Metagenomic analysis of the cow, sheep, reindeer and red deer rumen

Running title: The rumen metagenome across four ruminant species

Authors: Laura Glendinning [1]*, Buğra Genç[2#], R John Wallace[2], Mick Watson[1]

[1]Genetics and Genomics, The Roslin Institute and Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies,

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Midlothian, United Kingdom

[2]Rowett Institute, University of Aberdeen, Ashgrove Rd W, Aberdeen, Aberdeenshire, United

Kingdom

#Current address: Ondokuz Mayis University Veterinary Medicine Faculty Department of Laboratory

Animals, Atakum, Samsun, Turkey

*Corresponding author: Laura Glendinning (laura.glendinning@roslin.ed.ac.uk). The Roslin Institute,

Easter Bush Campus, Midlothian, United Kingdom, EH25 9RG. +44 0131 6519220.

Abstract:

Background: The rumen microbiota comprises a community of microorganisms which specialise in the degradation of complex carbohydrates from plant-based feed. These microbes play a highly important role in ruminant nutrition and could also act as sources of industrially useful enzymes. In this study, we performed a metagenomic analysis of samples taken from the ruminal contents of cattle (*Bos Taurus*), sheep (*Ovis aries*), reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*) and red deer (*Cervus elaphus*).

Results: We constructed 391 metagenome-assembled genomes originating from 16 microbial phyla. We compared our genomes to other publically available microbial genomes and found that they contained 279 novel species. We also found significant differences between the microbiota of different ruminant species in terms of the abundance of microbial taxonomies, carbohydrate-active enzyme genes and KEGG orthologs. However, we found that the vast majority of carbohydrate-active enzyme were present in all of our sample types, which may indicate that there is a core set of these enzymes which are present across ruminants and are independent of diet and environmental conditions.

Conclusions: We present a dataset of rumen-derived genomes which in combination with other publicly-available rumen genomes can be used as a reference dataset in future metagenomic studies.

Introduction:

The microbial communities which inhabit the rumen contain a mixture of bacteria, fungi, protozoa,

viruses and archaea and through fermentation are able to convert complex plant carbohydrates into

short-chain volatile fatty acids. The microbial pathways present have a large impact on feed

efficiency (1-3), alongside other important production traits such as milk and fat yield (4, 5).

Understanding the processes by which food is digested in the rumen may allow us to improve feed

efficiency in ruminants (1), either by the production of enzymes isolated from microbes or by

manipulating the microbiota through the use of pre- or probiotics (6). There are also other potential

industrial uses for the proteins produced by ruminal microbes, for example in processing biofuels,

bioremediation, processing pulp/paper and textile manufacturing (7-10). Ruminants are also the

largest source of anthropogenic methane emissions and gaining a greater understanding of which

microbes are important in methane production could lead to improved methane mitigation

strategies (6, 11-15).

While inroads have been made towards culturing members of the ruminal microbiota (16, 17) there

are still many members which have not been characterised. Metagenomics is a powerful tool which

allows us to examine the entire genetic repertoire of the rumen microbiota without the need for

culturing. Our group has previously published thousands of metagenome assembled genomes

(MAGs) from cattle rumen samples (18, 19) and hundreds of genomes from chicken caecal samples

(20), many of which were identified as novel species.

Several studies have examined the rumen microbiota using metagenomic techniques in cattle and

sheep; however, less effort has been made to characterise the microbiota of other ruminant species

which may be less commercially-important but which could harbour microbes which could be

industrially useful. For example, wild ruminants are likely to consume a far more diverse diet than

farm-raised individuals, and are therefore likely to contain microbes which are able to digest

different substrates. In this paper we analyse rumen metagenomic data from four ruminant species:

56 cattle (*Bos Taurus*), sheep (*Ovis aries*), red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) and reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*).

57 We compare the microbiota of these species taxonomically and functionally and construct 391

58 named rumen-uncultured genomes (RUGs), representing 372 putative novel strains and 279 putative

59 novel species.

60   **Materials and methods:**

61   **Ethics approval**

62   Cattle projects were carried out under Home Office PPL 30/2579. Sheep experimentation was

63   carried out under the conditions set out by UK Home Office licence no. 604028, procedure reference

64   number 8.

65

66   **Experimental design**

67   Reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*: Grazing mixed vegetation) and red deer (*Cervus elaphus*: Grazing mixed

68   vegetation) were shot in the wild, and ruminal digesta samples were collected immediately. Samples

69   were taken from Holstein cattle (*Bos Taurus*: Fed total mixed ration (once a day)) and Finn-Dorset

70   cross sheep (*Ovis aries*: Grazing mixed pasture) via a rumen cannula. Sheep sampling was performed

71   as described in McKain et al. (21). Samples were collected from the bovine rumen in the following

72   locations: top near cannula, middle at the front of the rumen, middle towards the back of the

73   rumen and bottom (approximately 45cm down from the entrance to the rumen). Digesta samples

74   were mixed with buffer containing glycerol as a cryoprotectant (21). The mixtures were kept on ice

75   for 1-2 hours then frozen at -20°C. DNA extraction was performed using repeated bead beating plus

76   column filtration, as described in (22). Shotgun sequencing was performed on an Ilumina Hiseq

77   2000, producing an average of 1626 million paired reads per sample, of 100bp or 151bp in length.

