

1 **Optimized sampling method for fecal microbiome and metabolome** 2 **preservation under room temperature**

3 **Tatsuhiko Nomaguchi¹, Yohsuke Yamauchi¹, Yuichiro Nishimoto¹, Yuka Togashi¹, Masaki**
4 **Ito¹, Felix Salim^{1,2}, Kota Fujisawa^{1,2}, Shinnosuke Murakami^{1,3}, Takuji Yamada^{1,2*}, Shinji**
5 **Fukuda^{1,3-6*}**

6 ¹ Metagen Inc., 246-2 Kakuganji, Tsuruoka, Yamagata 997-0052, Japan

7 ² Department of Life Science and Technology, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1 Ookayama,
8 Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8550, Japan

9 ³ Institute for Advanced Biosciences, Keio University, 246-2 Kakuganji, Tsuruoka, Yamagata 997-
10 0052, Japan

11 ⁴ Transborder Medical Research Center, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1 Tennodai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki
12 305-8575, Japan

13 ⁵ Gut Environmental Design Group, Kanagawa Institute of Industrial Science and Technology, 3-25-
14 13 Tonomachi, Kawasaki-ku, Kawasaki, Kanagawa 210-0821, Japan

15 ⁶ Laboratory for Regenerative Microbiology, Juntendo University Graduate School of Medicine,
16 Hongo, Tokyo 113-8421, Japan

17 * **Correspondence:** Takuji Yamada, yamada@metagen.co.jp; Shinji Fukuda,
18 sfukuda@metagen.co.jp

19 **Keywords: gut microbiome, gut metabolome, fecal sampling method, silica gel, integrated**
20 **analysis**

This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

21 **Abstract**

22 **Background:** The relationship among the human gut microbiome, microbially produced metabolites,
23 and health outcomes remains of great interest. To decrease participant burden, room-temperature
24 storage methods for fecal samples have become increasingly important. However, kits for storing the
25 fecal microbiome and metabolome have not been well explored. We hypothesized that storing fecal
26 samples by drying them with silica gel may be suitable.

27 **Objectives:** The objective was to evaluate the performance of storage at room temperature by drying
28 feces for subsequent examination of the microbiome, microbial pathways, and the metabolome.

29 **Methods:** Feces from ten healthy adults (6 male and 4 female) were sampled and immediately
30 processed, as controls, and stored at room temperature in an incubator, on an FTA card, in RNAlater,
31 or dried by silica gel. Storage at room temperature continued for 7 days. Drying by the silica gel
32 method was assessed for 14 days. The fecal microbiome was assessed by sequencing the bacterial
33 16S ribosomal RNA-encoding gene (V1-V2 region), fecal microbial pathway profiles were analyzed
34 by whole-genome shotgun metagenomics, and fecal metabolome profiles were analyzed using
35 capillary electrophoresis time-of-flight mass spectrometry (CE-TOFMS).

36 **Results:** Qualitative and β -diversity analyses of the microbiome, microbial pathways, and the
37 metabolome showed that drying by silica gel were closest to those immediately after processing.
38 When focusing on the abundances of individual microbes, microbial pathways, and metabolites,
39 some were found to be significantly different. However, the intra-method ranking of individual items
40 showed that 100%, 87-97%, and 63-76% of microbes, microbial pathways, and metabolites,
41 respectively, were significantly correlated between silica gel preserving and immediately processing
42 method.

43 **Conclusions:** The results showed that fecal sample drying could be effectively used for the
44 preservation of the fecal microbiome and metabolome.

45 1 Introduction

46 The gut microbiome and microbiome-derived metabolites are strongly associated with host health.
47 Some examples include not only intestinal diseases such as inflammatory bowel diseases [1],
48 *Clostridioides difficile* infection [2], and colorectal cancer [3] but also systemic diseases such as
49 glucose intolerance [4], and atherosclerosis [5]. Studies have revealed the importance of evaluating
50 the gut environment and thus the development of evaluation methodology, including collection
51 methods.

