Niche Partitioning Between Coastal and Offshore Shelf Waters Results in Differential Expression of Alkane and PAH Catabolic Pathways

Shawn M. Doyle[a#]**, Genmei Lin**[b]**, Maya Morales-McDevitt**[c]**, Terry L. Wade**[a,d]**, Antonietta Quigg**[a,e]**, and Jason B. Sylvan**[a#]

[a]Department of Oceanography, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA.
[b]School of Marine Sciences, Sun Yet-Sen University, Zhuhai, China.
[c]Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, RI, USA.
[d]Geochemical and Environmental Research Group, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA
[e]Department of Marine Biology, Texas A&M University at Galveston, Galveston, TX, USA.

Running title: **Niche partitioning of oil degrading bacterial ecotypes**

Abstract word count: 232 for abstract, 120 for importance
Main text word count: 4998

[#]Corresponding authors:
Shawn M. Doyle
Jason B, Sylvan
Department of Oceanography
Texas A&M University
Eller O&M Bldg, Rm 716
College Station, TX, 77843-3146
Tel: 979-845-5105
E-mail: shawndoyle@tamu.edu
        jasonsylvan@tamu.ediu

ABSTRACT

Marine oil spills can impact both coastal and offshore marine environments, but little information is available on how the microbial response to oil and dispersants might differ between these biomes. Here we describe the compositional and functional response of microbial communities to different concentrations of oil and chemically dispersed oil in coastal and offshore surface waters from the Texas-Louisiana continental shelf. Using a combination of analytical chemistry, 16S rRNA amplicon, and metatranscriptomic sequencing, we provide a broad, comparative overview of the specific functional and ecological response of hydrocarbon degrading bacteria in marine surface waters over time between two oceanic biomes. We found evidence for the existence of different ecotypes of several commonly described hydrocarbon degrading bacterial taxa which behaved differentially in coastal and offshore shelf waters despite being exposed to similar concentrations of oil, dispersants, and nutrients. This resulted in the differential expression of catabolic pathways for n-alkanes and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)—the two major categories of compounds found in crude oil—with preferential expression of n-alkane degradation genes in coastal waters while offshore microbial communities trended more towards the expression of PAH degradation genes. This was unexpected as it contrasts with the generally held view that n-alkanes, being more labile, are attacked before the more refractory PAHs. Collectively, our results provide new insights into the existence and potential consequences of niche partitioning of hydrocarbon degrading taxa between neighboring marine environments.

IMPORTANCE

In the wake of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, the taxonomic response of marine microbial communities to oil and dispersants has been extensively studied. However, relatively few studies on the functional response of these microbial communities have been reported, especially in a longitudinal fashion. Moreover, despite the fact that marine oil spills typically impact thousands of square kilometers of both coastal and offshore marine environments, little information is available on how the microbial response to oil and dispersants might differ between these biomes. The results of this study help fill this critical knowledge gap and provide valuable insight into how oil spill response efforts, such as chemically dispersing oil, may have differing effects in neighboring coastal and offshore marine environments.

INTRODUCTION

Crude oils are complex mixtures of thousands of different compounds, ranging from saturated alkanes and aromatic hydrocarbons to complex, heteroatom-containing resins and asphaltenes (1). While some of these compounds are recalcitrant to degradation, many can be utilized as a carbon or energy source by microorganisms (2). Microbial biodegradation is one of the primary means by which both natural and anthropogenic oil releases are bioremediated in nature. However, many crude oil hydrocarbons are poorly soluble, which lowers their availability to microorganisms and limits biodegradation rates. As such, chemical dispersants have been used after marine oil spills to disperse oil into the water column with the aim of dramatically increasing the surface area for microbial attack (3). Despite this, studies have reported conflicting results on whether chemical dispersants improve or suppress oil biodegradation rates by microbes (4–8).

The Deepwater Horizon (DwH) oil spill involved the release of ~780,000 m^3 crude oil into the Gulf of Mexico after which 7000 m^3 chemical dispersants were used during the spill response effort (9, 10). The magnitude of the spill led to a surge of research into the microbial ecology of marine oil spills and dispersant usage both in deep-sea habitats (11–15) and shoreline environments such as beaches (16–19) and salt marshes (20, 21). However, much less information is available on the responses of microbial communities in surface waters on the continental shelf (22). These areas in the Gulf of Mexico range from river-dominated, nutrient rich waters along the coasts to near oligotrophic waters on the continental shelf edge. Oil spills can affect many thousands of square kilometers of both open ocean and coastal habitats, and the microbial communities which inhabit these respective marine biomes can differ substantially in composition, structure, and metabolic

potential (23, 24). As a result, natural biodegradation of oil spills likely varies considerably

across different shelf water regimes. Understanding how microbial communities inhabiting

these different ocean biomes respond to oil and dispersants consequently represents an

important research need.

To better define the ecological and functional response of marine microorganisms to

oil, we conducted mesocosm experiments using coastal seawater collected from the

continental shelf (herein referred to as Coastal) and offshore waters on the edge of the

shelf (herein referred to as Offshore) of the northwestern Gulf of Mexico (Figure S1, Table

S1) and amended them with oil or chemically dispersed oil. The responses of the microbial

communities were subsequently followed over time using cell counts, 16S rRNA amplicon

and metatranscriptomic sequencing. This analysis allowed us to identify which groups of

bacteria responded to oil with and without dispersant and also characterize the functional

response of hydrocarbon-degrading microbes within the communities. Our results

revealed that ecotype differences between coastal and offshore communities resulted in

differential expression of alkane and PAH catabolic pathways between these oceanic

biomes and that the response to dispersants was variable by location.

RESULTS

Hydrocarbon Chemistry

We tracked total alkane and PAH concentrations over time using a combination of

GC/FID and GC/MS, respectively (Figure 1, Table S2). In the Control treatments of both

experiments, these concentrations were <5 µg L^{-1} for both classes of compounds with one

exception: the seawater used in the Coastal experiment naturally contained a low

concentration, roughly 20 µg L^{-1}, of n-alkanes. In the WAF treatments of both experiments,

alkane concentrations were also very low and did not differ substantially from those

observed in the Controls while initial PAH concentrations were elevated to ~50 µg L^{-1}. In

the DCEWAF and CEWAF treatments, chemically dispersing the oil increased initial alkane

concentrations to ~325 µg L^{-1} and ~3000 µg L^{-1}, respectively. Initial PAH concentrations

within these two dispersed oil treatments were also increased, but more modestly, to ~100

µg L^{-1} and ~400 µg L^{-1}, respectively.

Microbial cell abundance

Average cell abundances (Figure S2) were typical for seawater, ~10^6 cells mL^{-1} (25,

26). The average abundance in the Coastal experiment (2.4±0.7 ×10^6 cells mL^{-1}) was

twofold that in the Offshore experiment (1.3±0.5 ×10^6 cells mL^{-1}). Between treatments, cell

abundances were ~1.7-fold higher in the Coastal CEWAF treatment [$F(3,20)=11.5$,

$p<0.001$] than in the Control, WAF, and DCEWAF treatments, where cell abundances were

similar [$F(2,18)=1.22$, $p=0.32$]. In the Offshore experiment, cell abundances were instead

slightly lower (1.6-fold) in the Control treatment [$F(3,32)=3.03$, $p=0.04$], while those in the

WAF, DCEWAF, and CEWAF remained similar [$F(2,24)=0.78$, $p=0.47$]. Though the overall

effect was relatively small, we did observe slight increases in cell abundance over time in

both experiments within the two treatments containing the most oil (i.e. DCEWAF and

CEWAF) while those in the Control and WAF began to decrease towards the end of each

experiment.

