Undinarchaeota illuminate the evolution of DPANN archaea

Nina Dombrowski[1], Tom A. Williams[2], Jiarui Sun[3], Benjamin J. Woodcroft[3], Jun-Hoe Lee[4], Bui Quang Minh[5], Christian Rinke[3], Anja Spang[1,5,#]

[1]NIOZ, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Department of Marine Microbiology and Biogeochemistry, and Utrecht University, P.O. Box 59, NL-1790 AB Den Burg, The Netherlands
[2] School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1TQ, UK
[3]Australian Centre for Ecogenomics, School of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences, The University of Queensland, QLD 4072, Australia
[4]Department of Cell- and Molecular Biology, Science for Life Laboratory, Uppsala University, SE-75123, Uppsala, Sweden
[5]Research School of Computer Science and Research School of Biology, Australian National University, ACT 2601, Australia

#corresponding author. Postal address: Landsdiep 4, 1797 SZ 't Horntje (Texel). Email address: anja.spang@nioz.nl. Phone number: +31 (0)222 369 526

Introductory paragraph

The evolution and diversification of Archaea is central to the history of life on Earth. Cultivation-independent approaches have revealed the existence of at least ten archaeal lineages whose members have small cell and genome sizes and limited metabolic capabilities and together comprise the tentative DPANN archaea. However, the phylogenetic diversity of DPANN and the placement of the various lineages of this group in the archaeal tree remain debated. Here, we reconstructed additional metagenome assembled genomes (MAGs) of a thus far uncharacterized archaeal phylum-level lineage UAP2 (*Candidatus* Undinarchaeota) affiliating with DPANN archaea. Comparative genome analyses revealed that members of the Undinarchaeota have small estimated genome sizes and, while potentially being able to conserve energy through fermentation, likely depend on partner organisms for the acquisition of vitamins, amino acids and other metabolites. Phylogenomic analyses robustly recovered Undinarchaeota as a major independent lineage between two highly supported clans of DPANN: one clan comprising Micrarchaeota, Altiarchaeota and Diapherotrites, and another encompassing all other DPANN. Our analyses also suggest that DPANN archaea may have exchanged core genes with their hosts by horizontal gene transfer (HGT), adding to the difficulty of placing DPANN in the archaeal tree. Together, our findings provide crucial insights into the origins and evolution of DPANN archaea and their hosts.

Introduction

Archaea represent one of the two primary domains of life[1–3] and are thought to have played a major role in the evolution of life and origin of Eukaryotes[4–6]. While most archaea remain uncultivated, cultivation-independent approaches, such as single-cell and metagenomic sequencing, have revealed many previously unknown archaeal lineages in most environments on Earth and have changed our perception of archaeal functional and taxonomic diversity[7–10]. In particular, the Asgard[6] and DPANN superphyla[11,12] as well as a multitude of putative phylum-level lineages have been proposed in the archaeal domain over the last two decades but the phylogenetic relatedness and taxonomy of different archaeal lineages remain a matter of debate.

The DPANN radiation[12], named after the first members of this group (Diapherotrites, Parvarchaeota, Aenigmarchaeota, Nanoarchaeota and Nanohaloarchaeota)[11], comprises one of these recently proposed archaeal clades and is now thought to be comprised of at least ten and (according to NCBI taxonomy) putative phylum-level lineages[13,14]. Most members of the DPANN archaea are characterized by small cell sizes and reduced genomes, which code for a limited set of metabolic proteins[13]. The few members that have been successfully enriched in co-culture were shown to represent obligate ectosymbionts dependent on archaeal hosts for growth and survival. For instance, members of Nanoarchaeota are ectosymbionts of TACK archaea[15–20], Micrarchaeota were found in co-culture with Thermoplasmates[21,22] and Nanohaloarchaeota are dependent on halobacterial hosts[23]. Furthermore, evidence from FISH and co-occurrence analyses have suggested that Huberarchaeota may be ectosymbionts of members of the Altiarchaeota[24,25]. Yet, for most DPANN representatives, the identity of their symbiotic partners remains unclear.

Ever since the discovery of the first DPANN representative - *Nanoarchaeum equitans,* an ectosymbiont of *Ignicoccus hospitalis*[15] - the phylogenetic placement of putative DPANN clades in the archaeal tree have been uncertain[26]. While various phylogenetic analyses have indicated that DPANN may comprise a monophyletic radiation in the Archaea[10,11,27], these have been debated[8,28,29]. In particular, analyses focusing on the placement of selected DPANN lineages in isolation, such as Nanoarchaeota and Parvarchaeota, relative to other Archaea, have led to the conclusion that these represent fast-evolving Euryarchaeota[28,29]. Furthermore, it is debated whether the free-living Altiarchaeota belong to the DPANN radiation, form an independent lineage or belong to Euryarchaeota[8,9,14,30,31]. A potential cause for these conflicting topologies is that DPANN are often found on long branches in phylogenetic trees; these long branches might result from compositional biases or fast evolutionary rates[32,33] (as seen for obligate bacterial endosymbionts[34,35]) or might reflect genomic under sampling of the true diversity of this group[9]. These alternatives are difficult to distinguish because, in the absence of fossils or definitive geochemical traces in the fossil record, we lack a well-constrained timescale for archaeal evolution. Distantly-related long-branching lineages can sometimes artificially group together on trees due to methodological artefacts, a phenomenon called long ranch attraction (LBA)[32]. Ways to ameliorate such artifacts include increased taxonomic sampling[36], use of phylogenetic models less prone to LBA[37], and the removal of fast-evolving or compositionally-biased sites from the alignment[38]. Furthermore, it seems possible that horizontal gene transfers (HGT) between symbionts and hosts[39] could impede correct phylogenetic inferences if not accounted for.

Several recent studies have revealed the presence of a thus far uncharacterized archaeal lineage
referred to the Uncultivated Archaeal Phylum 2 (UAP2)[13,40,41], which seems to affiliate with DPANN
archaea and thus may be key in resolving long-standing debates regarding archaeal phylogeny and the
evolution of DPANN. In this study, we have used a metagenomics approach to obtain additional genomes
of members of the so far uncharacterized UAP2 and provide first insights into their metabolic repertoire
and lifestyle. Furthermore, we implemented comprehensive and careful phylogenomic techniques aimed
at ameliorating phylogenetic artifacts, shedding new light onto the evolutionary origin and phylogenetic
placement of the various DPANN lineages including UAP2 in an updated archaeal phylogeny.

Results and Discussion

A thus far uncharacterized putative archaeal phylum-level lineage in metagenome read archives

The generation of a large diversity of metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs) representing
archaeal and bacterial lineages across the tree of life has led to the definition of the tentative archaeal
UAP2 phylum[41]. Considering our lack of insights into the biology of members of this lineage as well as its
suggested key position in the archaeal tree, we aimed at obtaining a broader genomic representation of
the UAP2. In particular, we screened publicly available metagenomes using ribosomal protein sequences
of the previously reconstructed UAP2 MAGs and assembled and binned UAP2-positive samples yielding
six additional MAGs belonging to the UAP2 lineage (**Table 1, Supplementary Tables 1-2,** see Methods for
details). Four of the newly assembled MAGs were recovered from metagenomes of a groundwater aquifer
located adjacent to the Colorado River[42], while the two others as well as six previously reconstructed
MAGs, derived from metagenomes of marine waters in the Atlantic[41,43] and Indian Oceans[44] as well as the
Mediterranean Sea[45] (**Supplementary Table 2**). UAP2 representatives were detected in samples from
various depths in the water column (85-5000 m), fluctuating oxygen conditions (anoxic to oxic) and
temperatures (sampling sites had temperatures from 18 up to 106°C) (**Supplementary Figure 1,**
Supplementary Table 1). The MAGs, including previously published ones, are on average 78% complete
(min: 55%, max: 91%) and show low signs of contamination (<5%) and strain heterogeneity (<2%). In total,
they represent 2 high-quality (one from this study) and 10 medium-quality draft genomes according to
genome reporting standards for MAGs assessed using a general archaeal marker protein set (**Table 1,**
Supplementary Information)[46]. The UAP2 MAGs have small genomes with an average size of 0.66 MB,
coding for an average of 750 proteins. They likely represent a distinct archaeal phylum-level lineage based
on average amino acid identity (AAI) comparisons with other archaeal taxa (**Supplementary Figure 2**,
Supplementary Table 3), phylogenetic analyses including a concatenated 16S-23S rRNA gene tree
(**Supplementary Figures 3-5** and see below) as well as classification based on the Genome Taxonomy
Database (GTDB) rank normalization (**Table 1, Supplementary Table S2**). Furthermore, the aquifer and
marine UAP2 MAGs likely represent different orders as suggested by a relative evolutionary divergence
(RED) value of 0.47[47]. Based on two high-quality UAP2 MAGs (Table 1, **Supplementary Table S2**)[46], we
propose two type species; *Candidatus* Undinarchaeum marinum (SRR4028224.bin17) and *Candidatus*
Naiadarchaeum limnaeum (SRR2090159.bin1129), representing the marine and aquifer UAP2 clade,
respectively (see details below). Undines are water elementals described in the writings of the alchemist
Paracelsus, while Naiads were nymphs residing in ponds, springs and other bodies of fresh water in Greek
mythology.

Undinarchaeota branch between two major DPANN clades

Initial phylogenetic analyses placed Undinarchaeota (formerly UAP2) as a sister lineage to all other
DPANN archaea in unrooted trees[13,14,41]. If correct, this placement could give important insights into the
timing of DPANN evolution and the nature of the putative last DPANN common ancestor. However, this
deep-branching position was poorly supported[13,41]. In order to resolve the phylogenetic relationship of
Undinarchaeota and DPANN archaea as well as to test the monophyly of the DPANN radiation, we
performed in-depth phylogenetic analyses.

We began by updating the taxon sampling in three published marker protein datasets[10,48,49] and
inferred single-protein trees for each marker to evaluate phylogenetic congruence and detect
contaminant sequences and HGTs. Since initial manual inspection revealed extensive incongruence
among markers, we developed a marker protein ranking scheme to compare proteins and datasets
systematically and without a priori assumptions regarding archaeal phylogeny above the rank of order-,
class- or phylum. Briefly, we ranked marker genes according to the extent to which they supported the
monophyly of well-established archaeal phylum-, class and order-level lineages (**Supplementary Tables
4-5)** (Methods, Supplementary Information)[6,48,49]. For example, low ranking makers were highly
incongruent with individual members of accepted lineages not grouping together and had high numbers
of so-called splits indicating HGT events (see Methods for details, **Supplementary Tables 4-5**), while top
ranked markers had low indications for potential HGTs between specific DPANN lineages and unrelated
taxa. Note that since DPANN monophyly remains actively debated[8,9,11,12,26–29], we did not penalize marker
genes for failing to recover the monophyly of the superphylum as a whole, i.e. the placement of certain
DPANN lineages with other archaeal taxa.