52 In the academic field, the standard fecal sample collection method for evaluating the gut
53 microbiome and metabolome is freezing specimens immediately after collection because the
54 microbial composition in feces can change considerably within a short period at room temperature
55 [6]. However, immediate freezing requires freezer or laboratory equipment, which is inconvenient
56 for routine clinical practice and for obtaining samples in fieldwork locations such as jungles.
57 Therefore, methods to preserve fecal samples without freezing have been explored. In previous
58 studies, commercially available sampling kits and/or reagents that were considered capable of storing
59 the fecal microbiome at room temperature were evaluated [7–9]. While these studies have suggested
60 the potential of some kits for preserving the microbiome composition, there is currently no
61 methodology for preserving both the microbiome and metabolome. Furthermore, current sampling
62 kits frequently contain fixing reagents with high salt contents that are not safe to use for collection
63 outside the laboratory, also causing difficulty for metabolomic measurement by mass spectrometry.

64 For alternate preservation methods of the microbiome and metabolome composition in fecal
65 samples, we focused on drying. Drying, or more precisely, low water activity is a classic but reliable
66 method to inhibit microbial proliferation and has been used as a food storage technique for centuries
67 [10]. Although some microbes, such as spore-forming bacteria, are resistant to low water activity and
68 are able to persist, low water activity is able to prevent microbial growth [11]. In addition, sample
69 drying with desiccant has been used as a common DNA sampling method by field biologists, and

70 several studies have reported its DNA preservation potency [12,13]. Therefore, immediate drying
71 with desiccant may have great potential for the preservation of microbial community composition
72 and microbial DNA.

73 On the other hand, there is a concern that the drying process may cause loss of some volatile
74 metabolites in fecal samples. Gut microbiome constituents metabolize dietary fibers reaching the
75 large intestine to produce a variety of organic acids, including short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs),
76 which have been reported to be important factors for many health and disease conditions [14,15].
77 These organic acids include some volatile substances that would be lost while the fecal samples dry.
78 However, a previous study reported that fecal SCFA concentrations are stable after the freeze-drying
79 procedure, which may suggest the possibility that fecal metabolites may also be preserved in feces
80 during desiccant drying [16].

81 In this study, we aimed to evaluate a stool preservation method based on drying with silica gel,
82 a globally common desiccant, as a method of fecal sample preservation at room temperature that can
83 maintain the microbiome and metabolome profiles. As a result, qualitative and β -diversity analyses
84 of the microbiome, microbial pathways, and metabolome showed that drying by silica gel was the
85 closest to immediate freezing compared to other preservation methods, such as RNAlater and FTA
86 cards. In addition, the intramethod ranking of individual items showed that 100%, 87-97%, and 63-
87 76% of microbes, microbial pathways, and metabolites, respectively, were significantly correlated
88 with the immediate freezing method. These results showed that drying fecal samples with silica gel
89 has great potential for the preservation of the fecal microbiome and metabolome.

90 2 Methods


91 2.1 Trial design and sample collection

92 Storage of human fecal samples was tested using several methods (Fig. 1).

- 93 - Immediately frozen with liquid nitrogen after fecal sample collection and then used for DNA
94 and metabolite extraction. Processed as a positive control in this study (abbreviated method
95 name: Control).
- 96 - Stored at 25°C (room temperature maintained by incubator) as a negative control (abbreviated
97 method name: Room temp., stored at room temperature).
- 98 - Stored at 25°C with an FTA™ card (GE healthcare, USA) (abbreviated method name: FTA
99 card). The application process was as follows: 1) the fecal sample was applied onto the FTA
100 card, 2) the sample was allowed to dry for one hour at room temperature (official protocol),
101 and 3) the FTA card was placed into a hermetically sealed bag and stored in the incubator.
- 102 - Stored at 25°C with RNAlater (Qiagen, Netherlands) (abbreviated method name: RNAlater).
- 103 - Stored at 25°C with MGKit (Metagen, Japan) (abbreviated method name: Silica gel). The
104 application process was as follows: 1) a fecal sample was sandwiched with a predried silica gel
105 plate (30 x 40 x 3 mm³) that was wrapped with microporous polypropylene film, allowing dried
106 feces to be easily removed, and a 1 mm thick-silicone rubber sheet was also sandwiched to
107 ensure that the fecal sample was stored at a certain thickness to standardize the drying
108 efficiency; and 2) silica-sandwiched feces was stored into a reclosable plastic bag and stored in
109 the incubator (Fig. 1b).

