1
2
3
4   # Microbial diversity and sulfur cycling in an early earth analogue: From ancient novelty to modern commonality
5
6
7
8

9   **C. Ryan Hahn**[1]**, Ibrahim F. Farag**[1$]**, Chelsea L. Murphy**[1]**, Mircea Podar**[2,3]**, Mostafa S.
10   Elshahed**[1]**, and Noha H. Youssef**[1]*****

11
12   [1] Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,
13   OK, USA,
14   [2] Department of Microbiology, University of Tennessee Knoxville, Knoxville, TN, USA, and [3]
15   Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, USA

16
17   [$] Present address: University of Delaware, Newark DE.

18
19
20   **Classification: Biological Sciences-Microbiology**

*Correspondence: Noha H. Youssef: noha@okstate.edu

21   **Abstract**

Life emerged and diversified in the absence of molecular oxygen. The prevailing anoxia and

unique sulfur chemistry in the Paleo-, Meso- and Neoarchean, and early Proterozoic eons may

have supported microbial communities that are drastically different than those currently thriving

on the earth's surface. Zodletone spring in southwestern Oklahoma represents a unique habitat

where spatial sampling could substitute for geological eons: from the anoxic, surficial light

exposed sediments simulating a preoxygenated earth, to overlaid water column where air

exposure simulates the relentless oxygen intrusion during the Neo Proterozoic. We document a

remarkably diverse microbial community in the anoxic spring sediments, with 340/516 (65.89%)

of genomes recovered in a metagenomic survey belonging to 200 bacterial and archaeal families

that were either previously undescribed or that exhibit an extremely rare distribution on the

current earth. Such diversity is underpinned by the widespread occurrence of sulfite-, thiosulfate,

tetrathionate-, and sulfur-reduction, and paucity of sulfate-reduction machineries in these taxa;

hence greatly expanding lineages mediating reductive sulfur cycling processes in the tree of life.

Analysis of the overlaying water community demonstrated that oxygen intrusion lead to the

development of a significantly less diverse community dominated by well-characterized lineages

and a prevalence of oxidative sulfur cycling processes. Such transition from ancient novelty to

modern commonality underscores the profound impact of the great oxygenation event on the

earth's surficial anoxic community. It also suggests that novel and rare lineages encountered in

current anaerobic habitats could represent taxa once thriving in an anoxic earth, but have failed

to adapt to earth's progressive oxygenation.

Introduction

Sulfur is one of the most abundant elements on earth, exhibiting a wide range of oxidation states (-2 to +6). Microorganisms have evolved a plethora of genes and pathways for exploiting sulfur-redox reactions for energy generation. Reductive processes employ sulfur oxyanions or elemental sulfur as terminal electron acceptors in anaerobic respiratory schemes linked to heterotrophic or autotrophic growth. Oxidative processes, on the other hand, employ sulfides or elemental sulfur as electron donors, powering chemolithotrophic and photosynthetic growth.

Thermodynamic considerations limit reductive sulfur processes to habitats where oxygen is limited. This is reflected in the global distribution of sulfate (SO_4^{2-}), sulfite (SO_3^{2-}), thiosulfate ($S_2O_3^{2-}$), tetrathionate ($S_4O_6^{2-}$), and elemental sulfur (S^0) reducing microorganisms (henceforth collectively referred to as SRM) in permanently and seasonally anoxic and hypoxic habitats in marine [1, 2, 3], freshwater [4], terrestrial [5], and subsurface [6] ecosystems. Sulfate is highly abundant on the current earth, and hence sulfate-reduction dominates reductive processes in the global sulfur cycle; although reduction and disproportionation of the intermediate sulfur species, e.g. sulfur [7, 8], sulfite [8], thiosulfate and tetrathionate [9, 10] could be significant in localized settings.

The history of earth's sulfur cycle is a prime example of a geological-biological feedback loop, where the evolution of biological processes is driven by, and dramatically impacts, the earth's biogeochemistry. The earth's surface was completely anoxic during the first two billion years of its history, and the availability and speciation of various sulfur species greatly differed from its current values. Sulfate levels were significantly lower when compared to current values in oceanic water (28 mM), with estimates of <200 µM-1mM from the Archean up to the Paleoproterozoic (2.3 Gya) [11, 12, 13, 14]. On the other hand, intermediate sulfur species appear to have played an important role in shaping the ancient sulfur cycle [15]. Modeling suggests that mM

levels of SO_3^{2-} were attained in the Archaean anoxic shallow surficial aquifers as a result of

dissolution of the volcanic SO_2 prevailing in aquatic habitats [12]. Isotopic studies have

demonstrated the importance of elemental sulfur, sulfite, and thiosulfate reduction in the Archean

[15, 16].

The evolution of life (3.8 to 4.0 Gy) in the early Archean era and the subsequent

evolution of major bacterial and archaeal clades in the Archean and early Proterozoic eons [17]

occurred within this background of anoxia and characteristic sulfur-chemistry. As such, it has

been speculated that organisms using intermediate forms of sulfur were likely more common

than sulfate-reducing organisms [15]. However, while isotopic fractionation, modeling, and

microscopic studies could provide clues on prevailing sulfur speciation patterns and prevalent

biological processes, the identity of microorganisms mediating such processes is unknown. This

is mostly due to constrains on preservation of nucleic acids and other biological macromolecules,

with the oldest successful DNA sequenced sample being only 1.2 M years old [18].

