rev. Med. Pharmacol. Sci.* 20, 4742–4749. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27906427> (Accessed September 13, 2021).
- Biesbroek, G., Tsvitivadze, E., Sanders, E. A. M., Montijn, R., Veenhoven, R. H., Keijsers, B. J. F., et al. (2014). Early Respiratory Microbiota Composition Determines Bacterial Succession Patterns and Respiratory Health in Children. *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* 190, 1283–1292. doi:10.1164/rccm.201407-12400C

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors would like to thank Servei de Cultius Celulars, Producció d'Anticossos i Citometria (SCAC) of Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, for the service provided for the FACSCalibur cytometer. Additionally, our thanks to Servei Veterinari de Genètica Molecular (SVGM) for his assistance in experimental design process.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcell.2022.937157/full#supplementary-material>

- Boissière, A., Gala, A., Ferrières-Hoa, A., Mullet, T., Baillet, S., Petiton, A., et al. (2017). Cell-free and Intracellular Nucleic Acids: New Non-invasive Biomarkers to Explore Male Infertility. *Basic Clin. Androl.* 27, 7. doi:10.1186/S12610-017-0052-0
- Boivin, J., Bunting, L., Collins, J. A., and Nygren, K. G. (2007). International Estimates of Infertility Prevalence and Treatment-Seeking: Potential Need and Demand for Infertility Medical Care. *Hum. Reprod.* 22, 1506–1512. doi:10.1093/humrep/dem046
- Bosch, A. A. T. M., de Steenhuijsen Pijters, W. A. A., van Houten, M. A., Chu, M. L. J. N., Biesbroek, G., Kool, J., et al. (2017). Maturation of the Infant Respiratory Microbiota, Environmental Drivers, and Health Consequences. A Prospective Cohort Study. *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* 196, 1582–1590. doi:10.1164/rccm.201703-0554OC
- Brincat, D., Catania, S., Wismayer, P. S., and Calleja-Agius, J. (2015). Male Factors in ART Outcome Prediction. *Gynecol. Endocrinol.* 31, 169–175. doi:10.3109/09513590.2014.984678
- Bukharin, O. V., Perunova, N. B., Ivanova, E. V., Chaynikova, I. N., Bekpergenova, A. V., Bondarenko, T. A., et al. (2021). Semen Microbiota and Cytokines of Healthy and Infertile Men. *Asian J. Androl* 23, 1–6. doi:10.4103/aja202169
- Casanovas, A., Ribas-Maynou, J., Lara-Cerrillo, S., Jimenez-Macedo, A. R., Hortal, O., Benet, J., et al. (2019). Double-stranded Sperm DNA Damage Is a Cause of Delay in Embryo Development and Can Impair Implantation Rates. *Fertil. Steril.* 111, 699–707. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2018.11.035
- Chen, H., Luo, T., Chen, T., and Wang, G. (2018). Seminal Bacterial Composition in Patients with Obstructive and Non-obstructive Azoospermia. *Exp. Ther. Med.* 15, 2884–2890. doi:10.3892/etm.2018.5778
- Clemente, J. C., Ursell, L. K., Parfrey, L. W., and Knight, R. (2012). The Impact of the Gut Microbiota on Human Health: an Integrative View. *Cell* 148, 1258–1270. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.01.035
- da Fonseca Junior, A. M., Gaita, V., Argumedo, D. R., Castro, L. S., Losano, J. D., Leite, R. F., et al. (2020). Changes in Fertilization Medium Viscosity Using Hyaluronic Acid Impact Bull Sperm Motility and Acrosome Status. *Reprod. Dom. Anim.* 55, 974–983. doi:10.1111/rda.13739
- Dall'Asta, M., Laghi, L., Morselli, S., Re, M. C., Zagonari, S., Patuelli, G., et al. (2021). Pre-Pregnancy Diet and Vaginal Environment in Caucasian Pregnant Women: An Exploratory Study. *Front. Mol. Biosci.* 8, 726. doi:10.3389/FMOLB.2021.702370/BIBTEX
- de Kretser, D. (1997). Male Infertility. *Lancet* 349, 787–790. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(96)08341-9
- Diop, K., Andrieu, C., Michelle, C., Armstrong, N., Bittar, F., Bretelle, F., et al. (20172017). Characterization of a New *Ezakiella* Isolated from the Human Vagina: Genome Sequence and Description of *Ezakiella Massiliensis* Sp. Nov. *Curr. Microbiol.* 75, 456–463. doi:10.1007/S00284-017-1402-Z
- DuPlessis, E. R., Pellett, J., Stankovich, M. T., and Thorpe, C. (1998). Oxidase Activity of the Acyl-CoA Dehydrogenases. *Biochemistry* 37, 10469–10477. doi:10.1021/bi980767s