110 The storage period was 7 days, but storage in silica gel was still performed after 14 days (in this
111 article, named long-term). The protocol for this clinical trial was approved by the clinical trial ethics

112 review committee of Chiyoda Paramedical Care Clinic (publicly registered at UMIN-CTR, trial
 113 number: UMIN000028459). Written informed consent was received from all participants. Ten
 114 participants were recruited for the collection of fecal samples based on the following criterion: (1)
 115 between 0 and 100 years old. (2) Subjects who don't regularly use specific medicines. (3) Subjects
 116 who show understanding of the study procedures and agreement with participating the study by
 117 written informed consent prior to the study. (4) Subjects who does not have current medical history
 118 of severe disease. (5) Subjects who have been determined eligible by principal investigator. The
 119 characteristics of the subjects were as follows: sex: 6 males, 4 females; and age: 31.3 ± 4.5 years.



120

121 **Fig. 1 Overview of the study**

122 (A) Overview of the study. (B) Schematic diagram showing how the fecal sample was stored with silica gel.

123

124 **2.2 DNA and metabolite extraction from fecal samples**

125 DNA and metabolite extraction from fecal samples was performed as follows. The fecal samples in
 126 control and room temp. conditions were initially lyophilized using a VD-800R lyophilizer (TAITEC,

127 Saitama, Japan) for at least 16 h. Next, fecal samples were shaken vigorously with 3 mm zirconia
128 beads using a Shake Master (1,500 rpm, 10 min; Biomedical Science Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan).
129 Samples were then suspended in DNA extraction buffer containing 400 μ L of a 1% (weight/volume)
130 SDS/TE (10 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM EDTA; pH 8.0) solution and 400 μ L of
131 phenol/chloroform/isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1; NACALAI TESQUE, INC., Kyoto, Japan). The fecal
132 samples in the buffer were further shaken with 0.1 mm zirconia/silica beads using a Shake Master
133 (1,500 rpm, 5 min). After centrifugation ($17,800 \times g$; 5 min; room temperature) of the samples,
134 bacterial genomic DNA was purified by the standard phenol/chloroform/isoamyl alcohol protocol.
135 RNA was removed from the sample by RNase A (Takara Bio, Inc., Shiga, Japan) treatment, and then
136 DNA samples were purified again by the standard phenol/chloroform/isoamyl alcohol protocol. The
137 extracted DNA was shotgun sequenced by Macrogen Japan. After generating the library using a
138 TruSeq Nano, sequencing was performed using HiSeqX (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) according
139 to the manufacturer's protocol. For the 16S rRNA gene analysis, the primers 27F-mod
140 (AGRGTTTGATYMTGGCTCAG) and 338R (TGCTGCCTCCCGTAGGAGT) were used to
141 amplify the V1-V2 region of the 16S rRNA gene [17]. The amplified DNA was sequenced using a
142 MiSeq (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) according to the manufacturer's protocol. The 16S rRNA
143 gene was sequenced at Bioengineering Lab. Co., Ltd. (Kanagawa, Japan). Metabolite extraction from
144 fecal samples was performed based on previously described methods [18]. After extraction of
145 metabolites, the concentration of metabolites was measured by capillary electrophoresis time-of-
146 flight mass spectrometry (CE-TOFMS). The peaks from the CE-TOFMS were identified, and the
147 relative peak areas, which are values based on comparison with the internal standard peak areas,
148 were calculated. From the relative peak area, the quantitative values of some of the metabolites were
149 calculated by comparison with the reference material.

150 **2.3 Bioinformatics and statistical analysis**

151 The 16S rRNA gene data were analyzed by QIIME2 (version 2019.10) with our analytical pipeline
152 [19], as follows. Quality filtering and denoising were used to generate amplicon sequence variants
153 (ASVs) by DADA2 (options: --p-trim-left-f 20 --p-trim-left-r 19 --p-trunc-len-f 240 --p-trunc-len-r
154 140). The ASVs were assigned to taxa by applying the Silva SSU Ref Nr 99 (version 132) classifier
155 (command: “qiime feature-classifier classify-sklearn”; options: default).