Investigation of the microbial community in modern ecosystems with conditions resembling

those prevailing in the ancient earth could provide important clues to the nature, identity, and

evolutionary trajectory of microorganisms that thrived under conditions prevailing prior to

earth's oxygenation and the associated changes in the sulfur cycle. In Zodletone spring, a

surficial anoxic spring in southwestern Oklahoma, the prevailing conditions are analogous to

those predominant on the earth's surface in the late Archean/early Proterozoic eons At the source

of the spring, anoxic, surficial, light-exposed conditions are maintained in the sediments by

constant emergence of sulfide-saturated water at the spring source from anoxic underground

water formations in the Anadarko basin, along with gaseous hydrocarbons, which occurs in seeps

in the general vicinity. These surficial anoxic conditions also support a sulfur chemistry

characterized by high levels of sulfide, sulfite, sulfur (soluble polysulfide), thiosulfate, and a low

level of sulfate. Further, the sediments at the source of the spring are overlaid by an air-exposed

water column, where oxygen intrusion leads to a vertical oxygen gradient (from oxic in the top 1

μm, to hypoxic in the middle, to anoxic in deeper layers overlaying the sediments) that simulates

oxygen intrusion into such habitats during the great oxygenation event (Figure S1). As such the

spring represents a readily accessible habitat where spatial gradients remarkably correspond to

temporal geological transitions. Here, we combined metagenomic, metatranscriptomic, and

amplicon-based approaches to characterize the microbial community in Zodletone spring. Our

results provide a glimpse of the community mediating the ancient sulfur cycle, significantly

expand the overall microbial diversity by the description of a wide range of novel lineages, and

greatly increase the number of lineages documented to mediate reductive sulfur processes in the

microbial tree of life.

Results

Novel phylogenetic diversity in Zodletone sediments. Metagenomic sequencing of the spring

sediments yielded 281 Gbp, 79.54% of which assembled into 12 Gbp contigs, with 6.8 Gbp

contigs longer than 1Kbp. 1,848 genomes were binned, 683 of which passing quality control

criteria, and 516 remaining after dereplication (Table S1). These MAGs represented 64 phyla or

candidate phyla (53 bacterial and 11 archaeal), 127 classes, 198 orders, and 300 families (Figure

1a-b). Diversity assessment utilizing small subunit ribosomal protein S3 from assembled contigs

(n=2079), as well as a complementary 16S rRNA illumina sequencing effort (n=309,074

amplicons), identified a higher number of taxa (82 phyla and 1679 species in the ribosomal

protein S3 dataset, and 69 phyla and 1050 species in 16S rRNA dataset) (Figure S2).

Nevertheless, the overall community composition profiles generated from all three approaches

were broadly similar (Figure S2), suggesting that the MAG list broadly reflects the sediment

microbial community.

Assessment of novelty and degree of uniqueness of sediment MAGs identified a

remarkably high number of previously undescribed lineages (1 phylum, 14 classes, 43 orders,

and 97 families), as well as <u>L</u>ineages exhibiting <u>R</u>are global <u>D</u>istribution patterns compared to

other present time earth environments (defined as lineages represented by 5 genomes or less in

GTDB r95, henceforth LRD) (11 phyla, 24 classes, 45 orders, and 113 families) in the spring.

(Figure 1, 2a, b). At the family level, 132 (25.58%), and 208 (40.03%) genomes clustered into 97

novel and 113 LRD families respectively, bringing the proportion of genomes belonging to novel

or LRD families in Zodletone sediments to 65.89%. The high level of novelty in the sediment

MAGs is reflected in an average RED value of 0.76, a value that is slightly lower than the

median RED value for designation of a novel family (0.77) [19].

125   The Chloroflexota (n=69), Planctomycetota (n=47), Bacteroidota (n= 43),

126 Desulfobacterota (n= 43), Spirochaetota (n= 28 genomes), Patescibacteria (n=20 genomes), and

127 the archaeal phylum Nanoarchaeota (n=21) were the most abundant phyla in Zodletone spring

128 sediments, albeit representing only 52.52% of the total number of recovered genomes (S. Text,

129 Figure 1, 2C). An extreme paucity of genomes belonging to the Proteobacteria (6 genomes) and

130 Firmicutes (12 genomes), widely distributed and abundant taxa in current biomes[20], [20], and the

131 absence of oxygen-generating Cyanobacteria (0 genomes) were observed (Figure 1, 2C). Within

132 the Chloroflexota, 38/69 genomes belonged to 3 previously undescribed orders, 5 previously

133 undescribed families, and multiple LRD orders and families (Figure 3a). Within the

134 Planctomycetota, 17/47 genomes belonged to 2 previously undescribed orders, 8 previously

135 undescribed families, and multiple LRD orders and families (Figure 3b). Within the

136 Bacteroidota, 27/43 genomes belonged to 1 previously undescribed family, and multiple LRD

137 families (Figure 3c). Within the Spirochaetota, 19/28 genomes belonged to one previously

138 undescribed class, 2 previously undescribed orders, and 9 previously undescribed families, as

139 well as multiple LRD families (Figure 3d). Within the Desulfobacterota (Figure 3e), 35/43

140 genomes belonged to 3 previously undescribed classes, 10 previously undescribed orders, and 7

141 previously undescribed families, as well as multiple LRD families. Finally, an extremely diverse

142 community of Patescibacteria (13 different orders, 3 of which belonging to LRD orders, and 14

143 different families, including 6 previously undescribed and 2 LRD families), and Nanoarchaeota

144 (2 orders and 15 families, including 5 previously undescribed and 10 LRD families) were

145 identified in the spring sediments. A similar pattern of high proportion of previously undescribed

146 and LRD families was identified throughout all other lineages (S. Text, Figure 1a). Therefore, in

147 addition to expanding the number of novel lineages (classes, orders, and families), and greatly

enriching available genomes in rare, poorly represented taxa, our results highlight the uniqueness

and distinction of the microbial community thriving in Zodletone spring sediments, compared to

present earth environments studied so far.

Oxygen intrusion reduces the proportion of novel and rare lineages in Zodletone spring.

Metagenomic sequencing of the oxygen-exposed overlaying water column community yielded

323 Gbp, 80.07% of which assembled into 3.6 Gbp contigs with 3.1 Gbp contigs >1K. 883

genomes were binned, with only 114 remaining after dereplication. Of these, 62 belonged to

shared families with the sediment community, and 52 were water specific. Genomes recovered

from the water column belonged to a significantly lower number of phyla (n= 27), classes

(n=37), orders (n=52), and families (n=79) when compared to the euxinic sediments (Table S1).