78

79   **Bioinformatics**

80   Illumina adaptors were removed using trimmomatic (23). IDBA-UD (24) with the options --

81   num_threads 16 --pre_correction --min_contig 300 was used to perform single sample assemblies.

82   After indexing using BWA index, BWA-MEM was used to map reads to assemblies (25). BAM files

83   were created by SAM tools (26) and coverage was calculated using the command

jgi_summarize_bam_contig_depths from the MetaBAT software package (27). A coassembly was

carried out on all samples using MEGAHIT (28) with the options --continue --kmin-1pass -m 100e+10

--k-list 27,37,47,57,67,77,87 --min-contig-len 1000 -t 16. After filtering out reads which were <2kb,

indexing and mapping were performed as for single assemblies.

Metagenomic binning was carried out using MetaBAT2 with the options --minContigLength 2000, --

minContigDepth 2. From the single-assemblies, 1691 bins were created and from the co-assembly

2508 bins were created. Completeness and contamination of bins were calculated using CheckM

(options: lineage_wf, -t 16, -x fa), and the bins were dereplicated using dRep (29) (options:

dereplicate_wf -p 16 -comp 80 -con 10 -str 100 –strW 0). Thus, bins were discarded if their

completeness was <80% or if they had contamination >10%. The dereplicated 'winning' bins are

referred to below as RUGs. MAGpy was used to compare the RUGs to public datasets (30). Trees

produced by MAGpy were rerooted at the branch between archaea and bacteria using Figtree (31)

and visualised using GraPhlAn (32). Taxonomies were assigned using GTDB-Tk (33). For submission to

public repositories, our RUGs were named as the lowest taxonomic level at which NCBI and GTDB-Tk

matched. The taxonomies assigned to RUGs were manually checked against the taxonomic tree and

improved accordingly.

Carbohydrate-active enzymes (CAZymes) were identified using dbCAN2 (version 7, 24th August 2018)

by comparing RUG proteins to the CAZy database (34). RUG proteins were compared to the KEGG

database (downloaded on Sept 15th 2018) (35) using DIAMOND (36). KEGG hits for which the

alignment length was ≥ 90% of the query length were retained. The likely KEGG ortholog (KO) group

for each RUG protein was inferred from the DIAMOND search results and the KEGG database.

CAZyme and KEGG ortholog abundances were calculated as the sum of the reads mapping to RUG

proteins within each group after using DIAMOND to align reads to the RUG proteins. PULpy was used

to identify polysaccharide utilisation loci (37).

Statistical analyses were carried out within R (version 3.5.1) (38). The gplots package was used to

construct heatmaps (39). The complete linkage method for hierarchical clustering (R hclust function)

was used to cluster variables within heatmaps. The ggplot2 (40) package was used to construct

scatter plots and NMDS graphs. The vegan package (41) was used to create NMDS axes using the

Bray−Curtis dissimilarity. The Adonis function from the vegan package was used to perform

PERMANOVA analyses and DeSeq2 (42) was used to calculate differences in coverage for individual

CAZymes, KEGG orthologs and RUGs. UpSet graphs were constructed using the UpSetR package (43).

Taxonomies were assigned to paired sequence reads with Kraken (44) using a custom kraken

database consisting of RefSeq complete genomes with our RUGs and the rumen superset (19)

added. Prior to statistical analyses (excluding DeSeq2) and graph construction, data was subsampled.

For RUGs, subsampling to the lowest sample coverage was performed. CAZymes and KEGG orthologs

were subsampled to the lowest sample abundance.

Data availability

The paired-read fastq files generated for this study are available in the European Nucleotide Archive

under project PRJEB34458. RUG fasta files are available in Edinburgh DataShare

(https://doi.org/10.7488/ds/2640).

Results:

Construction of RUGs from rumen sequencing data

Results:

Construction of RUGs from rumen sequencing data

We produced 979G of Illumina sequencing data from 12 samples then performed a metagenomic

assembly of single samples and a co-assembly of all samples. This created a set of 391 dereplicated

genomes (99% ANI) with estimated completeness ≥80% and estimated contamination ≤10%

(**Supplementary Figure 1**). 284 of these genomes were produced from the single-sample assemblies

and 107 were produced from the co-assemblies. 172 genomes were >90% complete with

contamination <5%, and would therefore be defined as high-quality draft genomes by Bower et al.

