Biogeochemical and omic evidence for multiple paradoxical methane

production mechanisms in freshwater lakes

Elisabet Perez-Coronel[a*]; J. Michael Beman[b]

Environmental Systems Graduate Group, Department of Life & Environmental Sciences, and

Sierra Nevada Research Institute, University of California, Merced

[a]ORCID number: 0000-0003-2496-3840.

[b]ORCID number: 0000-0002-0655-4800

*Corresponding author: Elisabet Perez-Coronel. University of California, Merced. 5200 North

Lake Road, Merced, CA 95343, USA

e-mail for correspondence: elisabetperezcoronel@gmail.com

Abstract

Aquatic ecosystems are globally significant sources of the greenhouse gas methane (CH_4) to the

atmosphere. However, CH_4 is produced 'paradoxically' in oxygenated water via at least three

mechanisms, fundamentally limiting our understanding of overall CH_4 production. Here we

resolve these CH_4 production mechanisms through CH_4 measurements, $\delta^{13}CH_4$ analyses, 16S

rRNA sequencing, and metagenomics/transcriptomics applied to freshwater incubation

experiments with multiple time points and treatments (addition of a methanogenesis inhibitor,

dark, high-light). We captured significant paradoxical CH_4 production, but show that

methanogenesis was an unlikely CH_4 source. In contrast, abundant freshwater bacteria

metabolized methylphosphonate—similar to observations in marine ecosystems.

Metatranscriptomics and stable isotopic analyses applied to experimental treatments also

identified a potential CH_4 production mechanism linked to (bacterio)chlorophyll metabolism by

Cyanobacteria and especially Proteobacteria. Variability in these mechanisms across experiments

indicates that multiple, widely-distributed bacterial groups and pathways can produce substantial

quantities of CH_4 in aquatic ecosystems.

Introduction

Atmospheric concentrations of the potent greenhouse gas methane (CH_4) have increased

significantly due to anthropogenic activity, representing an important component of climate

change (IPCC 2014). However, these increases are superimposed on substantial natural

variability. Of all natural CH_4 sources to the atmosphere, freshwater lakes are particularly

important but poorly understood, with their estimated contribution ranging from 6 to 16% of all

natural CH_4 emissions—despite accounting for only ~0.9% of the Earth's surface area

(Bastviken et al. 2004). CH_4 emissions from lakes are conventionally viewed to be regulated by

CH_4 production (occurring predominantly in anoxic sediments) and subsequent CH_4 oxidation in

surface sediments and the water column (Bastviken 2009). However, oversaturation of CH_4 has

been consistently observed in oxygenated waters of aquatic systems (Tang et al. 2016). This

observation indicates that CH_4 is produced under oxic conditions, and that the rate of CH_4

production exceeds CH_4 oxidation. Since archaeal methanogenesis is an obligate anaerobic

process (Hoehler et al. 2018), oxic CH_4 production is typically referred to as the "methane

paradox," and has been observed in oceans (Karl et al. 2008, Damm et al. 2010), lakes (Grossart

et al. 2011, Bogard et al. 2014, Tang et al. 2014), and aerobic wetland soils (Angle et al. 2017).

Notably, paradoxical CH_4 production occurs near the surface, and so any produced CH_4 may

readily flux to the atmosphere. Identifying which mechanisms produce CH_4 in oxygenated

waters is therefore essential for our understanding of CH_4 fluxes and their contribution to climate

change.

Although multiple mechanisms for paradoxical aerobic CH_4 production have been

proposed, the degree to which these are active in freshwater lakes remains unknown. Initial

studies suggested that CH_4 production under oxygenated conditions could be occurring in anoxic

microsites in the water column—such as fecal pellets, detritus, and the gastrointestinal tracts of

larger organisms such as fish or zooplankton (Oremland 1979, Angelis & Lee 1994, Karl &

Tilbrook 1994). Several studies have also demonstrated a correlation between phytoplankton or

primary production and CH_4 production (Grossart et al. 2011, Bogard et al. 2014, Tang et al.

2014). While phytoplankton metabolites can be the source for methanogenesis in oxygenated

water, Grossart et al. (2011) showed that methanogens may reside on the surface of

phytoplankton cells and produce CH_4 in presumably anoxic microsites. Bogard et al. (2014) and

Donis et al. (2017) also hypothesized that several groups of methanogens have oxygen-tolerant

or detoxifying pathways that could aid in CH_4 production in the presence of oxygen. For

example, Angle et al. (2017) characterized a methanogen candidate that possesses the enzymes

to detoxify oxygen and produce CH_4 under aerobic conditions.

In contrast, the current prevailing view of marine ecosystems is that methylphosphonate

(MPn) is the main precursor of CH_4 production under oxic conditions, particularly in phosphorus

(P)-stressed ecosystems such as the open ocean (Karl et al. 2008, Repeta et al. 2016). MPn is the

simplest form of organic carbon (C)-P bonded compounds in aquatic ecosystems; microbial

utilization of MPn, and the consequent breakdown of the C-P bond, releases CH_4 as a by-product

(Kononova & Nesmeyanova 2002, Karl et al. 2008, Repeta et al. 2016). A broad range of marine

and freshwater bacteria have the genomic potential to metabolize MPn and produce CH_4, based

on the presence of the multi-gene C-P lyase pathway in their genomes. This includes multiple

groups of Proteobacteria, Firmicutes, Bacteroidetes, Chloroflexi, and Cyanobacteria (Kononova

& Nesmeyanova 2002, Huang et al. 2005, Sosa et al. 2019). While expression of this pathway is

thought to be regulated by phosphate availability (Kononova & Nesmeyanova 2002, Huang et al.

2005, Sosa et al. 2019), the degree to which this occurs in freshwater ecosystems is not well

known (Yao et al. 2016, Wang et al. 2017, Li et al. 2020). Finally, recent work indicates that

pure cultures of marine and freshwater Cyanobacteria can directly produce CH_4 (Bižić et al.

2020). However, the exact mechanism by which this occurs remains unknown, and this has not

been directly measured in aquatic ecosystems.

These proposed mechanisms for CH_4 production—(1) methanogenesis aided by

detoxifying genes or in anoxic microsites, (2) CH_4 production by breakdown of methylated

compounds, and (3) CH_4 production by Cyanobacteria—point to multiple mechanisms by which

CH_4 can be produced under oxygenated conditions. Many of these are recently discovered and

therefore poorly understood, and the degree to which they occur within different aquatic

ecosystems is largely unknown. We developed an experimental approach to disentangle these

mechanisms and determine which may produce CH_4 in freshwater lakes. We conducted

incubation experiments using surface waters from high-elevation lakes, in order to rule out

physical transport and focus on potential biological mechanisms of oxic CH_4 production. We

investigated specific mechanisms using a combination of CH_4 measurements over time,

experimental treatments and inhibitors, and 16S rRNA gene and transcript sequencing, while

also applying stable isotope analyses and metagenome and metatranscriptome sequencing to

selected experiments. Paradoxical CH_4 production was evident in multiple experiments and

experimental treatments, and could be attributed to MPn breakdown via widely-distributed

members of the *Comamonadaceae* family. However, experimental treatments, stable isotope

$\delta^{13}C$ signatures of CH_4, and metatranscriptomic data also point to a new potential mechanism of

aerobic CH_4 production carried out by Cyanobacteria and Proteobacteria.

Results and discussion

Our experiments provide evidence for widespread paradoxical CH_4 production in freshwater

lakes. Out of 19 total experiments conducted in five lakes in Yosemite National Park, 26% of

experiments showed unequivocal, monotonic CH_4 production in unamended controls; 16%

showed net oxidation in controls; several exhibited significant nonlinear patterns; and multiple

experimental treatments also showed significant production (see below; based on replicate

bottles incubated for at least 24 hours; Fig. 1). We observed particularly high CH_4 production

rates in Lukens Lake (e.g., L1 and L2 experiments), as well as consistent production in Lower

Gaylor Lake (LG1, LG3, and LG4) and Upper Cathedral Lake (UC1 and UC3). Net CH_4

production rates ranged from 0.98 to 22.8 nM/h, with the majority of values <4 nM/h. These

rates are consistent with the limited experiments previously conducted in other freshwater

lakes—e.g., 0.1-2.5 nM/h and 3.7 in Lake Stechlin, Germany (Grossart et al. 2011 and Tang et

al. 2014, respectively)—and, on the higher end, our values are similar to the range reported by

Bogard et al. (2014) for experimental manipulations in Lac Cromwell (2.08-8.33 nM/h). CH_4

turnover rates also ranged from 5 to 146 days (with in situ concentrations ranging from 309-2839

nM), consistent with turnover rates of ~18 days in Lake Stechlin (CH_4 concentration ~430 nM,

Grossart et al. 2011), ~2.2 days in Lac Cromwell (CH_4 concentration ~200 nM, Bogard et al.