- Duracka, M., Lukac, N., Kacaniova, M., Kantor, A., Hleba, L., Ondruska, L., et al. (2019). Antibiotics versus Natural Biomolecules: The Case of In Vitro Induced

- Bacteriospermia by *Enterococcus Faecalis* in Rabbit Semen. *Molecules* 24, 4329. doi:10.3390/molecules24 234329
- Farahani, L., Tharakan, T., Yap, T., Ramsay, J. W., Jayasena, C. N., and Minhas, S. (2021). The Semen Microbiome and its Impact on Sperm Function and Male Fertility: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Andrology* 9, 115–144. doi:10.1111/andr.12886
- Gajer, P., Brotman, R. M., Bai, G., Sakamoto, J., Schütte, U. M. E., Zhong, X., et al. (2012). Temporal Dynamics of the Human Vaginal Microbiota. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 4, 132ra52. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3003605
- Garcia-Segura, S., Oliver-Bonet, M., and Benet, J. (2022). Data from: Seminal Microbiota of Idiopathic Infertile Patients and its Relationship with Sperm DNA Integrity. *Bellaterra: Dipòsit Digit. Doc. la Univ. Autònoma Barcelona*. doi:10.5565/DDD.UAB.CAT/258024
- Garcia-Segura, S., Ribas-Maynou, J., Lara-Cerrillo, S., Garcia-Peiró, A., Castel, A. B., Benet, J., et al. (2020). Relationship of Seminal Oxidation-Reduction Potential with Sperm DNA Integrity and pH in Idiopathic Infertile Patients. *Biology* 9, 262. doi:10.3390/biology9090262
- Giles, E. M., and Couper, J. (2020). Microbiome in Health and Disease. *J. Paediatr. Child. Health* 56, 1735–1738. doi:10.1111/JPC.14939
- Guo, F., Ju, F., Cai, L., and Zhang, T. (2013). Taxonomic Precision of Different Hypervariable Regions of 16S rRNA Gene and Annotation Methods for Functional Bacterial Groups in Biological Wastewater Treatment. *PLoS One* 8, e76185. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0076185
- Hou, D., Zhou, X., Zhong, X., Settles, M. L., Herring, J., Wang, L., et al. (2013). Microbiota of the Seminal Fluid from Healthy and Infertile Men. *Fertil. Steril.* 100, 1261–1269. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2013.07.1991
- Human Microbiome Project Consortium (2012). Structure, Function and Diversity of the Healthy Human Microbiome. *Nature* 486, 207–214. doi:10.1038/nature11234
- Jarvi, K., Lacroix, J.-M., Jain, A., Dumitru, I., Heritz, D., and Mittelman, M. W. (1996). Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based Detection of Bacteria in Semen. *Fertil. Steril.* 66, 463–467. doi:10.1016/S0015-0282(16)58520-3
- Kaiser, H. F. (1959). Computer Program for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis. *Educ. Psychol. Meas.* 19, 413–420. doi:10.1177/001316445901900314
- Kawasaki, T., Kuzuyama, T., Furihata, K., Itoh, N., Seto, H., and Dairi, T. (2003). A Relationship between the Mevalonate Pathway and Isoprenoid Production in Actinomycetes. *J. Antibiot.* 56, 957–966. doi:10.7164/antibiotics.56.957
- Kerrigan, Z., Kirkpatrick, J. B., and D'Hondt, S. (2019). Influence of 16S rRNA Hypervariable Region on Estimates of Bacterial Diversity and Community Composition in Seawater and Marine Sediment. *Front. Microbiol.* 10, 1640. doi:10.3389/FMICB.2019.01640
- Kershaw-Young, C. M., Stuart, C., Evans, G., and Maxwell, W. M. C. (2013). The Effect of Glycosaminoglycan Enzymes and Proteases on the Viscosity of Alpaca Seminal Plasma and Sperm Function. *Animal Reproduction Sci.* 138, 261–267. doi:10.1016/j.anireprosci.2013.02.005
- Koedooder, R., Mackens, S., Budding, A., Fares, D., Blockeel, C., Laven, J., et al. (2019). Identification and Evaluation of the Microbiome in the Female and Male Reproductive Tracts. *Hum. Reprod. Update* 25, 298–325. doi:10.1093/humupd/dmy048
- Kolodziejczyk, A. A., Zheng, D., and Elinav, E. (2019). Diet-microbiota Interactions and Personalized Nutrition. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 17, 742–753. doi:10.1038/s41579-019-0256-8
- Kovac, J. R., Pastuszak, A. W., and Lamb, D. J. (2013). The Use of Genomics, Proteomics, and Metabolomics in Identifying Biomarkers of Male Infertility. *Fertil. Steril.* 99, 998–1007. doi:10.1016/J.FERTNSTERT.2013.01.111
- Lane, D. J. (1991). "16S/23S rRNA Sequencing," in *Nucleic Acid Techniques in Bacterial Systematics*. Editors E. Stackebrandt and M. Goodfellow (New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons), 115–175.