Microbial community composition

We profiled the composition and structure of the microbial communities using 16S

rRNA amplicon sequencing (Figure 2). NMDS ordination of Bray-Curtis dissimilarities (BC-

D) revealed that in the Offshore experiment, samples formed four distinct clusters

organized sequentially by the four treatments (Figure S3A and S3E). Relative to the Control

treatments, communities exposed to WAF were the most similar (BC-D: 0.30 ± 0.09; avg ±

SD), followed by DCEWAF (0.47 ± 0.13), and finally CEWAF (0.59 ± 0.14). A similar pattern

was observed in the Coastal experiment. Communities exposed to CEWAF were the most

distinct from the Controls (0.82 ± 0.10), followed by the DCEWAF (0.58 ± 0.14) and WAF

(0.39 ± 0.09), respectively.

In total, we detected 2880 ASVs across both experiments. Compositionally,

Gammaproteobacteria was the most abundant group observed, constituting an average of

77.4% and 67.0% of the overall communities within the Offshore and Coastal experiments,

respectively (Figure 2, Figure S4). Within this class, dominant taxa included

Alteromonadales (*Alteromonas*, *Marinobacter*, and *Aestuariibacter*), *Thiotrichales*

(*Methylophaga* and *Cycloclasticus*), *Oceanospirillales* (*Alcanivorax*, *Oleibacter*, and

Thalassolituus), and *Xanthomonadales* (*Polycyclovorans*) (Figure S5).

Identification of oil-enriched ecotypes

ASVs from the same genus often varied in how they responded to oil or dispersed oil

(Table S5). These differences occurred both between treatments and between the two

experiments. In order to more accurately define potential ecotype responses, we used

redundancy analysis (RDA) modeling to narrow our dataset and identify only those ASVs

which were directly enriched by oil within the WAF, DCEWAF, and CEWAF treatments. In

each model, variables for both time and initial oil concentration contributed significantly

($p<0.001$) to the RDA models (Figure S3, B-D and F-H). Using scalar projections of ASVs

onto the *Oil* vector in each model, we identified 30 oil-enriched ASVs between the two

experiments, 8 of which were identified in both the offshore and coastal shelf water

mesocosms (Figure 3).

The response of many oil-enriched ASVs to each treatment was notably different

between the two experiments. For example, we found three *Alcanivorax*-related ASVs were

enriched by oil in the Coastal experiment, but in the Offshore experiment these were either

very rare (e.g. ASV33 and ASV36) or were not significantly more abundant in the oil

amended treatments versus the Control (ASV16). Likewise, ASV8 (*Polycyclovorans*)—an

obligate hydrocarbon degrading taxa which inhabits the phycosphere of marine diatoms

and dinoflagellates (27)—was present in both experiments, but was enriched by oil in only

the Offshore experiment. We also found several ASVs belonging to the same genera which

exhibited differential responses to oil between the two experiments. For example, ASV2

(*Marinobacter*) was highly abundant in the Coastal treatments (11.9%; average relative

abundance), but was comparatively sparse Offshore (0.3%). Meanwhile, another

Marinobacter-related ASV (ASV19), was abundant in the Offshore WAF, DCEWAF, and

CEWAF treatments, but was restricted to only the WAF treatment in the Coastal

experiment. Lastly, ASV11 (*Cycloclasticus*) increased in relative abundance over time in all

three oil-amended Offshore treatments, but was unexpectedly nearly absent in the Coastal

CEWAF.

Identification of hydrocarbon degradation gene transcripts

We parsed the metatranscriptome datasets to identify and quantify the expression

of hydrocarbon degradation gene transcripts within the mesocosms. A GHOSTX query of

the KEGG database identified 6195 transcripts affiliated with hydrocarbon degradation

genes. An additional 163 transcripts were identified as alkane hydroxylating P450 genes

from the CYP153 family through a custom BLASTP search. We compared the abundance of

these hydrocarbon degradation gene transcripts between each oil-amended treatment and

its respective control treatment and used an outlier analysis to estimate the number of

upregulated genes at each time point (Figures S6 and S7). Within both experiments, this

number was generally higher in the DCEWAF and CEWAF treatments versus the WAF

treatments. We also observed that the number of upregulated genes increased overtime in

dispersant-amended treatments, but decreased overtime in WAF.

We next sought to test if the amount of upregulation among these upregulated

hydrocarbon degradation genes was affected by treatment. Highly expressed hydrocarbon

degradation gene transcripts were on average 10.4-fold more abundant in the oil-amended

treatments than in the Controls. However, using a factorial ANOVA test with pairwise

comparisons of the oil-amended treatments, we found only minor significant differences

between treatments (0.1 to 1.2-fold). In other words, the expression of upregulated

hydrocarbon degradation genes was higher in the WAF, DCEWAF, and CEWAF treatments

over the Controls, but by about the same amount per oil-amended treatment (Figure S8).

This indicates that the expression of hydrocarbon degradation genes was primarily

structured by microbial community turnover—which we observed in our 16S rRNA

amplicon dataset—rather than changes gene expression among community members.

Coastal versus offshore expression of n-alkane and PAH degradation pathways

To compare differences in the expression of hydrocarbon catabolic pathways in our

experiments, we consolidated the identified gene transcripts into four metabolic

categories: [1] n-alkane activation, [2] beta-oxidation of fatty acids, [3] ring-

hydroxylating/cleaving dioxygenases, and [4] PAH degradation (Figure 4). Alkane

degradation begins with terminal oxidation of the substrate to a primary alcohol with a

hydroxylase or monoxygenase enzyme (e.g. AlkB). The resulting alcohol is further oxidized

to a fatty acid by alcohol and aldehyde dehydrogenases before entering the beta oxidation

pathway (28). Likewise, PAH degradation typically begins with ring hydroxylation and

subsequent cleavage with dioxygenase enzymes (29), the products of which are then

channeled through various complex, multi-step catabolic pathways (30). Hence, these four

categories together represent the activation [1+3] and subsequent degradation [2+4]

pathways for saturated hydrocarbons (i.e. linear and cyclo- alkanes) and PAHs,

respectively, to central metabolism intermediates.

Alkane activation gene transcripts were observed primarily in the DCEWAF and

CEWAF treatments of the Coastal experiment where they were produced almost entirely by

Marinobacter and *Alcanivorax* (Figure 4). In comparison, expression of alkane degradation

genes in the Coastal WAF and Control treatments was very low (~28 TPM; transcripts per

million transcripts). This was consistent with the very low total alkane concentrations we

measured in these two treatments (< 14 ug/L; Figure 1). In the Offshore experiment,

expression of genes involved with alkane activation was instead comparatively low across

all four treatments.

Expression of fatty acid beta-oxidation genes was the highest of the four metabolic

categories, reflecting the nearly universal taxonomic distribution of this pathway [69]. In

the Coastal experiment, highest expression levels were again observed in the DCEWAF and

CEWAF with comparatively lower expression levels in the WAF and Control treatments.

Similar to the alkane activation genes, fatty acid beta-oxidation genes in the Coastal

experiment were expressed in large part by *Marinobacter* and *Alcanivorax* (Figure 4).

However, significant expression of *Alteromonas*, *Aestuariibacter*, *Oleibacter*, and

Pseudomonas-assigned transcripts were observed in this category as well. In the Offshore

experiment, abundant transcripts were detected from *Alteromonas* in all four treatments,

while those from *Marinobacter, Aestuaribacter* and *Alcanivorax* were mainly observed in

DCEWAF and CEWAF.

In contrast to the alkane degradation categories, overall expression for ring

cleavage/hydroxylation dioxygenase and PAH degradation genes was significantly higher

in the Offshore experiment (Figure 5). *Cycloclasticus*, a genus of obligate PAH degraders

(31), were the primary source of detected ring cleavage/hydroxylation dioxygenase gene

transcripts (~27% of all transcripts in these two categories) across both experiments.