2014), and 67 days in Yellowstone Lake (CH_4 concentration of 46.3 nM, Wang et al. 2017).

Our study is the first confirmation of the CH_4 paradox in high elevation lakes,

demonstrating significant CH_4 production under oxygenated conditions. Incubations were

monitored to confirm that they were under oxic conditions at all times, and observed CH_4

production is likely biotic, as sterile treatments (filtered lake water) did not show significant CH_4

production or oxidation over time. Methane accumulation was consistently observed in multiple

lakes, occurring across different experiments conducted in different years (2016, 2017 and

2018). However, our experimental results are also clearly indicative of natural spatial and

temporal variation in CH_4 production and oxidation. For example, variations over time within

incubation experiments, as well as variation between and within experimental treatments,

sometimes led to a lack of statistical significance—e.g., LG2 showed notable accumulation of

CH_4 which was not statistically significant due to variation across experimental replicates.

However, variations within and across experiments can provide insight into different CH_4

production mechanisms, and their relation to CH_4 consumption. Eleven experiments did not

show monotonic increases or decreases, which could reflect either (1) a complete absence of CH_4

metabolism at the time of sampling, or, more likely, (2) variations in the balance between co-

occurring CH_4 production and consumption over time. For example, initial CH_4 production could

be followed by oxidation once CH_4 concentrations reach a certain threshold required for

oxidation (Grossart et al. 2011). Conversely, initial decreases due to oxidation may be followed

by eventual production—for example through the development of P limitation that triggers CH_4

production via MPn metabolism (Karl et al. 2008). It is also possible that production and

oxidation proceed at similar rates, leading to no net change in concentrations, even though CH_4

is actively cycled. In this case, molecular data are useful for providing insight into the underlying

dynamics.

We tested for nonlinear patterns using ANOVA, and found two cases of initial CH_4

production followed by oxidation (LG1 and UC3; SI text). We also examined CH_4 oxidation—

manifested by the expression of the particulate methane monooxygenase gene *(pmoA)* in

metatranscriptomes—and found that CH_4 oxidation occurred in the majority of the incubations

surveyed (SI Text). These data, as well as observed variations in CH_4 concentrations, are

indicative of active CH_4 oxidation that may obscure paradoxical production. Put another way,

CH_4 is clearly produced in incubations showing initial increases (UC3, LG1) or significant net

increases (L1, L2, LG3, LG4 and UC1); but it may also actively occur in experiments showing

no significant change (or consumption) over time, if CH_4 oxidation rates are equal to or greater

than production rates. We therefore evaluated potential paradoxical CH_4 production mechanisms

across experiments using multiple experimental treatments (BES, dark, high-light), and applied

16S rRNA sequencing, metagenomics, metatranscriptomics, and $\delta^{13}C$ stable isotopic analyses to

samples collected during these experiments.

Methanogenesis

We used these multiple approaches to test for phytoplankton- or particle-based methanogenesis,

as initial observations in freshwater lakes showed methanogens attached to phytoplankton

(Grossart et al. 2011), while other work has suggested CH_4 production can occur in anoxic

microsites on particles (Oremland 1979, Angelis & Lee 1994, Karl & Tilbrook 1994). In all

experiments from 2017 and 2018, we included a treatment that consisted of the addition of the

methanogenesis inhibitor BES (2-bromoethanesulphonate). While there are some caveats with its

use (Oremland & Capone 1988), BES is widely used, including earlier tests of the CH_4 paradox

(Grossart et al. 2011, Tang et al. 2014). In our experiments, BES had an inhibitory effect on CH_4

production in four experiments, but actually significantly increased CH_4 production rates in four

experiments, and had no significant effect in the five remaining experiments. In parallel, 16S

rRNA sequencing of DNA from experiments L1-6 and LG1-4 recovered no methanogen 16S

sequences (out of 5.4 million total sequences; Table 1). Sequencing of 16S rRNA transcripts in

RNA samples from experiments L5-6, LG5-6, and UC3-4 recovered methanogen sequences in

only two samples (dark treatments from L5 and LG5), but total numbers were only 0.014% and

0.008% of all 16S rRNA sequences (Table 1). Analysis of metatranscriptomes likewise showed

that methyl coenzyme A (*mcrA*; responsible for methanogenesis) transcripts were absent in LG6

and UC4(tf) incubations and minimal in LG5, L7 and UC4(t0) (Fig. 2). *mcrA* genes were absent

in all metagenomes, with the sole exception of the L6(tf) incubation (Fig. 2). Collectively these

data indicate that water column-based methanogenesis is not a substantial source of CH_4, as BES

effects were mixed (Fig. 3), methanogens were almost entirely absent and inactive based on 16S

data (Table 1), and *mcrA* transcripts and genes were scantly expressed in metatranscriptomes and

rarely detected in metagenomes (Fig. 2).

Methylphosphonate breakdown as a source of methane

Instead, analysis of metatranscriptomes and metagenomes showed potential for CH_4 production

mechanisms other than conventional methanogenesis. In particular, we found evidence for

microbial metabolism of MPn based on the universal expression of alpha-D-ribose 1-

methylphosphonate 5-phosphate C-P lyase (*phnJ*) transcripts in metatranscriptomes (Fig. 2).

phnJ is responsible for the cleavage of the C-P bond that results in CH_4 production from MPn;

this mechanism is thought to be the dominant paradoxical CH_4 production mechanism in the

ocean (Repeta et al. 2016), but has been documented in only a limited number of freshwater

lakes (Yao et al. 2016, Wang et al. 2017, Li et al. 2020). In addition to *phnJ*, phosphonate-

binding periplasmic protein (*phnD)* genes (involved in the binding component of phosphonate

uptake; Rizk et al. 2006) were also universally expressed (Fig. 2). *phnJ* and *phnD* genes were

also recovered in all metagenomes (Fig. 2), and the majority of the genes were present in

organisms of the same genera as the metatranscriptomes—indicating that P assimilation from

MPn is broadly distributed among surface water microbes in these lakes.

Related to this, we examined whether transcripts and genes involved in the production of

MPn were also present and active. Transcripts of phosphoenolpyruvate mutase (*pepM*) and

phosphonopyruvate decarboxylase (*ppd*)—involved in phosphonate biosynthesis (Yu et al.

2013)—were present in some of the metatranscriptomes (Fig. 2), which suggests that

phosphonate may be synthesized in situ. Moreover and unexpectedly, genes involved in the

DMSP demethylation pathway (*dmdB*: 3-methylmercaptopropionyl-CoA ligase, *dmdC*: 3-

methylmercaptopropionyl-CoA dehydrogenase and, *dmdD*: Methylthioacryloyl-CoA hydratase)

were expressed in some of the metatranscriptomes. The role of DMSP degradation pathways in

the CH_4 paradox in the ocean has already been hypothesized—for example, the *dmdD* gene

involved in the production of methanethiol (MeSH) has been proposed to be a precursor for CH_4

paradox in polar waters subject to nutrient availability (Kiene et al. 2000, Damm et al. 2010,

Moran et al. 2012). *dmdD* was expressed in one of our incubations (LG5) and not detected in any

metagenomes, whereas *dmdC* was more commonly expressed (exceptions LG5 and UC4-HL)

and present in all metagenomes (Fig 2). Dimethylsulfonioproprionate demethylase (*dmdA*;

involved in the first step in DMSP breakdown) and *dmdB* genes were also present in L6 and LG2

incubations (Fig 2). Few studies have examined DMSP degradation in lakes, although DMS

concentrations in freshwater can be similar to those found in oceans (Sela-Adler et al.