These analyses revealed that many universal archaeal genes, including those coding for ribosomal
proteins and other core elements of the genetic machinery, may have undergone inter-lineage gene
transfers during archaeal diversification (**Supplementary Tables 4-5**). We now have increased power to
detect such transfers due to the expanded taxonomic sampling of the archaeal domain compared to
previous analyses but the information contained in single protein alignments as well as bootstrap support
in corresponding trees is generally low (see Methods**, Supplementary Tables 4-5)**, motivating the use of
protein concatenations for phylogenetic reconstructions. However, a large number of gene transfers
among markers can mislead phylogenomic analysis because current concatenation and supertree
methods assume that all genes evolve on the same underlying tree. To ameliorate the impact of
incongruent markers on our inferences, concatenated phylogenies were inferred from the 25% and 50%
top-ranked marker proteins which corresponds to those markers with lowest numbers of splits and in turn
potential HGTs. We used the best-fitting models of sequence evolution available in both maximum-
likelihood using IQ-TREE[50] and Bayesian frameworks[51], in combination with alignment recoding,
assessment and filtering of compositional biases, as well as statistical topology testing (**Supplementary
Table 6, Supplementary Figures 6-56,** Methods, Supplementary Information). Our analyses consistently
recovered the clanhood[52] of the DPANN archaea (including Undinarchaeota) as a whole (that is, all DPANN
archaea clustered together on the unrooted tree). Furthermore, our inferences based on curated marker
set alignments suggested that Undinarchaeota form a distinct lineage that branches between two other
DPANN clans (sequence clusters on the unrooted tree[52]) with maximum statistical support (**Figure 1a,b,
Supplementary Figures 6-45, Supplementary Table 6**; Supplementary Information). These clans

comprised the Altiarchaeota, Micrarchaeota and Diapherotrites (hereafter referred to as DPANN Cluster
1) and all remaining members of the DPANN (Woesearchaeota, Pacearchaeota, Parvarchaeota, UAP1,
Nanoarchaeota, Huberarchaeota, Aenigmarchaeota and Nanohaloarchaeota) (hereafter referred to as
DPANN Cluster 2), respectively (**Figure 1a,b**). Finally, in all phylogenies, Undinarchaeota formed two
GTDB-level orders, consisting of aquifer-derived and ocean-derived MAGs, i.e. the Naiadarchaeales and
Undinarchaeales, respectively (**Figure 1a,b; Supplementary Table 2**).
Next, we compared these results with phylogenetic inferences based on the 25 and 50% most
incongruent markers (**Supplementary Tables 4-5**), which were inferred to have experienced high rates of
inter-lineage transfers or were otherwise affected by conflicting phylogenetic signals (**Supplementary
Figures 46-49**). In agreement with our predictions, these analyses yielded phylogenetic trees with various
highly supported clusters among unrelated taxa (Supplementary Information). For instance, analyses
based on the 25% lowest ranking markers recovered Nanoarchaeota as members of the TACK archaea
(**Supplementary Figure 47**) and Nanohaloarchaeota as a sister lineage of Halobacteria (either as a
separate cluster (**Supplementary Figure 46**) or with DPANN archaea (**Supplementary Figure 47)**, in
agreement with known symbiont-host relationships[16,17,23]. This is particularly notable because we did not
a priori penalize trees in which certain DPANN lineages branch with certain other archaeal lineages
(**Supplementary Tables 4-5**). In turn, these analyses suggest that conflicting results regarding the
placement of certain DPANN lineages, may be due to, at least in part, to the use of a large number of
markers affected by host-symbiont HGT. For instance, Nanohaloarchaeota may artificially be drawn
towards the Euryarchaeota[28] when marker sets include too many proteins that were affected by
symbiont-host transfers.
Compositional biases in protein sequences can also lead to artefacts in phylogenetic
reconstructions[53,54]. To assess the reliability of the inferred placement of Undinarchaeota based on our
top-ranked marker protein sets and to ameliorate remaining biases, we subjected the curated alignment
to different data treatments including removal of compositionally heterogeneous and fast-evolving sites
(see Methods for details, **Supplementary Table 6, Supplementary Figures 13-22 and 30-40**). Removal of
compositionally biased sites resulted in notable changes in the tree topology. In particular, the originally
inferred sister relationship between Haloarchaea and Methanonatronarchaeia[55] was supported only in
analyses based on the original non-treated alignment; removal of 10% or more of the most biased sites
instead supported a close relationship between Methanonatronarchaeia and Archaeoglobales
(**Supplementary Figures 13 and 17**), in agreement with more recent work[56]. Importantly, the placement
of Undinarchaeota relative to the DPANN Cluster 1 and Cluster 2, as well as the monophyly of each of
these clusters, remained stable irrespective of the fraction of heterogeneous sites removed (10% - 40% of
sites), suggesting that our inferences are not an artifact of compositional biases.
Finally, we reconstructed phylogenies using a recently-developed non-reversible substitution
model that captures asymmetries in the exchange rates between amino acids[57] to investigate the position
of Undinarchaeota relative to the root of the archaeal tree (**Figure 1c, Supplementary Figures
10,11,19,22,24,25,36 and 39, Supplementary Table 6**). This method does not rely on an outgroup and
therefore avoids potential LBA artifacts associated with the use of distantly related bacterial sequences
to root the archaeal tree[27]. Notably, all our analyses recovered a monophyletic clade of Asgard, TACK and
Euryarchaeota with the root being excluded from within this clade with high statistical support (100%).
However, the non-reversible model failed to strongly resolve the root position within the DPANN

radiation. In particular, the maximum-likelihood root was placed either (a) between all DPANN (including
Cluster 1 and 2 as well as Undinarchaeota) on one side and all other Archaea on the other side (**Figure**
1c,d, Supplementary Table 6, Supplementary Figures 10-11), (b) between the Cluster 1 and all other
archaea (**Figure 1e, Supplementary Table 6, Supplementary Figures 24-25 and 36**) or(c) between a cluster
comprising Micrarchaeota-Diapherotrites and the rest of the Archaea (**Figure 1f, Supplementary Table 6,**
Supplementary Figures 19, 22 and 39). However, none of these root positions inferred using non-
reversible models received high bootstrap support. Rooting using a bacterial outgroup recovered a root
between a monophyletic DPANN clade and the rest of Archaea with moderate to high bootstrap support
(94% ultrafast bootstrap[58], 98% SH-like aLRT support[59]; **Supplementary Figure S56**), consistent with
previous results[27]. Thus, our analyses provide strong support for the clanhood of DPANN archaea including
Undinarchaeota, but do not confidently resolve the position of the archaeal root either within that clan,
or between DPANN and other Archaea[10,14,27].
213
Synapomorphies supporting the monophyly of Undinarchaeota and Cluster 2 DPANN
To further assess the phylogenetic placement of the Undinarchaeota lineage, we surveyed the
genomes of DPANN lineages for gene content synapomorphies (shared derived characters) that might
enable us to distinguish competing hypotheses for the archaeal root. Similar to other DPANN lineages,
Undinarchaeota MAGs encode most proteins involved in replication, transcription and translation and
repair (**Supplementary Tables 7-9**, **Supplementary Figures 58-61**, Supplementary Information). While
Undinarchaeota did not share specific features with any of the other archaeal clades, we identified
candidate synapomorphies supporting a monophyletic clade comprising Undinarchaeota and Cluster 2
DPANN. Specifically, members of these lineages lack genes encoding the exosome component Csl4, which
is present in Cluster 1 DPANN and most other archaea (**Supplementary Figure 61**). The archaeal exosome
is thought to consist of four subunits: Rrp41 and Rrp42 form the core ring structure, and Csl4 and Rrp4
constitute the rRNA-binding cap[60]. In spite of the absence of Csl4, Undinarchaeota and Cluster 2 DPANN
archaea encode all other subunits of the complex (Rrp4/41/42) suggesting a structural or functional
difference of their exosome.
Furthermore, Undinarchaeota and Cluster 2 DPANN share a synapomorphy related to the
archaeal DNA primase[61]. Previous work[62] has suggested that, while DNA primases of most Archaea
(including those of the Micrarchaeota) are composed of two subunits encoded by *pri*S and *pri*L, some
DPANN lineages (at that time the Nanoarchaeota, Nanohaloarchaeota and Parvarchaeota), were found to
possess a *pri*S-*pri*L fusion gene. Our analyses, which includes a larger genomic representation of DPANN
archaea, revealed that representatives of the DPANN Cluster 1 consistently encode canonical *pri*S and *pri*L
genes, while all Undinarchaeota and DPANN Cluster 2 archaea have a fused version (**Supplementary Table**
11). Note that *pri*S and *pri*L arose from an ancestral duplication and are thus homologous. A phylogenetic
analysis of all PriS and PriL subunits (after splitting the fused version), revealed that the fusion likely
occurred at the origin of the Undinarchaeota and DPANN Cluster 2 (100/100 and 91.3/99 bootstrap
support for PriS and PriL, respectively; **Supplementary Figure 57**).
Consistent with our phylogenetic analyses, these findings support a clade containing
Undinarchaeota and DPANN Cluster 2 as sister lineages from which the archaeal root is excluded. It will
be interesting to experimentally investigate the functional implication of the identified synapomorphies

(exosome component loss, DNA primase fusion) and determine whether they could have played a role in
reductive genome evolution in Undinarchaeota and DPANN Cluster 2 archaea.
244
Gene repertoires indicate fermentative lifestyle and reliance on a host
Catabolism. Comparative genome analyses and inference of the metabolic potential of
Undinarchaeota (**Supplementary Tables 7-8 and 12-15,** Supplementary Information for details), suggest
that representatives of this clade likely rely on fermentative processes for energy conservation (**Figure 2**).
In particular, the presence of the lower Embden-Meyerhof and non-oxidative pentose-phosphate
pathway but absence of most genes coding for enzymes of the tricarboxylic acid cycle (TCA) suggest that
Undinarchaeota could generate ATP through fermentation of pyruvate to acetate. Simple carbohydrates,
such as pyruvate, could perhaps be taken up by passive diffusion[63]. Furthermore, some members of the
Naiad- and Undinarchaeales may be able to use extracellular DNA as growth substrates (**Figure 2**). For
example, most representatives of the Undinarchaeota encode the complete nucleoside degradation
pathway[64–66](Supplementary Information), including an AMP phosphorylase (DeoA), ribose 1,5-
bisphosphate isomerase and Group-III ribulose 1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase (RbcL; RuBisCO)
(**Supplementary Figure 59**). In fact, many DPANN representatives have been reported to harbor a RuBisCO
homolog and certain members have been suggested to be able to use nucleosides as substrates[66,67].
Undinarchaeota may import DNA via pili encoded by all Undinarchaeota MAGs and subsequently degrade
those using their encoded nucleases (Supplementary Information)[68,69]. Intermediates of the nucleoside
degradation pathway, such as glycerate-3-phosphate, may subsequently be channeled into the lower
glycolytic pathway and contribute to energy conservation by an ATP synthesizing acetate-CoA ligase
(acdA). Other products (e.g. glyceraldehyde-3P and fructose-6P produced via gluconeogenesis) may be
further metabolized through the non-oxidative pentose-phosphate pathway allowing the synthesis of
cellular building blocks such as pyrimidines and purines. It is however notable that group-III-like RuBisCO
homologs encoded by Undinarchaeales MAGs have mutations in two positions of the RuBisCO motif[64–67].
In turn, it remains to be determined whether RuBisCO has retained its canonical function in these
members of the Undinarchaeales and indeed enables growth on nucleosides (**Supplementary Figure 59**;
Supplementary Information). Considering the limited set of predicted proteins involved in central carbon
metabolism, experimental verification will be needed to assess whether the encoded pathways provide
sufficient ATP to sustain the energy metabolism of the various Undinarchaeota representatives.
Anabolism. Even though all representatives of the Undinarchaeota encode a near complete
gluconeogenesis pathway (**Figure 2**) including the potentially ancient bifunctional fructose 1,6-
bisphosphate (FBP) aldolase/phosphatase, which would allow the synthesis of fructose-6-phosphate[70],
many other biosynthesis pathways are incomplete. For instance, while the Naiadarchaeales MAGs encode
all proteins required to synthesize archaeal-type ether lipids, lipid biosynthesis pathways are incomplete
in Undinarchaeales MAGs, which lack key genes for the conversion of glycerone-phosphate to
archaetidylinositol-phosphate, in spite of the presence of the archaeal mevalonate pathway[10] in
representatives of both lineages. Incomplete pathways for lipid biosynthesis are particularly common in
DPANN Cluster 2 representatives (incl. *N. equitans*) (**Figure 3, Supplementary Figure 62**)[10,13,14,71,72] and
the characterization of the *N. equitans - I. hospitalis* symbiotic system has confirmed the exchange of lipids
between symbiont and host[73]. Thus, while members of the Naiadarchaeales may synthesize their own
lipids, Undinarchaeales representatives may depend on an external source of archaeal or bacterial lipids

or intermediates in spite of the presence of the mevalonate pathway and their ability to synthesize
geranylgeranyl diphosphate (Supplementary Information). Similarly, the lack of several genes coding for
enzymes of the purine biosynthesis pathways in members of the Undinarchaeales but not
Naiadarchaeales, indicates that the former are also dependent on the external source of inosine
monophosphate (IMP) or other intermediates of the purine biosynthesis pathway (**Figures 2-3,**
Supplementary Tables 7-8 and 9, Supplementary Information).