The community exhibited a much lower level of novelty and rarity at the phylum, class, order,

and family levels when compared to the sediment community respectively (Figure 2 a, b). Water-

specific genomes (n=52) mostly belonged to well-characterized microbial lineages e.g. families

Rhodobacteraceae, and Rhodospirillaceae in the Alphaproteobacteria, families

Thiomicrospiraceae, Halothiobacillaceae, Acidithiobacillaceae, Burkholderiaceae,

Chromatiaceae, Methylothermaceae in the Gammaproteobacteria, families Sulfurimonadaceae,

Sulfurovaceae in phylum Camplylobacterota, and well described families in the phyla

Bacteroidota, Desulfobacterota (S. Text, Figure 1, Table S1). Collectively, this demonstrates a

pattern where the intrusion of oxygen is associated with a negative impact on previously

undescribed and LRD lineages that are prevalent in the sediment, and triggered the propagation

of proliferation of cosmopolitan communities within the bacterial tree of life.

Reductive sulfur processes dominate Zodletone spring sediment communities. A total of 149

genomes (28.9 % of all genomes), belonging to 32 phyla, 51 classes, 69 orders, and 97 families

were involved in at least one reductive sulfur processes (Figure 4, Table S2). By comparison,

only 21 sediment genomes (4.06% of all genomes) encoded at least one sulfur oxidation pathway

(Figure 4, Table S2). The reductive sulfur-community in the spring exhibited two unique traits:

First, a majority of genomes encoding such capacities belonged to novel (47 genomes) or LRD

(66 genomes) lineages (Figure 4), and second: sulfite-, polysulfide-, thiosulfate-, and

tetrathionate reduction appears to be more prevalent than sulfate-reduction capacities in the

sediment genomes.

Sulfate-reduction capacity was observed in only 18 sediment genomes (Figure 4, 5a), but

exhibited a unique community composition, when compared to well-studied marine and

terrestrial habitats [1, 2, 4, 21]. Sulfate-reduction capacities were observed in mostly previously

undescribed or LRD lineages within the Zixibacteria, Acidobacteriota (members of family

UBA6911, equivalent to Acidobacteria group 18), Myxococcota, Bacteroidota, Planctomycetota,

candidate phylum OLB16 (1 genome), as well as rare and novel lineages within the

Desulfobacterota (Figure 4, S3a). Organization of the sulfate reduction genes differed between

different phyla, with Myxococcota, Zixibacteria, OLB16, and Acidobacteriota genomes

encoding all genes for sulfate activation and reduction, dissimilatory sulfite reduction, as well as

energy conservation on one locus, while Desulfobacterota genomes encoded genes for sulfate

activation and reduction as well as energy conservation on one locus with genes for dissimilatory

sulfite reduction on another, as previously observed in cultured Desulfobacterota [22, 23, 24].

Sulfite (but not sulfate) reduction via the DsrAB+DsrC+DsrKMJOP system was

identified in only 8 genomes belonging to 7 families within the phyla Planctomycetes,

Chloroflexota, Spirochaetota, and Desulfobacterota (Figure 4, S3b). Gene organization of the *dsr*

locus in the above 9 genomes differed between different phyla, with Chloroflexota, and

Spirochaetota genomes encoding all genes for dissimilatory sulfite reduction (dsrABC plus

dsrKMJOP) on one locus, while Planctomycetota and Desulfobacterota genomes showed a split

dsr locus with dsrABC on one locus and dsrMKJOP on another.

On the other hand, sulfite-reduction capacity within Zodletone spring sediment solely via

the Asr/Hdr system was rampant, being encountered in 104 genomes belonging to 28 phyla, 43

(8 novel and 9 LRD) classes, 56 (18 novel, and 12 LRD) orders, and 72 (31 novel and 25 LRD)

families (Figure 4, S3b), with a gene organization of the *asr* locus adjacent to the *hdr* locus in the

majority of genomes. Asr-encoding genomes in the sediments included members of

predominantly previously undescribed and LRD lineages within the Chloroflexota,

Desulfobacterota. Planctomycetota, and Bacteroidota. The capacity was also rampant in the yet-

uncultured bacterial phyla, many of which have fairly limited distribution on the current earth,

e.g. the candidate phyla CSSED10-310, FCPU426, RBG-13-66-14, SM23-31, SZUA-182,

UBP14, Aureabacteria, Sumerlaeota. Interestingly, all genomes belonging to the novel phylum

Krumholzibacteriota, recently described from the spring sediment [25], encoded complete

anaerobic sulfite reductase systems. Zodletone dissimilatory sulfite reductase (Figure S3a) and

the anaerobic sulfite reductase (Figure S3b) sequences clustered with reference sequences from

the same phylum, generally showing no evidence of LGT (S. text).

Sulfur (polysulfide) reduction capacities were observed in twenty Zodletone sediment genomes

that encoded *psrABC* genes (Figure 4, S3c). These genomes belonged mostly to previously

undescribed and LRD families within the phyla Bacteroidota, Desulfobacterota, Myxococota,

Acidobacterota, Chloroflexota, and Campylobacterota (Figure 4), In addition, representatives of

the cytolpasmic sulfurhydrogenase I (HydABCD system), and/or II (ShyABCD system) were

identified in 119 Zodletone sediment genomes (Figure 4). However, as described above, direct

involvement of these enzymes in an ETS-associated respiration is not yet clear.

Thiosulfate disproportionation and reduction. The quinone-dependent membrane-bound

molybdopterin-containing thiosulfate reductase PhsABC was encoded in 11 genomes belonging

to 6 phyla, with Bacteroidota representing the major phsABC-encoding phylum (4 genomes).