2015). Our findings suggest that members of the Actinobacteria phylum and the

betaproteobacterial *Comamonadaceae* family may be involved in DMSP transformations in lakes

based on metatranscriptomic data, and at least raise the possibility of DMS and CH_4 production

from DMSP.

The majority of the *phnJ* transcripts and genes were also found among organisms in the

Comamonadaceae family: while >40 different bacterial genera expressed or possessed *phnJ*

genes, multiple *Comamonadaceae* genera accounted for 20.9% of *phnJ* transcripts in

metatranscriptomes and 30.4% of *phnJ* genes in metagenomes. *phnJ* transcripts and genes from

Sphingobacteriales were also abundant in several samples (LG5 and LG6 metatranscriptomes,

L6 metagenomes). *Comamonadaceae* transcripts and genes showed notably high identity to

database sequences, with the majority of sequences showing >92% and up to 100% amino acid

identity to *Acidovorax, Hydrogenophaga*, *Limnohabitans, Polaromonas*, *Rhodoferax*, and

Variovorax phnJ sequences.

16S data are consistent with this and demonstrate that *Comamonadaceae* were

universally present and abundant across experiments. In 16S rRNA gene sequence libraries from

experiments L1-6, LG1-4, and UC1, *Comamonadaceae* ranged from 2% (L6) to 12% (UC1) of

all sequences (Table 1), and were abundant in several incubations with significant CH_4

production (L1, L2, UC1). Sequencing of 16S rRNA transcripts in RNA samples from

experiments L5-6, LG5-6, and UC3-4 showed similar values (Table 1), and *Comamonadaceae*

reached 15% of all 16S rRNA transcripts in the UC3 and UC4 experiments (where CH_4 was

significantly produced in some treatments). Similar to *phnJ* results, 16S sequences from the

dominant *Comamonadaceae* ASVs showed high (98.8-100%) nucleotide sequence identity to

16S rRNA genes in sequenced genomes.

Finally, we assembled and annotated metatranscriptomes and metagenomes to examine

whether particular groups possess and express multiple *phn* genes in parallel, as the genes

involved in phosphonate acquisition and utilization often occur in clusters (Huang et al. 2005).

We found that *phnJ* genes commonly clustered with other *phn* genes on the same contigs,

particularly those from the *Comamonadaceae*. For example, contigs >50 kb containing *phnC*,

phnD, *phnE*, *phnI*, *phnJ*, *phnK*, *phnL*, *phnM* were present in metagenomes from the LG2 and L6

incubations, and were affiliated with the abundant freshwater bacterial group *Limnohabitans*

(Newton et al. 2011, Kasalický et al. 2018, Imhoff et al. 2019), as well as other members of the

Comamonadaceae, such as *Hydrogenophaga* and *Acidovorax.* Several longer contigs also

contained *pst* or *pho* genes involved in P uptake and metabolism.

P limitation is common in freshwater lakes, as it is in the open ocean (Björkman & Karl

2003, Sickman et al. 2003, Elser et al. 2009). High-elevation lakes in the Sierra Nevada are

typically oligotrophic (Sickman et al. 2003, Moser et al. 2019), and inorganic phosphate

concentrations in the lakes sampled here are consistently near the limits of detection (100 nM) by

colorimetric techniques, with the vast majority of measurements <200 nM (Hayden & Beman

2016, Perez-Coronel et al. in review) Under these conditions, organic P compounds—including

phosphonates—could serve as important sources of P. Our findings are consistent with this idea,

and the presence and expression of *phnJ* genes indicates that several microbial groups are

capable of releasing CH_4 through the cleavage of the C-P bond in MPn (Fig. 2). Our data in

particular implicate multiple genera within the *Comamonadaceae* in MPn metabolism, given

high *phnJ* and 16S identities, recovery of contigs containing *phn* and other genes involved in P

acquisition and metabolism, and their widespread presence and abundance in all experiments

(Table 1).

Evidence for methane production by Cyanobacteria and Proteobacteria

In addition to microbial use of MPn, Cyanobacteria were recently identified as a possible source

of paradoxical CH_4 production—yet this has not been specifically investigated in the

environment, and the pathway by which Cyanobacteria ultimately produce CH_4 remains

unknown (Bižić et al. 2020). Based on 16S rRNA genes and transcripts (Table 1), and

metagenomes and metatranscriptomes, Cyanobacteria were common in our samples. However,

Cyanobacteria were also variable across lakes, over time in individual experiments, and

especially between experimental treatments. We evaluated whether these variations could be

used to determine whether Cyanobacteria are a significant source of paradoxical CH_4 production

in freshwater.

In particular, two additional treatments were used to partition the relative effects of CH_4

production vs. oxidation and evaluate Cyanobacteria as a potential source of CH_4. First, we

conducted light versus dark treatments in some experiments, as light has been shown to inhibit

CH_4 oxidation (Dumestre et al. 1999, Murase & Sugimoto 2005, Thottathil et al. 2018), and CH_4

production in cyanobacterial cultures was positively correlated with light (Bižić et al. 2020). As a

result, dark treatments would be expected to have higher CH_4 oxidation rates, lower

cyanobacterial CH_4 production, and therefore lower CH_4 concentrations compared with

controls. Additionally, we increased light intensity in four experiments, which may have a two-

fold effect: (1) greater inhibition of CH_4 oxidation, and (2) increased rates of CH_4 production

from Cyanobacteria or other phytoplankton (Grossart et al. 2011, Bogard et al. 2014, Bižić et al.

2020). For both of these reasons, we expected to observe higher CH_4 production rates under

higher light levels.

Dark bottles showed mixed results, with four cases of CH_4 consumption (L4, LC1, and
LG6 at 24 hours and LG5 at 86 hours; all $p<0.05$), production in two cases (UC2 at 24 hours and
L5 at 74 hours; both $p<0.05$), and no significant difference in four experiments (L3, L7, LG4 and
UC3). In two of four experiments with high light treatments, we observed increased CH_4
production (L2 and UC4; both $p<0.05$). The UC4 experiment was particularly illuminating, as
higher light intensity significantly boosted CH_4 production rates by 62-fold compared with the
control (up to 3.2 nM/h; $p<0.0005$). This was among the strongest treatment effects observed
across all experiments (Fig. 3). BES also increased CH_4 production rate by 49-fold compared
with control in this experiment (up to 2.5 nM/h; $p<0.0005$, Fig 3).

To examine this in greater detail, we analyzed both the stable isotope composition of CH_4
produced during the UC4 experiment, as well as changes in gene expression in response to
experimental treatments in metatranscriptomes. $\delta^{13}C$ of CH_4 from multiple sampling time points
in the BES and HL treatments was compared with controls in the UC4 experiment. $\delta^{13}C$ values
in the LG6 and L7 experiments—which did not show CH_4 production in treatments—were also
analyzed for purposes of comparison. Consistent with a lack of CH_4 production in these
experiments, $\delta^{13}C$ of CH_4 showed no significant variation between treatments in the LG6 and L7
experiments (Fig. 4).

UC4 data presented a clear contrast, as $\delta^{13}CH_4$ values were significantly lower in the BES
and HL treatments compared with controls (Fig. 4). Along with increased CH_4 concentrations,
these data are indicative of production of isotopically-depleted CH_4 in the BES and HL
treatments, which we calculate to be -56.9‰ to -57.0‰ based on isotopic mass balance.
Traditionally this could be interpreted as methanogenesis, as the $\delta^{13}C$ of biogenic CH_4 (-110 to -
50‰) is lower than terrestrial organic material (-28 to -26‰ for C3 plants) or lake primary
production (-35 to -25‰) (Grey 2016). While methanogenesis cannot be entirely ruled out, very
low levels of *mcrA* expression (Fig. 2) in these treatments suggest another source. Strong
isotopic fractionation from MPn also seems unlikely, as the mean isotopic fractionation for CH_4
derived from MPn by the cleavage of the C-P bond is only 1.3‰ (Taenzer et al. 2020). MPn
could be allochthonous (terrestrial) or autochthonous (based on *pepM* results), but in either case,
is unlikely to be so ^{13}C-depleted. For example, in marine systems, CH_4 production from MPn
actually increases $\delta^{13}C$ of CH_4 (Repeta et al. 2016). *phnJ* was also downregulated in both the

BES and high-light treatments (Fig. 5), further suggesting that MPn breakdown may not be the

major source of CH_4 in these treatments.