(45). The distribution of these RUGs between our samples can be found in **Dataset 1** (based on

coverage). **Dataset 2** contains the predicted taxonomic assignment for each RUG while **Figure 1**

shows a phylogenetic tree of the genomes. The tree is dominated by the *Bacteroidota* (136 RUGs: All

order *Bacteroidales*) and the *Firmicutes_A* (121 RUGs), followed by lesser numbers of the

Firmicutes_C (40 RUGs), *Synergistota* (20 RUGs: All family *Aminobacteriaceae*), *Firmicutes* (19 RUGs),

Proteobacteria (15 RUGs), *Cyanobacteriota* (9 RUGs: All family *Gastranaerophilaceae*),

Actinobacteriota (7 RUGs), *Euryarchaeota* (7 RUGs: All family *Methanobacteriaceae*), *Spirochaetota*

(5 RUGs), *Elusimicrobiota* (3 RUGs: All family *Endomicrobiaceae*), *UBP6* (3 RUGs: All genus *UBA1177*),

Fibrobacterota (2 RUGs: All genus *Fibrobacter*), *Riflebacteria* (2 RUGs: All family *UBA8953*),

Chloroflexota (1 RUGs: family *Anaerolineaceae*) and *Desulfobacterota* (1 RUGs: genus *Desulfovibrio*).

All members of the phylum *Firmicutes_A* belonged to the *Clostridia* class: orders *4C28d-15* (n=9),

CAG-41 (n=3), *Christensenellales* (n=4), *Lachnospirales* (n=56), *Oscillospirales* (n=45),

Peptostreptococcales (n=2) and *Saccharofermentanales* (n=2). *Firmicutes_C* contains the orders

Acidaminococcales (n=8) and *Selenomonadales* (n=32). The phylum *Firmicutes* contained the orders

Acholeplasmatales (n=3), *Erysipelotrichales* (n=1), *Izimaplasmatales* (n=1), *ML615J-28* (n=1),

Mycoplasmatales (n=1). *RFN20* (n=7) and *RF39* (n=5), The *Actinobacteria* contained the orders

Actinomycetales (n=1) and *Coriobacteriales* (n=6). The *Proteobacteria* phylum contains the orders

Enterobacterales (n=4), *Paracaedibacterales* (n=1), *RF32* (n=8) and *UBA3830* (n=2). The

Spirochaetota contains the orders *Sphaerochaetales* (n=1) and *Treponematales* (n=4).

After sub-sampling, we found that samples from different ruminant species clustered significantly

separately by abundance of RUGs (PERMANOVA: P = 3e-05). This may be due to the fact that the

vast majority of RUGs were only found in a single host species (**Figure 2**), including 111 RUGs in red

deer, 78 RUGs in reindeer, 40 RUGs in cow and 31 RUGs in sheep. Only 3 RUGs were found in ≥1X

average coverage in all species: uncultured *Bacteroidaceae sp. RUG30019*, uncultured *Prevotella sp.*

RUG30028 and uncultured *Prevotella sp. RUG30114*, suggesting a lack of a cross-species core gut

microbiome at the strain level.

We compared our RUGs to microbial genomes which had previously been sequenced from the

rumen to determine if we had discovered any novel strains or species. We dereplicated our RUGs at

99% and 95% ANI to a "superset" of genomes containing rumen RUGs previously produced by our

group (19), Hess et al. (10), Parks et al. (46), Solden et al. (47) and Svartström et al. (48) and the

genomes from the Hungate collection (16). After dereplication at 99% and the removal of any RUGS

with ≥99% ANI to an existing genome (as assigned by GTDB-Tk) or which clustered with members of

the superset, 372 of our RUGs remained, representing putative novel strains. After dereplication at

95% and the removal of any RUGS with ≥95% ANI to an existing genome (assigned by GTDB-tk) or

which clustered with members of the superset, 279 of our RUGs remained, representing putative

novel species. The majority of these species originated from single-sample assemblies: 110 from red

deer samples, 68 from reindeer samples, 23 from sheep samples and 1 from cattle samples,

suggesting that many novel microbial species remain to be discovered from non-cattle ruminant

hosts. These novel species are taxonomically diverse, with members belonging to the phyla

Bacteroidota (n = 97), *Firmicutes_A* (n = 85), *Firmicutes_C* (n = 27), *Firmicutes* (n = 16), *Synergistota*

(n = 14), *Proteobacteria* (n = 11), *Cyanobacteriota* (n = 9), *Actinobacteriota* (n = 5), *Spirochaetota* (n =

4), *Euryarchaeota* (n = 3), *Elusimicrobiota* (n = 3), *Riflebacteria* (n = 2), *Chloroflexota* (n = 1),

Desulfobacterota (n = 1) and *UBP6* (n = 1).

31 of our total RUGs were able to be taxonomically identified to species level and these contain

bacteria which are commonly isolated from the rumen including novel strains of *Bacteroidales*

bacterium UBA1184 (46), *Bacteroidales bacterium UBA3292* (46), *Butyrivibrio fibrisolvens*,

Escherichia coli, *Fibrobacter sp. UWB2* (49), *Lachnospiraceae bacterium AC3007* (16),

Lachnospiraceae bacterium UBA2932 (46), *Methanobrevibacter sp. UBA188* (46),

Methanobrevibacter sp. UBA212 (46), *Prevotella sp. UBA2859* (46), *Ruminococcaceae bacterium*

UBA3812 (46), *Ruminococcus sp. UBA2836* (46), *Sarcina sp. DSM 11001* (16), *Selenomonas sp.*

AE3005 (16), *Succiniclasticum ruminis* and *Succinivibrio dextrinosolvens*.