Furthermore, all Undinarchaeota representatives lack genes encoding proteins involved in amino
acid and vitamin biosynthesis. Notably, and in agreement with several other potentially symbiotic DPANN
archaea[13,14], all Undinarchaeota representatives seem to contain a limited set of genes for transporters
such as amino acid transporter PotE and uncharacterized di/tri-carboxylate transporters (Supplementary
Information, **Figures 2-3**), suggesting that they are unable to acquire all essential building blocks directly
from the environment. In turn, members of the Undinarchaeota seem to depend on partner organisms to
provide compounds that cannot be synthesized or taken up from the environment using transporters. Key
differences among the biosynthetic capabilities of members of the Naiad- and Undinarchaeales, may
translate into varying substrate requirements and demands from potential host organisms.

Cell-cell interactions. Consistent with a host-dependent lifestyle, we detected several proteins
with domains known to be involved in cell-cell interactions and common among symbionts[13]. While
Undinarchaeota lack genes for ankyrin domain proteins and only encode a small number of beta
propeller/WD40 domain proteins, the proteome of members of the Naiadarchaeales comprises diverse
proteins with immunoglobulin domains, while Undinarchaeales encode Concanavalins/LamG domain
proteins (arCOG07813) (**Supplementary Tables 20-21**). Homology modeling and structure predictions
suggested that these proteins might encode potential cell adhesion proteins (**Supplementary Tables 22-**
23) and in turn may be involved in attachment or biofilm formation in Undinarchaeota. Notably, the
complete absence of LamG domain proteins in the Naiadarchaeales representatives indicates that
members of the two Undinarchaeota orders rely on different mechanisms mediating potential symbiont-
host interactions.

Gene repertoires and reductive genome evolution in DPANN. The presence and absence patterns
of genes involved in core metabolic pathways of Undinarchaeota MAGs shows similar trends as seen in
DPANN Cluster 2 archaea further supporting the sisterhood of this clade (**Figure 4, Supplementary Tables**
7-9,12). For instance, most DPANN Cluster 2 archaea lack genes involved in core metabolic pathways, such
as the electron transport chain, carbon fixation other than the RuBisCO gene, as well as transport and
motility genes (**Figure 3**)[10,13–16,23,25,39,74]. While Undinarchaeota seem to have more complete pathways
than many of the DPANN Cluster 2 representatives, they appear metabolically less flexible than several
members of DPANN Cluster 1 (**Figure 3**)[30,31,75,76]. For instance, members of the DPANN Cluster 1 have more
complete nucleoside and lipid biosynthesis pathways and include free-living organisms. In particular,
representatives of the Altiarchaeota have been suggested to comprise autotrophic archaea that may use
the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway for carbon fixation[24,25,30] and while this lineage includes symbionts, these
do not seem to be obligate[77,78]. In fact, Altiarchaeota have recently been found to include members that
likely serve as hosts for Huberarchaeota belonging to DPANN Cluster 2[25]. Furthermore, at least some
members of the Diapherotrites have been suggested to be capable of a fermentative free-living lifestyle[76].
However, in spite of overall gene repertoire patterns being consistent with results from our phylogenetic
analyses, there is a large variation in gene content and extent of genome reduction within DPANN

lineages[13]. Thus, our analyses further support the notion that while reductive genome evolution may have
characterized the evolution of Undinarchaeota and DPANN Cluster 2 archaea already at the time of their
divergence, the extent of streamlining varies widely and seems to have occurred in parallel in different
lineages[13].
330
Insights into interaction partners of Undinarchaeota
Genomic analyses of the first members of the Nanoarchaeota[39] as well as our marker protein
analyses have indicated that DPANN symbionts may have exchanged genes with their hosts. Furthermore,
co-occurrence patterns have recently allowed to pinpoint Altiarchaeota as host for the
Huberarchaeota[24,25]. Thus, to shed light onto potential interaction partners of the Naiad- and
Undinarchaeales, respectively, we have inferred routes of horizontal gene transfer and generated
proportionality networks.
In particular, we reconstructed phylogenies of proteins present in at least three Undinarchaeota
genomes (520 genes total) and analyzed sisterhood-relationships among taxonomically distinct lineages
including a reference set of 364 archaeal, 3020 bacterial and 100 eukaryotic genomes (**Figure 4,**
Supplementary Tables 16-17, Methods**,** Supplementary Information). Using this approach, we were able
to successfully detect signals of HGT among known host-symbiont pairs. For instance, our analysis
indicates that Nanoarchaeota and Huberarchaeota have exchanged 11% and 16% of the analyzed proteins
with their respective hosts belonging to the Crenarchaeota and Altiarchaeota, respectively. Furthermore,
our phylogenies suggest that Nanohaloarchaeota and Halobacteria shared a large amount of analyzed
proteins horizontally (12.4% and 7%) (**Figure 4**), which is in agreement with our core gene analyses
(**Supplementary Tables 4-5**). However, some of the sisterhood relationships could also be due to
compositional biases as a result of protein sequence adaptation to high salinity environments or
phylogenetic artifacts. Notably, Undinarchaeota does not show a dominant fraction of genes shared with
a specific lineage, i.e. most proteins seem to cluster with taxonomically closely related DPANN lineages
(**Figure 4**) or in some cases with potentially deeply branching Euryarchaeota such as
Hydrothermarchaeota or group 1 methanogens (**Supplementary Tables 4,16,17**). The few
Undinarchaeota genes that may have been shared with distantly related taxa encoded proteins that
grouped for instance with Bathyarchaeota and Thermoplasmata (i.e. including Poseidoniales and
Pontarchaea, or MG-II and -III) (Supplementary Information, **Supplementary Tables 4 and 16**). For
instance, the manual inspection of respective trees revealed that certain Undinarchaeota, in particular
marine Undinarchaeales, may have exchanged core genes with members of the Pontarchaea, including a
gene encoding ribosomal proteins S19 (arCOG04099, TIGR01025), respectively (**Supplementary Table 4**).
Yet, due to the small fraction of putative HGTs with any of these non-DPANN lineages relative to the total
proteome of Undinarchaeota, it remains to be assessed whether these patterns are genuine or result from
phylogenetic artifacts, lack of partner organisms in current databases or Undinarchaeota forming less
intimate interactions than DPANN Cluster 2 archaea.
Finally, we used a read-based co-occurrence analysis to assess whether MAGs of Undinarchaeota
are proportional to other archaeal and bacterial genomes[79] (see Methods for details). Due to the low
number of available samples for our inferences of co-proportionality, this analysis did not detect any
significant co-occurrence patterns for members of the Naiadarchaeales. However, it did indicate that

marine Undinarchaeales may co-vary with three genomes of the Chloroflexi, all belonging to the order
Dehalococcoidales (**Supplementary Figure 63**, Supplementary Information).
In turn, further analyses, such as fluorescence *in situ* hybridization, will be needed to identify the
organisms engaging in symbiotic interactions with Undinarchaeota. For instance, it will be important to
determine their host-specificity and test whether certain members of marine Undinarchaeales indeed
interact with members of the Chloroflexi or Pontarchaea. Together with previous findings[80], our results
suggest that certain DPANN symbionts could have non-archaeal partners highlighting the importance of
taking into account total community composition when inferring potential co-occurrences between
DPANN and other organismal groups.
376

Conclusions

We provided an updated view on the evolution of DPANN archaea by investigating the
phylogenetic placement and metabolic potential of the Undinarchaeota, a previously uncharacterized
archaeal lineage whose members have small genomes and limited metabolic gene repertoires indicative
of various auxotrophies. Its members, classified into the two order-level lineages Undinarchaeales and
Naiadarchaeales, may lead a symbiotic lifestyle and depend on (a) partner organism(s) for growth and
survival similar to other members of the various DPANN representatives[10,13,14]. In addition to insights into
the biology of members of the Undinarchaeota, their genomes contributed valuable data to address the
longstanding debate about whether DPANN indeed form a monophyletic clade or instead represent an
artifactual assemblage of phylogenetically disparate lineages[11,12,14,26–31,81,82]. In our analyses, which were
based on a broader taxon sampling, we not only attempted to account for the effect of compositional
biases but also developed a new method for detecting potential HGTs of marker proteins. Our results,
based on markers least effected by HGT, consistently recovered clan-hood of all DPANN lineages, such
that DPANN monophyly (i.e. monophyly of DPANN Cluster 1, Undinarchaeota and DPANN Cluster 2) solely
depends on the placement of the root. Notably, in analyses based on phylogenetic markers that had
indications for extensive inter-lineage HGT, Nanoarchaeota and Nanohaloarchaeota group with their
respective hosts the TACK-archaea and Halobacteria, respectively. This finding indicates that the previous
clading of certain DPANN lineages with Euryarchaeota[28,81] might to a certain degree be a result of
conflicting signals among marker proteins concatenated into one supermatrix. Finally, our analyses
robustly excluded the root from a clade consisting of Euryarchaeota, TACK and Asgard lineages,
strengthening the hypothesis that some or all of the DPANN superphylum diverged early from the
archaeal tree[27]. In turn, further exploration of DPANN promises to shed light on their roles in
biogeochemical cycles and food webs as well as the early evolution of cellular life and symbiosis.
400

Species description

Description of Candidatus Undinarchaeum (Un.din.ar.chae'um. L. n. *Undina* female water spirit or nymph
(from L. fem. n. *unda* water, wave); N.L. neut. n. *archaeum* (from Gr. adj. *archaios* ancient) archaeon; N.L.

neut. n. *Undinarchaeum* an archaeon of water origin). *Candidatus* Undinarchaeum marinum (ma.ri'num.
L. neut. adj. *marinum* of the sea, marine)

Description of Candidatus Undinarchaeum marinum (ma.ri'num. L. neut. adj. *marinum* of the sea, marine).
Type material is the genome designated as SRR2090159.bin1129 representing *Candidatus*
Undinarchaeum marinum.

Description of Candidatus Naiadarchaeum (Na.iad.ar.cha'eum. L. fem. n. *Naias, -adis* a water-nymph of
springs and streams, Naiad from Greek mythology; N.L. neut. n. *archaeum* (from Gr. adj. *archaios* ancient)
archaeon; N.L. neut. n. *Naiadarchaeum* an archaeon from the freshwater).

Description of Candidatus Naiadarchaeum limnaeum (lim.nae'um. N. L. neut. adj. *limnaeum* (from Gr. adj.
limnaios from the marsh, lake) living in the freshwater). Type material is the genome designated as
SRR4028224.bin17 representing *Candidatus* Naiadarchaeum limnaeum.

Based on these genera, we further propose the families *Candidatus* Undinarchaeaceae fam. nov. and
Candidatus Naiadarchaeaceae fam. nov., the orders *Candidatus* Undinarchaeales ord. nov. and
Candidatus Naiadarchaeales ord. nov., the class *Candidatus Undinarchaeia* class nov., and the phylum
Candidatus Undinarchaeota phylum nov.
420

Captions for Figures and Tables

Table 1 | Genome characteristics of Undinarchaeota MAGs. General genome statistics, including genome
size, GC content, contig number and other quality characteristics (presence of 16S, 23S and 5S rRNA
genes). Additionally, the degree of genome completeness and contamination was estimated using
CheckM. The CheckM results were investigated for marker genes commonly absent in DPANN archaea
(Supplementary Information) and CheckM was re-run excluding seven marker proteins. The results of this
analysis are shown in brackets.

Figure 1 | Phylogenetic placement of Undinarchaeota. (a) Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analysis
(LG+C60+F+R model) based on an alignment generated with the 50% top ranked marker proteins (n=56)
and 364 taxa set. For this alignment 10% of the most heterogeneous sites were removed using chi2
pruning. The full tree is shown in **Supplementary Figure 17**. (b) Bayesian phylogenetic tree (CAT+GTR
model) of an alignment generated with the 25% top ranked marker proteins (n=28) and 127 taxa set. For
this alignment 40% of the most heterogeneous sites were removed using chi2 pruning. The full tree is
shown in **Supplementary Figure 8**. Euryarchaeota 1 includes all Euryarchaeota with the exception of
Theionarchaea, Thermococci, Persephonarchaea and Hadesarchaea, which are clustered in
Euryarchaeota 2. Scale bar: Average number of substitutions per site. (c-f) Possible positions of the
archaeal root inferred using bacteria as an outgroup (c) or using the non-reversible model in IQ-TREE 2 (d-
f). All of these methods recover a clade of Undinarchaeota and Cluster 2 DPANN, consistent with
synapomorphies including a fused DNA primase and a reduced exosome that lacks Csl4.