- Laudes, M., Geisler, C., Rohmann, N., Bouwman, J., Pischon, T., and Schlicht, K. (2021). Microbiota in Health and Disease-Potential Clinical Applications. *Nutrients* 13, 3866. doi:10.3390/NU13113866
- Lewis, S. E. M., and Simon, L. (2010). Clinical Implications of Sperm DNA Damage. *Hum. Fertil.* 13, 201–207. doi:10.3109/14647273.2010.528823
- Liu, H., Zhang, C., Zhang, X., Tan, K., Zhang, H., Cheng, D., et al. (2020). A Novel Carotenoids-Producing Marine Bacterium from Noble Scallop *Chlamys nobilis* and Antioxidant Activities of its Carotenoid Compositions. *Food Chem.* 320, 126629. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.126629
- Lundy, S. D., Sangwan, N., Parekh, N. V., Selvam, M. K. P., Gupta, S., McCaffrey, P., et al. (2021). Functional and Taxonomic Dysbiosis of the Gut, Urine, and Semen Microbiomes in Male Infertility. *Eur. Urol.* 79, 826–836. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2021.01.014
- Lundy, S. D., Vij, S. C., Rezk, A. H., Cohen, J. A., Bajic, P., and Ramasamy, R. (2020). The Microbiome of the Infertile Male. *Curr. Opin. Urology* 30, 355–362. doi:10.1097/MOU.0000000000000742
- Malla, M. A., Dubey, A., Kumar, A., Yadav, S., Hashem, A., and Abd Allah, E. F. (2019). Exploring the Human Microbiome: The Potential Future Role of Next-Generation Sequencing in Disease Diagnosis and Treatment. *Front. Immunol.* 9, 2868. doi:10.3389/FIMMU.2018.02868/BIBTEX
- Mändar, R., Punab, M., Borovkova, N., Lapp, E., Kiiker, R., Korrovits, P., et al. (2015). Complementary Semiovaginal Microbiome in Couples. *Res. Microbiol.* 166, 440–447. doi:10.1016/J.RESMIC.2015.03.009
- Mändar, R., Punab, M., Korrovits, P., Türk, S., Ausmees, K., Lapp, E., et al. (2017). Seminal Microbiome in Men with and without Prostatitis. *Int. J. Urol.* 24, 211–216. doi:10.1111/iju.13286
- Markowiak-Kopeć, P., and Śliżewska, K. (2020). The Effect of Probiotics on the Production of Short-Chain Fatty Acids by Human Intestinal Microbiome. *Nutrients* 12, 1107. doi:10.3390/nu12041107
- Martins, A. D., and Agarwal, A. (2019). Oxidation Reduction Potential: A New Biomarker of Male Infertility. *Panminerva Med.* 61, 108–117. doi:10.23736/S0031-0808.18.03 529-2
- Mehrparavar, B., Minai-Tehrani, A., Arjmand, B., and Gilany, K. (2019). Metabolomics of Male Infertility: A New Tool for Diagnostic Tests. *J. Reprod. Infertil.* 20, 64–69.