Comparing microbial taxonomies, CAZymes and KEGG orthologs between ruminant species

We assigned taxonomies to paired sequence reads using our custom kraken database containing

RefSeq complete genomes, our RUGs, and a superset of rumen isolated microbial genomes. After

subsampling we compared the abundance of members of the microbiota in different ruminant

species at multiple taxonomic levels. Averaging reads across rumens species, the vast majority of

reads mapped to bacteria (Sheep: 97%, Cow: 97%, Reindeer: 92%, Red deer: 98%) with smaller

amounts of archaea (Sheep: 2.3%, Cow: 2.1%, Reindeer: 6.3%, Red deer: 1.9%) and Eukaryota

(Sheep: 0.22%, Cow: 1.3%, Reindeer: 1.8%, Red deer: 0.56%). In all ruminants *Bacteroidota* was the

most abundant phylum (Sheep: 64%, Cow: 65% Reindeer: 54% Red deer: 52%), with *Firmicutes* being

the second most abundant (Sheep: 29%, Cow: 26% Reindeer: 26% Red deer: 38%). Using

PERMANOVA, significant differences in the abundance of taxonomies between ruminant species

were found at both high (Kingdom: P = 0.01058, Phylum: P = 0.00017) and low (Family: P = 1e-05,

Genus: P = 3e-05) taxonomic levels (**Supplementary figure 2**).

We also compared the abundance of genes encoding for specific carbohydrate-active enzymes

(CAZymes) between species. These enzymes are responsible for the synthesis, binding and

metabolism of carbohydrates. The carbohydrate esterases (CEs), glycoside hydrolases (GHs),

glycosyltransferases (GTs) and polysaccharide lyases (PLs) act to degrade cellulose, hemicellulose

and other carbohydrates which could otherwise not be digested by the host. Non-catalytic

carbohydrate-binding modules (CBMs) bind to specific carbohydrates, increasing the efficiency of

enzymatic degradation (50). The auxiliary activities (AAs) redox enzymes are reclassified CBMs which

are lytic polysaccharide monooxygenases (51). In our samples we found the following numbers of

these CAZyme families: 6 AAs redox enzymes, 39 CBMs, 14 CEs, 191 GHs, 61 GTs and 27 PLs. The ten

most abundant GHs in the different ruminant species were: for cows GH2, GH3, GH31, GH97, GH28,

GH51, GH43_10, GH105, GH10 and GH95; for sheep GH2, GH3, GH28, GH31, GH97, GH32, GH51,

GH77, GH78 and GH95; for red deer GH2, GH3, GH31, GH97, GH77, GH32, GH51, GH109, GH28 and

GH78; and for reindeer GH2, GH3, GH92, GH109, GH97, GH13, GH31, GH78, GH28 and GH77. The

abundance of CAZymes in all samples can be seen in **Figure 3**. Different ruminant species were found

to have significantly differently abundant CAZyme genes (PERMANOVA: P = 1e-05, **Figure 4**).

However, it should be noted that the vast majority of CAZyme families were found in all sample

types (**Figure 5**), indicating that there exists a set of CAZymes which are present across ruminant

species consuming different diets and living in vastly different conditions.

DeSeq2 was used to identify specific CAZymes which were significantly more abundant in one

ruminant species vs another (**Dataset 3**). Those CAZymes which were consistently more abundant in

specific species when compared to other species are listed in **Supplementary tables 1-4**.

CAZymes are often found organised into Polysaccharide Utilization Loci (PUL) which comprise a set

of genes that enable the binding and degradation of specific carbohydrates or multiple

carbohydrates. We used the software PULpy to predict PULs which were present in our

Bacteroidales RUGs. Of the 136 RUGs which belong to the taxonomy *Bacteroidales*, 112 contain

putative PULs. Within these RUGs we identified 970 PULs, with numbers of PULs per RUG ranging

from 1 to 35. The largest quantity of PULs originating from one RUG was 35 from uncultured

Bacteroidales sp. RUG30227; these encoded a wide range of CAZymes. This RUG was more abundant

in reindeer samples than samples from other ruminants. Of the 970 PULs, 332 of these were a single

susC/D pair. A summary of identified PULs can be found in **Dataset 4** (**Figure 6**).

We also examined the abundance of genes which belonged to specific KEGG orthologs. KEGG

orthologs represent a wide range of molecular functions and are defined by a network-based

classification. We found that, as for CAZymes, ruminant species clustered significantly by the

abundance of genes with specific KEGG orthologs (PERMANOVA: P = 1e-05, **Figure 7**) and that the

vast majority of orthologs were found in all ruminant species (**Figure 8**). However, the large amount

of orthologs (n=729) which were only found in the two domesticated species (cattle and sheep) is

also worthy of note. DeSeq2 was used to identify many KEGG orthologs which were significantly

more abundant in one ruminant species vs another (**Dataset 5**). Those orthologs which were

consistently more abundant in specific ruminant species (Adjusted p-value <0.05) are listed in

Dataset 6.