Figure 2 | Metabolic characteristics of Undinarchaeota projected on key pathways. Full circles: Gene of interest is present in all or more than 50% of genomes. Half circles: Gene of interest is present in less than 50% but found in at least one Undinarchaeota MAG. Open circle: Gene is absent in all Undinarchaeota MAGs. Dark green: MAGs belonging to the marine Undinarchaeales. Light green: MAGs belonging to the aquifer Naiadarchaeales. *deo*A was only present in one Naiadarchaeales MAG and genes encoding RuBisCO were only found in two out of four Naiadarchaeales MAGs and it remains to be determined whether this is due to genome incompleteness or a sign of genome streamlining. A detailed list of genes encoded by Undinarchaeota can be found in **Supplementary Tables 7-9**.

Figure 3 | Occurrence of key metabolic proteins across major archaeal lineages. Protein occurrence was calculated by detecting key proteins of interest across 364 archaeal genomes and calculating the occurrence in percent across the total number of genomes included in each phylogenetic cluster based on a presence/absence table. Number in brackets: number of genomes included in each individual phylogenetic cluster. CF = Carbon fixation. FD = Fatty acid degradation. A table listing gene occurrences in archaeal lineages can be found in **Supplementary Table 9** and a list of metabolic genes shown in this plot can be found in **Supplementary Table 19**.

Figure 4 | Potential HGTs of core proteins of Undinarchaeota across archaeal lineages. The plot is based on phylogenetic analyses of 520 core proteins (shared across at least three MAGs of the Undinarchaeota), which included a representative set of archaeal, bacterial and eukaryotic genomes (n=3482 taxa). In particular, this plot depicts sisterhood-relationships observed in these phylogenies for all major archaeal lineages including the Undinarchaeota (see **Supplementary Table 18** for the full list of genomes used and **Supplementary Table 16-17** for the accompanying data for the HGT analysis). See custom scripts and Methods for more details.

Methods

Genome recovery and reconstructions

Reconstructing MAGs of Undinarchaeota

We mined the Sequence Read Archive (SRA) for public metagenomes using SingleM (https://github.com/wwood/singlem). Thereby, we found 37 metagenomes containing reads assigned to Undinarchaeota (**Supplementary Table 1**). Genomes from these 37 metagenomes were recovered by assembly with megahit (v1.1.3)[83], mapping raw reads from each sample to its corresponding assembly using BamM (v1.7.3) (https://github.com/Ecogenomics/BamM) using BWA 'mem' (v0.7.15)[84] with default parameters. Binning was carried out with MetaBAT (v2.11.1)[85] using default parameters and allowed the reconstruction of six MAGs. The quality of these six as well as the six previously published Undinarchaeota MAGs was assessed using CheckM (v1.0.7)[86]. Additionally, the CheckM marker set was screened for markers that were absent in all 12 Undinarchaeota MAGs. Thereby, we identified 7 markers (PF01287,

482 PF01667, PF01912, PF01982, PF04127, TIGR00432 and TIGR01213) that were not only absent in
483 Undinarchaeota but often in other DPANN archaea (Supplementary Information). As the inclusion of these
484 markers might underestimate the completeness scores, we also ran CheckM excluding these markers.
485 Both results are summarized in **Table 1**.
486

<u>Contamination Screening</u>
Contigs from all 12 Undinarchaeota MAGs were manually investigated for signs of contamination
by looking for an abnormal GC-content (~10% difference in average GC-content) and/or taxonomic
composition. To determine the taxonomic composition, the protein files of each genome (see section
below) were searched against the NCBI-non-redundant (nr) database (downloaded in November 2018)
using DIAMOND v0.9.22.123 (settings: --more-sensitive --evalue 1e-10 --seq 100 --no-self-hits --taxonmap
prot.accession2taxid.gz)[87]. The best hit for each protein was selected based on the highest e-value and
bit-score. Subsequently, the obtained NCBI taxonomy identifier was merged with the taxonomic string
information provided by NCBI using a mapping file generated in January 2019 using ncbitax2lin
(https://github.com/zyxue/ncbitax2lin). Contigs with an "abnormal" taxonomic distribution (>90% of
proteins on a contig assigned to a non-archaeal or non-DPANN lineage with a percentage identity above
80%) were either removed or confirmed by phylogenetic analyses of single gene trees (see Supplementary
Information).
Notably, several Undinarchaeota MAGs appeared to encode a short genomic region similar to an
archaeal fosmid sequence deposited at NCBI and referred to as uncultured marine group I/III
euryarchaeote KM3_51_D01 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/663520902). In particular, proteins
encoded in this region shared about 84% ANI to protein homologs found on this fosmid. To investigate
whether our MAGs may be contaminated by contigs of members of the MGII/III archaea
(Pontarchaea/Poseidoniales), we performed single protein trees of marker proteins located in this
genomic region and queried the ORFs located on fosmid KM3_51_D01 against NCBI-nr Importantly, our
results (i) suggested that this fosmid does not belong to the Pontarchaea/Poseidoniales archaea and
should be reclassified as "uncultured archaeon KM3" and (ii) verified, that respective genomic regions in
our MAGs are not contaminated. Please see Supplementary Information for further details.
510

Phylogenetic analyses

Generation of a backbone datasets for phylogenetic analyses

Archaeal backbones. To generate a representative archaeal reference set all archaeal genomes
were downloaded from NCBI (January 2019). Genomes with a completeness >40% and contamination
<25% (determined with CheckM lineage_wf v1.0.11)[86] were used for an initial phylogenetic analysis using
the PhyloSift marker set. In brief, homologs of 34 PhyloSift marker proteins were identified in each
genome using the PhyloSift v1.0.1 'find' mode (settings: --besthit)[48]. Subsequently, marker proteins were
individually aligned using MAFFT L-INS-i v7.407 (settings: --reorder)[88] and trimmed using BMGE v1.12
(settings: -m BLOSUM30 -h 0.55)[89]. The concatenated protein alignment was used to reconstruct a
phylogenetic tree using IQ-TREE v1.6.7 (settings: -m LG -nt AUTO -bb 1000 -alrt 1000)[50,58,59]. Based on this
tree, a sub-selection of 364 archaeal reference genomes was generated (comprising 352 reference
archaeal and 12 Undinarchaeota genomes, **Supplementary Table 18**), which covers the archaeal

phylogenetic diversity while still allows to perform computationally intensive phylogenetic analyses
needed to resolve the placement of DPANN in the tree of Archaea. Selected genomes preferentially
derived from type strains as well as from known hosts of DPANN archaea. Furthermore, representative
MAGs and SAGs were selected based on high completeness and low degree of contamination. Based on
an initial maximum likelihood analysis (IQ-TREE, C60+LG model) including these 364 species, *Zestosphaera*
tikiterensis NZ3 seems to represent a lineage of the order Sulfolobales rather than the Desulfurococcales[90]
with high statistical support (i.e. bootstrap of >97%, **Supplementary Figure 9**). Furthermore, the
placement of "Acidilobales" within the Desulfurococales was highly supported (i.e. bootstrap of 100%,
Supplementary Figure 9), which indicates that Acidilobaceae represents a family level lineage within the
Desulfurococcales rather than an order level lineage[91]. This also corresponds to the taxonomy of the
Genome Taxonomy Database (GTDB; https://gtdb.ecogenomic.org). We therefore assigned both
Zestosphaera tikiterensis NZ3 and Acidilobaceae to the Desulfurococcales in our analyses.

To create a smaller archaeal reference set suitable for Bayesian phylogenies, the 364 archaeal
genome set was further subsampled to only include 127 taxa. In particular, at least two members of all
major archaeal order-level lineages were selected based on phylogenetic distance, genome quality. For
MAGs that were only classified at phylum level (i.e. Woesearchaeota), we selected a representative set of
taxa based on the 364 species tree.

Bacterial backbones. To generate a bacterial backbone, we downloaded a list of available
genomes from NCBI in 2018 (ftp://[ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genomes/genbank/bacteria/](ftp://ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genomes/genbank/bacteria/)). This list was parsed
to only include type strains or representative genomes. From this list we randomly selected a
representative strain per genus. In a second step, we selected 15-30 genomes from candidate phyla from
the unparsed list. This initial set was screened for completeness and contamination in CheckM[86] and
genomes with less than 50% completeness and more than 10% contamination were excluded. We
performed initial phylogenies using alignments generated by PhyloSift[48] using the PhyloSift search, align
and name algorithms to find marker proteins. Individual genes were aligned with MAFFT L-INS-i (settings:
--reorder)[88] and trimmed using BMGE (settings: -m BLOSUM30 -h 0.55)[89]. The concatenated protein
alignment was used to reconstruct a phylogenetic tree using IQ-TREE v1.6.7 (settings: -m LG -bb 1000 -
alrt 1000)[50]. The initial alignments were screened for long-branches and genomes that did not fall into the
expected position in the tree were removed from the taxa selection resulting in a set of 3020 bacterial
genomes.

Eukaryotic backbones. 98 eukaryotic genomes and largely complete transcriptomes were
selected so as to obtain even sampling across the known major lineages of eukaryotes. Where possible,
we selected free-living representatives of clades with a completely sequenced genome; alternatively, we
selected the most complete transcriptome from a free-living member of the group.

Selection of marker proteins for phylogenetic analyses

To accurately place Undinarchaeota in the archaeal tree of life, we identified suitable markers
among three different but overlapping marker proteins sets: (a) a set of herein identified potential single-
copy, near universal archaeal orthologues and the marker protein sets implemented in GTDB (b) and
PhyloSift (c).

(a) We inferred a set of markers by running the OMA standalone algorithm[92] on a set of 149
archaeal genomes chosen to represent known taxonomic diversity. We inferred single protein trees for

97 orthologues that were present in at least 75% of the genomes and manually inspected the resulting
trees to identify and remove 15 markers that had undergone gene transfer, resulting in a final set of 82
candidate single-copy orthologs.

(b) The GTDB marker set was downloaded February 2019 (release r86 downloaded from
https://gtdb.ecogenomic.org). This set was modified by combining the 122 archaeal GTDB marker set with
the complete TIGRFAM database. Therefore, the extra PFAMs defined in the GTDB marker set were added
to the TIGRFAM database (TIGRFAMs_15.0_HMM.LIB: downloaded Sept 2018) and the combined
database will be referred to as TIGRFAM_GTDB.

(c) The PhyloSift marker set[48] included all previously reported markers excluding genes for the
phenylalanine synthetase. These three marker sets were combined by adding the PhyloSift and OG marker
protein set to the TIGRFAM_GTDB database with the final database consisting of 151 non-redundant
protein families.

Assessment of the 151 marker set for suitability in concatenations

Homologs in the bacterial, eukaryotic and archaeal backbone datasets as well as in
Undinarchaeota MAGs were identified using hmmsearch v3.1b2 (settings: -E 1e-20)[93]. The output was
parsed to only include the best hit based on the e-value and bit-score. Afterwards, marker proteins were
individually aligned using MAFFT L-INS-i (settings: --reorder)[88] and trimmed using BMGE (settings: -t AA -
m BLOSUM30 -h 0.55)[89]. Subsequently, we inferred single protein phylogenies with IQ-tree (settings: -m
LG+G+F+R -bb 1000 -alrt 1000)[50] for each of these 151 marker protein families, including homologs
identified in the corresponding reference genomes (i.e. 364 archaea, 3020 bacteria and 98 eukaryotes
(see details above). Marker proteins in which archaea and eukaryotes were not monophyletic (i.e.
archaeal lineages were paraphyletic with some lineages emerging from within Bacteria), were excluded
from any further analysis (see also **Supplementary Tables 4-5**).