Instead, our isotopic data and metatranscriptomic data are consistent with Cyanobacteria

as a source of CH_4 in the UC4 experiment. In cyanobacterial cultures, produced CH_4 was

isotopically-depleted, with values (-45 to -55‰; Bižić et al. 2020) similar to those we

observed. Only the addition of ^{13}C-labeled dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) to cyanobacterial

cultures resulted in higher $\delta^{13}C$-CH_4 values, demonstrating that CH_4 was ultimately derived from

DIC. Although the pathway by which Cyanobacteria produce CH_4 remains unidentified, Bižić et

al. (2020) hypothesized that CH_4 is produced during the photosynthetic process owing to positive

correlation between light and CH_4. However, we found no significant differences in carbon

fixation ($p>0.05$) or photosynthesis ($p>0.05$) KEGG Pathway categories between treatments in

the UC4 experiment.

We consequently used metatranscriptomic data to identify specific functions that were

significantly different in the treatments vs. the control, and that may explain differences in CH_4

concentrations and isotopic composition. This is an advantage of 'omic data, as it is possible to

examine previously unidentified potential mechanisms for CH_4 production. Through comparison

of all functions across metatranscriptomes from the UC4 experiment, we identified two

functions, both involved in porphyrin and chlorophyll metabolism, that were upregulated:

ferredoxin:protochlorophyllide reductase (DPOR) and chlorophyllide a reductase (COR) were

significantly different between the control and the BES ($p<0.0005$) and HL ($p<0.005$) treatments

(Fig. 5). While not directly involved in the photosynthesis pathway, DPOR is found in

photosynthetic bacteria, Cyanobacteria, and green algae, and is involved in the light independent

reduction of protochlorophyllide (Fujita et al. 1993, Nomata et al. 2008); COR catalyzes the first

step in the conversion of chlorin to a bacteriochlorin ring during bacteriochlorophyll biosynthesis

(Nomata et al. 2006, Chew & Bryant 2007, Tsukatani et al. 2013). Notably, both DPOR and

COR are nitrogenase-like enzymes (Nomata et al. 2006, Chew & Bryant 2007, Tsukatani et al.

2013), and both were abundant in all metatranscriptomes and metagenomes. DPOR and COR

were particularly common within the *Limnohabitans* and *Polynucleobacter* genera, as some

strains of these abundant freshwater bacteria are capable of performing aerobic anoxygenic

photosynthesis (Kasalický et al. 2018, Imhoff et al. 2019, Hahn et al. 2017). DPOR exclusively

was also found in several cyanobacterial groups—such as *Pseudanabaena*, *Dolichospermum*,

Gloeomargarita and *Oscillatoria*—in the metatranscriptome data.

Based on these findings, we propose two potential mechanisms that could be involved in

paradoxical CH_4 production in oxic surface waters of freshwater lakes: (1) methane may be

produced from methoxyl groups present in (bacterio)chlorophyll precursors, or (2) methane

production may be catalyzed by DPOR and COR enzymes. In terrestrial plants, CH_4 is thought to

be produced aerobically from structural components—such as pectin, lignin and cellulose

(Keppler et al. 2006, Messenger et al. 2009, Vigano et al. 2008)—mainly in plants under stress

(such as increased temperature, UV radiation or physical damage; Bruhn et al. 2012).

Protochlorophyllide, chlorophyllide, and other bacteriochlorophyll precursors contain methoxyl

groups that have been shown to serve as precursors of CH_4 in plants (Keppler et al. 2008), and a

similar mechanism may be active in Cyanobacteria and/or Proteobacteria under stress in our

experimental treatments.

Alternatively, CH_4 production may be catalyzed by DPOR and COR enzymes.

Nitrogenases reduce a range of multibond compounds (Hu et al. 2011, Yang et al. 2011, Lee et

al. 2010, Zheng et al. 2018), and this quality is shared across different nitrogenases (Seefeldt et

al. 2020). Although DPOR and COR were expressed and present in all metatranscriptomes and

metagenomes, expression of both was an order of magnitude higher in the UC4 experiment

compared with the LG5, LG6, and L7 experiments (with the exception of COR in LG5). This

suggests that this mechanism can be variable, but is highly consistent with the lack of a $\delta^{13}CH_4$

isotopic signal in the LG6 and L7 experiments compared with the UC4 experiment (Fig. 4). We

propose that, similar to the findings of Zheng et al. (2018), the nitrogenase-like enzymes DPOR

and COR may be able to catalyze the reduction of CO_2 into CH_4. Importantly, these enzymes are

present in Cyanobacteria as well as the abundant and ubiquitous freshwater bacterial groups

Limnohabitans and *Polynucleobacter* (Kasalický et al. 2018, Imhoff et al. 2019, Hahn et al.

2017).

Multiple mechanisms produce methane in freshwater lakes

Our combined results indicate that multiple paradoxical CH_4 production mechanisms are active

in freshwater ecosystems, and have several implications for our understanding of aquatic CH_4

production. First, confirmation of the CH_4 paradox in freshwater is still limited in scope and

relatively recent (Grossart et al. 2011, Bogard et al. 2014, Bižić et al. 2020). We conducted

multiple experiments in multiple lakes, and measured significant CH_4 production in 37% of

experiments (Fig. 1). In many of the remaining experiments, variations over time, across

experimental treatments, and in *pmoA* gene expression patterns suggest that CH_4 production

occurs in parallel with coupled CH_4 oxidation (Fig. 2). Because CH_4 oxidation may obscure CH_4

production, use of different experimental treatments combined with 'omic data is required to

identify paradoxical CH_4 production. Our findings therefore expand on limited data and

demonstrate that paradoxical CH_4 production is common, but variable, in freshwater.

Given the ubiquity of *phnJ* genes in our data (Fig. 2), their presence on contigs from

abundant organisms, and the potential for P limitation in these lakes, microbial metabolism of

MPn may represent an important baseline CH_4 production mechanism in freshwater lakes. This

fits with current understanding of marine ecosystems (Karl et al. 2008, Repeta et al. 2016).

Metatranscriptomic and metagenomic data also indicate that, like the ocean, DMSP

transformations may be active in freshwater—with potential implications for both DMS and CH_4

production. Our data further demonstrate that MPn may itself be produced within lakes based on

ppd and *pepM* expression (Fig. 2). Quantifying the relative contributions of allochthonous vs.

autochthonous MPn production—as well as broader P acquisition dynamics—is therefore

essential to understanding CH_4 production in freshwater. Phosphonate compounds were once

thought to be resistant to breakdown and their formation remains poorly understood (Kafarski

2019). Under P limiting conditions, competition for these and other P compounds among

multiple groups of organisms will be intense and potentially variable in space and time. Along

with variations in CH_4 oxidation relative to production rates, this can drive variations in CH_4

production such as those evident in our data.

As a newly-identified CH_4 source that has not been examined in the environment and

occurs via an unknown pathway (Bižić et al. 2020), we used a combination of approaches to

identify whether cyanobacterial CH_4 production occurs in freshwater, and by what means.

Although independent data types (CH_4 concentrations, treatment effects, isotopic data, 'omic

data) may be interpreted in multiple ways, the combined data are consistent with cyanobacterial

production in the UC4 experiment. For example, the high light and BES treatments boosted CH_4

concentrations (Fig. 3), but this CH_4 is unlikely to have been the result of methanogenesis or

MPn breakdown given low and decreasing *mcrA* and *phnJ* expression (Fig. 5). If methanogenesis

is a source of CH$_4$ in these lakes, per transcript/gene rates would have to be remarkably high

given 16S rRNA and *mcrA* numbers. Instead, Cyanobacteria were present and responsive to

treatments as shown by metagenomic, metatranscriptomic, and 16S data. Our data are further

indicative of an isotopically light C source (Fig. 4)—consistent with δ^{13}C values from

cyanobacterial cultures reported by Bižić et al. 2020).