- Mo, H., and Elson, C. E. (1999). Apoptosis and Cell-Cycle Arrest in Human and Murine Tumor Cells Are Initiated by Isoprenoids. *J. Nutr.* 129, 804–813. doi:10.1093/jn/129.4.804
- Monteiro, C., Marques, P. I., Cavadas, B., Damião, I., Almeida, V., Barros, N., et al. (2018). Characterization of Microbiota in Male Infertility Cases Unravels Differences in Seminal Hyperviscosity and Oligoasthenoteratozoospermia Possibly Correlated with Increased Prevalence of Infectious Bacteria. *Am. J. Reprod. Immunol.* 79, e12838. doi:10.1111/aji.12838
- Okwelogu, S. I., Ikechebel, J. I., Agbakoba, N. R., and Anukam, K. C. (2021). Microbiome Compositions from Infertile Couples Seeking In Vitro Fertilization, Using 16S rRNA Gene Sequencing Methods: Any Correlation to Clinical Outcomes? *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* 11, 709372. doi:10.3389/FMICB.2021.709372
- Peluso, G., Palmieri, A., Cozza, P. P., Morrone, G., Verze, P., Longo, N., et al. (2013). The Study of Spermatic DNA Fragmentation and Sperm Motility in Infertile Subjects. *Arch. Ital. Urol. Androl.* 85, 8–13. doi:10.4081/aiua.2013.1.8
- Poongothai, J., Gopenath, T. S., Manonayaki, S., and Poongothai, S. (2009). Genetics of Human Male Infertility. *Singap. Med. J.* 50, 336–347.
- Pourmasumi, S., Sabeti, P., Rahiminia, T., Mangoli, E., Tabibnejad, N., and Talebi, A. R. (2017). The Etiologies of Sperm DNA Abnormalities in Male Infertility: An Assessment and Review. *Int. J. Reprod. Biomed.* 15, 331–344. doi:10.29252/ijrm.15.6.331
- Rateb, S. A. (2021). Purification of Cryopreserved Camel Spermatozoa Following Protease-based Semen Liquefaction by Lectin-functionalized DNA-defrag Magnetic Nanoparticles. *Reprod. Dom. Anim.* 56, 183–192. doi:10.1111/rda.13863
- Ravel, J., Gajer, P., Abdo, Z., Schneider, G. M., Koenig, S. S. K., McCulle, S. L., et al. (2011). Vaginal Microbiome of Reproductive-Age Women. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 108, 4680–4687. doi:10.1073/pnas.1002611107
- Rehewy, M. S. E., Hafez, E. S. E., Thomas, A., and Brown, W. J. (1979). Aerobic and Anaerobic Bacterial Flora in Semen from Fertile and Infertile Groups of Men. *Archives Androl.* 2, 263–268. doi:10.3109/01485017908987323
- Ribas-Maynou, J., Yeste, M., Becerra-Tomás, N., Aston, K. I., James, E. R., and Salas-Huetos, A. (2021). Clinical Implications of Sperm DNA Damage in IVF and ICSI: Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Biol. Rev.* 96, 1284–1300. doi:10.1111/BRV.12700
- Ribas-Maynou, J., and Benet, J. (2019). Single and Double Strand Sperm DNA Damage: Different Reproductive Effects on Male Fertility. *Genes* 10, 105. doi:10.3390/genes10020105
- Ribas-Maynou, J., Garcia-Peiró, A., Abad, C., Amengual, M. J., Navarro, J., and Benet, J. (2012). Alkaline and Neutral Comet Assay Profiles of Sperm DNA

- Damage in Clinical Groups. *Hum. Reprod.* 27, 652–658. doi:10.1093/humrep/der461
- Rijnders, S., Bolscher, J. G. M., McDonnell, J., and Vermeiden, J. P. W. (2007). Filling Time of a Lamellar Capillary-Filling Semen Analysis Chamber Is a Rapid, Precise, and Accurate Method to Assess Viscosity of Seminal Plasma. *J. Androl.* 28, 461–465. doi:10.2164/jandrol.106.002360
- Shreiner, A. B., Kao, J. Y., and Young, V. B. (2015). The Gut Microbiome in Health and in Disease. *Curr. Opin. Gastroenterology* 31, 69–75. doi:10.1097/MOG.000000000000139
- Sims, D., Sudbery, I., Ilott, N. E., Heger, A., and Ponting, C. P. (20142014). Sequencing Depth and Coverage: Key Considerations in Genomic Analyses. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 15, 121–132. doi:10.1038/nrg3642