Within these genomes, only two (a Chloroflexota family UBA6092 genome, and a

Desulfatiglandales family HGW15 genome) also encoded a dissimilatory sulfite reductase (the

Asr system) akin to the Gammaproteobacteria thiosulfate disproportionating pure culture

members, where the final products of thiosulfate disproportionation are expected to be only

hydrogen sulfide (Figure 4). On the other hand, 5 of the 11 phsABC-encoding Zodletone

genomes also encoded the sulfite dehydrogenase SoeABC system, akin to Desulfobacterota and

Firmicutes pure culture members, where the final products of thiosulfate disproportionation are

expected to be both hydrogen sulfide and sulfate. (Figure 4).

In addition to the phsABC system, 14 Zodletone genomes belonging to 6 phyla

(Desulfobacterota,Acidobacteriota, Chloroflexota, Bacteroidota, Spirochaetota, and

Myxococcota) encoded a rhodanase-like enzyme [EC: 2.8.1.1 or EC: 2.8.1.3] for thiosulfate

disproportionation, as well as enzymes for both sulfite oxidation (by means of reversal of sulfate

reduction via Sat+AprAB, or the sulfite dehydrogenase SoeABC), and sulfite reduction (via the

dissimilatory sulfite reductases Dsr or Asr), where the final products of thiosulfate

disproportionation are expected to be both hydrogen sulfide and sulfate (Figure 4).

Tetrathionate reduction. Seventy-three Zodletone sediment genomes encoded the octaheme

tetrathionate reductase (OTR) enzyme. These genomes belonged to 14 phyla with major

contribution from Bacteroidota (30 genomes), Chloroflexota (10 genomes), and Desulfobacterota

(10 genomes). In addition to Otr, 68 Zodletone genomes encoded the Ttr enzyme system. These

genomes belonged to 14 phyla with major contribution from Chloroflexota (22 genomes), and

Desulfobacterota (20 genomes). As shown previously in *Salmonella typhimurium* [26], in presence

of means for thiosulfate disproportionation/reduction and sulfite reduction, the thiosulfate

produced as a result of tetrathionate reduction could be further reduced to sulfide. Out of the 105

sediment genomes encoding the Otr, and/or Ttr enzymes, only 12 genomes also encoded

thiosulfate and sulfite reduction enzymes. These genomes belonged to the phyla Acidobacteriota,

Chloroflexota, Desulfobacterota, Myxococcota, and Spirochaetota.

Substrates supporting sulfidogenic capacities at Zodletone spring. Within lineages mediating

reductive sulfur processes in Zodletone sediments (n=98), a wide range of substrates supporting

sulfidogenesis were identified (Table S3, Figure 4). These included hexoses (26-87% of

sulfidogenic lineages), pentoses (30-41% of sulfidogenic lineages), amino acids and peptides

(39% of lineages), short chain fatty acids, e.g. lactate, propionate, butyrate, and acetate (22-73%

of lineages), long chain fatty acids (29% of lineages), aromatic hydrocarbons (3% of lineages),

and short chain alkanes (6% of lineages). Autotrophic capacities with hydrogen as the electron

donor were identified in 28% of sulfidogenic lineages.

Transcriptomic analysis. Transcriptional expression of genes involved in S-species

reduction/disproportionation was analyzed in the spring sediments (Figure 5). All S-species

reduction/ disproportionation genes discussed above were identified and mapped to 51 distinct

phyla. Total transcription levels of the Asr system were 4-times higher than the Dsr system,

consistent with the higher number of Zodletone sediment genomes encoding the Asr system

compared to the Dsr system. Transcription of Asr system genes were mapped to the phyla

Chloroflexota, Planctomycetota, Desulfobacterota, Bacteroidota, Fermentibacterota,

Acidobacteriota, CSSED10-310, Actinobacteriota, Spirochaetota, WOR-3, and Fibrobacterota;

while DSR genes to Desulfobacterota, Acidobacteriota, Zixibacteria, and Myxococcota (Dsr)

(Figure 5). Sulfate reduction genes (Sat, AprAB, and QmoABC) were also transcribed with

major contribution from Desulfobacterota, Myxococcota, Zixibacteria, and Acidobacteriota.

Transcription of the thiosulfate disproportionating rhodanese-like enzyme [EC: 2.8.1.1 or EC:

2.8.1.3], thiosulfate reductase *phsABC*, tetrathionate reduction genes *ttrABC*, octaheme

tetrathionate reductase *otr* , and *psrABC* for polysulfide reduction, and cytoplasmic

sulfurhydrogenases I and II (*hyd/shy* systems) was also identified (Figure 5, S. text for detailed

contributions of taxa).

Oxidative sulfur processes dominate Zodletone water community.

Reductive sulfur-processes were extremely sparse in the water community (S. text). In contrast

oxidative sulfur processes dominated the water community, with pathways encoding sulfide,

sulfur, thiosulfate, tetrathionate, and/or sulfite oxidation to sulfate present in 59/114 (51.8%) of

water genomes, belonging to 13 phyla, 16 classes, 25 orders, and 43 families, respectively. The

oxidative sulfur community in the water belonged to mostly well-characterized lineages (Table

S3, Figure 4), with only 8 and 10 genomes involved in oxidative sulfur processes belonged to

previously undescribed, and LDR families, respectively. A complete SOX system, putatively

mediating oxidation of a wide range of reduced sulfur-species to sulfate was encoded in genomes

belonging to well-characterized families within the Proteobacteria (11 genomes in

Acidithiobacillaceae, Burkholderiaceae, Halothiobacillaceae, Rhodobacteraceae, and

Thiomicrospiraceae) and Campylobacterota (3 genomes in the family Sulfurimonadaceae)

(Figure 4). The capacity for sulfide oxidation to sulfur (sulfide dehydrogenase and/or the

sulfide:quinone oxidoreductase Sqr) was encoded in thirty nine water genomes within the phyla

Bacteroidota, Proteobacteria, Campylobacterota, Chloroflexi, Desulfobacterota, Marinisomatota,

and Nitrospirota (S. Text, Figure 4). Only two of the above thirty-nine genomes (a Proteobacteria

genome and a Nitrospirota genome) encoded the capacity to further oxidize the

sulfur/polysulfide to sulfite via the reversal of the Dsr system, the sulfite dehydrogenase