156 Metagenomic shotgun data were processed with the bioBakery3 workflow (version 3.0.0.a.7)
157 to generate functional gene profiles (options: wmgx --bypass-strain-profiling) [20]. The workflow
158 starts with low-quality reads or human genome read removal with KneadData version 0.10.0.
159 Functional gene and metabolic pathway profiles were generated with HUMAnN version
160 3.0.0.alpha.3. The ChocoPhlAn3 and UniRef 90 databases (obtained January 2019) were used for
161 functional gene annotation, while metabolic pathway annotation was performed with MetaCyc.
162 Functional gene and metabolic pathway profiles were normalized according to relative abundance
163 with `humann_renorm_tables`.

164 For statistical analysis, in-house Python scripts were used (version 3.7.6). For the comparison
165 of the distance of the fecal microbiome and metabolome profiles, the Friedman test and Nemenyi test
166 were used (`scipy` 1.5.2 and `scikit_posthocs` 0.7.0). In the subsequent analysis, microbes with a mean
167 relative abundance below 0.001 and microbial pathways and metabolites undetected in 75% of the
168 samples were excluded. For the pairwise comparison of the abundances of microbes, microbial
169 pathways, and metabolites, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test with Benjamini–Hochberg false discovery
170 rate (FDR-BH) correction was used (`scipy` version 1.5.2 and `statsmodels` 0.10.0). Spearman's
171 correlation coefficient and the test for no correlation were used to compare the ranks of each
172 microbe, microbial pathway, and metabolite. The relative abundances of microbiome, microbial
173 pathway table, and metabolome abundance table are shown in Supplementary Tables S1-3,
174 respectively.

175 **3 Results**

176 **3.1 Qualitative analysis of the fecal microbiome and metabolome with each sampling method**

177 In this study, we hypothesized that fecal drying with silica gel may preserve the fecal microbiome
 178 and metabolome and compared stool drying with silica gel and several other fecal storage methods
 179 (Fig. 1). However, metabolome analysis after processing with RNAlater could not be performed
 180 because of the high salt content. In addition, the FTA card could not measure each metabolite
 181 amount but measure the concentration due to the low stool volume.

182 First, qualitative analysis was performed. From all samples, 241 genera, 458 metabolic
 183 pathways, were detected and 316 metabolites were detected. According to a comparison of the
 184 bacteria and metabolites detected by each sampling method, the overlap with the control method was
 185 calculated (Table 1). Although microbes and microbial pathways were reasonably well preserved by
 186 all methods (microbes: 71.9%-87.2%, microbial pathways: 90.0%-94.3%), metabolites were not well
 187 preserved with FTA card storage ($36.6 \pm 5.3\%$). Of all sampling methods, silica gel had the highest
 188 overlap with the control for genus ($86.2 \pm 3.1\%$), microbial pathways ($94.3 \pm 3.0\%$) and metabolites
 189 ($81.3 \pm 5.4\%$). Long-term silica gel preservation retains more fecal features for genus ($87.2 \pm 3.1\%$)
 190 and metabolites ($82.4 \pm 4.9\%$).

191

192 **Table 1** Qualitative analysis of bacteria and metabolites for each sampling method

	Taxonomic annotation (Genus)		Functional annotation (Microbial pathways)		Metabolome profile (Metabolites)	
	Number ^{*a}	Coverage ^{*b}	Number ^{*a}	Coverage ^{*b}	Number ^{*a}	Coverage ^{*b}
Control	169	-	432	-	279	-
Room temperature	172	0.839 (0.046)	434	0.900 (0.072)	280	0.764 (0.082)
FTA card	177	0.807 (0.079)	425	0.931 (0.021)	157	0.366 (0.053)
RNAlater	209	0.719 (0.138)	425	0.929 (0.027)	-	-
Silica gel	173	0.862 (0.031)	432	0.943 (0.030)	288	0.813 (0.054)
Silica gel (Long term)	165	0.872 (0.031)	439	0.927 (0.063)	278	0.824 (0.049)

193 ^{*a}: Number of genus, microbial pathways and metabolites were calculated by 16S rRNA gene analysis, shotgun

194 metagenomics analysis, and CE-TOFMS analysis, respectively.

195 ^{*b}: Percentage of items detected by each method among items detected by the control method; the values are shown
196 as the mean (Standard Deviation).