These *Cycloclasticus*-derived dioxygenase gene transcripts were observed in every sample

except the Controls and the Coastal CEWAF. This pattern was also observed in our 16S

rRNA amplicon dataset wherein the relative abundance patterns of ASV11 (*Cycloclasticus*)

was substantially lower in the Coastal CEWAF treatments (Figure 3). Other taxa to which a

significant portion of dioxygenase and PAH degradation gene transcripts were assigned to

were *Halomonas*, *Halioxenophilus*, unclassified *Gammaproteobacteria*, and unclassified

Bacteria (Figure 4).

In both experiments, there was a general decrease with increasing oil

concentrations in the alpha diversity of expressed genes involved in alkane degradation

(CEWAF > DCEWAF > WAF > Control) (Figure 6). However, this effect disappeared in the

categories for PAH degradation, where instead a large drop in alpha diversity occurred for

all treatments with added oil, but the difference between the three oil-amended treatments

was minimal.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we found initial oil concentration strongly structured the microbial communities. Many of the identified bacteria belong to hydrocarbon degrading taxa which are known to bloom in seawater during oil spills or near natural oil seeps (2, 32, 33). However, we also found evidence that many of these taxa were composed of ecotypes which responded remarkably different to oil and dispersants in coastal and offshore shelf waters. These differences were reflected in the expression of hydrocarbon degrading genes, resulting in unexpected differences in alkane and PAH degradation pathways between the two oceanographic zones. Interestingly, patterns in the diversity of expressed hydrocarbon genes did not vary substantially between environments, indicating that some aspects of the response of microbial communities in marine surface waters to oil or chemically dispersed oil exposure may be common between locales. Overall, these findings highlight that natural remediation processes such as microbial biodegradation are not uniform across different ocean biomes and reinforce the need for a better understanding of the spatial and temporal variances in natural oil remediation processes.

Ecotype Dynamics

Following the distinct clustering we observed in the NMDS ordinations, many of the oil-enriched taxa (e.g. *Marinobacter*, *Alteromonas*, *Alacnivorax*, and *Polycyclovorans*) appeared to bloom in response to increasing oil concentrations, while others (e.g. *Methylophaga*) appeared to primarily be either inhibited or outcompeted by organisms increasing in relative abundance. *Alteromonas* and *Aestuaribacter* were identified as oil-enriched in our 16S rRNA dataset (Figure 3) and have been repeatedly identified in laboratory and field based 16S rRNA surveys of marine oil spills (2, 34–37). In our

metatranscriptomes, these two taxa were almost exclusively responsible for expression of

fatty acid oxidation genes. This suggests that these two taxa were primarily secondary

alkane degraders relying on other community members to activate alkanes (38).

Halomonas were detected in the CEWAF treatments, but were not abundant elsewhere. It

was not one of the ASVs enriched by oil, and is not known for PAH degradation, so it may

also have responded to secondary metabolites in the CEWAF treatments.

Halioxenophilus are known to degrade xylene (39), but this newly discovered genus

has not been reported to degrade PAHs in an environmental context previously. In our

study, PAH degradation gene transcripts assigned to *Halioxenophilius* indeed belonged to

the xylene degradation pathway (Figure 5) and were detected in equal abundance in both

the Coastal and Offshore experiments. However, the total abundance of this pathway was

substantially lower than the benzoate degradation pathway, indicating this genus likely

catalyzes a secondary "shunt" for PAH degradation intermediates.

Differential Expression of Alkane and PAH Catabolic Pathways

Several factors are at play when considering the ecological dynamics of alkane and

PAH degrading microorganisms in marine environments. First is the relative metabolic

complexity of these two processes. The catabolic pathway for alkane degradation is

comparatively simple: the activation of an alkane to a fatty alcohol is a single step process

through the action of an alkane hydroxylase (40). Once an alkane is activated, the

subsequent fatty alcohol quickly feeds through a couple intermediates into the beta-

oxidation pathway to produce several acetyl-CoA molecules, a central TCA cycle

intermediate. In contrast, PAH degradation involves a complex series of multi-enzyme ring

hydroxylation and ring cleavage steps (30). Considering the energetic costs with

synthesizing these enzymes, there is likely a fitness cost associated with biodegrading

PAHs, especially those of high-molecular weight, compared to biodegrading alkanes. This is

consistent with patterns of crude oil weathering typically observed in the environment,

where the alkane fraction of crude oil typically disappears faster than the PAH fraction

(41–44).

One of the most striking results from our metatranscriptomic datasets was the

difference in the expression of alkane and PAH catabolic pathways between the Coastal and

Offshore experiments. In particular, the substantially lower expression of alkane activation

genes concurrently with increased expression of PAH degradation genes in the Offshore

experiment (Figure 5) was unexpected as it contrasts with the above notion that n-alkanes

are more labile and are attacked before the more refractory PAHs. This is not due to a lack

of alkane degrading taxa—known alkane degrading species such as *Marinobacter* (45),

Thalassolituus (46), and *Oleibacter* (47) were present in both experiments (Figure 3).

Laboratory studies have estimated that the input of phytoplankton-derived alkane

production into marine surface waters is ~100-fold greater than the combined inputs from

oil spills and natural oil seeps (48) and can sustain populations of alkane-degrading

bacteria which rapidly expand upon exposure to crude oil (49, 50). Thus, the differences in

alkane activation transcripts we observed between the two experiments may be due to a

priming effect from the larger abundances of phytoplankton typically observed in Gulf of

Mexico coastal shelf waters. Three lines of evidence in our data support this hypothesis: [1]

ASVs classified as Cyanobacteria and/or Chloroplasts were substantially more abundant in

our Coastal mesocosms than our Offshore mesocosms (Figure 2), [2] transcripts for

aldehyde-deformylating oxygenase—the key enzyme in cyanobacterial alkane biosynthesis

(51, 52)—were exclusively observed in our coastal metatranscriptomes, and [3] the

concentration of naturally present alkanes (i.e. in the Controls) was approximately 10-fold

higher in our coastal seawater samples than those collected offshore (Figure 1, Table S2).

345   With regards to the expression of PAH degradation pathways in our

metatranscriptomes, a major difference between the Coastal and Offshore experiment

appeared to be due to a differential response of *Cycloclasticus* ecotypes. Our data initially

appears to suggest that members of this genus are sensitive to highly concentrated

(~50ppm) CEWAF preparations. We have seen this before in a previous mesocosm

experiment we conducted with near-shore seawater: *Cyloclasticus*-related OTUs were

nearly completely absent in CEWAF treatments, but thrived in WAF and DCEWAF (34).

However, in the current study, this sensitivity enigmatically did not occur in the Offshore

experiment at all. In fact, in our metatranscriptomes, the Offshore CEWAF treatment

contained the largest abundance of *Cycloclasticus* affiliated dioxygenase and PAH

degradation gene transcripts. Furthermore, in our 16S rRNA datasets, *Cycloclasticus* related

ASVs were absent in the Coastal CEWAF but bloomed from 0.05% to 10.3% relative

abundance in the Offshore CEWAF (Figure 3). Although there is evidence that some

Cycloclasticus species are sensitive to high concentrations of inorganic nutrients (53) or

differences in temperature (54), this does not provide a valid explanation for our findings

as we amended all mesocosms with f/20 media and both experiments were performed at

the same temperature. Taken together, these new findings indicate that a strong selective

pressure against *Cycloclasticus* sp. occurred in coastal seawater at high concentrations of

chemically dispersed oil, but this negative selection was not solely due to nutrient

concentrations, the presence of chemical dispersants, or high concentrations of oil. Further

research will be needed to elucidate the cause of this apparent niche partitioning by

Cycloclasticus ecotypes. Possibilities include variable physiological responses to oil

exposure under different environmental regimes, or ecological competition with other

microorganisms.