(quinone) SoeABC, or the sulfite dehydrogenase (cytochrome) SorAB system was encountered

in 1, 22, and 3 genomes respectively, belonging to well characterized families within

Bacteroidetes, Proeobacteria, and Campilobacterota (S. text, Figure S4). Finally, for thiosulfate

oxidation, Eight water genomes (Proteobacteria and Flavobactereaceae) encoded thiosulfate to

tetrathionate oxidation capacities via either the thiosulfate dehydrogenase *tsdA* [EC: 1.8.2.2] or

doxAD [EC: 1.8.5.2]. Two of these 8 genomes (1 Rhodobacteraceae, and 1 Halothiobacillaceae

genomes) also encoded tetrathionate hydrolase (*tetH*) [27] known to cleave tetrathionate to

thiosulfate, sulfur, and sulfate. Simultaneous identification of the SOX system and both forms of

sulfide dehydrogenase (fccAB and Sqr) imply that these two genomes encode the capacity for

complete thiosulfate oxidation to sulfate.

Discussion

The microbial community in Zodletone spring sediments exhibited a high level of phylogenetic

diversity, novelty, and rarity (Figure 1-3). Conversely, representatives of lineages that

predominate in most present earth environments, e.g. Proteobacteria, Firmicutes, and

Cyanobacteria were absent or extremely sparse within the sediments. The community in the

spring sediments was also characterized by a high proportion of SRM, and the prevalence of

lineages mediating sulfur cycle intermediates (sulfite, thiosulfate, tetrathionate, and elemental

sulfur). Many of the organisms mediating reductive sulfur-cycling processes belonged to novel

and LRD lineages, hence greatly expanding the range of SRM within the tree of life (Figure 4).

What drives the assembly, propagation, and maintenance of such a diverse, novel, and

distinct community in the spring sediments? The high level of diversity, novelty, and rarity

within Zodletone spring sediment SRM community could be attributed to two main factors. First,

the availability of a wide range of sulfur cycle intermediates in concentrations much higher than

sulfate, in contrast to sulfate-predominance in current ecosystems [2]. Such pattern selects for a

more diverse community of SRM in the spring, when compared to predominantly sulfate-driven

marine and freshwater ecosystems (Figure 4). Second, additional factors usually constraining

SRM growth in several habitats, e.g. diel or seasonal intrusion of oxygen, Fe and NO_3 [1, 28, 29, 30],

recalcitrance of available substrates [6, 31, 32], temperature [33, 34], pH [21, 35, 36], salinity [37], and pressure

extremes [31, 38], or combinations thereof, are absent in the spring. Therefore, while the reductive

global sulfur cycle appears to be dominated by a few sulfate-reducing lineages within the

Desulfobacterota, and to a lesser extent the Firmicutes, as well as Thermodesulfobacteria and

Archaeoglobus in high temperature habitat, the SRM community in the spring is extremely

diverse, encompassing a wide range of previously undescribed and LRD lineages (Figure 4, 5,

S4-S6).

Sulfate-reducing organisms are the most prevalent component of the reductive sulfur

cycle in most marine and aquatic ecosystems. Aspects of the ecology [2], physiology [39], and

biochemistry [40, 41, 42] of dissimilatory sulfate reduction have been extensively investigated [43].

While not the most prevalent process, the sulfate-reducing community in Zodletone spring

sediment exhibited a unique composition, with members of the Zixibacteria, Acidobacteriota,

Myxococcota, Bacteroidota, Planctomycetota, and candidate phylum OLB16 constituting the

major players, as well as rare and novel lineages within the Desulfobacterota (Desulfatiglandales,

and Order C00003060), with scarce representation of canonical Desulfobacterota sulfate

reducers (1 genome). While the identification of the dissimilatory sulfate reducing machinery in

some of these lineages (e.g. Zixibacteria, Acidobacteriota, and Planctomycetota) has been shown

before [44, 45, 46], these members rarely appear to be the dominant players in a single ecosystem.

Compared to sulfate-reduction, the ecology and diversity of microbial dissimilatory

sulfite reduction has not been extensively studied. The biochemistry of the process has been

examined in sulfate-reducers, when grown on sulfite [43], as well as in a few other dedicated sulfite

reducers, e.g. *Desulfitobacterium* [47], *Salmonella* [48], *Shewanella* [49], and *Wolinella* [50]. A recent

study suggested the importance and ancient nature of sulfite reduction in an extreme

thermophilic environment in a limited diversity biofilm [51]. We document a plethora of

microorganisms within the phyla Planctomycetes, Chloroflexota, Spirochaetota, and

Desulfobacterota encoding the dissimilatory sulfite reductase DSR, as well as 72 additional

families (31 novel and 25 LRD) encoding the anaerobic sulfite reductase. These organisms

greatly expand the known sulfite reduction capacity within the domain Bacteria. Further, the

novelty or rarity of some of these families is a reflection of the dearth of present-time habitats

that could support this mode of metabolism, once predominant on ancient earth.

The bulk of knowledge on thiosulfate reduction and or disproportionation comes from

studies in pure cultures, e.g. members of the Desulfobulbaceae (e.g. *Desulfocapsa*) [52, 53] and the

genera *Desulfovibrio* and *Desulfomonile* [54, 55, 56] within Desulfobacterota, the

gammaproteobacterium *Pantoea agglomerans* [57], members of Thermodesulfobacteria [58] and

Firmicutes [59] . Radioisotope tracing of different sulfur atoms showed a significant contribution of

thiosulfate disproportionation to the sulfur cycle in marine [60], as well as freshwater sediments [61].

However, the lack of a marker gene for the process hinders ecological culture-independent

studies. Similar to sulfite, the high levels, and constant generation of thiosulfate in Zodletone

sediments sustains a highly diverse thiosulfate reducing (thiosulfate reductase plus a sulfite

reduction complex), or disproportionating (thiosulfate reductase plus both sulfite reduction and

sulfite oxidation systems) community with major contribution from novel or rare families in the

Acidobacteriota, Chloroflexota, Desulfobacterota, KSB1, Myxococcota, and Spirochaetota.