197


198 3.2 Quantitative analysis

199 3.2.1 Beta diversity analysis - Precision and accuracy

200 In measurement, precision (how close measurements are to each other) and accuracy (how close
201 measurements are to the true value) should be high. In this section, we analyzed the precision and
202 accuracy of the determination of the overall microbiome, microbial pathways, and metabolome
203 profile.

204 First, each method's precision for microbiome and metabolome profiling was determined.
205 The precision of the microbial pathway profiling was not calculated because it was a singular. The
206 precision of the microbiome profiling was similar for all groups (Fig. 2A). However, the precision of
207 the metabolome profiling was significantly lower in the FTA group than in the other groups (Fig. 2B;
208 $p < 0.05$; Nemenyi test). These results suggest that the microbiome and metabolome profiles were
209 calculated precisely by many methods, except for the metabolome profile when the FTA card
210 method was used.

211



212


213 **Fig. 2 Boxplot of microbiome and metabolome profiling precision.**

214 The mean values of the (A) microbiome weighted UniFrac distances, and (B) metabolome spearman distances between
215 triplicates in each condition and subject were calculated and are shown in the boxplots. Microbiome weighted UniFrac
216 distance did not show the significant difference by multiple comparison procedure (Friedman test). *, significant
217 difference from other conditions by Nemenyi test ($p < 0.05$). Room temp., room temperature.

218

219 Subsequently, the accuracy of each method was determined (Fig. 3). In determining accuracy,
220 the control method (immediate processing) was treated as the true value. As the positive control,
221 average distances between control samples was used, but there is no positive control for microbial
222 pathways abundance table as it use single sample. As the result, significant differences in
223 microbiome and metabolome profile were detected in Room temp, FTA card, and RNAlater method,
224 excluding RNAlater method in metabolome profile, when compared to controls (Fig. 3A, C).

225



226


227 **Fig. 3 Boxplot of the accuracy of the microbiome, microbial pathway, and metabolome profiling shows that**
228 **the silica gel preservation method preserves the fecal microbiome and metabolome, resulting in high-**
229 **accuracy determination of the profiles.**

230 The (A) microbiome weighted UniFrac distance, (B) microbial pathway Spearman distance, and (C) metabolome
231 Spearman distance to the control condition in each condition were calculated; for the control condition, the mean
232 value of the distance between replicates was calculated. *, $p < 0.05$ compared with the control in the Nemenyi test.

233

234 **3.2.2 Differences in the abundance of individual microbes, microbial pathways, and**
235 **metabolites due to storage methods**

236 Next, abundance on each microbe, microbial pathway, and metabolite was compared to evaluate the
237 effects of storage methods. Although the differences in microbes and microbial pathways were not
238 large, metabolites were depleted in the FTA card method (Fig. 4). For each item, statistical tests were
239 performed between the control condition and each condition, and significant differences were
240 detected for many of the items, but the differences were not significant after FDR adjustment.
241 However, for the RNAlater method, some significant differences were found in microbial pathways
242 abundance even after FDR adjustment; for the FTA card method, several significant differences were
243 found in genus, microbial pathways, and metabolites even after FDR adjustment (Supplementary
244 Tables 4 and 5).
245



246
247 **Fig. 4 Distribution of the fold change of the abundance of each microbe, microbial pathway, and metabolite**
248 **compared to that in the control condition.**

249 A boxplot of the fold change of the abundance of each microbe, microbial pathway, and metabolite compared to
250 that in the control condition is shown. The 10 items with the highest mean value in all samples were used. For the

251 FTA card method, the fold change was calculated after conversion to relative abundance, as different units were
252 used.


253

254 **3.2.3 Differences in the rank of individual microbes, microbial pathways, and metabolites due** 255 **to storage methods**

256 In the previous section, we analyzed the abundances of each microbe, microbial pathway, and
257 metabolite. If there was no difference in abundance, the results with one method could be directly
258 compared to results with a control method. However, if the within-sampling method rankings were
259 consistent across conditions, the same results would be expected in a case–control study within each
260 condition. For each item, we calculated the correlation between the within-control method rankings
261 and the rankings within each method (Fig. 5 and Supplementary Tables 6 and 7). Overall, genus
262 showed a high correlation with control method for all methods, however, fewer metabolites showed
263 significant correlations compared to genus (genus: 92.4%-100%, metabolites: 9.5%-76.2%;
264 Supplementary Tables 6 and 7).