Discussion:

239 The rumen microbiota plays a crucial role in the ability of ruminants to efficiently digest feed while

240 the rumen microbiota and their products also have a potential use in diverse industrial applications.

241 The ruminal microbiota of red deer and reindeer have previously been studied using 16S rRNA gene

242 sequencing (52-55). However, metagenomic studies of these species are limited, with only one study

243 in reindeer (56) and no studies in red deer.

244 In this study we constructed 391 rumen microbial genomes from metagenomic data from cattle,

245 sheep, red deer and reindeer. We assigned taxonomies to our RUGs using GTDB-Tk rather than NCBI

246 based taxonomies as this improves the classification of uncultured bacteria due to the use of a

247 genome-based taxonomy (33). We have also previously found less need to manually correct

248 taxonomic assignments when using GTDB-Tk (20). Our microbes predominantly belonged to the

249 *Bacteroidota* and *Firmicutes_A*, with lesser numbers of 14 other phyla. We dereplicated our

250 genomes alongside a superset of rumen bacterial genomes (19) and used the results output by

251 GTDB-Tk to identify RUGs which represent novel microbial strains and species. Amongst our

252 genomes we identified 372 novel strains and 279 novel species. These microbes were taxonomically

253 diverse, belonging to 15 phyla. Only 31 RUGs were assigned an identity at species level.

254 The vast majority of our total RUGs were only present on average at ≥1 coverage in one ruminant

255 species. However, when assigning taxonomies to reads using kraken we found that many

256 taxonomies were shared between sample types. When comparing the abundance of sequences

257 which belong to different taxonomies within our data we found that species separated by the

258 microbial taxa present at high and low taxonomic levels. We are aware that the sample sizes for our

259 study are small and therefore any conclusions about differences between the microbiota of

260 ruminant species should be drawn cautiously. However, our data are supportive of the hypothesis

261 that there are host species-specific rumen microbiota at the strain and species level but that these

262 differences do not necessarily translate into large differences in the types of CAZymes expressed.

While we found that there were significant differences between the abundances of CAZymes

between ruminant species, most CAZymes were present in all ruminant species. These results also

reflected those which we found when analysing the abundance of KEGG orthologs. We also

identified 970 PULs in our *Bacteriodales* RUGs, with numbers of PULs per genome ranging from 1 to

35. The RUG containing 35 PULs was found most abundantly in reindeer samples, emphasising the

potential for the discovery of novel carbohydrate-active enzymes in lesser studied ruminant species,

as also highlighted by a previous study which identified multiple PULs in metagenomic samples from

reindeer (56). Unfortunately due to the nature of our samples, with red deer and reindeer samples

originating from animals eating a non-regimented diet, we are not able to provide metadata as to

the exact nutritional composition of our animals' diets, therefore a more in depth analysis of dietary

carbohydrates vs CAZyme/PUL abundance is not possible.

In conclusion, metagenomic binning is a highly powerful technique; however, while we believe that

sequencing the microbiota and the construction of metagenome-assembled genomes is an

important first step in characterising the rumen microbiota we feel that in the future it highly

important that culture based studies are performed in order for us to gain a functional

understanding of the microbiota and to design interventions to improve livestock productivity or to

produce industrially useful microbial products. In conclusion, we present a dataset of RUGs from

four ruminant species which can be used as a reference dataset in future metagenomic studies and

to aid in the design of culture based studies.

Acknowledgements:

The Rowett Institute is funded by the Rural and Environment Science and Analytical Services Division

(RESAS) of the Scottish Government. BG thanks the Higher Education Council of the Turkish Republic

for the award of a travelling fellowship. We thank Bob Mayes and Dave Hamilton of the James

Hutton Institute for their permission and help in sampling the sheep digesta, Kevin Shingfield for the

provision of reindeer digesta samples, and Euan Munro for red deer digesta samples. We also thank

Nest McKain of RI for technical assistance. The Roslin Institute forms part of the Royal (Dick) School

of Veterinary Studies, University of Edinburgh. This project was supported by the Biotechnology and

Biological Sciences Research Council, including institute strategic programme and national capability

awards to The Roslin Institute (BBSRC: BB/P013759/1, BB/P013732/1, BB/J004235/1, BB/J004243/1),

and the Technology Strategy Board (TS/J000108/1, TS/J000116/1).

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

References:

1.   Lima J, Auffret MD, Stewart RD, Dewhurst RJ, Duthie CA, Snelling TJ, et al. Identification of

rumen microbial genes involved in pathways linked to appetite, growth, and feed conversion

efficiency in cattle. Front Genet. 2019;**10**: 701.

2.   Ben Shabat SK, Sasson G, Doron-Faigenboim A, Durman T, Yaacoby S, Miller MEB, et al.

Specific microbiome-dependent mechanisms underlie the energy harvest efficiency of ruminants.

Isme J. 2016;**10**: 2958-72.