Finally, the extremely high levels of zero valent sulfur, available as soluble polysulfide, result in

enriching the community with a plethora of polysulfide-reducing organisms.

As described above, the prevailing conditions in Zodletone spring (anaerobic, surficial,

light-exposed, sulfidic, with abundance of S cycle intermediates) remarkably mimic the

conditions that were prevalent in the late Archean and early Proterozoic eons, when the evolution

of major bacterial and archaeal clades (based on recently refined timing estimates from [62]), with

the notable exception of Proteobacteria and Cyanobacteria) occurring prior to oxygen evolution.

This study infers that the microbial communities presumably thriving in surficial earth were

extremely diverse, with an abundance of SRM lineages. The evolution of oxygenic

photosynthesis has led to the steady and inexorable accumulation of O_2 in Earth's atmosphere

(the great oxidation event, GOE), with the rise of atmospheric O_2 to 1-5% of current levels

between 2.4 and 2.1 billion years (Gyr) ago, and its accumulation to values comparable to

modern values 500-600 Mya [63]. Due to the sensitivity and expected lack of adaptive mechanisms

to cope with atmospheric oxygen in multiple strict anaerobes, as well as the chemical instability

of multiple S species in an oxygenated atmosphere, the GOE exerted a profound negative impact

on anaerobic surficial life forms (the oxygen catastrophe) leading to the first and arguably most

profound extinction event in earth's history. In addition to suppressing anaerobiosis in

atmospherically-exposed habitats, the GOE also led to a significant change in the S cycle, from

one based on atmospheric inputs to one dependent on oxidative weathering leading to the release

of huge amount of sulfate derived from the oxidation of pyrite and the dissolution of sulfate

minerals [64], hitherto a minor byproduct of Archean abiotic and biotic reactions [15, 65]. Therefore, it

appears that loss of niches associated with geological transformations could be one of the

possible explanations for high extinction rates for microorganisms on earth, as well as the

constant identification of rare, novel taxa within anaerobic settings. It is notable that

phylogenetically novel branches with extremely rare distribution in earth (defined as phyla with

5 genomes or less in GTDB) have been consistently identified in anaerobic habitats.

The hypothesis that the GOE played an important role in the extinction of many novel

anaerobic lineages, specifically those mediating SCI reductive processes is bolstered by our

analysis of the overlaying microbial community in the spring. Here, spatial oxygen intrusion

provides a mimicking effect to the relentless temporal progression of oxygenation through the

Proterozoic (2.4-2.1 Gya) and Paleo-Phanerozoic (500-600 Mya). The analysis demonstrates a

community transitioning from ancient novelty to modern commonality, with the proportion of

novel and rare taxa as well as lineages associated with reductive sulfur processes decreasing at

the expense of propagation of organisms mediating oxidative sulfur processes.

In summary, by examining microbial diversity in Zodletone spring, we greatly expand the

overall diversity within the tree of life via the discovery and characterization of a wide range of

novel lineages, and significantly enrich representation of a wide range of LRD lineages. We also

describe a unique sulfur-cycling community in the spring that is largely dependent on sulfite,

thiosulfate, sulfur, and tetrathionate, rather than sulfate, as an electron acceptor. Given the

remarkable similarity to conditions prevailing prior to the GOE, we consider the spring an

invaluable portal to investigate the community thriving on the earth's surface during these eons,

and posit that GOE-precipitated the near extinction of a wide range of phylogenetically distinct

oxygen-sensitive lineages and drastically altered the reductive sulfur-cycling community from

sulfite, sulfur, and thiosulfate reducers to predominantly sulfate reduction in the current earth.

Materials and Methods

Site description and geochemistry. Zodletone spring is located in the Anadarko Basin of

western Oklahoma (N34.99562° W98.68895°). The spring arises from underground, where water

is pumped out slowly along with sediments. Sediments settled at the source of the spring, a

boxed square $1m^2$ (Figure S1) are overlaid with water that collects and settles in a concrete pool

erected in the early 1900s. The settled water is 50-cm deep above the sediments and is exposed

to atmospheric air. Water and sediments originating from the spring source are highly reduced

due to the high dissolved sulfide levels (8-10 mM) in the spring sediments. Microsensor

measurements show a completely anoxic (oxygen levels < 0.1 μM) and highly reduced source

sediments. Oxygen levels slowly increase in the overlaid water column from 2–4 μM at the 2

mm above the source to complete oxygen exposure on the top of the water column [66]. The spring

geochemistry has regularly been monitored during the last two decades [66, 67, 68] and is remarkably

stable. The spring is characterized by low levels of sulfate (50-94 μM), with higher levels of

sulfite (0.21 mM), elemental sulfur (0.1 mM), and thiosulfate (0.52) [68, 69].

Sampling. Samples were collected from the source sediments and standing overlaid water in

sterile containers and kept on ice until brought back to the lab (~2h drive), where they were

immediately processed. For metatranscriptomics, samples were collected at three different time

points: morning (9:15 am), afternoon (2:30 pm), and evening (5:30 pm) in June 2019; stored on

dry ice until transferred to the lab where they were stored at -80ºC until processed for RNA

extraction within a week.

Nucleic acid extraction. DNA was directly extracted from 0.5 grams of source sediments. For

water samples, water was filtered on 0.2 μm sterile filters. DNA was directly extracted from

filters (20 filters, 10 L of water samples). Extraction was conducted using the DNeasy PowerSoil

kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA). RNA was extracted from 0.5 g sediment samples using

RNeasy PowerSoil Total RNA Kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA) according to the manufacturer's

instructions.