404   Notably, these patterns were most clearly evident in experimental treatments,

highlighting the efficacy of including different treatments to identify production

mechanisms. We leveraged 'omic data from these different treatments to identify potential

mechanisms of CH$_4$ production—providing an experimental approach, additional isotopic

signature data, and two potential gene targets to examine in other aquatic ecosystems. We found

that this mechanism was not limited to the Cyanobacteria, as the majority of DPOR and COR

transcripts and genes were derived from several members of the Proteobacteria. This has

multiple implications, as *Limnohabitans* and *Polynucleobacter* are among the most abundant and

ubiquitous bacteria found in freshwater ecosystems (Newton et al. 2011, Kasalický et al. 2018,

Imhoff et al. 2019, Hahn et al. 2017). Although there is significant genomic diversity within

these groups (Newton et al. 2011, Kasalický et al. 2013, Hahn et al. 2016), this suggests that the

potential for CH$_4$ production via this pathway may be widespread in freshwater. *Limnohabitans*

also expressed *phnJ* genes, indicating that they can play a dual role in paradoxical CH$_4$

production.

418   Ultimately, our combined dataset indicates that paradoxical CH$_4$ production is complex,

with multiple interacting groups and processes, each affected by multiple environmental

variables (e.g., P availability, light), and all producing CH$_4$ to differing degrees. Understanding

this complexity is essential, as multiple paradoxical CH$_4$ production mechanisms are widely-

distributed, and so may be important sources of CH$_4$ to the atmosphere.

Materials and methods

Field site, sample collection, and experimental set up

Water samples were collected in 2016-2018 in five high-elevation lakes in Yosemite National

Park, and used in incubation experiments. Samples were collected in Lukens (L), Lower

Cathedral (LC), Upper Cathedral (UC), Lower Gaylor (LG), and Upper Gaylor (UG) Lakes;

incubations are denoted by lake abbreviation and sequential numbering (Table 2). Water samples

were collected in the littoral and limnetic zones of the lakes at 0.1 m depth with previously acid-
washed plastic cubitainers, and then kept on ice or refrigeration to maintain in-lake temperature
until laboratory incubations were established within 24 hours of samples collection. Temperature
and dissolved oxygen were measured at the time of sample collection using a ProODO YSI
probe (YSI Inc., Yellow Springs, OH, USA).
Water collected in the lakes was transferred to 170 or 300 ml Wheaton bottles, capped
and crimped, and a known volume of air was introduced to generate a headspace for sampling.
Initial CH_4 samples were collected, and bottles were incubated in water baths at constant
temperature. All incubations were run in triplicate and set to the temperature at which water
samples were collected in the field. The different treatments used in the experiments were:

- Control: unamended lake water following a natural day-night set up (water bath lid was
opened at 7:00 hours and closed at 18:00 hours).
- Dark: unamended lake water; bottles were kept in the dark during the whole incubation
time.
- BES: lake water was amended with 2-bromoethanesulphonate (BES) to a final
concentration of $5x10^{-4}$ M. This concentration has been established to inhibit
methanogens (Oremland & Capone 1988) and has been used in methane paradox
experimentation before (Grossart et al. 2011). This treatment followed the same natural
daylight set up than the control.
- High light: unamended lake water was subjected to 500 mmol/m^2 inside a growth
chamber and followed the same natural daylight set up than the control (light would turn
on at 7:00 hours and off at 18:00 hours).

For all incubation types, gas samples were taken from the headspace every 6-24 hours for up to
96 hours with a syringe and immediately transferred to exetainers for later analyses in a gas
chromatograph. Not all treatments were tested in each incubation experiment. Temperature and
oxygen concentrations were monitored at each sampling point. Optical sensor spots (Fibox,
Loligo Systems, Viborg, Denmark) were used to measure oxygen concentrations during
incubations (detection limit of 100 nM) and make sure that the water did not go anoxic at any
time. Temperature was measured with a Fibox temperature sensor and kept constant during the
incubation time. Water samples were filtered at the beginning and end of the incubation for DNA
and RNA sampling.

Methane measurements

Methane concentrations were measured via headspace equilibration and gas chromatography. Headspace gas samples from incubations were collected with a gas-tight syringe into 12-mL Labco Exetainer vials (Labco Ltd., Lampeter, Ceredigion, UK) after incubations bottles were shaken for 2 minutes to reach equilibration. Samples were subsequently analyzed using a Shimadzu GC-2014 gas chromatograph with flame ionization detection (FID) for CH_4 (Weiss 1981). Headspace CH_4 concentration measurements were then used to calculate CH_4 concentration in lake water based on Henry's law of equilibrium (Yamamoto et al. 1976).

DNA and RNA Extraction

Water samples were filtered through 0.22 μm (Millipore, Darmstadt, Germany) then DNA filter samples were preserved in Sucrose-Tris-EDTA (STE) buffer in pre-prepped Lysis Matrix E tubes and frozen at -80°C until extraction. RNA samples were preserved in RNA*later*® (Ambion™, AM7021) in pre-prepped Lysing Matrix E tubes (MP Bio, Eschwege, Germany), and frozen at -80°C until extraction. DNA was extracted using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit with a modified protocol from Beman et al. (2012). Briefly, samples were lysed with 100µL 10% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS), DNA gets separated from proteins and cellular debris using proteinase K (20mg mL^{-1}; Qiagen, Inc., Valencia, CA, USA), precipitated with ethanol and cleaned up. After extraction samples were preserved at -80°C until further analyses. RNA was extracted using a *mir*Vana miRNA Isolation Kit (Ambion™, AM1560) with a modified protocol from Huber & Fortunato (2017). Briefly, samples are lysed with the kit's lysing matrix, then subjected to an organic extraction with phenol chloroform followed by a wash to obtain RNA. Immediately after RNA extraction we used the SuperScript III First-Strand Synthesis System for RT-PCR (Life Technologies Corporation, Carlsbad, CA, USA) to synthesize first-strand cDNA and samples were preserved at -80°C until further analyses. DNA, RNA and cDNA purity was measured using a Biospectrometer (Eppendorf AG, Hamburg, Germany) and the concentrations were quantified using PicoGreen Quant-iT dsDNA quantitation assay (ThermoFisher Scientific, USA) for DNA samples and the MaestroNano Pro (Maestrogen Inc., Taiwan) for RNA and cDNA samples.

16S sequencing

DNA and RNA extracted from filtered water samples were diluted to a common concentration

(1ng/ul) and sent for 16S rRNA amplicon sequencing on an Illumina MiSeq (Illumina, San

Diego, CA, USA) according to Earth Microbiome protocols. We used the universal primers

515F-Y (5'- GTGYCAGCMGCCGCGGTAA) and 926R (5'-CCGYCAATTYMTTTRAGTTT).

DNA samples were sequenced at the Joint Genome Institute (Berkeley, CA, USA) and RNA

samples at the Argonne National Laboratory (Lemont, IL, USA).

ASVs were generated from 16S rDNA and rRNA sequence data using the Divisive

Amplicon Denoising Algorithm (DADA2; Callahan et al. 2016) as implemented in QIIME 2

(Bolyen et al. 2019), and then used for subsequent analyses. After import and demultiplexing,

read quality was visualized using the 'qiime tools view' command. Reads were then processed

using the 'qiime dada2 denoise-paired' command, with 13 bp trimmed from both the forward

and reverse reads, truncation of reverse to 169 bp (due to the well-known decline in sequence

quality observed for MiSeq reverse reads), and training of the denoising algorithm on 1 million

reads. Classification of ASVs was conducted in mothur (Schloss et al. 2009) using the SILVA

(version 128) database.

Metatranscriptomes and metagenomes

Metatranscriptomes and metagenomes were generated from later experiments in order to

examine potential production mechanisms and coupled methane oxidation. Following

extraction, DNA and RNA samples were sent for metagenome/metatranscriptome sequencing in

the Vincent J. Coates Genome Sequencing Laboratory (GSL) at the University of California,

Berkeley (https://genomics.qb3.berkeley.edu/), which is supported by NIH S10 OD018174

Instrumentation Grant. For each DNA sample, 250 ng of genomic DNA was sheared and

libraries were prepared using the KAPA HyperPrep Kit (Kapa Biosystems, Wilmington, MA,

USA). For each RNA sample, ~800 ng of total RNA was depleted of rRNA using the Ribo-Zero

rRNA Removal Kit (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA), sheared, and libraries were prepared

using the KAPA RNA HyperPrep Kit (Kapa Biosystems, Wilmington, MA, USA). 12 samples

were pooled into a single lane and sequenced via 150-cycle paired-end sequencing on the

Illumina HiSeq 4000 platform (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA).