- Sirichoat, A., Sankuntaw, N., Engchanil, C., Buppasiri, P., Faksri, K., Namwat, W., et al. (20202020). Comparison of Different Hypervariable Regions of 16S rRNA for Taxonomic Profiling of Vaginal Microbiota Using Next-Generation Sequencing. *Arch. Microbiol.* 203, 1159–1166. doi:10.1007/S00203-020-02114-4
- Taha, E. A., Ez-Alidin, A. M., Sayed, S. K., Ghandour, N. M., and Mostafa, T. (2012). Effect of Smoking on Sperm Vitality, DNA Integrity, Seminal Oxidative Stress, Zinc in Fertile Men. *Urology* 80, 822–825. doi:10.1016/j.urology.2012.07.002
- Tomaiuolo, R., Veneruso, I., Cariati, F., and D'Argenio, V. (2020). Microbiota and Human Reproduction: The Case of Male Infertility. *High-Throughput* 9, 10. doi:10.3390/ht9020010
- Valcarce, D. G., Genovés, S., Riesco, M. F., Martorell, P., Herráez, M. P., Ramón, D., et al. (2017). Probiotic Administration Improves Sperm Quality in Asthenozoospermic Human Donors. *Benef. Microbes* 8, 193–206. doi:10.3920/BM2016.0122
- Valcarce, D. G., Riesco, M. F., Martínez-Vázquez, J. M., and Robles, V. (2019). Long Exposure to a Diet Supplemented with Antioxidant and Anti-inflammatory Probiotics Improves Sperm Quality and Progeny Survival in the Zebrafish Model. *Biomolecules* 9, 338. doi:10.3390/biom9080338
- van den Munckhof, E. H. A., Hafkamp, H. C., de Kluijver, J., Kuijper, E. J., de Koning, M. N. C., Quint, W. G. V., et al. (2020). Nasal Microbiota Dominated by *Moraxella* Spp. Is Associated with Respiratory Health in the Elderly Population: a Case Control Study. *Respir. Res.* 21, 181. doi:10.1186/s12931-020-01443-8
- Vancanneyt, M., Segers, P., Abraham, W. R., and Vos, P. D. (2015). “Brevundimonas,” in *Bergey’s Manual of Systematics of Archaea and Bacteria* (New Jersey, NJ: American Cancer Society), 1–14. doi:10.1002/9781118960608.gbm00791
- Weng, S.-L., Chiu, C.-M., Lin, F.-M., Huang, W.-C., Liang, C., Yang, T., et al. (2014). Bacterial Communities in Semen from Men of Infertile Couples: Metagenomic Sequencing Reveals Relationships of Seminal Microbiota to Semen Quality. *PLoS One* 9, e110152. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0110152
- W. B. Whitman (Editor) (2015). *Bergey’s Manual of Systematics of Archaea and Bacteria* (New Jersey, NJ: John Wiley & Sons). doi:10.1002/9781118960608
- Wood, D. E., and Salzberg, S. L. (2014). Kraken: Ultrafast Metagenomic Sequence Classification Using Exact Alignments. *Genome Biol.* 15, R46. doi:10.1186/gb-2014-15-3-r46
- World Health Organization (2010). *WHO Laboratory Manual for the Examination and Processing of Human Semen*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22235670> (Accessed June 25, 2020). Yang, H., Zhang, J., Xue, Z., Zhao, C., Lei, L., Wen, Y., et al. (2020). Potential Pathogenic Bacteria in Seminal Microbiota of Patients with Different Types of Dysspermatism. *Sci. Rep.* 10, 6876. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-63787-x
- Yao, Y., Qiu, X.-J., Wang, D.-S., Luo, J.-K., Tang, T., Li, Y.-H., et al. (2021). Semen Microbiota in Normal and Leukocytospermic Males. *Asian J. Androl.* 24, 1–8. doi:10.4103/aja202172
- Young, V. B. (2017). The Role of the Microbiome in Human Health and Disease: an Introduction for Clinicians. *BMJ* 356, j831. doi:10.1136/BMJ.J831
- Zeyad, A., Hamad, M., Amor, H., and Hammadeh, M. E. (2018). Relationships between Bacteriospermia, DNA Integrity, Nuclear Protamine Alteration, Sperm Quality and ICSI Outcome. *Reprod. Biol.* 18, 115–121. doi:10.1016/j.repbio.2018.01.010
- Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.
- Publisher’s Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.
- Copyright © 2022 Garcia-Segura, del Rey, Closa, Garcia-Martínez, Hobeich, Castel, Vidal, Benet, Ribas-Maynou and Oliver-Bonet. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.