3.   Patil RD, Ellison MJ, Wolff SM, Shearer C, Wright AM, Cockrum RR, et al. Poor feed efficiency

in sheep is associated with several structural abnormalities in the community metabolic network of

their ruminal microbes. J Anim Sci. 2018;**96**: 2113-24.

4.   Jami E, White BA, Mizrahi I. Potential role of the bovine rumen microbiome in modulating

milk composition and feed efficiency. PLoS One. 2014;**9**: e85423.

5.   Scharen M, Frahm J, Kersten S, Meyer U, Hummel J, Breves G, et al. Interrelations between

the rumen microbiota and production, behavioral, rumen fermentation, metabolic, and

immunological attributes of dairy cows. J Dairy Sci. 2018;**101**: 4615-37.

6.   Huws SA, Creevey CJ, Oyama LB, Mizrahi I, Denman SE, Popova M, et al. Addressing global

ruminant agricultural challenges through understanding the rumen microbiome: Past, present, and

future. Front Microbiol. 2018;**9**: 33.

7.   Solbak AI, Richardson TH, McCann RT, Kline KA, Bartnek F, Tomlinson G, et al. Discovery of

pectin-degrading enzymes and directed evolution of a novel pectate lyase for processing cotton

fabric. J Biol Chem. 2005;**280**: 9431-8.

8.   Singh B, Gautam SK, Verma V, Kumar M, Singh B. Metagenomics in animal gastrointestinal

ecosystem: Potential biotechnological prospects. Anaerobe. 2008;**14**: 138-44.

9.   Ufarte L, Laville E, Duquesne S, Morgavi D, Robe P, Klopp C, et al. Discovery of carbamate

degrading enzymes by functional metagenomics. PLoS One. 2017;**12**: e0189201.

10.   Hess M, Sczyrba A, Egan R, Kim TW, Chokhawala H, Schroth G, et al. Metagenomic discovery

of biomass-degrading genes and genomes from cow rumen. Science. 2011;**331**: 463-7.

11.   Wallace RJ, Rooke JA, McKain N, Duthie CA, Hyslop JJ, Ross DW, et al. The rumen microbial

metagenome associated with high methane production in cattle. BMC Genomics. 2015;**16**: 839.

12.   Difford GF, Plichta DR, Lovendahl P, Lassen J, Noel SJ, Hojberg O, et al. Host genetics and the

rumen microbiome jointly associate with methane emissions in dairy cows. PLoS Genet. 2018;**14**:

e1007580.

13.   Shi WB, Moon CD, Leahy SC, Kang DW, Froula J, Kittelmann S, et al. Methane yield

phenotypes linked to differential gene expression in the sheep rumen microbiome. Genome Res.

2014;**24**: 1517-25.

14.   Auffret MD, Stewart R, Dewhurst RJ, Duthie CA, Rooke JA, Wallace RJ, et al. Identification,

comparison, and validation of robust rumen microbial biomarkers for methane emissions using

diverse *Bos taurus* breeds and basal diets. Front Microbiol. 2018;**8**: 2642.

15.   Roehe R, Dewhurst RJ, Duthie CA, Rooke JA, McKain N, Ross DW, et al. Bovine host genetic

variation influences rumen microbial methane production with best selection criterion for low

methane emitting and efficiently feed converting hosts based on metagenomic gene abundance.

PLoS Genet. 2016;**12**: 20.

16.   Seshadri R, Leahy SC, Attwood GT, Teh KH, Lambie SC, Cookson AL, et al. Cultivation and

sequencing of rumen microbiome members from the Hungate1000 Collection. Nat Biotechnol.

2018;**36**: 359-67.

17.   Creevey CJ, Kelly WJ, Henderson G, Leahy SC. Determining the culturability of the rumen

bacterial microbiome. Microb Biotechnol. 2014;**7**: 467-79.

18.   Stewart RD, Auffret MD, Warr A, Wiser AH, Press MO, Langford KW, et al. Assembly of 913

microbial genomes from metagenomic sequencing of the cow rumen. Nat Commun. 2018;**9**: 870.

19.   Stewart RD, Auffret MD, Warr A, Walker AW, Roehe R, Watson M. Compendium of 4,941

rumen metagenome-assembled genomes for rumen microbiome biology and enzyme discovery. Nat

Biotechnol. 2019;**37**: 953-61.

20.   Glendinning L, Stewart RD, Pallen MJ, Watson KA, Watson M. Assembly of hundreds of novel

bacterial genomes from the chicken caecum. preprint at bioRxiv. 2019: 699843.

21.   McKain N, Genc B, Snelling TJ, Wallace RJ. Differential recovery of bacterial and archaeal 16S

rRNA genes from ruminal digesta in response to glycerol as cryoprotectant. J Microbiol Methods.

2013;**95**: 381-3.

22.   Yu ZT, Morrison M. Improved extraction of PCR-quality community DNA from digesta and

fecal samples. Biotechniques. 2004;**36**: 808-12.

23.   Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.

Bioinformatics. 2014;**30**: 2114-20.