Data were demultiplexed by the GSL and reads were filtered and trimmed using BBDuk

(https://jgi.doe.gov/data-and-tools/bbtools/bb-tools-user-guide/bbduk-guide/) with the following

parameters: maq=8, maxns=1, minlen=40,minlenfraction=0.6, k=23, hdist=1, trimq=12,

qtrim=rl. Forward and reverse reads were then merged using PANDASeq

(https://github.com/neufeld/pandaseq; Masella et al. 2012) with default parameters. Merged

reads were subsequently annotated in DIAMOND (http://diamondsearch.org/; Buchfink et al.

2015) using the NCBI NR database (accessed February 11th, 2020) with the following search

criteria: maximum number of target sequences = 1, bit-score > 40. In order to quantify

functional gene abundances, we filtered the DIAMOND annotation data (Percent identity > 60%,

bit score > 100) to find the number of functional genes of interest present in each metagenome or

metatrascriptome. We calculated percent abundance based on the total number of reads and the

number of targeted genes in each metagenome or metatranscriptome.

UC4 metatranscriptomes were uploaded to the Joint Genome Institute (JGI;

https://img.jgi.doe.gov/) Integrated Microbial Genomes & Microbiomes platform for further

analyses. We used the function comparisons tool to identify functions that were significantly

different in the treatments vs. the control, and the function category tool identify differences in

KEGG pathway categories among the treatments. Moreover, we used the phylogenetic

distribution tool to quantify the abundance of different phylogenetic groups of potential

importance in the methane paradox.

Stable isotopic measurements

Headspace of incubation bottles was transferred to evacuated exetainers and sent to the UC

Davis Stable Isotope Facility (Davis, CA) for analysis. Measurements of stable isotope ratios of

carbon (δ^{13}C) in CH_4 were conducted using a ThermoScientific Precon concentration unit

interfaced to a ThermoScientific Delta V Plus isotope ratio mass spectrometer

(ThermoScientific, Bremen, Germany). In brief, gas samples are passed through a H_2O/ CO_2

scrubber and a cold trap, and CH_4 is then separated from other gases and oxidized to CO_2. Pure

CO_2 reference gas is used to calculate provisional δ values, and final δ values are calculated after

correcting for changes in linearity and instrumental drift, and expressed relative to the Vienna

PeeDee Belemnite (V-PDB) standard.

Statistical analyses

Spearman's correlation test was used to assess the relationship between time (h) and CH_4

concentration in all incubations and across all treatments. A priori significance level was defined

as $\alpha < 0.05$. A significantly positive relationship between time and CH_4 was considered as net CH_4

production in the incubation, whereas a significantly negative relationship was considered as net

CH_4 consumption; otherwise we defined the incubation as not having significant net production

or consumption over time. We subsequently used ANOVA and Tukey honestly significant

difference (HSD) post-hoc tests to test for cases where CH_4 production or oxidation varied

significantly between sampling time points, resulting in nonlinear patterns in CH_4 concentrations

over the course of the experiment. For example, initial CH_4 production could be followed by

subsequent oxidation, resulting in significant CH_4 increases followed by significant decreases.

To express the different responses in terms of CH_4 concentration over time among the

different experiments treatments we first calculated the response ratios (lnRR) by the following

equation:

$$lnRR = ln\,\frac{mean\ CH_4\ in\ treatment}{mean\ CH_4\ in\ control}$$

Additionally, we calculated which treatments were significantly different from each other and

the control using ANOVA and Tukey honestly significant difference (HSD) post-hoc tests.

All statistical analyses and figures were done in the R statistical environment (RStudioVersion

1.2.5001).

Tables

Table 1. Relative abundance of methanogens, Cyanobacteria, and *Comamonadaceae* as a % of
16S rRNA genes and transcripts sequenced in different experiments and treatments.
577

Exp.	Treatment	Time (h)	Methanogens	Cyanobacteria	*Comamonadaceae*
			% of 16S rRNA genes		
L1	Control	0	0	0.902	9.17
L2	Control	0	0	1.10	6.03
	Control	24	0	1.65	5.20
L3	Control	0	0	0.061	4.56
L4	Control	0	0	2.38	7.97
L6	Control	0	0	5.55	2.03
	BES	45	0	12.6	0.338
LG1	Control	0	0	0.646	5.32
	Control	24	0	0.377	2.04
LG2	Control	0	0	0.795	11.1
LG3	Control	24	0	0.246	0.881
LG4	Control	0	0	5.79	4.35
UC1	Control	0	0	0.880	11.6
			% of 16S rRNA transcripts		
L5	Control	0	0	46.0	6.43
	Control	74	0	28.8	6.66
	Dark	74	0.014	58.5	4.70
	BES	74	0	24.9	8.65

L6	Control	0	0	8.34	6.27
	Control	55	0	0.800	5.42
	BES	55	0	0	5.20
L7	Dark	96	0	65.5	0.841
	BES	96	0	46.4	1.95
	High light	96	0	45.0	1.06
LG5	Control	0	0	17.3	12.8
	Control	86	0	2.00	12.0
	Dark	86	0.008	19.2	10.2
	BES	86	0	1.04	25.6
LG6	Control	0	0	3.05	6.14
	Control	96	0	2.45	8.69
	Dark	96	0	2.65	2.53
	BES	96	0	2.28	5.02
	High light	96	0	7.18	2.64
UC3	Control	0	0	0.227	7.98
	Control	24	0	0.275	8.72
	Control	48	0	0.221	15.2
	Control	57	0	0	12.3
	Dark	57	0	0	8.66
	BES	57	0	0	10.9
UC4	Control	96	0	3.148	14.0
	High light	96	0	0.474	7.25

578   **Table 2.** Experimental incubations characteristics. BES corresponds to the addition of 2-
579   bromoethanesulphonate as a methanogenesis inhibitor, Dark represents experiments incubated in
580   total darkness and HL (high-light) are experiments subjected to high-light intensity during the
581   incubation.
582

Exp.	Y	M	D	CH$_4$	P	16S rDNA	16S rRNA	Metat	Metag	Length (h)	Treatments
L1	2016	8	12-13	+	0.02	X				24	
L2	2016	9	11-12	+	0.02	X				24	HL
L3	2017	7	28-30			X				48	BES, Dark
L4	2017	8	8-10			X				48	BES, Dark
L5	2017	9	26-29	-	0.02	X	X			74	BES, Dark
L6	2017	11	13-15			X	X	X	X	55	BES
L7	2018	9	23-28	-	0.02		X	X		96	BES, Dark, HL
LG1	2016	8	8-9	+/-	0.02	X				24	
LG2	2016	9	9-10			X			X	24	
LG3	2016	10	7-8	+	0.02	X				24	
LG4	2017	8	24-26	+	0.02	X				48	BES, Dark

LG5	2017	10	1-4				X	X		86	BES, Dark
LG6	2018	9	10-14				X	X		96	BES, Dark, HL
UC1	2016	8	10-11	+	0.02					24	
UC2	2017	8	10-12							48	BES, Dark
UC3	2017	10	8-11	+/-	0.006		X			57	BES, Dark
UC4	2018	10	8-12				X	X		96	BES, Dark, HL
LC1	2017	8	26-28	-	0.02					48	BES, Dark
UG1	2017	8	12-14							48	BES

583
584

585   **Figures**
586

587
588
589   **Figure 1.** CH₄ production or consumption rates across incubation experiments. Different colors
590   represent significant linear increases (production; red), linear decreases (consumption; blue),
591   nonlinear patterns (green), or no significant change in CH₄ concentrations (grey) over 24 hours in
592   unamended controls.

605   **Figure 2.** Variations across experiments and treatments in (a) transcript abundance (% of total
606   reads of metatranscriptomes) and (b) gene abundance (% of total reads of metagenomes) for
607   functional genes quantified involved in methane oxidation (*pmoA*), methanogenesis
608   (*mcrA*), phosphonate assimilation (*phnD*, *phnJ*), phosphonate synthesis (*ppd*, *pepM*), and DMSP
609   metabolism (*dmdA*, *dmdB*, *dmdC*, *dmdD*).