Next, we used a custom python script (count_sister_taxa.py;
https://github.com/Tancata/phylo/blob/master/count_sister_taxa.py) to rank each marker protein
phylogeny based on the extent to which it resolved monophyletic clades of well-established archaeal
phylum- or order-level lineages. In brief, the script counts for each tree, how many times a certain taxon
does not group with its expected taxonomic clade across all bootstrap trees, thus representing so-called
splits. Splits (which may arise through HGT or phylogenetic artifacts) are counted for each taxon across all
protein phylogenies and provide the basis for ranking the different markers according to their reliability.
Here, we counted both the total number of splits as well as the splits normalized to the total species count.
Note, monophyly was assessed on the level of following archaeal clades: Geothermarchaeota,
Halobacteria, Methanonatronarchaeales, Methanomicrobiales, Methanosarcinales, Methanocellales,
Methanophagales, Archaeoglobales, Thermoplasmatales, Acidiprofundales, Methanomassiliicoccales,
Poseidoniales, Thermoplasmata (not assigned at order level), Pontarchaea, Undinarchaeota,
Woesearchaeota, Pacearchaeota, NovelDPANN_1 (UAP1), Parvarchaeota, Nanohaloarchaeota,
Aenigmarchaeota, Diapherotrites, Huberarchaeota, Micrarchaeota, Altiarchaeota, Methanopyrales,
Methanobacteriales, Methanococcales, Desulfurococcales, Sulfolobales, Thermoproteales,
Marsarchaeota, Thermococcales, Theionarchaea, Methanofastidiosa, Hadesarchaea, Persephonarchaea,
Odinarchaeota, Verstraetearchaeota, Thorarchaeota, Lokiarchaeota, Heimdallarchaeota,
Bathyarchaeota, Thaumarchaeota, Korarchaeota, Aigarchaeota, Geoarchaeales, Hydrothermarchaeota

and Nanoarchaeota. The number of split phylogenetic clusters (in percentage) as well as the total number
of splits normalized by the total number of species within each tree was used as criteria to rank and define
the 25%, 50% and 75% top as well as 25% and 50% lowest ranking marker proteins (**Supplementary Tables**
4-5). Finally, the 50% top-ranking single protein trees were manually inspected for signs of contamination
or paralogues that were then manually removed from the marker protein sequences. After manual
cleaning, the marker proteins were aligned using MAFFT L-INS-i[88] and trimmed using BMGE[89] as described
above. The single proteins were concatenated using catfasta2phyml.pl
(https://github.com/nylander/catfasta2phyml). Note that all single protein phylogenies as well as the
individual protein files and alignments have been deposited in a Zenodo repository
(10.5281/zenodo.3672835).

Phylogenetic analyses for the species trees

To confirm the placement of Undinarchaeota several different phylogenetic trees were generated (all
trees are summarized in **Supplementary Table 6** and shown in full in **Supplementary Figures 6-56**):
618

(I) Using different subsets of marker proteins for maximum-likelihood phylogenies
The alignment for the concatenated 25%, 50% and 75% top as well as 25% and 50% lowest ranking
marker proteins were generated for the 364 as well as 127 taxa set and phylogenetic trees were generated
using IQ-TREE (v1.6.7, settings: -m LG+C60+F+R -bb 1000 -alrt 1000)[50].
(II) Stationary trimming for maximum-likelihood phylogenies
The concatenated alignment for the 50% top ranking marker proteins was aligned with MAFFT L-
INS-i[88] and trimmed with BMGE[89] using stationary trimming (options: -s FAST -h 0:1 -g 1) to remove
compositional heterogenous sites from both the 127 and 364 taxa set. Trees were generated using IQ-
TREE[50](settings: -m LG+C60+F+R -bb 1000 -alrt 1000).
(III) Data recoding for maximum-likelihood phylogenies
The concatenated alignment for the 50% top ranking marker proteins (alignment: MAFFT L-INS-
i[4], trimming: BMGE[89]) was re-coded into 4 character-states (SR4 re-coding[94]; i.e. data simplification from
20 to four character states) to reduce compositional heterogeneity both for the 127 and 364 taxa set using
a custom script (Recode_aa.py). The states used were the following: A,G,N,P,S,T = A; C,H,W,Y = C;
D,E,K,Q,R = G and F,I,L,M,V = T. Phylogenetic trees were generated using IQ-TREE (settings: -m C60SR4 -
bb 1000 -alrt 1000).
(IV) Removing fast-evolving sites for maximum-likelihood phylogenies
SlowFaster[95] was used on the concatenated alignment for the 50% top ranking marker proteins
(alignment: MAFFT L-INS-i[88], trimming: BMGE[89]; settings see above) to remove fast-evolving sites both
from the 127 and 364 taxa set. Sites were removed in a stepwise manner removing 10%, 20%, 30% and
40% of the fastest evolving sites. Phylogenetic trees were generated using IQ-TREE[50] (settings: -m
LG+C60+F+R -bb 1000 -alrt 1000).
(V) Removing heterogenous sites for maximum-likelihood phylogenies
Alignment_pruner.pl (https://github.com/novigit/davinciCode/blob/master/perl) was used to
remove heterogenous sites in a stepwise manner from the concatenated alignment for the 50% top
ranking marker proteins (alignment: MAFFT L-INS-i[88], trimming: BMGE[89]; settings see above) both from
the 127 and 364 taxa set. Sites were removed in a stepwise manner removing 10%, 20%, 30% and 40% of

the most heterogeneous sites and the trees were generated using IQ-TREE[50] (settings: -m LG+C60+F+R -
bb 1000 -alrt 1000).
(VI) Using published marker gene sets for maximum-likelihood phylogenies
649   Several alternative marker sets were used to confirm the tree topologies. These include the
650   PhyloSift marker set[48] using the default alignment with hmmalign[96] or MAFFT L-INS-i[88], the 122 archaeal
651   GTDB marker set[49] using FastTree v2.1.10[97](settings: WAG, LG) or IQ-TREE[50] (settings: LG+C60+F+R), the
652   RP14 marker set[10] and the universal 48 marker set[6]. Please note that the PhyloSift[48], 122 GTDB marker
653   gene set[49] and RP14 marker protein[10] set were subjected to phylogenetic analyses before defining the 364
654   taxa set and include slightly less taxa (356).
655   **(VII) Using different subsets of marker proteins for Bayesian phylogenies**
656   The concatenated alignment for the 25% and 50% top ranking marker proteins (alignment: MAFFT
L-INS-i[88], trimming: BMGE[89] and the 127 taxa set were used for Bayesian inferences using PhyloBayes-MPI
v1.8[51] (settings: -cat -gtr -x 10 -1 -dgam 4). In particular, for each marker protein family, four parallel chains
were run until convergence was reached, unless stated otherwise (maxdiff < 0.3; settings: bpcomp -x
25%_burnin chain1 chain2 chain3 chain4). Additionally, we checked for the minimum effective size using
tracecomp (minimum effective size > 50; settings: -x 25%_burnin chain1 chain2 chain3 chain4).
Subsequently, readpb_mpi of the pb_mpi package was used for posterior predictive testing (settings: --
allpred).
(VIII) Rooting maximum-likelihood phylogenetic trees using non-reversible models
665   To root our phylogenetic trees, we analyzed the concatenated alignment based on the 50% top
ranking marker proteins using a single partition model and a multiple partition non-reversible model.
These analyses were performed on the 127 and 364 taxa set using the full alignments and the recoded
alignments in which 20% or 40% of the most heterogeneous sites were removed. Trees were generated
with an updated version of IQ-TREE v2[57] (while all previously mentioned phylogenies were generated with
IQ-TREE v1)[50]. The single partition models were run with the following settings: -mset LG -bb 1000 -alrt
1000 -m MFP+MERGE, followed by --model-joint NONREV --min-freq 0.001 -nparam 10 -optfromgiven -
bb 1000 -alrt 1000. The multiple partition model was run with these settings: -model-joint NONREV --min-
freq 0.001 -nparam 10 -optfromgiven -bb 1000 -alrt 1000. Additionally, we used minimal ancestor
deviation (MAD) rooting to determine the root position[98].
(IX) Rooting maximum-likelihood phylogenetic trees using bacteria as an outgroup
676   To root our phylogenetic trees with bacteria as an outgroup we added 88 bacterial genomes to
our 127 archaeal taxa selection. These 88 bacterial genomes were selected from the bacterial backbone
tree by covering a broad diversity and including at least one to three genomes per phylum. However, to
minimize LBA artifacts, we did not select members of the CPR[99] as well as other symbionts or
thermophiles, which often emerge on long branches in phylogenetic trees[100,101]. Next, we identified
homologs of the universal 48 markers[6] in each genome, individually aligned proteins using MAFFT L-INS-
i[88] (settings: --reorder) and trimmed using BMGE (settings: -t AA -m BLOSUM30 -h 0.55)[89]. Single proteins
were concatenated using catfasta2phyml.pl (https://github.com/nylander/catfasta2phyml) and a
phylogenetic tree was generated using IQ-TREE (settings: -m LG+C60+F+R -bb 1000 -alrt 1000).
685

Phylogenetic analyses of the core Undinarchaeota protein set

A set of 520 proteins for Undinarchaeota were selected based on arCOGs detected in at least three or more Undinarchaeota genomes with an e-value greater than 1e-20 (see below). Next, these 520 arCOGs were queried against a protein database of 364 archaeal, 3020 bacterial and 98 eukaryotic genomes using PSI-BLAST (settings: -evalue 1e-20 -show_gis -outfmt 6 -max_target_seqs 1000 -dbsize 100000000 -comp_based_stats F -seg no) against the arCOG database (version from 2014)[102]. Protein alignments were generated for each individual protein family using MAFFT L-INS-i[88] (protein alignments with <1000, settings: --reorder) or MAFFT (alignments with >1000 sequences, settings: --reorder). Afterwards, all alignments were trimmed using BMGE[89] (settings: -t AA -m BLOSUM30 -h 0.55). Phylogenetic trees were generated using IQ-TREE[50] (settings: -m LG+G -wbtl -bb 1000 -bnni). To search for HGT events, trees were analyzed using the script count_sister_taxa.py (https://github.com/Tancata/phylo/blob/master/count_sister_taxa.py), which allows to determine the closest sister lineage of any taxon of interest in an unrooted phylogeny, i.e. the sister lineage is defined as the lineage in the smallest sister group while all other taxa are the outgroup. Cases in which homologs of Undinarchaeota formed a sister lineage to non-DPANN, were visually confirmed and all hits for Undinarchaeota are listed in **Supplementary Tables 16-17**.

Phylogenetic analyses of 16S and 23S rRNA genes

16S and 23S rRNA gene sequences were identified in all archaeal genomes using Barrnap v0.9[103] (settings: --kingdom arc --evalue 1e-20; https://github.com/tseemann/barrnap). Partial sequences and sequences shorter than 400 bp were removed prior to extracting the sequences using bedtools v2.26.0[104]. Subsequently, sequences were individually aligned using MAFFT L-INS-i[88] and trimmed using TrimAL[105](v1.2rev59, -automated1 setting) or BMGE[89] (settings: -t DNA -m DNAPAM100:2 -h 0.55) and concatenated (https://github.com/nylander/catfasta2phyml). 16S and 23S rRNA gene homologs located on the same contig were concatenated whenever more than one copy of the 16S or 23S rRNA gene was encoded by a genome. Alignment_pruner.pl (https://github.com/novigit/davinciCode/blob/master/perl) was used to remove the 10% most heterogenous sites from the alignment. After running an initial tree with all 16S-23S rRNA gene sequences using IQ-TREE, we confirmed that MAGs with multiple copies clustered together and removed all but one representative copy for the following tree. Additionally, we removed 16S and 23S rRNA homologs of the genome-reduced Huberarchaeota to avoid potential long-branch attraction artifacts. A phylogenetic tree was generated with IQ-TREE for the full-length alignment trimmed with TrimAL[105] (setting: -automated1), BMGE[89] (settings: -t DNA -m DNAPAM100:2 -h 0.55) as well as the 10% pruned TrimAL alignment (IQ-TREE; settings: -m GTR+G -bb 1000 -alrt 1000)[50]. The trees are provided in **Supplementary Figures 3-5**.