265 A comparison of the results with the different methods showed that the highest number of
266 bacteria and metabolites were preserved when fecal samples were stored in silica gel (Fig. 5a-c). In
267 addition, the room temperature condition was characterized by a low correlation coefficient for
268 *Bacteroides* (Spearman's Rho = 0.273; Supplementary Table 6). The Spearman correlation
269 coefficients, *p*-values, and *q*-values for each microbe, microbial pathway and metabolite are listed in
270 Supplementary Table 6.

271



272

273 **Fig. 5 The silica gel method preservation preserves the intra-ranking of genus, microbial pathway, and**
274 **metabolite abundance.**

275 The Spearman correlation coefficients between the control method and each method for each genus, microbial
276 pathway, and metabolite are shown in the boxplots.

277 4 Discussion

278 The purpose of this study was to explore methods of preserving microbes, microbial genes and
279 metabolites in fecal samples. Among various methods, we focused particularly on fecal sample
280 storage by drying. To evaluate the microbes, microbial genes, and metabolites in fecal samples, we
281 performed a comparative analysis with several methods.

282 First, fecal samples that were preserved with RNAlater could not measure metabolome
283 contents by CE-TOFMS due to high salt content. In addition, it is standard to normalize by dry/wet
284 stool weight when measuring metabolite concentrations [21]. However, the FTA card could not be
285 used to measure stool weight due to the low stool volume. These methods are not considered well
286 suited for measuring metabolome abundance.

287 Next, we analyzed (1) qualitative detection, (2) quantitative precision, and (3) quantitative
288 accuracy for the microbiome, metagenome, and metabolome profiling in fecal samples. In the (1)
289 qualitative analysis, there were no large differences among all the methods conducted in this study
290 for the preservation of microbes and microbial pathways. However, there were differences regarding

291 metabolites; the FTA card method resulted in fewer metabolites detected ($36.6 \pm 5.3\%$ compared to
292 the control method). It is known that there are local and microenvironmental differences in the
293 microbiome depending on the location of the stool [22]. Although stool samples were mixed as a
294 pretreatment in this study, it is possible that the metabolites included in the FTA card were biased
295 due to the small amount of stool in the FTA card. In the (2) quantitative precision analysis, it was
296 shown that the microbiome and microbial pathways were preserved with all methods, but the
297 metabolome had low precision with the FTA card method. The same reason noted above may
298 regarding large technical replication. In the (3) quantitative accuracy analysis, the difference between
299 the technical replicates of the control method was smaller than the difference between the control
300 method and each method in terms of median (Fig. 3). In some methods except for silica gel method,
301 significant differences were detected. This result suggests that each sampling method affects the
302 result of microbiome, metagenome, and metabolome profiles.

303 For the analysis of each microbe, microbial pathway, and metabolite, (1) comparative
304 quantity analysis and (2) comparative rank analysis for each method were performed. The
305 comparative quantity analysis indicate that the values are comparable even if the methods are
306 different. The comparative rank analysis indicates whether the results obtained from comparisons
307 within the same method are the same. In the comparison analysis of the quantities, significant
308 differences were detected for some genus, microbial pathways, and metabolites with all methods. In
309 particular, the FTA card method detected significant differences in the abundances of some items
310 even after FDR correction. (2) Many genera, microbial pathways, and metabolites were found to be
311 conserved in the rank analysis. This result suggested that comparisons such as case-control studies
312 within the same method would yield the same results. However, fewer metabolites showed
313 significant correlations compared to genus. When discussing the results of metabolite analysis that
314 are not significantly correlated, we should be aware of the possibility that differences may appear
315 depending on the method (Supplementary Tables 6 and 7). Focusing on individual items, the

316 rankings of individual microbe and microbial pathway abundance were relatively conserved.
317 However, for the room temperature method, the low correlation of *Bacteroides* (Spearman's Rho =
318 0.273; Supplementary Table 6) may have influenced the relative abundance of other bacteria.
319 Therefore, the room temperature method may not be suitable for gut microbiome analysis. In
320 addition, only 76.2% of metabolites were conserved in the abundance of ranking, even with the best
321 method (Long-term silica gel preservation; Fig. 5c and Supplementary table 7). Especially focusing
322 on propionate and butyrate, two of the most commonly measured SCFA metabolites, they both
323 strongly correlated with the silica gel method (butyrate, room temperature: 0.285, FTA card: 0.539,
324 silica gel: 0.830, silica gel (long-term): 0.952; propionate, room temperature: 0.697, FTA card:
325 0.340, silica gel: 0.830, silica gel (long-term): 0.952; Supplementary Figure 1).