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we showed that prokaryotic communities can respond in different

ways to oil spills depending on the location of the spill, which is tightly tied to the starting

initial community. In our experimental design, season, oil, dispersant, and inorganic

nutrients were controlled for between the two experiments. Only community composition

and potentially chemical characteristics not measured here were different, indicating that

these were responsible for the different responses observed. This is important because oil

spills can and do spread out over multiple marine realms (e.g. 2010 Deepwater Horizon,

1979 Ixtoc-1, Gulf War, and 1978 Amoco Cadiz oil spills). The response of microbial

communities within those realms may vary and this should weigh into management and

mitigation decisions during and after an oil spill. As was shown here, even within the same

genus, different ecotypes may respond differently to oil and/or dispersant. Gene

expression can vary on the community level between different environments facing the

same spill. Previous work has shown that niche partitioning may be important to

compositional responses to oil spills (7, 34), but this work is the among the first to show

that gene expression is also impacted. We conclude that niche partitioning and ecotype

dynamics play a critically important role in how marine environments response to past and

future oil spills.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Mesocosm Experiments and Sampling

Surface seawater (1m) for the Coastal and Offshore mesocosm experiments were collected at 29°38' N, 93°50' W, on July 16th, 2016 and at 29°53' N, 94°20' W, on July 9th, 2016, respectively (Figure S1, Table S1). The seawater was transferred to a holding tank in the Texas A&M University at Galveston Sea Life Facility, covered, and stored at room temperature overnight prior to experiment initiation. Four treatments were prepared in triplicate as described previously in Doyle et al. (34): [1] "Control", containing only seawater, [2] "WAF", containing seawater and oil supplied as a water-accommodated fraction, [3] "CEWAF", containing seawater, oil, and Corexit supplied as a chemically-enhanced water-accommodated fraction in a dispersant to oil ratio of 1:20, and [4] "DCEWAF", a 1:10 dilution of the "CEWAF" treatment. The WAF and CEWAF was prepared by adding 25 mL (5 mL every 30 min for 2.5 h) of Macondo surrogate oil (WAF) or oil plus dispersant (CEWAF) into 130L of seawater in duplicate baffled recirculation tanks (BRT) and allowing the oil and seawater to mix for ~24 h (55). Mesocosm tanks were then filled by withdrawing WAF from the bottom of the recirculation tanks in order to avoid including any non-accommodated oil floating on the surface of the BRTs. Because the concentration of oil in the CEWAF treatment was so high, we included the DCEWAF treatment in order to observe the effects of a chemically dispersed oil, but at a concentration more commonly encountered at sea after an oil spill (56). Each mesocosm tank contained 90L of seawater supplemented at the start of the experiment with nutrients (N, P, Si) prepared using the Guillard and Ryther recipe for f/20 media (57) . This was done to ensure microbial communities would not be nutrient limited during the experiment. Full-spectrum

fluorescent lamps (UV-Vis 375-750nm; Sylvania GRO-LUX; Wilmington, MA, USA) provided

a 12h light/12h dark cycle (50-80 μmol photons m^{-2} s^{-1}) and the room was kept at ~21°C.

Each mesocosm experiment was run until the remaining oil concentration within

the CEWAF treatment (highest oil concentration) reached ~20% of the initial oil

concentration (58, 59). This was 72h and 96h for the Coastal and Offshore experiments,

respectively. For each experiment, starting at time zero and every 12h thereafter, ~1L of

water was collected from each mesocosm in a clean, opaque Nalgene bottle through a

PTFE-lined spigot mounted on the side of each tank (10cm above bottom). For cell count

samples, 10mL of this water was fixed with formalin (final concentration 2%) and stored at

4°C. For DNA samples, the collected water was prefiltered through a 10μm filter to exclude

zooplankton and large eukaryotic cells followed by filtering 200mL onto a 47mm, 0.22μm

Supor PES membrane (Pall; Port Washington, NY, USA). For RNA samples, up to 800mL (or

until clogged) of the remaining 10μm-prefiltered water was filtered onto 47mm, 0.22μm

Supor PES membranes. After collection, all filters were placed in cryotubes and stored at -

80°C. RNA filters were immersed in 1mL of TE buffer (10mM Tris, 1mM EDTA, pH 7.5)

before freezing.

Analysis of hydrocarbon chemistry

Samples (1-3.5 L) were collected every 24 hours in amber bottles with Teflon lined

screw caps from each of the triplicate treatment tanks and immediately amended with

~20mL of dichloromethane (DCM). Prior to extraction, PAH surrogates (d8-naphthalene,

d10-acenaphthene, d10-phenanthrene, d12-chrysene, and d12-perylene) and aliphatic

surrogate standards (deuterated nC12, nC20, nC24, and nC30) were added (60). The DCM

mixture was reduced, exchanged into hexane, and then transferred to silica gel/alumina

columns for purification (59). Hydrocarbons were eluted with 200 ml of a 1:1

pentane/DCM solution, evaporated, and exchanged with hexane (61, 62). Aliphatic

hydrocarbons were then analyzed on an Agilent 7890 gas chromatograph with a flame

ionization detector (GC/FID) according to Wade et al. (61) with updates in Morales-

McDevitt et al. (60). PAHs were analyzed on a Hewlett-Packard 6890 gas chromatograph

coupled with a Hewlett-Packard 5973 mass selective detector. A laboratory reference

sample was analyzed with each batch of samples to confirm GC/MS/SIM system

performance and calibration (61, 62). Alkylated PAH were quantitated based response of

the parent PAH compound (60).

16S rRNA Gene Amplicon Sequencing

The V4 hyper-variable region of the 16S rRNA gene was amplified from each sample

following the protocol previously described in Doyle et al. (34). Briefly, filters were sliced

into small pieces using a sterile scalpel and subsequently extracted using FastDNA Spin kits

(MP Biomedical; Santa Ana, CA, USA). Five sample-free filters were processed as protocol

blanks. Universal (Bacteria and Archaea) V4 primers 515F and 806R primers were used for

amplification (63) . Sequencing was performed on the Illumina MiSeq platform (500 cycle,

V2 chemistry) at the Georgia Genomics Facility (Athens, GA, USA). Raw read curation and

processing into amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) was performed by following the

standard pipeline of the DADA2 package (64) in R (see Supplementary Methods; Figure

S9). All ASV tables were subsampled without replacement to an even depth (Table S3)

before downstream ecological analyses were performed with a combination of mothur

v1.42.1, phyloseq v1.28, and/or vegan v.2.5-6 (65–67).

Redundancy Analysis

Redundancy analyses (RDA) were performed to investigate the relationship

between microbial community compositions, hours of incubation, and initial oil

concentrations and to identify ASVs associated with the presence of oil. For these analyses,

ASVs without an average relative abundance ≥0.2% in at least one sample were excluded.

ASV counts were normalized using a Hellinger transformation to transform the abundance

data into a Euclidean space (68). The significance of each RDA model was assessed using a

permutational ANOVA test (69) and the variance explained by each variable (i.e. hours and

initial oil concentration) was estimated by variance partitioning with partial RDAs (70).

ASVs associated with the presence of oil were identified as those whose RDA-weighted

average loading scores were positively correlated with the presence of oil and were greater

than the equilibrium contribution of the RDA model (the proportion of variance which

would be explained by a random canonical axis).