Phylogenetic analyses of the RuBisCO gene

RuBisCO protein sequences were identified by their arCOG ID (arCOG04443), which was identified in all Undinarchaeota as described in section 'Gene calling and annotation'. Subsequently, we extracted the sequences for the RuBisCO protein from Undinarchaeota and combined them with an unmasked alignment generated in a previous study[67] using mafft_align[88] with the --add option. The alignment was trimmed using BMGE (-g 0.5 -b 1 -m BLOSUM30 -h 0.55)[89] and a tree generated using IQ-TREE (-m LG+G -wbtl -bb 1000 -bnni). The conservation of the catalytic site was compared in reference to *Synechococcus*

728   *elongatus* PCC_6301 as described previously[67]. The tree is provided in **Supplementary Figure 59**. The logo
729   for the catalytic site was generated with logomaker v0.8 in python v2.7.15[106].
730
Phylogenetic analyses of the archaeal DNA primase
To compare the phylogenetic history of the canonical and the fused PriL and PriS subunits of the
primase we extracted arCOGs corresponding to the two subunits (arCOG04110 for PriS and arCOG03013
for PriL, respectively) from the 364 reference archaeal genomes. To determine the conserved domains for
PriS and PriL in both the fused and canonical proteins we uploaded the sequences to the Conserved
Domain Search Service (CD-Search) web-based tool using default settings (**Supplementary Table 11**). The
start and end positions provided by CD-Search were used to split the fused version of the primase into
"unfused" PriS and PriL subunits using bedtools getfasta. The sequences for the canonical PriS and PriL as
well as split PriS and PriL were combined and aligned using MAFFT L-INS-i[88](option --reorder) and trimmed
using TrimAL[105] (-gappyout). A phylogenetic tree was generated with IQ-TREE (-m LG+F+C10 -bb 1000 -alrt
1000)[50]. The tree is provided in **Supplementary Figure 57**.
742
Gene calling and annotation
We annotated the 12 MAGs of Undinarchaeota (six from this study) as well as our set of 352
archaeal reference genomes. Gene calling was performed using Prokka[107] (v1.14, settings: --kingdom
Archaea --addgenes --increment 10 --compliant --centre UU --norrna --notrna). For further functional
annotation, the generated protein files were compared against several databases, including the arCOGs
(version from 2014)[102], the KO profiles from the KEGG Automatic Annotation Server[108] (KAAS; downloaded
April 2019), the Pfam database[109] (Release 31.0), the TIGRFAM database[110] (Release 15.0), the
Carbohydrate-Active enZymes (CAZy) database[111] (downloaded from dbCAN2 in September 2019), the
MEROPs database[112] (Release 12.0), the Transporter Classification Database[113] (TCDB; downloaded in
November 2018), the hydrogenase database[114] (HydDB; downloaded in November 2018) and NCBI_nr
(downloaded in November 2018). Additionally, all proteins were scanned for protein domains using
InterProScan (v5.29-68.0; settings: --iprlookup --goterms)[115].
Individual database searches were conducted as described in the following section. ArCOGs were
assigned using PSI-BLAST v2.7.1+ (settings: -evalue 1e-4 -show_gis -outfmt 6 -max_target_seqs 1000 -
dbsize 100000000 -comp_based_stats F -seg no)[116]. KOs as well as PFAMs, TIGRFAMs and CAZymes were
identified in all archaeal genomes using hmmsearch v3.1b2[96] (settings: -E 1e-4). The Merops database was
searched using BLASTp v2.7.1 (settings: -outfmt 6, -evalue 1e-20). For all database searches the best hit
for each protein was selected based on the highest e-value and bitscore and all results are summarized
for Undinarchaeota in **Supplementary Table 7**. For InterProScan we report multiple hits corresponding to
the individual domains of a protein using a custom script (parse_IPRdomains_vs2_GO_2.py). Additionally,
tRNA genes were identified from contigs of Undinarchaeota and all archaeal reference genomes using
tRNAscan-SE v2.0[117] and the results are summarized in **Supplementary Table 10.**
Proteins potentially involved in cell-cell interactions (**Supplementary Table 20**, some of which
were reported in Castelle et al., 2018[13]) were separately screened with HHpred[118] and Phyre2[119]. HHpred
was run on a local server by first running hhblits the uniclust30_2018_08 database (settings: -E 1E-03, -
oa3m). The alignment file in a3m format was used as an input in hhsearch against the pdb70 database
(settings: -p 20 -Z 250 -loc -z 1 -b 1 -B 250 -ssm 2 -sc 1 -seq 1 -dbstrlen 10000 -norealign -maxres 32000 -

contxt context_data.crf -blasttab). Protein homology was investigated using Phyre2 by using the batch
upload function of the web-version.
772
Metabolic comparisons
Results from the gene calling and annotation described above were used as basis for comparative
genome analyses and metabolic comparisons. For simplicity we reported gene presence/absence patterns
on class level whenever possible, while DPANN and most taxa without cultured representatives were
defined at the phylum level. First, the occurrence of each individual gene found across each
MAG/reference genome was counted in R (v3.5.0). This count table provided the basis for summary tables
generated using the ddply function of the plyr package (v 1.8.4). The results of these analyses are
summarized in **Supplementary Tables 9 and 12**. To plot the heatmap shown in **Figure 3**, the count table
was first transferred to a presence/absence matrix and the ddply function was used to summarize the
counts across each phylogenetic cluster. The data was visualized as a heatmap using the ggplot function
with geom_tile and facet_wrap of the ggplot2 package v3.0.0. A table summarizing the gene IDs used can
be found in **Supplementary Table 19**. The heatmap was manually merged with the collapsed tree in
Inkscape v0.91.
786
787 **Average amino acid identity**
788   The average amino acid identity (AAI) across all archaeal reference genomes and the 12
789 Undinarchaeota MAGs was calculated using comparem v0.0.23 (settings: aai_wf)[120]. The output was
790 summarized in R (v3.5.0) using the packages reshape2 (v1.4.3), plyr (v1.8.4) and dplyr (v0.7.6) generating
791 the **Supplementary Table 3** and ggplot2 (v3.0.0) and ggpubr (v0.2) to plot the data.
792
Undinarchaeota co-occurrence analysis
37 SRA metagenomes (**Supplementary Table 1**) containing reads assigned to Undinarchaeota
were pseudo-aligned to a genome dataset consisting of 6,890 GTDB r89 archaeal and bacterial genus-
dereplicated genomes (GTDB; https://gtdb.ecogenomic.org) and 12 Undinarchaeota MAGs using the
software Kallisto v.0.44.0 with the default k-mer size (31 bp)[121]. To reduce the number of false positive
genomes, the pseudo-alignment results were subjected to three filtering criteria published previously[121].
The subset of genomes that fulfilled the three criteria was used to create a reference database for read
mapping of the 37 SRA metagenomes via bamM using default parameters
(https://github.com/Ecogenomics/BamM). Relative abundances (Ar) were normalized based on the total
read counts, i.e. the maximum number of reads of all metagenomes (Nm) divided by the sample read
count (Ns), multiplied by number of reads of that particular sample that mapped to the genome (r), and
the average read length (l), divided by the genome size (g) ($Ar=Nm/Ns * (r*l/g)$)[25,79]. Proportionality was
analyzed using the R package propR[79] based on normalized relative abundances, followed by the centered
log-ratio transformation. Only metagenomes containing maximum UAP2 normalized relative abundance
above 1.0 were included in this step (that resulted in 27 metagenomes involved in calculating
proportionality). Finally, genomes that were proportional ($\rho \geq 0.9$) to more than three Undinarchaeota
MAG were identified as Undinarchaeota co-correlated.

Data and Code availability

The datasets analyzed during the current study are available in the NCBI repository at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ and the accession numbers can be found in Supplementary Table 1. New MAGs generated from the current study have been deposited at NCBI GenBank and can be accessed under BioProject **PRJNA609027** as well as via our repository at Zenodo. Furthermore, additional supplementary files including: (a) genome files including the contigs and protein files for all 12 Udinarcheota MAGs as well as the 352 reference genomes, (b) phylogenies for the species and single gene tree analyses including protein files, alignments and treefiles (Supplementary Figures 6-56) and (c) workflows for the annotations and phylogenies as well as custom python and R-scripts (to analyze tree files), perl code (to parse data) and R codes (to parse the data and generate figures) have been deposited at Zenodo with the **doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3672835**.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a grant of the Swedish Research Council (VR starting grant 2016-03559 to AS), the NWO-I foundation of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (WISE fellowship to AS), and an Australian Research Council (ARC) Future Fellowship (FT170100213, awarded to CR). TW was supported by a Royal Society University Research Fellowship. BW was supported by the Australian Research Council Discovery Early Career Research Awards #DE160100248.

We want to thank Damien de Vienne for helpful discussion regarding testing of protein tree congruency as well as Celine Petitjean for sharing genomic and transcriptomic data of a selection of representative eukaryotes. We are also grateful to those that made their metagenomic datasets publicly accessible, including Pierre Offre for the MOCA dataset, Jill Banfield for the aquifer metagenomes, Peer Bork for the Indian Ocean metagenomes and Francisco Rodriguez-Valera for the Mediterranean metagenomes.

References

1. Woese, C. R. & Fox, G. E. Phylogenetic structure of the prokaryotic domain: The primary kingdoms. *PNAS* **74**, 5088–5090 (1977).

2. Williams, T. A., Foster, P. G., Cox, C. J. & Embley, T. M. An archaeal origin of eukaryotes supports only two primary domains of life. *Nature* **504**, 231–236 (2013).

3. Williams, T. A., Cox, C. J., Foster, P. G., Szöllősi, G. J. & Embley, T. M. Phylogenomics provides robust support for a two-domains tree of life. *Nat Ecol Evol* **4**, 138–147 (2020).

4. Spang, A. *et al.* Complex archaea that bridge the gap between prokaryotes and eukaryotes. *Nature* **521**, 173–179 (2015).

5.   Eme, L., Spang, A., Lombard, J., Stairs, C. W. & Ettema, T. J. G. Archaea and the origin of eukaryotes. *Nature*
Reviews Microbiology **15**, nrmicro.2017.133 (2017).

6.   Zaremba-Niedzwiedzka, K. *et al.* Asgard archaea illuminate the origin of eukaryotic cellular complexity.
Nature **541**, 353–358 (2017).

7.   Hug, L. A. *et al.* A new view of the tree of life. *Nature Microbiology* **1**, 16048 (2016).

8.   Adam, P. S., Borrel, G., Brochier-Armanet, C. & Gribaldo, S. The growing tree of Archaea: new perspectives
on their diversity, evolution and ecology. *The ISME Journal* **11**, 2407–2425 (2017).

9.   Spang, A., Caceres, E. F. & Ettema, T. J. G. Genomic exploration of the diversity, ecology, and evolution of the
archaeal domain of life. *Science* **357**, eaaf3883 (2017).

10.   Castelle, C. J. & Banfield, J. F. Major new microbial groups expand diversity and alter our understanding of
the tree of life. *Cell* **172**, 1181–1197 (2018).

11.   Rinke, C. *et al.* Insights into the phylogeny and coding potential of microbial dark matter. *Nature* **499**, 431–
437 (2013).

12.   Castelle, C. J. *et al.* Genomic expansion of domain archaea highlights roles for organisms from new phyla in
anaerobic carbon cycling. *Current Biology* **25**, 690–701 (2015).

13.   Castelle, C. J. *et al.* Biosynthetic capacity, metabolic variety and unusual biology in the CPR and DPANN
radiations. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 1 (2018) doi:10.1038/s41579-018-0076-2.

14.   Dombrowski, N., Lee, J.-H., Williams, T. A., Offre, P. & Spang, A. Genomic diversity, lifestyles and evolutionary
origins of DPANN archaea. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **366**, (2019).

15.   Huber, H. *et al.* A new phylum of Archaea represented by a nanosized hyperthermophilic symbiont. *Nature*
417, 63–67 (2002).

16.   Jahn, U. *et al.* Nanoarchaeum equitans and Ignicoccus hospitalis: New insights into a unique, intimate
association of two Archaea. *J. Bacteriol.* **190**, 1743–1750 (2008).