16S rRNA gene amplification, sequencing, and analysis. Triplicate DNA extractions were

performed for both sediment and water samples from the Zoddletone spring. To characterize the

microbial diversity based on 16S rRNA gene sequences we used the Quick-16S™ NGS Library

Prep Kit (Zymo Research, Irvine CA), following the manufacturer's protocol. For amplification

of the V4 hypervariable region we used a mix of modified versions of primers 515F-806R [70],

tailored to provide better coverage for several under-represented microbial lineages. They

included 515FY (5'GTGYCAGCMGCCGCGGTAA) [71], 515F-Cren (5'

GTGKCAGCMGCCGCGGTAA, for Crenarchaeota) [72], 515F-Nano

(5'GTGGCAGYCGCCRCGGKAA, for Nanoarchaeota) [72], 515F-TM7 (5'

GTGCCAGCMGCCGCGGTCA for TM7/Saccharibacteria) [73] as forward mix and 805RB (5'

GGACTACNVGGGTWTCTAAT) [74] and 805R-Nano (5'GGAMTACHGGGGTCTCTAAT, for

Nanoarchaeota) [72] as reverse mix. Purified barcoded amplicon libraries were sequenced on an

Illumina MiSeq instrument (Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA) using a v2 500 cycle kit, according to

manufacturer's protocol. Demultiplexed forward and reverse reads were imported as paired fastq

files into QIIME2 v. 2020.8 [75] for analysis. The DADA2 plugin was used to trim, denoise, pair,

purge chimeras and select amplicon sequence variants (ASVs), using the command "qiime dada2

denoise-paired". Between 44k and 194k non-chimeric sequences were obtained for the individual

samples. The ASVs were taxonomically classified in QIIME2 using a trained classifier built

based on Silva-138-99 rRNA sequence database. The ASVs were assigned to 1643 taxonomic

categories corresponding to taxonomic level 7 (species and above) and to 932 genera (level 6).

Alpha rarefaction curves indicated saturation of observed sequence features (ASVs) at a

sequencing depth of 70-80k sequences.

Metagenome sequencing, assembly, and binning. Metagenomic sequencing was conducted

using the services of a commercial provider (Novogene, Beijing, China) using two lanes of the

Illumina HiSeq 2500 system for each of the water and sediment samples. Transcriptomic

sequencing using Illumina HiSeq 2500 2 × 150bp paired-end technology was conducted using

the services of a commercial provider (Novogene Corporation, Beijing, China). Metagenomic

reads were assessed for quality using FastQC followed by quality filtering and trimming using

Trimmomatic v0.38 [76]. High quality reads were assembled into contigs using MegaHit (v.1.1.3)

with minimum Kmer of 27, maximum kmer of 127, Kmer step of 10, and minimum contig

length of 1000 bp. Bowtie2 was used to calculate sequencing coverage of each contig by

mapping the raw reads back to the contigs. Assembled contigs were searched for ribosomal

protein S3 (rpS3) sequences using a custom hidden Markov model (HMM) built from Uniprot

reference sequences assigned to the Kegg Orthologies K02982, and K02984 (corresponding to

the bacterial, and archaeal RPS3, respectively) using hmmbuild (HMMER 3.1b2). rpS3

Sequences were clustered at 99% ID using CD-HIT as previously suggested for a putative

species cutoff for rpS3 data [77]. Taxonomic affiliations of (rpS3) groups were identified using

Diamond Blast against the GTDB r95 database [19].

Contigs from the sediment and water assemblies were binned into draft genomes using

both Metabat [78] and MaxBin2 [79]. DasTool was used to select the highest quality bins from each

metagenome assembly [80]. CheckM was used for estimation of genome completeness, strain

heterogeneity, and contamination [81]. Genomic bins showing contamination levels higher than

10%, were further refined based on the taxonomic affiliations of the binned contigs, as well as

the GC content, tetranucleotide frequency, and coverage levels using RefineM [82]. Low quality

bins (>10% contamination) were cleaned by removal of the identified outlier contigs, and the

percentage completeness and contamination were again re-checked using CheckM.

Genomes classification, annotation, and metabolic analysis. Taxonomic classifications

followed the Genome Taxonomy Database (GTDB) release r95 [19], and were carried out using the

classify_workflow in GTDB-Tk (v1.1.0) [83]. Phylogenomic analysis utilized the concatenated

alignment of a set of 120 single-copy bacterial genes, and 122 single-copy archaeal genes [19]

generated by the GTDB-Tk. Maximum-likelihood phylogenomic tree was constructed in

FastTree using the default parameters [84].

Annotation and metabolic analysis. Protein-coding genes were predicted using Prodigal [85].

GhostKOALA [86] was used for the functional annotation of every predicted open reading frame in

every genomic bin and to assign protein-coding genes to KEGG orthologies (KOs).

Analysis of sulfur cycling genes. To identify taxa mediating key sulfur-transformation

processes in the spring sediments, we mapped the distribution of key sulfur-cycling genes in all

genomes and deduced capacities in individual genomes by documenting the occurrence of entire

pathways (as explained below in details). This was subsequently confirmed by phylogenetic

analysis and examining contiguous genes organization in processes requiring multi-subunit

and/or multi-gene. Further, expression data was used from three time points to identify the

fraction of the community that is metabolically actively involved in the process. Analysis of S

cycling capabilities was conducted on individual genomic bins by building and scanning hidden

markov model (HMM) profiles as explained below. To build the sulfur-genes HMM profiles,

Uniprot reference sequences for all genes with an assigned KO number were downloaded,

aligned using Clustal-omega [87], and the alignment was used to build an HMM profile using

hmmbuild (HMMER 3.1b2) [88]. For genes not assigned a KO number (e.g. *otr*, *tsdA*, *tetH*), a

representative protein was compared against the KEGG Genes database using Blastp and

significant hits (those with e-values < e-80) were downloaded and used to build HMM profiles as

explained above. The custom-built HMM profiles were then used to scan the analyzed genomes

for significant hits using hmmscan (HMMER 3.1b2) [88] with the option -T 100 to limit the results

to only those profiles with an alignment score of at least 100. Further confirmation was achieved

through phylogenetic assessment and tree building procedures, in which potential candidates

identified by hmmscan were aligned to the reference sequences used to build the custom HMM

profiles using Clustal-omega [87], followed by maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree construction

using FastTree [84]. Only candidates clustering with reference sequences were deemed true hits

and were assigned to the corresponding KO. Details on the genes examined for evidence of

sulfate, sulfite, polysulfide, tetrathionate, and thiosulfate reduction, thiosulfate

disproportionation, and various sulfur oxidation processes are provided in the supplementary

document (S. text).