RNA Extraction and Metatranscriptome Sequencing

For each mesocosm experiment, three time points, corresponding to the start,

middle, and end of the experiment, were selected for metatranscriptomic sequencing (0h,

36h, and 72h for the Coastal experiment, and 0h, 48h, and 96h for the Offshore

experiment). To ensure an adequate quantity of RNA was recovered for sequencing, the

triplicate samples for each treatment were combined into a single extraction. A customized

phenol:chloroform RNA extraction was used to isolate RNA; details are given in

Supplementary Methods. Genomic DNA was eliminated from RNA samples with TURBO

DNA-free kits (Ambion; Waltham, MA, USA) followed by purification with MEGAclear

Transcription Clean-up kits (Ambion). The resulting purified total RNA extracts were

processed with MICROBExpress kits (Ambion) to reduce the amount of 16S and 23S rRNA

transcripts within the samples and then sent to the University of Delaware DNA

Sequencing & Genotyping Center (Newark, DE, USA) for Illumina HiSeq 2500 sequencing

(paired-end 150bp reads).

Metatranscriptome analysis

De novo transcriptome assembly was performed with the curated paired reads (see

Supplementary Methods for details) using Trinity v2.5.1 (71) with default parameters,

producing 648 351 contigs ranging between 201 and 54 422 bp in length. Contig

abundances within each sample were then quantified by mapping reads to the

metatranscriptome assembly with kallisto v0.44.0 (72). Read counts were normalized for

contig length into TPM (transcripts per million transcripts) values as previously described

(73), and scaled for cross-sample comparison using the trimmed mean of M-values (TMM)

method described by Robinson and Oshlack (74). Open reading frames were identified and

translated into amino acid sequences using Prodigal v2.6.3 in anonymous mode (75).

Functional annotations were performed using a GHOSTX v1.3.7 search against the Kyoto

Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) database using the single-directional best hit

assignment method targeted to prokaryotes. A custom R script was then used to select all

transcripts whose functional annotation belonged to a KEGG pathway involved in the

degradation of saturated hydrocarbons (alkanes and cycloalkanes), PAHs, or their

metabolic intermediates to central metabolism (glycolysis, TCA cycle) substrates (Table

S7). We also searched for genes involved in the initial oxidation of alkanes using a BLASTP

(single best hit $\leq$1E^{-20}, alignment length $\geq$100, bit score $\geq$50) search of a custom database

(Table S8) of soluble cytochrome P450 alkane hydroxylases of the CYP153 family (45).

These proteins would have been missed from the above KEGG-based analysis as there are

currently no KEGG orthologs specific to this family of enzymes (76). Identified

hydrocarbon degradation gene transcripts were taxonomically classified using KAIJU v1.6.3

in greedy mode (5 substitutions allowed) with the NCBI non-redundant database

(+eukaryotes) as a reference (77). Transcripts with identically scored matches to different

taxa were classified to the least common ancestor in the phylogenetic tree. Following the

method described in Jenior et al. (78), an outlier analysis was performed to estimate the

number of highly expressed transcripts within each sample.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Data is publicly available through the Gulf of Mexico Research Initiative Information

and Data Cooperative (GRIIDC) at http://data.gulfresearchinitative.org DOIs:

10.7266/N77D2SPZ (Coastal 16S rRNA libraries), 10.7266/N7C53JDP (Offshore 16S rRNA

libraries), 10.7266/9EDJRA3Q (metatranscriptome sequences), 10.7266/N74X568X

(Coastal alkane and PAH measurements), and 10.7266/N78P5XZD (Offshore alkane and

PAH measurements).

FUNDING INFORMATION

This research was made possible by a grant from The Gulf of Mexico Research

Initiative to support consortium research entitled ADDOMEx (Aggregation and Degradation

of Dispersants and Oil by Microbial Exopolymers) and the ADDOMEx-2 Consortia.

REFERENCES

1.   Tissot BP, Welte DH. 1984. Petroleum formation and occurrence, 2nd ed. Springer: Berlin,

Heidelberg, Germany.

2.   Head IM, Jones DM, Röling WFM. 2006. Marine microorganisms make a meal of oil. Nature

Reviews Microbiology 4:173–182.

3.   Lessard RR, DeMarco G. 2000. The Significance of Oil Spill Dispersants. Spill Science &

Technology Bulletin 6:59–68.

4.   Brakstad OG, Ribicic D, Winkler A, Netzer R. 2018. Biodegradation of dispersed oil in seawater

is not inhibited by a commercial oil spill dispersant. Marine Pollution Bulletin 129:555–561.

5.   Hamdan L, Fulmer P. 2011. Effects of COREXIT® EC9500A on bacteria from a beach oiled by

the Deepwater Horizon spill. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 63:101–109.

6.   Kleindienst S, Seidel M, Ziervogel K, Grim S, Loftis K, Harrison S, Malkin SY, Perkins MJ, Field J,

Sogin ML, Dittmar T, Passow U, Medeiros PM, Joye SB. 2015. Chemical dispersants can

suppress the activity of natural oil-degrading microorganisms. Proceedings of the National

Academy of Sciences 112:14900–14905.

7.   Techtmann SM, Zhuang M, Campo P, Holder E, Elk M, Hazen TC, Conmy R, Domingo JWS. 2017.

Corexit 9500 Enhances Oil Biodegradation and Changes Active Bacterial Community Structure

of Oil-Enriched Microcosms. Appl Environ Microbiol 83:e03462-16.

8.   Tremblay J, Yergeau E, Fortin N, Cobanli S, Elias M, King TL, Lee K, Greer CW. 2017. Chemical

dispersants enhance the activity of oil-and gas condensate-degrading marine bacteria. The

ISME Journal.

9.   Atlas RM, Hazen TC. 2011. Oil Biodegradation and Bioremediation: A Tale of the Two Worst

Spills in U.S. History. Environmental Science & Technology 45:6709–6715.

10.   Kujawinski EB, Kido Soule MC, Valentine DL, Boysen AK, Longnecker K, Redmond MC. 2011.

545   Fate of Dispersants Associated with the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. Environ Sci Technol

546   45:1298–1306.

547   11.   Dubinsky EA, Conrad ME, Chakraborty R, Bill M, Borglin SE, Hollibaugh JT, Mason OU, M.

548   Piceno Y, Reid FC, Stringfellow WT, Tom LM, Hazen TC, Andersen GL. 2013. Succession of

549   Hydrocarbon-Degrading Bacteria in the Aftermath of the *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill in the

550   Gulf of Mexico. Environmental Science & Technology 47:10860–10867.

551   12.   Gutierrez T, Singleton DR, Berry D, Yang T, Aitken MD, Teske A. 2013. Hydrocarbon-degrading

552   bacteria enriched by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill identified by cultivation and DNA-SIP.

553   The ISME journal 7:2091.

554   13.   Hazen TC, Dubinsky EA, DeSantis TZ, Andersen GL, Piceno YM, Singh N, Jansson JK, Probst A,

555   Borglin SE, Fortney JL, Stringfellow WT, Bill M, Conrad ME, Tom LM, Chavarria KL, Alusi TR,

556   Lamendella R, Joyner DC, Spier C, Baelum J, Auer M, Zemla ML, Chakraborty R, Sonnenthal EL,

557   D'haeseleer P, Holman H-YN, Osman S, Lu Z, Nostrand JDV, Deng Y, Zhou J, Mason OU. 2010.

558   Deep-Sea Oil Plume Enriches Indigenous Oil-Degrading Bacteria. Science 330:204–208.

559   14.   Mason OU, Hazen TC, Borglin S, Chain PS, Dubinsky EA, Fortney JL, Han J, Holman H-YN,

560   Hultman J, Lamendella R, others. 2012. Metagenome, metatranscriptome and single-cell

561   sequencing reveal microbial response to Deepwater Horizon oil spill. The ISME journal

562   6:1715–1727.

563   15.   Rivers AR, Sharma S, Tringe SG, Martin J, Joye SB, Moran MA. 2013. Transcriptional response

564   of bathypelagic marine bacterioplankton to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. The ISME journal

565   7:2315–2329.