326 The following limitations should be considered for our study. First, we analyzed multivariate
327 data, which included abundances of hundreds of intestinal microbes, microbial pathways, and
328 metabolites. Therefore, there is a multiple comparison test problem. It is thus necessary to examine
329 each microbe, microbial pathway, and metabolite in another larger cohort. Second, only healthy
330 subjects were used in this study. Although the silica gel drying method will be applied to research on
331 bacteria specific to sick subjects in the future, we did not analyze the gut microbiome and
332 metabolome of sick subjects. Further validation of the gut microbiome and metabolome of diseased
333 individuals may be necessary.

334 In conclusion, fecal sample drying could be used to preserve the fecal microbiome and
335 metabolome. This drying method could make a significant contribution to microbiome research
336 when used in larger cohorts.

337 **5 Conflict of Interest**

338 T.N., Y.Y., Y.N., Y.T., M.I., F.S., K.F., and S.M. are employees of Metagen, Inc.; T.Y. and S.F. are
339 founders of Metagen, Inc. Metagen, Inc. sells commercially a fecal sampling kit using silica gel as
340 MGKit.

341 **6 Author Contributions**

342 Conceptualization: T.N. and S.F.; Formal Analysis: Y.Y., Y.N., F.S., and K.F.; Investigation: Y.T.,
343 M.I. and T.N.; Visualization: Y.Y. and Y.N.; Writing – Original Draft: Y.N.; Writing – Review &
344 Editing: T.N., Y.Y., Y.N., Y.T., M.I., S.M., T.Y., and S.F.

345 **7 Funding**

346 This study was funded by Metagen, Inc.

347 **8 Acknowledgments**

348 The supercomputing resource was provided by the Human Genome Center (University of Tokyo).
349 Additionally, we would like to thank all the members who discussed the study and participated in the
350 trial at Metagen, Inc.

351 **9 References**

- 352 1. Lloyd-Price J, Arze C, Ananthakrishnan AN, Schirmer M, Avila-Pacheco J, et al. Multi-omics of the gut
353 microbial ecosystem in inflammatory bowel diseases. *Nature*. 2019;569:655–62.
- 354 2. Dawkins JJ, Allegretti JR, Gibson TE, McClure E, Delaney M, Bry L, et al. Gut metabolites predict
355 *Clostridioides difficile* recurrence. *Microbiome*. 2022;10:87.
- 356 3. Wirbel J, Pyl PT, Kartal E, Zych K, Kashani A, Milanese A, et al. Meta-analysis of fecal metagenomes
357 reveals global microbial signatures that are specific for colorectal cancer. *Nat Med*. 2019;25:679–89.
- 358 4. Koh A, Molinaro A, Ståhlman M, Khan MT, Schmidt C, Mannerås-Holm L, et al. Microbially Produced
359 Imidazole Propionate Impairs Insulin Signaling through mTORC1. *Cell*. 2018;175:947-961.e17.