24.   Peng Y, Leung HCM, Yiu SM, Chin FYL. IDBA-UD: a de novo assembler for single-cell and

metagenomic sequencing data with highly uneven depth. Bioinformatics. 2012;**28**: 1420-8.

25.   Li H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. arXiv.

2013: preprint arXiv:1303.3997.

26.   Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The Sequence

Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics. 2009;**25**: 2078-9.

27.   Kang DWD, Froula J, Egan R, Wang Z. MetaBAT, an efficient tool for accurately

reconstructing single genomes from complex microbial communities. PeerJ. 2015;**3**: 15.

28.   Li DH, Liu CM, Luo RB, Sadakane K, Lam TW. MEGAHIT: An ultra-fast single-node solution for

large and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph. Bioinformatics. 2015;**31**:

1674-6.

29.   Olm MR, Brown CT, Brooks B, Banfield JF. dRep: a tool for fast and accurate genomic

comparisons that enables improved genome recovery from metagenomes through de-replication.

Isme J. 2017;**11**: 2864-8.

30.   Stewart RD, Watson M, Auffret MD, Roehe R, Snelling TJ. MAGpy: A reproducible pipeline for

the downstream analysis of metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs). Bioinformatics. 2018;**35**:

2150–2.

31.   Rambaut A. FigTree v1. 4. http://treebioedacuk/software/figtree20122012.

32.   Asnicar F, Weingart G, Tickle TL, Huttenhower C, Segata N. Compact graphical

representation of phylogenetic data and metadata with GraPhlAn. PeerJ. 2015;**3**: e1029.

33.   Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Waite DW, Rinke C, Skarshewski A, Chaumeil PA, et al. A

standardized bacterial taxonomy based on genome phylogeny substantially revises the tree of life.

Nat Biotechnol. 2018;**36**: 996-1004.

34.   Cantarel BL, Coutinho PM, Rancurel C, Bernard T, Lombard V, Henrissat B. The Carbohydrate-

Active EnZymes database (CAZy): An expert resource for glycogenomics. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009;**37**:

D233-D8.

35.   Kanehisa M, Goto S. KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes. Nucleic Acids Res.

2000;**28**: 27-30.

36.   Buchfink B, Xie C, Huson DH. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND. Nat

Methods. 2015;**12**: 59-60.

37.   Stewart RD, Auffret MD, Roehe R, Watson M. Open prediction of polysaccharide utilisation

loci (PUL) in 5414 public *Bacteroidetes* genomes using PULpy. preprint in bioRxiv. 2018: 421024.

38.   Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2013.

39.   Warnes GR, Bolker B, Bonebakker L, Gentleman R, Huber W, Liaw A, et al. gplots: Various R

programming tools for plotting data. https://rdrrio/cran/gplots/2019.

40.   Wickham H. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. http://ggplot2org20162016.

41.   Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin DMPR, et al. vegan:

Community Ecology Package. https://CRANR-projectorg/package=vegan20132018.

42.   Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-

seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 2014;**15**: 550.

43. Conway JR, Lex A, Gehlenborg N. UpSetR: An R package for the visualization of intersecting

sets and their properties. Bioinformatics. 2017;**33**: 2938-40.

44. Wood DE, Salzberg SL. Kraken: Ultrafast metagenomic sequence classification using exact

alignments. Genome Biol. 2014;**15**: R46.

45. Bowers RM, Kyrpides NC, Stepanauskas R, Harmon-Smith M, Doud D, Reddy TBK, et al.

Minimum information about a single amplified genome (MISAG) and a metagenome-assembled

genome (MIMAG) of bacteria and archaea. Nat Biotechnol. 2017;**35**: 725-31.

46. Parks DH, Rinke C, Chuvochina M, Chaumeil PA, Woodcroft BJ, Evans PN, et al. Recovery of

nearly 8,000 metagenome-assembled genomes substantially expands the tree of life. Nat Microbiol.

2017;**2**: 1533-42.

47. Solden LM, Naas AE, Roux S, Daly RA, Collins WB, Nicora CD, et al. Interspecies cross-feeding

orchestrates carbon degradation in the rumen ecosystem. Nat Microbiol. 2018;**3**: 1274-84.

48. Svartstrom O, Alneberg J, Terrapon N, Lombard V, de Bruijn I, Malmsten J, et al. Ninety-nine

de novo assembled genomes from the moose (*Alces alces*) rumen microbiome provide new insights

into microbial plant biomass degradation. Isme J. 2017;**11**: 2538-51.

49. Neumann AP, Suen G. The phylogenomic diversity of herbivore-associated *Fibrobacter* spp.

is correlated to lignocellulose-degrading potential. mSphere. 2018;**3**: e00593-18.

50. Shoseyov O, Shani Z, Levy I. Carbohydrate binding modules: Biochemical properties and

novel applications. 2006;**70**: 283-95.

51. Levasseur A, Drula E, Lombard V, Coutinho PM, Henrissat B. Expansion of the enzymatic

repertoire of the CAZy database to integrate auxiliary redox enzymes. Biotechnol Biofuels. 2013;**6**:

41.