16.   Engel AS, Gupta AA. 2014. Regime Shift in Sandy Beach Microbial Communities following
Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Remediation Efforts. PLoS ONE 9:e102934.

17.   Kostka JE, Prakash O, Overholt WA, Green SJ, Freyer G, Canion A, Delgardio J, Norton N, Hazen
TC, Huettel M. 2011. Hydrocarbon-Degrading Bacteria and the Bacterial Community Response
in Gulf of Mexico Beach Sands Impacted by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. Applied and
Environmental Microbiology 77:7962–7974.

18.   Lamendella R, Strutt S, Borglin SE, Chakraborty R, Tas N, Mason OU, Hultman J, Prestat E,
Hazen TC, Jansson J. 2014. Assessment of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill impact on Gulf coast
microbial communities. Front Microbiol 5.

19.   Rodriguez-r LM, Overholt WA, Hagan C, Huettel M, Kostka JE, Konstantinidis KT. 2015.
Microbial community successional patterns in beach sands impacted by the Deepwater
Horizon oil spill. The ISME journal.

20.   Beazley MJ, Martinez RJ, Rajan S, Powell J, Piceno YM, Tom LM, Andersen GL, Hazen TC, Van
Nostrand JD, Zhou J, Mortazavi B, Sobecky PA. 2012. Microbial Community Analysis of a
Coastal Salt Marsh Affected by the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. PLoS ONE 7:e41305.

21.   Mahmoudi N, Porter TM, Zimmerman AR, Fulthorpe RR, Kasozi GN, Silliman BR, Slater GF.
2013. Rapid Degradation of Deepwater Horizon Spilled Oil by Indigenous Microbial
Communities in Louisiana Saltmarsh Sediments. Environ Sci Technol 47:13303–13312.

22.   King GM, Kostka JE, Hazen TC, Sobecky PA. 2015. Microbial Responses to the *Deepwater
Horizon* Oil Spill: From Coastal Wetlands to the Deep Sea. Annual Review of Marine Science
7:377–401.

23.   Fortunato CS, Crump BC. 2011. Bacterioplankton Community Variation Across River to Ocean

588   Environmental Gradients. Microb Ecol 62:374–382.

589   24.   D'Ambrosio L, Ziervogel K, MacGregor B, Teske A, Arnosti C. 2014. Composition and enzymatic

590   function of particle-associated and free-living bacteria: a coastal/offshore comparison. The

591   ISME Journal 8:2167–2179.

592   25.   Watson SW, Novitsky TJ, Quinby HL, Valois FW. 1977. Determination of bacterial number and

593   biomass in the marine environment. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 33:940–946.

594   26.   Bianchi A, Giuliano L. 1996. Enumeration of viable bacteria in the marine pelagic environment.

595   Applied and environmental microbiology 62:174–177.

596   27.   Gutierrez T, Green DH, Nichols PD, Whitman WB, Semple KT, Aitken MD. 2013.

597   Polycyclovorans algicola gen. nov., sp. nov., an Aromatic-Hydrocarbon-Degrading Marine

598   Bacterium Found Associated with Laboratory Cultures of Marine Phytoplankton. Applied and

599   Environmental Microbiology 79:205–214.

600   28.   Van Beilen JB, Li Z, Duetz WA, Smits THM, Witholt B. 2003. Diversity of Alkane Hydroxylase

601   Systems in the Environment. Oil & Gas Science and Technology 58:427–440.

602   29.   Johnsen AR, Wick LY, Harms H. 2005. Principles of microbial PAH-degradation in soil.

603   Environmental Pollution 133:71–84.

604   30.   Seo J-S, Keum Y-S, Li QX. 2009. Bacterial Degradation of Aromatic Compounds. Int J Environ

605   Res Public Health 6:278–309.

31.   Dyksterhouse SE, Gray JP, Herwig RP, Lara JC, Staley JT. 1995. Cycloclasticus pugetii gen. nov.,

sp. nov., an aromatic hydrocarbon-degrading bacterium from marine sediments. International

Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology 45:116–123.

32.   Yakimov MM, Timmis KN, Golyshin PN. 2007. Obligate oil-degrading marine bacteria. Current

Opinion in Biotechnology 18:257–266.

33.   Orcutt BN, Joye SB, Kleindienst S, Knittel K, Ramette A, Reitz A, Samarkin V, Treude T, Boetius

A. 2010. Impact of natural oil and higher hydrocarbons on microbial diversity, distribution,

and activity in Gulf of Mexico cold-seep sediments. Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies

in Oceanography 57:2008–2021.

34.   Doyle SM, Whitaker EA, De Pascuale V, Wade TL, Knap AH, Santschi PH, Quigg A, Sylvan JB.

2018. Rapid Formation of Microbe-Oil Aggregates and Changes in Community Composition in

Coastal Surface Water Following Exposure to Oil and the Dispersant Corexit. Front Microbiol

9.

35.   Redmond MC, Valentine DL. 2012. Natural gas and temperature structured a microbial

community response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Proceedings of the National Academy

of Sciences 109:20292–20297.

36.   Wang W, Zhong R, Shan D, Shao Z. 2014. Indigenous oil-degrading bacteria in crude oil-

contaminated seawater of the Yellow sea, China. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology

98:7253–7269.

37.   Jin HM, Kim JM, Lee HJ, Madsen EL, Jeon CO. 2012. Alteromonas As a Key Agent of Polycyclic

Aromatic Hydrocarbon Biodegradation in Crude Oil-Contaminated Coastal Sediment. Environ

Sci Technol 46:7731–7740.

38. McGenity TJ, Folwell BD, McKew BA, Sanni GO. 2012. Marine crude-oil biodegradation: a

central role for interspecies interactions. Aquatic Biosystems 8:10.

39. Iwaki H, Yamamoto T, Hasegawa Y. 2018. Isolation of marine xylene-utilizing bacteria and

characterization of Halioxenophilus aromaticivorans gen. nov., sp. nov. and its xylene

degradation gene cluster. FEMS Microbiol Lett 365.

40. Rojo F. 2009. Degradation of alkanes by bacteria. Environmental Microbiology 11:2477–2490.

41. Das N, Chandran P. 2011. Microbial Degradation of Petroleum Hydrocarbon Contaminants: An

Overview. Biotechnology Research International 2011:1–13.

42. Sugiura K, Ishihara M, Shimauchi T, Harayama S. 1997. Physicochemical Properties and

Biodegradability of Crude Oil. Environ Sci Technol 31:45–51.

43. Wang Z, Fingas M, Blenkinsopp S, Sergy G, Landriault M, Sigouin L, Foght J, Semple K, Westlake

DWS. 1998. Comparison of oil composition changes due to biodegradation and physical

weathering in different oils. Journal of Chromatography A 809:89–107.

44. Jonker MTO, Brils JM, Sinke AJC, Murk AJ, Koelmans AA. 2006. Weathering and toxicity of

marine sediments contaminated with oils and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 25:1345–1353.

45. Nie Y, Chi C-Q, Fang H, Liang J-L, Lu S-L, Lai G-L, Tang Y-Q, Wu X-L. 2014. Diverse alkane

hydroxylase genes in microorganisms and environments. Scientific Reports 4:4968.

46. Yakimov MM. 2004. Thalassolituus oleivorans gen. nov., sp. nov., a novel marine bacterium

that obligately utilizes hydrocarbons. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SYSTEMATIC AND

EVOLUTIONARY MICROBIOLOGY 54:141–148.