- 360 5. Tang WHW, Wang Z, Levison BS, Koeth RA, Britt EB, Fu X, et al. Intestinal Microbial Metabolism of
361 Phosphatidylcholine and Cardiovascular Risk. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368:1575–84.
- 362 6. Jalanka J, Salonen A, Salojärvi J, Ritari J, Immonen O, Marciani L, et al. Effects of bowel cleansing on the
363 intestinal microbiota. *Gut*. 2015;64:1562–8.
- 364 7. Nishimoto Y, Mizutani S, Nakajima T, Hosoda F, Watanabe H, Saito Y, et al. High stability of faecal
365 microbiome composition in guanidine thiocyanate solution at room temperature and robustness during
366 colonoscopy. *Gut*. 2016;65:1574–5.
- 367 8. Liang Y, Dong T, Chen M, He L, Wang T, Liu X, et al. Systematic Analysis of Impact of Sampling
368 Regions and Storage Methods on Fecal Gut Microbiome and Metabolome Profiles. *mSphere*. American
369 Society for Microbiology; 2020;5:e00763-19.
- 370 9. Guan H, Pu Y, Liu C, Lou T, Tan S, Kong M, et al. Comparison of Fecal Collection Methods on Variation
371 in Gut Metagenomics and Untargeted Metabolomics. *mSphere*. American Society for Microbiology;
372 2021;6:e00636-21.
- 373 10. Chirife J, del Pilar Buera M, Labuza TP. Water activity, water glass dynamics, and the control of
374 microbiological growth in foods. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*. Taylor & Francis;
375 1996;36:465–513.
- 376 11. <1112> Application of Water Activity Determination to Nonsterile Pharmaceutical Products [Internet].
377 Available from: https://doi.usp.org/USPNF/USPNF_M402_01_01.html
- 378 12. Chase MW, Hills HH. Silica gel: An ideal material for field preservation of leaf samples for DNA studies.
379 *TAXON*. 1991;40:215–20.
- 380 13. Allison MJ, Round JM, Bergman LC, Mirabzadeh A, Allen H, Weir A, et al. The effect of silica
381 desiccation under different storage conditions on filter-immobilized environmental DNA. *BMC Research*
382 *Notes*. 2021;14:106.
- 383 14. Kimura I, Ozawa K, Inoue D, Imamura T, Kimura K, Maeda T, et al. The gut microbiota suppresses
384 insulin-mediated fat accumulation via the short-chain fatty acid receptor GPR43. *Nat Commun*. 2013;4:1829.
- 385 15. Hee B van der, Wells JM. Microbial Regulation of Host Physiology by Short-chain Fatty Acids. *Trends in*
386 *Microbiology*. Elsevier; 2021;29:700–12.


- 387 16. Ueyama J, Oda M, Hirayama M, Sugitate K, Sakui N, Hamada R, et al. Freeze-drying enables
388 homogeneous and stable sample preparation for determination of fecal short-chain fatty acids. *Analytical*
389 *Biochemistry*. 2020;589:113508.
- 390 17. Kim S-W, Suda W, Kim S, Oshima K, Fukuda S, Ohno H, et al. Robustness of Gut Microbiota of Healthy
391 Adults in Response to Probiotic Intervention Revealed by High-Throughput Pyrosequencing. *DNA Research*.
392 2013;20:241–53.
- 393 18. Kim Y-G, Sakamoto K, Seo S-U, Pickard JM, Gilliland MG, Pudlo NA, et al. Neonatal acquisition of
394 *Clostridia* species protects against colonization by bacterial pathogens. *Science*. 2017;356:315–9.
- 395 19. Bolyen E, Rideout JR, Dillon MR, Bokulich NA, Abnet CC, Al-Ghalith GA, et al. Reproducible,
396 interactive, scalable and extensible microbiome data science using QIIME 2. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2019;37:852–7.
- 397 20. Beghini F, McIver LJ, Blanco-Míguez A, Dubois L, Asnicar F, Maharjan S, et al. Integrating taxonomic,
398 functional, and strain-level profiling of diverse microbial communities with bioBakery 3. Turnbaugh P,
399 Franco E, Brown CT, editors. *eLife*. eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd; 2021;10:e65088.
- 400 21. So D, Whelan K, Rossi M, Morrison M, Holtmann G, Kelly JT, et al. Dietary fiber intervention on gut
401 microbiota composition in healthy adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr*.
402 2018;107:965–83.
- 403 22. Hosomi K, Ohno H, Murakami H, Natsume-Kitatani Y, Tanisawa K, Hirata S, et al. Method for preparing
404 DNA from feces in guanidine thiocyanate solution affects 16S rRNA-based profiling of human microbiota
405 diversity. *Sci Rep*. 2017;7:4339.

406

407 **10 Data Availability Statement**

408 The obtained sequence data are available in the DNA Data Bank of Japan (DDBJ) Sequence Read
409 Archive (DRA) (DRA accession number: DRA016258).

410 **11 Supplementary Figure**



411

412 **Supplementary Figure 1 Scatter plot of propionate and butyrate in control and silica gel method.**

413 Scatter plots were drawn using the mean triplicate values for each subject. The red line represents the regression

414 curve.