52. Ostbye K, Wilson R, Rudi K. Rumen microbiota for wild boreal cervids living in the same

habitat. FEMS Microbiol Lett. 2016;**363**: fnw233.

53.   Salgado-Flores A, Hagen LH, Ishaq SL, Zamanzadeh M, Wright ADG, Pope PB, et al. Rumen

and cecum microbiomes in reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus tarandus*) Are changed in response to a

lichen diet and may affect enteric methane emissions. PLoS One. 2016;**11**: e0155213.

54.   Sundset M, Edwards J, Cheng Y, Senosiain R, Fraile M, Northwood K, et al. Molecular

diversity of the rumen microbiome of Norwegian reindeer on natural summer pasture. Microb Ecol.

2009;**57**: 335-48.

55.   Qian WX, Ao WP, Jia CH, Li ZP. Bacterial colonisation of reeds and cottonseed hulls in the

rumen of Tarim red deer (*Cervus elaphus yarkandensis*). Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek. 2019;**112**: 1283-

96.

56.   Pope PB, Mackenzie AK, Gregor I, Smith W, Sundset MA, McHardy AC, et al. Metagenomics

of the Svalbard reindeer rumen microbiome reveals abundance of polysaccharide utilization loci.

PLoS One. 2012;**7**: e38571.

Figure legends:

Figure 1: Phylogenetic tree of the 391 draft microbial genomes from rumen samples, labelled by

taxonomic class. Taxonomies were defined by GTDB-Tk.

Figure 2: UpSetR graph showing the number of shared microbial genomes at average 1X coverage

(after sub-sampling to equal depth) within four ruminant species.

Figure 3: Heatmap showing the abundance of CAZyme families within ruminal contents samples

from four different species. Euclidean clustering was used to cluster CAZymes and samples.

Figure 4: NMDS of ruminal samples clustered by abundance of CAZymes, using Bray−Curtis

dissimilarity values (PERMANOVA; P = 1e-05).

Figure 5: UpSetR graph showing the number of shared CAZyme families at average 1X coverage

within four ruminant species.

Figure 6: Several predicted polysaccharide utilisation loci (PULs). A: The most common PUL

consisting of only a susC/D pair. B-E: The 4 largest PULs identified in our dataset.

Figure 7: NMDS of ruminal samples clustered by abundance of KEGG orthologs, using Bray−Curtis

dissimilarity values (PERMANOVA; P = 1e-05).

Figure 8: UpSetR graph showing the number of shared KEGG orthologs families at average 1X

coverage within four ruminant species.

Dataset legends:

Dataset 1: Average coverage of RUGs in all samples. Coverage was calculated by mapping the RUG scaffolds to adaptor-trimmed Illumina reads.

Dataset 2: Description of each RUG, including taxonomy, novelty, genome completeness, genome contamination, genome size, number of ambiguous bases, number of scaffolds, number of contigs, N50 (scaffolds), N50 (contigs), mean scaffold length, mean contig length, longest contig and GC content.

Dataset 3: CAZymes which were more abundant in sheep, cattle, reindeer or red deer (DeSeq2: Adjusted p-value <0.05).

Dataset 4: Summary of polysaccharide utilisation loci found in *Bacteroidales* RUGs.

Dataset 5: KEGG orthologs which were more abundant in sheep, cattle, reindeer or red deer (DeSeq2: Adjusted p-value <0.05).

Dataset 6: KEGG orthologs which were consistently more abundant in sheep, cattle, reindeer or red deer (DeSeq2: Adjusted p-value <0.05).

Supplementary figure 1: Contamination and completeness (defined by CheckM software) of 391 dereplicated metagenome-assembled-genomes from rumen samples. Grey: genomes which are 80-90% complete with 5-10% contamination. Red: genomes which are >90% complete with <5% contamination.

Supplementary figure 2: NMDS of ruminal samples clustered by abundance of taxonomies, using Bray−Curtis dissimilarity values. A: Kingdom (PERMANOVA; P = 0.01058), B: Phylum (PERMANOVA; P= 0.00017), C: Family (PERMANOVA; P = 1e-05), D: Genus (PERMANOVA; P = 3e-05).

Supplementary table 1: CAZymes which were consistently more abundant in cattle.
Supplementary table 2: CAZymes which were consistently more abundant in sheep.
Supplementary table 3: CAZymes which were consistently more abundant in red deer.

475   **Supplementary table 4**: CAZymes which were consistently more abundant in reindeer.

- ● Desulfovibrionia
- ● Alphaproteobacteria
- ● Synergistia
- ● Methanobacteria
- ● Endomicrobia
- ● Spirochaetia
- ● Bacteroidia
- ● Vampirovibrionia
- ● Negativicutes
- ● Anaerolineae
- ● Elusimicrobia
- ● Actinobacteria
- ● UBA1177
- ● UBA8953
- ● Coriobacteriia
- ● Clostridia
- ● Bacilli
- ● Gammaproteobacteria
- ● Fibrobacteria