17.   Munson-McGee, J. H. *et al.* Nanoarchaeota, their Sulfolobales host, and Nanoarchaeota Virus distribution
across Yellowstone National Park Hot Springs. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **81**, 7860–7868 (2015).

18.   Wurch, L. *et al.* Genomics-informed isolation and characterization of a symbiotic Nanoarchaeota system
from a terrestrial geothermal environment. *Nature Communications* **7**, 12115 (2016).

19.   Jarett, J. K. *et al.* Single-cell genomics of co-sorted Nanoarchaeota suggests novel putative host associations
and diversification of proteins involved in symbiosis. *Microbiome* **6**, 161 (2018).

20.   John, E. S., Flores, G. E., Meneghin, J. & Reysenbach, A.-L. Deep-sea hydrothermal vent metagenome-
assembled genomes provide insight into the phylum Nanoarchaeota. *Environmental Microbiology Reports*
11, 262–270 (2019).

21.   Golyshina, O. V. *et al.* 'ARMAN' archaea depend on association with euryarchaeal host in culture and in situ.
Nature Communications **8**, 60 (2017).

22. Krause, S., Bremges, A., Münch, P. C., McHardy, A. C. & Gescher, J. Characterisation of a stable laboratory co-
culture of acidophilic nanoorganisms. *Scientific Reports* **7**, 3289 (2017).

23. Hamm, J. N. *et al.* Unexpected host dependency of Antarctic Nanohaloarchaeota. *PNAS* 201905179 (2019)
doi:10.1073/pnas.1905179116.

24. Probst, A. J. *et al.* Differential depth distribution of microbial function and putative symbionts through
sediment-hosted aquifers in the deep terrestrial subsurface. *Nature Microbiology* 1 (2018)
doi:10.1038/s41564-017-0098-y.

25. Schwank, K. *et al.* An archaeal symbiont-host association from the deep terrestrial subsurface. *The ISME*
Journal 1 (2019) doi:10.1038/s41396-019-0421-0.

26. Brochier, C., Gribaldo, S., Zivanovic, Y., Confalonieri, F. & Forterre, P. Nanoarchaea: representatives of a
novel archaeal phylum or a fast-evolving euryarchaeal lineage related to Thermococcales? *Genome Biol* **6**,
R42 (2005).

27. Williams, T. A. *et al.* Integrative modeling of gene and genome evolution roots the archaeal tree of life. *PNAS*
201618463 (2017) doi:10.1073/pnas.1618463114.

28. Aouad, M. *et al.* Extreme halophilic archaea derive from two distinct methanogen Class II lineages. *Molecular*
Phylogenetics and Evolution **127**, 46–54 (2018).

29. Petitjean, C., Deschamps, P., López-García, P. & Moreira, D. Rooting the domain Archaea by phylogenomic
analysis supports the foundation of the new kingdom Proteoarchaeota. *Genome Biol Evol* **7**, 191–204 (2015).

30. Probst, A. J. *et al.* Biology of a widespread uncultivated archaeon that contributes to carbon fixation in the
subsurface. *Nature Communications* **5**, 5497 (2014).

31. Bird, J. T., Baker, B. J., Probst, A. J., Podar, M. & Lloyd, K. G. Culture independent genomic comparisons
reveal environmental adaptations for Altiarchaeales. *Front Microbiol* **7**, (2016).

32. Bergsten, J. A review of long-branch attraction. *Cladistics* **21**, 163–193 (2005).

33. Jeffroy, O., Brinkmann, H., Delsuc, F. & Philippe, H. Phylogenomics: the beginning of incongruence? *Trends in*
Genetics **22**, 225–231 (2006).

34. Moran, N. A. Accelerated evolution and Muller's ratchet in endosymbiotic bacteria. *PNAS* **93**, 2873–2878
(1996).

35. Silva, F. J. & Santos-Garcia, D. Slow and fast evolving endosymbiont lineages: Positive correlation between
the rates of synonymous and non-synonymous substitution. *Front. Microbiol.* **6**, (2015).

36. Pollock, D. D., Zwickl, D. J., McGuire, J. A. & Hillis, D. M. Increased taxon sampling Is advantageous for
phylogenetic inference. *Syst Biol* **51**, 664–671 (2002).

37. Lartillot, N., Brinkmann, H. & Philippe, H. Suppression of long-branch attraction artefacts in the animal
phylogeny using a site-heterogeneous model. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **7**, S4 (2007).

38. Pisani, D. Identifying and removing fast-evolving sites using compatibility analysis: An example from the
Arthropoda. *Syst Biol* **53**, 978–989 (2004).

39.   Podar, M. *et al.* A genomic analysis of the archaeal system Ignicoccus hospitalis-Nanoarchaeum equitans. *Genome Biology* **9**, R158 (2008).

40.   Tully, B. J., Graham, E. D. & Heidelberg, J. F. The reconstruction of 2,631 draft metagenome-assembled genomes from the global oceans. *Sci Data* **5**, 1–8 (2018).

41.   Parks, D. H. *et al.* Recovery of nearly 8,000 metagenome-assembled genomes substantially expands the tree of life. *Nature Microbiology* 1 (2017) doi:10.1038/s41564-017-0012-7.

42.   Anantharaman, K. *et al.* Thousands of microbial genomes shed light on interconnected biogeochemical processes in an aquifer system. *Nature Communications* **7**, 13219 (2016).

43.   Bergauer, K. *et al.* Organic matter processing by microbial communities throughout the Atlantic water column as revealed by metaproteomics. *PNAS* **115**, E400–E408 (2018).

44.   Sunagawa, S. *et al.* Structure and function of the global ocean microbiome. *Science* **348**, 1261359 (2015).

45.   Haro-Moreno, J. M. *et al.* Fine metagenomic profile of the Mediterranean stratified and mixed water columns revealed by assembly and recruitment. *Microbiome* **6**, 128 (2018).

46.   Bowers, R. M. *et al.* Minimum information about a single amplified genome (MISAG) and a metagenome-assembled genome (MIMAG) of bacteria and archaea. *Nat Biotech* **35**, 725–731 (2017).

47.   Parks, D. H. *et al.* A standardized bacterial taxonomy based on genome phylogeny substantially revises the tree of life. *Nature Biotechnology* (2018) doi:10.1038/nbt.4229.

48.   Darling, A. E. *et al.* PhyloSift: phylogenetic analysis of genomes and metagenomes. *PeerJ* **2**, e243 (2014).

49.   Chaumeil, P.-A., Mussig, A. J., Hugenholtz, P. & Parks, D. H. GTDB-Tk: a toolkit to classify genomes with the Genome Taxonomy Database. *Bioinformatics* (2019) doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz848.

50.   Nguyen, L.-T., Schmidt, H. A., Haeseler, A. von & Minh, B. Q. IQ-TREE: A Fast and Effective Stochastic Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies. *Mol Biol Evol* **32**, 268–274 (2015).

51.   Lartillot, N., Rodrigue, N., Stubbs, D. & Richer, J. PhyloBayes MPI: Phylogenetic reconstruction with infinite mixtures of profiles in a parallel environment. *Syst Biol* **62**, 611–615 (2013).

52.   Wilkinson, M., McInerney, J. O., Hirt, R. P., Foster, P. G. & Embley, T. M. Of clades and clans: terms for phylogenetic relationships in unrooted trees. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **22**, 114–115 (2007).

53.   Foster, P. G. & Hickey, D. A. Compositional bias may affect both DNA-based and protein-based phylogenetic reconstructions. *J Mol Evol* **48**, 284–290 (1999).

54.   Foster, P. G. Modeling compositional heterogeneity. *Syst Biol* **53**, 485–495 (2004).

55.   Sorokin, D. Y. *et al.* Discovery of anaerobic lithoheterotrophic haloarchaea, ubiquitous in hypersaline habitats. *The ISME Journal* **11**, 1245–1260 (2017).

56.   Aouad, M., Borrel, G., Brochier-Armanet, C. & Gribaldo, S. Evolutionary placement of Methanonatronarchaeia. *Nature Microbiology* **4**, 558 (2019).

57.   Minh, B. Q. *et al.* IQ-TREE 2: New models and efficient methods for phylogenetic inference in the genomic era. *Mol Biol Evol* doi:10.1093/molbev/msaa015.

58. Hoang, D. T., Chernomor, O., von Haeseler, A., Minh, B. Q. & Vinh, L. S. UFBoot2: Improving the Ultrafast
Bootstrap Approximation. *Mol Biol Evol* **35**, 518–522 (2018).

59. Guindon, S. *et al.* New Algorithms and Methods to Estimate Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies: Assessing the
Performance of PhyML 3.0. *Syst Biol* **59**, 307–321 (2010).

60. Evguenieva-Hackenberg, E., Hou, L., Glaeser, S. & Klug, G. Structure and function of the archaeal exosome.
Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: RNA **5**, 623–635 (2014).

61. Bocquier, A. A. *et al.* Archaeal primase: bridging the gap between RNA and DNA polymerases. *Current*
Biology **11**, 452–456 (2001).

62. Raymann, K., Forterre, P., Brochier-Armanet, C. & Gribaldo, S. Global phylogenomic analysis disentangles the
complex evolutionary history of DNA replication in Archaea. *Genome Biol Evol* **6**, 192–212 (2014).

63. Oren, A. Pyruvate: a key nutrient in hypersaline environments? *Microorganisms* **3**, 407–416 (2015).

64. Sato, T., Atomi, H. & Imanaka, T. Archaeal type III RuBisCOs function in a pathway for AMP metabolism.
Science **315**, 1003–1006 (2007).

65. Aono, R., Sato, T., Imanaka, T. & Atomi, H. A pentose bisphosphate pathway for nucleoside degradation in
Archaea. *Nature Chemical Biology* **11**, 355–360 (2015).

66. Wrighton, K. C. *et al.* RubisCO of a nucleoside pathway known from Archaea is found in diverse uncultivated
phyla in bacteria. *ISME J* **10**, 2702–2714 (2016).

67. Jaffe, A. L., Castelle, C. J., Dupont, C. L. & Banfield, J. F. Lateral gene transfer shapes the distribution of
RuBisCO among Candidate Phyla Radiation bacteria and DPANN archaea. *Mol Biol Evol* **36**, 435–446 (2019).

68. Mulcahy, H., Charron-Mazenod, L. & Lewenza, S. Pseudomonas aeruginosa produces an extracellular
deoxyribonuclease that is required for utilization of DNA as a nutrient source. *Environmental Microbiology*
12, 1621–1629 (2010).

69. Chimileski, S., Dolas, K., Naor, A., Gophna, U. & Papke, R. T. Extracellular DNA metabolism in Haloferax
volcanii. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **5**, (2014).

70. Say, R. F. & Fuchs, G. Fructose 1,6-bisphosphate aldolase/phosphatase may be an ancestral gluconeogenic
enzyme. *Nature* **464**, 1077–1081 (2010).

71. Villanueva, L., Schouten, S. & Damsté, J. S. S. Phylogenomic analysis of lipid biosynthetic genes of Archaea
shed light on the 'lipid divide'. *Environ Microbiol* **19**, 54–69 (2017).

72. Waters, E. *et al.* The genome of Nanoarchaeum equitans: Insights into early archaeal evolution and derived
parasitism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **100**, 12984–12988 (2003).

73. Jahn, U., Summons, R., Sturt, H., Grosjean, E. & Huber, H. Composition of the lipids of Nanoarchaeum
equitans and their origin from its host Ignicoccus sp. strain KIN4/I. *Arch Microbiol* **182**, 404–413 (2004).

74. Chen, L.-X. *et al.* Metabolic versatility of small archaea Micrarchaeota and Parvarchaeota. *The ISME Journal*
12, 756–775 (2018).

75.   Probst, A. J. & Moissl-Eichinger, C. "Altiarchaeales": Uncultivated Archaea from the Subsurface. *Life (Basel)* **5**,
1381–1395 (2015).

76.   Youssef, N. H. *et al.* Insights into the metabolism, lifestyle and putative evolutionary history of the novel
archaeal phylum 'Diapherotrites'''. *ISME J* **9**, 447–460 (2015).