612
613
614 **Figure 3.** Log response ratios for experimental treatments at 24 hours. Asterisks denote
615 experimental treatments that were significantly different from the control. Experiments L3, L5,
616 LG5, and UC3 were longer experiments and treatment effects are shown for 36, 74, 86 and 57
617 hours respectively.

618
619 **Figure 4.** Contrasts in $\delta^{13}C$ values of CH_4 over time in experimental treatments in the UC4, L7,
620 and LG6 experiments. Different colors denote different experimental treatments. Scales of the
621 vertical axes differ between experiments due to different patterns in $\delta^{13}CH_4$.

622
623
Figure 5. Upregulation and downregulation of genes in UC4 experimental treatments.
Percentage change in expression is shown for genes involved in methane oxidation (*pmoA*),
methanogenesis *(mcrA)*, phosphonate assimilation *(phnD*, *phnJ)*, phosphonate synthesis (*pepM*,
ppd), and porphyrin and chlorophyll metabolism (DPOR, COR). BES treatment is shown in the
top panel and the high-light treatment in the bottom panel. Colors denote the effect of the
treatment on the different genes quantified.

630   **References**
631

Angelis MA de, Lee C. 1994. Methane production during zooplankton grazing on marine
phytoplankton. Limnology and Oceanography. 39(6):1298–1308.

Angle JC, Morin TH, Solden LM, Narrowe AB, Smith GJ, Borton MA, Rey-Sanchez C, Daly
RA, Mirfenderesgi G, Hoyt DW, et al. 2017. Methanogenesis in oxygenated soils is a substantial
fraction of wetland methane emissions. Nature Communications. 8(1):1567.

Bastviken D. 2009. Methane. In: Likens GE, editor. Encyclopedia of Inland Waters [Internet].
Oxford: Academic Press; [accessed 2019 Apr 15]; p. 783–805.
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780123706263001174

Bastviken D, Cole J, Pace M, Tranvik L. 2004. Methane emissions from lakes: Dependence of
lake characteristics, two regional assessments, and a global estimate. Global Biogeochemical
Cycles [Internet]. [accessed 2019 Mar 16] 18(4).
https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2004GB002238

Bižić M, Klintzsch T, Ionescu D, Hindiyeh MY, Günthel M, Muro-Pastor AM, Eckert W, Urich
T, Keppler F, Grossart H-P. 2020. Aquatic and terrestrial cyanobacteria produce methane.
Science Advances. 6(3):eaax5343.

Björkman KM, Karl DM. 2003. Bioavailability of dissolved organic phosphorus in the euphotic
zone at Station ALOHA, North Pacific Subtropical Gyre. Limnology and Oceanography.
48(3):1049–1057.

Bogard MJ, del Giorgio PA, Boutet L, Chaves MCG, Prairie YT, Merante A, Derry AM. 2014.
Oxic water column methanogenesis as a major component of aquatic CH_4 fluxes. Nature
Communications. 5:5350.

Bruhn D, Møller IM, Mikkelsen TN, Ambus P. 2012. Terrestrial plant methane production and
emission. Physiologia Plantarum. 144(3):201–209.

Chew AGM, Bryant DA. 2007. Chlorophyll Biosynthesis in Bacteria: The Origins of Structural
and Functional Diversity. Annual Review of Microbiology. 61(1):113–129.

Damm E, Helmke E, Thoms S, Schauer U, Nöthig E, Bakker K, Kiene RP. 2010. Methane
production in aerobic oligotrophic surface water in the central Arctic Ocean. Biogeosciences.
7(3):1099–1108.

Donis D, Flury S, Stöckli A, Spangenberg JE, Vachon D, McGinnis DF. 2017. Full-scale
evaluation of methane production under oxic conditions in a mesotrophic lake. Nature
Communications. 8(1):1–12.

Dumestre JF, Guézennec J, Galy-Lacaux C, Delmas R, Richard S, Labroue L. 1999. Influence of
Light Intensity on Methanotrophic Bacterial Activity in Petit Saut Reservoir, French Guiana.
Appl Environ Microbiol. 65(2):534–539.

Elser JJ, Andersen T, Baron JS, Bergström A-K, Jansson M, Kyle M, Nydick KR, Steger L,
Hessen DO. 2009. Shifts in Lake N:P Stoichiometry and Nutrient Limitation Driven by
Atmospheric Nitrogen Deposition. Science. 326(5954):835–837.

Fujita Y, Matsumoto H, Takahashi Y, Matsubara H. 1993. Identification of a nifDK-Like Gene
(ORF467) Involved in the Biosynthesis of Chlorophyll in the Cyanobacterium Plectonema
boryanum. Plant Cell Physiol. 34(2):305–314.

Grey J. 2016. The Incredible Lightness of Being Methane-Fuelled: Stable Isotopes Reveal
Alternative Energy Pathways in Aquatic Ecosystems and Beyond. Front Ecol Evol [Internet].
[accessed 2020 May 1] 4. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fevo.2016.00008/full

Grossart H-P, Frindte K, Dziallas C, Eckert W, Tang KW. 2011. Microbial methane production
in oxygenated water column of an oligotrophic lake. PNAS. 108(49):19657–19661.

Hahn MW, Jezberová J, Koll U, Saueressig-Beck T, Schmidt J. 2016. Complete ecological
isolation and cryptic diversity in Polynucleobacter bacteria not resolved by 16S rRNA gene
sequences. The ISME Journal. 10(7):1642–1655.

Hahn MW, Koll U, Karbon G, Schmidt J, Lang E. 2017. Polynucleobacter aenigmaticus sp. nov.
isolated from the permanently anoxic monimolimnion of a temperate meromictic lake.
International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology,. 67(11):4646–4654.

Hayden CJ, Beman JM. 2016. Microbial diversity and community structure along a lake
elevation gradient in Yosemite National Park, California, USA. Environmental Microbiology.
18(6):1782–1791.

Hoehler T, Losey NA, Gunsalus RP, McInerney MJ. 2018. Environmental Constraints that Limit
Methanogenesis [Reference work chapter] [Internet]. [place unknown]: Springer; [accessed 2020
May 17]. https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1604967

Hu Y, Lee CC, Ribbe MW. 2011. Extending the Carbon Chain: Hydrocarbon Formation
Catalyzed by Vanadium/Molybdenum Nitrogenases. Science. 333(6043):753–755.

Huang J, Su Z, Xu Y. 2005. The Evolution of Microbial Phosphonate Degradative Pathways. J
Mol Evol. 61(5):682–690.

Imhoff JF, Rahn T, Künzel S, Neulinger SC. 2019. Phylogeny of Anoxygenic Photosynthesis
Based on Sequences of Photosynthetic Reaction Center Proteins and a Key Enzyme in
Bacteriochlorophyll Biosynthesis, the Chlorophyllide Reductase. Microorganisms. 7(11):576.

IPCC, 2014: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and
III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core
Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp.
699
Kafarski P. 2019. Phosphonates: Their Natural Occurrence and Physiological Role.
Contemporary Topics about Phosphorus in Biology and Materials [Internet]. [accessed 2020 Jul

12]. https://www.intechopen.com/online-first/phosphonates-their-natural-occurrence-and-
physiological-role

Karl DM, Beversdorf L, Björkman KM, Church MJ, Martinez A, Delong EF. 2008. Aerobic
production of methane in the sea. Nature Geoscience. 1(7):473–478.

Karl DM, Tilbrook BD. 1994. Production and transport of methane in oceanic particulate organic
matter. Nature. 368(6473):732–734.

Kasalický V, Jezbera J, Hahn MW, Šimek K. 2013. The Diversity of the Limnohabitans Genus,
an Important Group of Freshwater Bacterioplankton, by Characterization of 35 Isolated Strains.
PLoS One [Internet]. [accessed 2020 Mar 20] 8(3).
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3591437/

Kasalický V, Zeng Y, Piwosz K, Šimek K, Kratochvilová H, Koblížek M. 2018. Aerobic
Anoxygenic Photosynthesis Is Commonly Present within the Genus Limnohabitans. Appl
Environ Microbiol [Internet]. [accessed 2020 Jul 26] 84(1).
https://aem.asm.org/content/84/1/e02116-17

Keppler F, Hamilton JTG, Braß M, Röckmann T. 2006. Methane emissions from terrestrial
plants under aerobic conditions. Nature. 439(7073):187–191.