47.   Teramoto M, Ohuchi M, Hatmanti A, Darmayati Y, Widyastuti Y, Harayama S, Fukunaga Y.

650   2011. Oleibacter marinus gen. nov., sp. nov., a bacterium that degrades petroleum aliphatic

651   hydrocarbons in a tropical marine environment. International Journal of Systematic and

652   Evolutionary Microbiology 61:375–380.

653   48.   White HK, Marx CT, Valentine DL, Sharpless CM, Aeppli C, Gosselin K, Kivenson V, Liu RM,

654   Nelson RK, Sylva SP, Reddy CM. 2019. Examining inputs of biogenic and oil-derived

655   hydrocarbons in surface waters following the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. ACS Earth Space

656   Chem acsearthspacechem.9b00090.

657   49.   Lea-Smith DJ, Biller SJ, Davey MP, Cotton CAR, Sepulveda BMP, Turchyn AV, Scanlan DJ, Smith

658   AG, Chisholm SW, Howe CJ. 2015. Contribution of cyanobacterial alkane production to the

659   ocean hydrocarbon cycle. PNAS 112:13591–13596.

660   50.   Valentine DL, Reddy CM. 2015. Latent hydrocarbons from cyanobacteria. PNAS 112:13434–

661   13435.

662   51.   Li N, Chang W, Warui DM, Booker SJ, Krebs C, Bollinger JM. 2012. Evidence for Only

663   Oxygenative Cleavage of Aldehydes to Alk(a/e)nes and Formate by Cyanobacterial Aldehyde

664   Decarbonylases. Biochemistry 51:7908–7916.

665   52.   Jiménez-Díaz L, Caballero A, Pérez-Hernández N, Segura A. 2017. Microbial alkane production

666   for jet fuel industry: motivation, state of the art and perspectives. Microbial Biotechnology

667   10:103–124.

668   53.   Singh AK, Sherry A, Gray ND, Jones DM, Bowler BFJ, Head IM. 2014. Kinetic parameters for

669   nutrient enhanced crude oil biodegradation in intertidal marine sediments. Front Microbiol 5.

670   54.   Teira E, Lekunberri I, Gasol JM, Nieto-Cid M, Álvarez-Salgado XA, Figueiras FG. 2007. Dynamics

671   of the hydrocarbon-degrading Cycloclasticus bacteria during mesocosm-simulated oil spills.

672   Environmental Microbiology 9:2551–2562.

673   55.   Knap AH, Sleeter TD, Dodge RE, Wyers SC, Frith HR, Smith SR. 1983. The effects of oil spills

674   and dispersant use on corals: a review and multidisciplinary experimental approach. Oil and

675   Petrochemical Pollution 1:157–169.

676   56.   Lee K, Nedwed T, Prince RC, Palandro D. 2013. Lab tests on the biodegradation of chemically

677   dispersed oil should consider the rapid dilution that occurs at sea. Marine Pollution Bulletin

678   73:314–318.

679   57.   Guillard RRL, Ryther JH. 1962. STUDIES OF MARINE PLANKTONIC DIATOMS: I. CYCLOTELLA

680   NANA HUSTEDT, AND DETONULA CONFERVACEA (CLEVE) GRAN. Canadian Journal of

681   Microbiology 8:229–239.

682   58.   Kamalanathan M, Xu C, Schwehr K, Bretherton L, Beaver M, Doyle SM, Genzer J, Hillhouse J,

683   Sylvan JB, Santschi P, Quigg A. 2018. Extracellular Enzyme Activity Profile in a Chemically

684   Enhanced Water Accommodated Fraction of Surrogate Oil: Toward Understanding Microbial

685   Activities After the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. Front Microbiol 9.

686   59.   Xu C, Lin P, Zhang S, Sun L, Xing W, Schwehr KA, Chin W-C, Wade TL, Knap AH, Hatcher PG,

687   Yard A, Jiang C, Quigg A, Santschi PH. 2019. The interplay of extracellular polymeric

688   substances and oil/Corexit to affect the petroleum incorporation into sinking marine oil snow

689   in four mesocosms. Science of The Total Environment 693:133626.

690   60.   Morales-McDevitt M, Shi D, Knap AH, Quigg A, Sweet ST, Sericano JL, Wade TL. in review. Fate

691   and transport of petroleum hydrocarbons in controlled mesocosm studies. PLOS ONE.

61. Wade TL, Sweet ST, Sericano JL, Guinasso NL, Diercks A-R, Highsmith RC, Asper VL, Joung D,

Shiller AM, Lohrenz SE, Joye SB. 2011. Analyses of Water Samples From the Deepwater

Horizon Oil Spill: Documentation of the Subsurface Plume, p. 77–82. *In* Liu, Y, MacFadyen, A, Ji,

Z-G, Weisberg, RH (eds.), Geophysical Monograph Series. American Geophysical Union,

Washington, D. C.

62. Wade TL, Sericano JL, Sweet ST, Knap AH, Guinasso NL. 2016. Spatial and temporal

distribution of water column total polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and total

petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) from the Deepwater Horizon (Macondo) incident. Marine

Pollution Bulletin 103:286–293.

63. Walters W, Hyde ER, Berg-Lyons D, Ackermann G, Humphrey G, Parada A, Gilbert JA, Jansson

JK, Caporaso JG, Fuhrman JA, others. 2016. Improved bacterial 16S rRNA gene (V4 and V4-5)

and fungal internal transcribed spacer marker gene primers for microbial community surveys.

mSystems 1:e00009–15.

64. Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJA, Holmes SP. 2016. DADA2: High-

resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nature Methods 13:581–583.

65. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. 2013. phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive Analysis

and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. PLOS ONE 8:e61217.

66. Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB,

Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Szoecs E, Wagner H. 2018. vegan: Community Ecology

Package.

67. Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, Hall JR, Hartmann M, Hollister EB, Lesniewski RA, Oakley

BB, Parks DH, Robinson CJ, Sahl JW, Stres B, Thallinger GG, Horn DJV, Weber CF. 2009.

Introducing mothur: Open-Source, Platform-Independent, Community-Supported Software for

Describing and Comparing Microbial Communities. Appl Environ Microbiol 75:7537–7541.

68. Legendre P, Gallagher ED. 2001. Ecologically meaningful transformations for ordination of

species data. Oecologia 129:271–280.

69. Legendre P, Oksanen J, Braak CJF ter. 2011. Testing the significance of canonical axes in

redundancy analysis. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 2:269–277.

70. Legendre P, Borcard D, Roberts DW. 2012. Variation partitioning involving orthogonal spatial

eigenfunction submodels. Ecology 93:1234–1240.

71. Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M, Levin JZ, Thompson DA, Amit I, Adiconis X, Fan L,

Raychowdhury R, Zeng Q, Chen Z, Mauceli E, Hacohen N, Gnirke A, Rhind N, Palma F di, Birren

BW, Nusbaum C, Lindblad-Toh K, Friedman N, Regev A. 2011. Full-length transcriptome

assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference genome. Nature Biotechnology 29:644–652.

72. Bray NL, Pimentel H, Melsted P, Pachter L. 2016. Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq

quantification. Nature Biotechnology 34:525–527.

73. Wagner GP, Kin K, Lynch VJ. 2012. Measurement of mRNA abundance using RNA-seq data:

RPKM measure is inconsistent among samples. Theory Biosci 131:281–285.

74. Robinson MD, Oshlack A. 2010. A scaling normalization method for differential expression

analysis of RNA-seq data. Genome Biology 11:R25.

75. Hyatt D, Chen G-L, LoCascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. 2010. Prodigal: prokaryotic

gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC Bioinformatics 11:119.

76.   Tremblay J, Greer C. 2019. Metagenomic Data Mining in Oil Spill Studies, p. 211–223. *In*

735   Comprehensive Biotechnology 3rd Edition. Pergamon.

736   77.   Menzel P, Ng KL, Krogh A. 2016. Fast and sensitive taxonomic classification for metagenomics

737   with Kaiju. Nature Communications 7:11257.