77.   Moissl, C., Rudolph, C. & Huber, R. Natural communities of novel Archaea and Bacteria with a string-of-
pearls-like morphology: Molecular analysis of the Bacterial partners. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **68**, 933–937
(2002).

78.   Moissl, C., Rudolph, C., Rachel, R., Koch, M. & Huber, R. In situ growth of the novel SM1 euryarchaeon from a
string-of-pearls-like microbial community in its cold biotope, its physical separation and insights into its
structure and physiology. *Arch Microbiol* **180**, 211–217 (2003).

79.   Quinn, T. P., Richardson, M. F., Lovell, D. & Crowley, T. M. propr: An R-package for identifying proportionally
abundant features using compositional data analysis. *Scientific Reports* **7**, 1–9 (2017).

80.   Hamann, E. *et al.* Syntrophic linkage between predatory Carpediemonas and specific prokaryotic
populations. *ISME J* **11**, 1205–1217 (2017).

81.   Narasingarao, P. *et al.* De novo metagenomic assembly reveals abundant novel major lineage of Archaea in
hypersaline microbial communities. *ISME J* **6**, 81–93 (2012).

82.   Williams, T. A. & Embley, T. M. Archaeal "Dark Matter" and the origin of Eukaryotes. *Genome Biol Evol* **6**,
474–481 (2014).

83.   Li, D., Liu, C.-M., Luo, R., Sadakane, K. & Lam, T.-W. MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-node solution for large and
complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 1674–1676 (2015).

84.   Li, H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. (2013).

85.   Kang, D. D., Froula, J., Egan, R. & Wang, Z. MetaBAT, an efficient tool for accurately reconstructing single
genomes from complex microbial communities. *PeerJ* **3**, e1165 (2015).

86.   Parks, D. H., Imelfort, M., Skennerton, C. T., Hugenholtz, P. & Tyson, G. W. CheckM: assessing the quality of
microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and metagenomes. *Genome Research* **25**, 1043–
1055 (2015).

87.   Buchfink, B., Xie, C. & Huson, D. H. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND. *Nature Methods*
12, 59–60 (2015).

88.   Katoh, K., Misawa, K., Kuma, K. & Miyata, T. MAFFT: a novel method for rapid multiple sequence alignment
based on fast Fourier transform. *Nucl. Acids Res.* **30**, 3059–3066 (2002).

89.   Criscuolo, A. & Gribaldo, S. BMGE (Block Mapping and Gathering with Entropy): a new software for selection
of phylogenetic informative regions from multiple sequence alignments. *BMC Evol Biol* **10**, 210 (2010).

90.   St. John, E. *et al.* A New Symbiotic Nanoarchaeote (Candidatus Nanoclepta minutus) and its Host
(Zestosphaera tikiterensis gen. nov., sp. nov.) from a New Zealand Hot Spring. *Systematic and Applied*
Microbiology (2018) doi:10.1016/j.syapm.2018.08.005.

91.   Prokofeva, M. I. *et al.* Isolation of the anaerobic thermoacidophilic crenarchaeote Acidilobus saccharovorans

1019   sp. nov. and proposal of Acidilobales ord. nov., including Acidilobaceae fam. nov. and Caldisphaeraceae fam.

1020   nov. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology,* **59**, 3116–3122 (2009).

1021   92.   Altenhoff, A. M. *et al.* OMA standalone: orthology inference among public and custom genomes and

1022   transcriptomes. *Genome Res.* (2019) doi:10.1101/gr.243212.118.

1023   93.   Eddy, S. R. A new generation of homology search tools based on probabilistic inference. in *Genome*

1024   *Informatics 2009* 205–211 (PUBLISHED BY IMPERIAL COLLEGE PRESS AND DISTRIBUTED BY WORLD

1025   SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING CO., 2009). doi:10.1142/9781848165632_0019.

1026   94.   Susko, E. & Roger, A. J. On reduced amino acid alphabets for phylogenetic inference. *Mol Biol Evol* **24**, 2139–

1027   2150 (2007).

1028   95.   Kostka, M., Uzlikova, M., Cepicka, I. & Flegr, J. SlowFaster, a user-friendly program for slow-fast analysis and

1029   its application on phylogeny of Blastocystis. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9**, 341 (2008).

1030   96.   Finn, R. D., Clements, J. & Eddy, S. R. HMMER web server: interactive sequence similarity searching. *Nucleic*

1031   *Acids Res* **39**, W29–W37 (2011).

1032   97.   Price, M. N., Dehal, P. S. & Arkin, A. P. FastTree 2 – Approximately Maximum-Likelihood Trees for Large

1033   Alignments. *PLOS ONE* **5**, e9490 (2010).

1034   98.   Tria, F. D. K., Landan, G. & Dagan, T. Phylogenetic rooting using minimal ancestor deviation. *Nature Ecology*

1035   *& Evolution* **1**, 1–7 (2017).

1036   99.   Brown, C. T. *et al.* Unusual biology across a group comprising more than 15% of domain Bacteria. *Nature*

1037   **523**, 208–211 (2015).

1038   100.   Philippe, H., Zhou, Y., Brinkmann, H., Rodrigue, N. & Delsuc, F. Heterotachy and long-branch attraction in

1039   phylogenetics. *BMC Evol Biol* **5**, 50 (2005).

1040   101.   Brochier, C. & Philippe, H. A non-hyperthermophilic ancestor for Bacteria. *Nature* **417**, 244–244 (2002).

1041   102.   Makarova, K. S., Wolf, Y. I. & Koonin, E. V. Archaeal Clusters of Orthologous Genes (arCOGs): An update and

1042   application for analysis of shared features between Thermococcales, Methanococcales, and

1043   Methanobacteriales. *Life* **5**, 818–840 (2015).

1044   103.   Seemann, T. barrnap 0.9 : rapid ribosomal RNA prediction. *https://github.com/tseemann/barrnap*.

1045   104.   Quinlan, A. R. & Hall, I. M. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features.

1046   *Bioinformatics* **26**, 841–842 (2010).

1047   105.   Capella-Gutiérrez, S., Silla-Martínez, J. M. & Gabaldón, T. trimAl: a tool for automated alignment trimming in

1048   large-scale phylogenetic analyses. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1972–1973 (2009).

1049   106.   Tareen, A. & Kinney, J. B. Logomaker: beautiful sequence logos in Python. *Bioinformatics* (2019)

1050   doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz921.

1051   107.   Seemann, T. Prokka: rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2068–2069 (2014).

1052 108. Aramaki, T. *et al.* KofamKOALA: KEGG ortholog assignment based on profile HMM and adaptive score

1053    threshold. *bioRxiv* 602110 (2019) doi:10.1101/602110.

1054 109. Bateman, A. *et al.* The Pfam protein families database. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**, D138–D141 (2004).

1055 110. Haft, D. H., Selengut, J. D. & White, O. The TIGRFAMs database of protein families. *Nucleic Acids Res* **31**, 371–

1056    373 (2003).

1057 111. Cantarel, B. L. *et al.* The Carbohydrate-Active EnZymes database (CAZy): an expert resource for

1058    Glycogenomics. *Nucl. Acids Res.* **37**, D233–D238 (2009).

1059 112. Rawlings, N. D., Barrett, A. J. & Finn, R. Twenty years of the MEROPS database of proteolytic enzymes, their

1060    substrates and inhibitors. *Nucl. Acids Res.* **44**, D343–D350 (2016).

1061 113. Saier, M. H., Tran, C. V. & Barabote, R. D. TCDB: the Transporter Classification Database for membrane

1062    transport protein analyses and information. *Nucleic Acids Res* **34**, D181–D186 (2006).

1063 114. Søndergaard, D., Pedersen, C. N. S. & Greening, C. HydDB: A web tool for hydrogenase classification and

1064    analysis. *Scientific Reports* **6**, 34212 (2016).

1065 115. Jones, P. *et al.* InterProScan 5: genome-scale protein function classification. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1236–1240

1066    (2014).

1067 116. Altschul, S. F. *et al.* Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search programs.

1068    *Nucl. Acids Res.* **25**, 3389–3402 (1997).

1069 117. Lowe, T. M. & Eddy, S. R. tRNAscan-SE: a program for improved detection of transfer RNA genes in genomic

1070    sequence. *Nucleic Acids Res* **25**, 955–964 (1997).

1071 118. Steinegger, M. *et al.* HH-suite3 for fast remote homology detection and deep protein annotation. *BMC*

1072    *Bioinformatics* **20**, 473 (2019).

1073 119. Kelley, L. A., Mezulis, S., Yates, C. M., Wass, M. N. & Sternberg, M. J. E. The Phyre2 web portal for protein

1074    modeling, prediction and analysis. *Nat Protoc* **10**, 845–858 (2015).

1075 120. Parks, D. *A toolbox for comparative genomics. Contribute to dparks1134/CompareM development by*

1076    *creating an account on GitHub*. (2019).

1077 121. Bray, N. L., Pimentel, H., Melsted, P. & Pachter, L. Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq quantification. *Nature*

1078    *Biotechnology* **34**, 525–527 (2016).

1079

1080

Table 1

BinID	Order	Habitat	Length (MB)	GC (%)	Contig (bp)	nr. of contigs	nr. of proteins	16S	23S	5S	tRNA count	Nr. of markers	0	1	2	3	4	5+	Completeness (%)	Contamination (%)	Heterogeneity (%)
			General Stats									**CheckM statistics**									
SRR2090153.bin1042	Naiadarchaeales	Aquifer	0.72	37.7	12,286	144	809				15	149 (142)	61 (54)	87	1	0	0	0	65.0 (69.1)	0.93 (1.0)	0
SRR2090153.bin461	Naiadarchaeales	Aquifer	0.68	43.0	11,937	152	787				17	149 (142)	76 (69)	69	4	0	0	0	55.0 (58.6)	3.7 (3.92)	50
SRR2090159.bin1129*	**Naiadarchaeales**	**Aquifer**	**0.98**	**37.9**	**97,397**	**52**	**1081**		**1**	**1**	**21**	**149 (142)**	**11 (4)**	**135**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**90.7 (96.0)**	**2.8 (2.9)**	**0**
SRR2090159.bin1288	Naiadarchaeales	Aquifer	0.70	43.0	19,705	102	821				17	150 (142)	63 (56)	82	4	0	0	0	65.1 (69.3)	3.7 (3.9)	75
GCA_002502135.1	Undinarchaeales	Marine	0.73	39.5	74,625	23	819	1	1	1	19	151 (142)	23 (16)	126	0	0	0	0	79.9 (84.3)	0 (0)	0
GCA_002494525.1	Undinarchaeales	Marine	0.64	40.7	145,584	11	706		1	1	21	152 (142)	12 (5)	137	0	0	0	0	89.7 (95.1)	0 (0)	0
GCA_002495465.1	Undinarchaeales	Marine	0.61	41.4	75,044	19	696		1	1	19	153 (142)	21 (14)	128	0	0	0	0	82.6 (87.6)	0 (0)	0
GCA_002501985.1	Undinarchaeales	Marine	0.61	40.8	118,101	22	678			1	21	154 (142)	14 (7)	135	0	0	0	0	87.9 (93.1)	0 (0)	0
GCA_002687935.1	Undinarchaeales	Marine	0.67	41.6	173,317	11	752	1	1	1	21	155 (142)	12 (5)	135	2	0	0	0	89.7 (95.1)	1.9 (2.0)	100
SRR4028224.bin17*	**Undinarchaeales**	**Marine**	**0.62**	**42.3**	**114,673**	**19**	**700**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**21**	**156 (142)**	**12 (5)**	**137**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**89.7 (95.1)**	**0 (0)**	**0**
SRR5007147.bin71	Undinarchaeales	Marine	0.62	42.0	54,083	39	705			1	21	157 (142)	17 (10)	132	0	0	0	0	87.2 (92.5)	0 (0)	0
U_76725	Undinarchaeales	Marine	0.37	40.2	12,036	80	416				13	158 (142)	76 (69)	72	1	0	0	0	54.4 (58.1)	0.93 (1.0)	100

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Phylogenetic relationships of undinarchaeal core proteins across archaeal clades of interest