Keppler F, Hamilton JTG, McRoberts WC, Vigano I, Braß M, Röckmann T. 2008. Methoxyl
groups of plant pectin as a precursor of atmospheric methane: evidence from deuterium labelling
studies. New Phytologist. 178(4):808–814.

Kiene RP, Linn LJ, Bruton JA. 2000. New and important roles for DMSP in marine microbial
communities. Journal of Sea Research. 43(3):209–224.

Kononova SV, Nesmeyanova MA. 2002. Phosphonates and Their Degradation by
Microorganisms. Biochemistry (Moscow). 67(2):184–195.

Lee CC, Hu Y, Ribbe MW. 2010. Vanadium Nitrogenase Reduces CO. Science. 329(5992):642–
642.

Li W, Dore JE, Steigmeyer AJ, Cho Y-J, Kim O-S, Liu Y, Morgan-Kiss RM, Skidmore ML,
Priscu JC. 2020. Methane production in the oxygenated water column of a perennially ice-
covered Antarctic lake. Limnology and Oceanography. 65(1):143–156.

Messenger DJ, Mcleod AR, Fry SC. 2009. The role of ultraviolet radiation, photosensitizers,
reactive oxygen species and ester groups in mechanisms of methane formation from pectin.
Plant, Cell & Environment. 32(1):1–9.

Moran MA, Reisch CR, Kiene RP, Whitman WB. 2012. Genomic Insights into Bacterial DMSP
Transformations. Annual Review of Marine Science. 4(1):523–542.

Moser KA, Baron JS, Brahney J, Oleksy IA, Saros JE, Hundey EJ, Sadro SA, Kopáček J,
Sommaruga R, Kainz MJ, et al. 2019. Mountain lakes: Eyes on global environmental change.

Global and Planetary Change [Internet]. [accessed 2019 Apr 19].
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921818118306702

Murase J, Sugimoto A. 2005. Inhibitory effect of light on methane oxidation in the pelagic water column of a mesotrophic lake (Lake Biwa, Japan). Limnology and Oceanography. 50(4):1339–1343.

Newton RJ, Jones SE, Eiler A, McMahon KD, Bertilsson S. 2011. A Guide to the Natural History of Freshwater Lake Bacteria. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev. 75(1):14–49.

Nomata J, Mizoguchi T, Tamiaki H, Fujita Y. 2006. A Second Nitrogenase-like Enzyme for Bacteriochlorophyll Biosynthesis RECONSTITUTION OF CHLOROPHYLLIDE a REDUCTASE WITH PURIFIED X-PROTEIN (BchX) AND YZ-PROTEIN (BchY-BchZ) FROM RHODOBACTER CAPSULATUS. J Biol Chem. 281(21):15021–15028.

Nomata J, Ogawa T, Kitashima M, Inoue K, Fujita Y. 2008. NB-protein (BchN-BchB) of dark-operative protochlorophyllide reductase is the catalytic component containing oxygen-tolerant Fe-S clusters. FEBS Letters. 582(9):1346–1350.

Oremland RS. 1979. Methanogenic activity in plankton samples and fish intestines A mechanism for in situ methanogenesis in oceanic surface waters. Limnology and Oceanography. 24(6):1136–1141.

Oremland RS, Capone DG. 1988. Use of "Specific" Inhibitors in Biogeochemistry and Microbial Ecology. In: Marshall KC, editor. Advances in Microbial Ecology [Internet]. Boston, MA: Springer US; [accessed 2019 Dec 1]; p. 285–383. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-5409-3_8

Perez-Coronel E, Hart SC, Beman JM. 2020. Seasonal methane dynamics in high-elevation lakes in the Sierra Nevada California: the role of elevation, temperature, organic matter, and inorganic nutrients [Internet]. [accessed 2020 Jul 26]. https://eartharxiv.org/yvgq4/

Repeta DJ, Ferrón S, Sosa OA, Johnson CG, Repeta LD, Acker M, DeLong EF, Karl DM. 2016. Marine methane paradox explained by bacterial degradation of dissolved organic matter. Nature Geoscience. 9(12):884–887.

Rizk SS, Cuneo MJ, Hellinga HW. 2006. Identification of cognate ligands for the Escherichia coli phnD protein product and engineering of a reagentless fluorescent biosensor for phosphonates. Protein Science. 15(7):1745–1751.

Seefeldt LC, Yang Z-Y, Lukoyanov DA, Harris DF, Dean DR, Raugei S, Hoffman BM. 2020. Reduction of Substrates by Nitrogenases. Chem Rev. 120(12):5082–5106.

Sela-Adler M, Said-Ahmad W, Sivan O, Eckert W, Kiene RP, Amrani A. 2015. Isotopic evidence for the origin of dimethylsulfide and dimethylsulfoniopropionate-like compounds in a warm, monomictic freshwater lake. Environ Chem. 13(2):340–351.

Sickman JO, Melack JM, Clow DW. 2003. Evidence for nutrient enrichment of high-elevation lakes in the Sierra Nevada, California. Limnology and Oceanography. 48(5):1885–1892.

Sosa OA, Repeta DJ, DeLong EF, Ashkezari MD, Karl DM. 2019. Phosphate-limited ocean
regions select for bacterial populations enriched in the carbon–phosphorus lyase pathway for
phosphonate degradation. Environmental Microbiology. 21(7):2402–2414.

Taenzer L, Carini PC, Masterson AM, Bourque B, Gaube JH, Leavitt WD. 2020. Microbial
Methane From Methylphosphonate Isotopically Records Source. Geophysical Research Letters.
47(1):e2019GL085872.

Tang KW, McGinnis DF, Frindte K, Brüchert V, Grossart H-P. 2014. Paradox reconsidered:
Methane oversaturation in well-oxygenated lake waters. Limnology and Oceanography.
59(1):275–284.

Tang KW, McGinnis DF, Ionescu D, Grossart H-P. 2016. Methane Production in Oxic Lake
Waters Potentially Increases Aquatic Methane Flux to Air. Environ Sci Technol Lett. 3(6):227–
233.

Thottathil SD, Reis PCJ, Giorgio PA del, Prairie YT. 2018. The Extent and Regulation of
Summer Methane Oxidation in Northern Lakes. Journal of Geophysical Research:
Biogeosciences. 123(10):3216–3230.

Tsukatani Y, Yamamoto H, Harada J, Yoshitomi T, Nomata J, Kasahara M, Mizoguchi T, Fujita
Y, Tamiaki H. 2013. An unexpectedly branched biosynthetic pathway for bacteriochlorophyll b
capable of absorbing near-infrared light. Sci Rep [Internet]. [accessed 2020 Jul 26] 3.
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3564038/

Vigano I, Weelden H van, Holzinger R, Keppler F, McLeod A, Röckmann T. 2008. Effect of UV
radiation and temperature on the emission of methane from plant biomass and structural
components. Biogeosciences. 5(3):937–947.

Wang Q, Dore JE, McDermott TR. 2017. Methylphosphonate metabolism by Pseudomonas sp.
populations contributes to the methane oversaturation paradox in an oxic freshwater lake.
Environmental Microbiology. 19(6):2366–2378.

Yang Z-Y, Dean DR, Seefeldt LC. 2011. Molybdenum Nitrogenase Catalyzes the Reduction and
Coupling of CO to Form Hydrocarbons. J Biol Chem. 286(22):19417–19421.

Yao M, Henny C, Maresca JA. 2016. Freshwater Bacteria Release Methane as a By-Product of
Phosphorus Acquisition. Appl Environ Microbiol. 82(23):6994–7003.

Yu X, Doroghazi JR, Janga SC, Zhang JK, Circello B, Griffin BM, Labeda DP, Metcalf WW.
2013. Diversity and abundance of phosphonate biosynthetic genes in nature. Proc Natl Acad Sci
USA. 110(51):20759–20764.

Zheng Y, Harris DF, Yu Z, Fu Y, Poudel S, Ledbetter RN, Fixen KR, Yang Z-Y, Boyd ES,
Lidstrom ME, et al. 2018. A pathway for biological methane production using bacterial iron-only
nitrogenase. Nature Microbiology. 3(3):281–286.