738   78.   Jenior ML, Leslie JL, Young VB, Schloss PD. 2018. *Clostridium difficile* Alters the Structure and

739   Metabolism of Distinct Cecal Microbiomes during Initial Infection To Promote Sustained

740   Colonization. mSphere 3:e00261-18, /msphere/3/3/mSphere261-18.atom.

 FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Measured concentrations (μg/L) of total alkanes and total PAHs over time in both

mesocosm experiments. Error bars denote standard deviation.

Figure 2. Relative abundances of abundant microbial lineages observed in each

experiment. Each bar is the average of triplicate treatments. Community composition in the

original seawater samples collected for each experiment are shown under category "SW".

The plot was built to display the highest resolution classification for the most abundant

taxa. The plot was constructed as follows: First, ASVs were clustered at the genus level and

any genera having a relative abundance ≥15% in at least one of the samples were plotted.

This procedure was subsequently repeated with the remaining unplotted ASVs at the

taxonomic levels of family, order, class and phylum. Any remaining rare ASVs left after this

procedure were not plotted.

Figure 3. Heatmap displaying the relative abundances of the 30 ASVs identified as being

oil-enriched using the RDA models. ASVs identified in both experiments are highlighted

with a gray bar. Colored stars on the left side indicate the treatment(s) in which an ASV's

relative abundance over time was significantly enriched versus the Control. ASV read

counts were transformed with a Hellinger transformation in order to facilitate a clearer

visual comparison between abundant and sparse taxa.

Figure 4. Coastal and offshore microbial communities exhibited differential expression of

alkane and PAH catabolic pathways after exposure to oil. Taxonomic affiliations and

abundances of hydrocarbon degradation gene transcripts are shown within four metabolic

categories. Y-axes are individually scaled for each category (row). Transcripts belonging to

minor taxa (<2% total abundance) were removed for clarity.

Figure 5. Summary overview of the taxonomic distribution and summed abundances,

between all four treatments, of expressed hydrocarbon degradation genes involved in the

transformation of n-alkanes (orange arrows) and PAHs (green arrows) to central

metabolism intermediates.

Figure 6. Alpha diversity of hydrocarbon degradation gene transcripts within the four

metabolic categories. Transcripts within each category were taxonomically classified using

KAIJU (minimum score 65) and then clustered by genus before calculating Inverse-Simpson

indices.

LEGENDS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Figure S1. Map showing the locations where seawater for the Coastal and Offshore

experiments were collected.

Figure S2. Observed cell abundances with each treatment of the Coastal and Offshore

experiments. Error bars denote standard deviations.

Figure S3. (A, E) NMDS ordination of Bray-Curtis dissimilarities in the Offshore and Coastal

experiments indicated microbial community structure was driven by the level of oil

exposure (treatment). Numbered labels indicate hours of incubation. (B-D and F-H) RDA

score triplots for the three oil-amended treatments within the Offshore and Coastal

experiments, respectively. Each treatment was modeled against the Control. Colored circles

represent samples. Plus (+) signs represent ASVs. Purple rings represent the equilibrium

contribution of the overall model. Arrows represent the vectors of the two explanatory

variables used in the model: (1) the presence of oil, and (2) hours of incubation. Right-

angled scalar projections of an ASV point onto the oil vector approximates that ASV's

association with the presence of oil. Bolded, red ASVs were designated as oil-associated for

this study.

Figure S4. Relative abundances of abundant microbial lineages observed in each

experiment based on the metatranscriptomes. The plot was built to display the highest

resolution classification for the most abundant taxa. The plot was constructed as follows:

First, transcripts were clustered at the genus level and any genera having a relative

abundance ≥20% in at least one of the samples were plotted. This procedure was

subsequently repeated with the remaining unplotted transcripts at the taxonomic levels of

family, order, class and phylum. Any remaining rare transcripts left after this procedure

were not plotted.

Figure S5. Observed variation in the relative abundance of the 10 most abundant orders in

the 16S rRNA amplicon dataset. Cross-lines indicated the median observed relative

abundance. Larger boxes indicate increased variability over time with that respective

treatment.

Figure S6. Outlier analysis of hydrocarbon degradation gene expression within the Coastal

WAF, DCEWAF, and CEWAF treatments versus the Control treatments. Each point

represents a unique open reading frame identified in the respective metatranscriptomes.

Outliers were defined using a squared residual cutoff value of 2 versus the x = y dotted-line.

Points are colored by taxonomic assignment (genus) of each transcript. Gray points denote

those genes whose abundance were comparable between the respective oil-amended

treatment and the Control. Outliers above the shaded-gray ribbon were considered highly

expressed. Outlier analysis was performed using a modification of the custom R-scripts

described in Jenior et al. (2018).

Figure S7. Outlier analysis of hydrocarbon degradation gene expression within the

Offshore WAF, DCEWAF, and CEWAF treatments versus the Control treatments. Each point

represents a unique open reading frame identified in the respective metatranscriptomes.

Outliers were defined using a squared residual cutoff value of 2 versus the x = y dotted-line.

Points are colored by taxonomic assignment (genus) of each transcript. Gray points denote

those genes whose abundance were comparable between the respective oil-amended

treatment and the Control. Outliers above the shaded-gray ribbon were considered highly

expressed. Outlier analysis was performed using a modification of the custom R-scripts

described in Jenior et al. (2018).

Figure S8. Hydrocarbon degradation genes were identified by comparing their abundance

in each oil-amended treatment with that observed in the respective Control. Although the

number of upregulated genes differed between treatments (see Figure S6 and S6), the

amount those genes were upregulated did not differ between treatment.

Figure S9. Rarefaction curves for all 16S ASV libraries reached saturation.

Table S1. Seawater samples collected for mesocosm experiments.

Table S2. Measured concentrations (µg/L) of total alkanes and total PAHs over time in

both mesocosm experiments. Half-lifes (t0.5) were calculated over 72 hours. %RSD

denotes the relative standard deviation. n.d. indicates half-life not determined.

Table S3. Alpha Diversity Summary of 16S rRNA amplicon libraries. (* denotes values

calculated after normalizing read-depth by subsampling each library to 7754 reads; 1000

iterations)

Table S4. Number of sequence reads that made it through each step of the DADA2 pipeline.

Table S5. Read count within each sample, taxonomy, and sequence of each ASV.

Table S6. Metatranscriptome reads identifed as rRNA using SortMeRNA

Table S7. All transcripts whose KEGG annotation, generated using GHOSTX, matched one

of the following were identified as hydrocarbon degradation gene transcripts

Table S8. List of proteins in our CYP153 database. We used this database along with

BLASTP to identify transcripts for P450 alkane hydroxylases of the CYP153 family.

Composition of Mesocosm Communities based on 16S rRNA ASVs

Legend:
- *Thiotrichales; Piscirickettsiaceae;* **Methylophaga**
- *Alteromonadales; Alteromonadaceae;* **Alteromonas**
- *Alteromonadales; Alteromonadaceae;* **Marinobacter**
- *Xanthomonadales; Solimonadaceae;* **Polycyclovorans**
- *Oceanospirillales; Oceanospirillaceae;* **Thalassolituus**
- Subsection I; Family I; **Synechococcus**
- *Alphaproteobacteria;* SAR11 clade
- *Oceanospirillales;* **Oceanospirillaceae**
- *Pseudomonadales;* **Pseudomonadaceae**
- **Alteromonadales**
- **Cellvibrionales**
- **unassigned Chloroplast**
- **Alphaproteobacteria**
- **Gammaproteobacteria**
- **Bacteroidetes**
- **Proteobacteria**
- **Planctomycetes**
- **Actinobacteria**

Expression of hydrocarbon degradation genes