Phylogenetic analysis and operon organization of S cycling genes. The phylogenetic affiliation

of the S cycling proteins AsrB, Otr, PhsC, PsrC, and DsrAB was examined by aligning

Zodletone genome predicted protein sequences to Uniprot reference sequences using Mafft [89].

The DsrA and DsrB alignments were concatenated in MEGA X [90]. All alignments were used to

construct maximum likelihood phylogenetic trees in RAxML [91]. The R package genoPlotR [92]

was used to produce gene maps for the DSR and ASR loci in Zodletone genomes using the

Prodigal predicted gene starts, ends, and strand.

Transcription of sulfur cycling genes. A total of 21.4 M, 27.9 M, and 22.5 M 150-bp paired-end

reads were obtained from the morning, afternoon, and evening RNA-seq libraries. Reads were

pseudo-aligned to all Prodigal-predicted genes from all genomes using Kallisto with default

settings [93]. The calculated transcripts per million (TPM) were used to obtain total transcription

levels for genes identified from genomic analysis as involved in S cycling in the spring.

Additional metabolic analysis. For all other non-sulfur related functional predictions, combined

GhostKOALA outputs of all genomes belonging to a certain order (for orders with 5 genomes or

less; n=206), or family (for orders with more than 5 genomes; n=85) were checked for the

presence of groups of KOs constituting metabolic pathways (additional file 1). The list of these

291 lineages is shown in Table S2. The presence of at least 80% of KOs assigned to a certain

pathway in at least one genome belonging to a certain order/family was used as an indication of

the presence of that pathway in that order/family. Such criteria were used for the prediction of

autotrophic capabilities, as well as catabolic heterotrophic degradation capabilities of sugars,

amino acids, long-chain fatty acids, short chain fatty acids, anaerobic benzoate degradation,

anaerobic short chain alkane degradation, aerobic respiration, nitrate reduction, nitrification, and

chlorophyll biosynthesis. Glycolytic, and fermentation capabilities were predicted by feeding the

GhostKOALA output to KeggDecoder [94]. Proteases, peptidases, and protease inhibitors were

identified using Blastp against the Merops database [95], while CAZymes (glycoside hydrolases

[GHs], polysaccharide lyases [PLs], and carbohydrate esterases [CEs]) were identified by

searching all ORFs from all genomes against the dbCAN hidden Markov models V9 [96]

(downloaded from the dbCAN web server in September 2020) using hmmscan. FeGenie [97] was

used to predict the presence of iron reduction and iron oxidation genes in individual bins.

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation Grants

2016423 (to NHY and MSE) and 2016371 to MP.

  Figure legends:

Figure 1. Phylogenomics of the 516 bacterial (A), and 114 archaeal (B) genomes analyzed in

this study. The maximum likelihood trees were constructed in FastTree [84] based on the

concatenated alignments of 120 (bacterial), and 122 (archaeal) housekeeping genes obtained

from Gtdb-TK [83]. The branches represent order-level taxonomy and are color coded by phylum.

For phyla with 4 orders or less branches are labeled as Phylum_Class_Order. For phyla with

more than 4 orders, the phylum is shown at the base of the colored wedge and the branches are

labeled as Class_Order. Lineages staring with ZN depict novel lineages (ZNC = novel class;

ZNO = novel order). Bootstrap support values are shown as bubbles for nodes with >70%

support. Tracks around the tree represent (from innermost to outermost): cultured status at the

order level (cultured versus uncultured), abundance in Gtdb based on the number of available

genomes (abundant with more than 5 genomes, rare with 5 genomes or less, and novel with no

genomes in Gtdb), percentage database enrichment (calculated as number of genomes belonging

to a certain order binned in the current study as a percentage of the number of genomes

belonging to the same order in Gtdb), energy conservation capabilities depicted by colored

circles (salmon, aerobic respiration; orange, Fe^{3+} respiration; yellow, nitrate/nitrite reduction;

dark green, reductive sulfur processes; lime green, nitrogen oxidation; cyan, oxidative sulfur-

processes; pink, respiratory hydrogen oxidation; and purple, photosynthesis), and the number of

MAGs belonging to each order binned from the sediment (blue bars) and the water (orange bars).

For orders with 20 or more genomes, the family-level delineation is shown in Figure 3. These

orders are: Anaerolineales (Fig. 3A), Bacteroidales (Fig. 3B), Sedimentisphaerales (Fig. 3C),

Spirochaetales (Fig. 3D), Syntrophales (Fig. 3E), and Woesearchaeales (Fig. 3F).

Figure 2. Novelty, rarity, and phylum-level makeup in Zodletone sediment and water

communities. Genomes belonging to novel (orange), and LRD (blue) lineages are shown as a

percentage of total binned genomes in the sediment (A) and the water (B) communities. The sum

of novel and LRD genomes is shown in grey. (C) Phylum-level affiliation for sediment versus

water genomes. Number of genomes belonging to each phylum is shown for the sediment (blue

bars on the left) and the water (orange bars on the right).

Figure 3. Family-level delineation for orders with 20 or more genomes. The maximum

likelihood trees were constructed in FastTree [84] based on the concatenated alignments of 120-,

and 122- single copy genes, respectively, obtained from Gtdb-TK [83]. Bootstrap support values

are shown as bubbles for nodes with >70% support. Families are color-coded. To the right of the

trees, tracks are shown for cultured status at the family level (cultured versus uncultured), and

abundance in Gtdb based on the number of available genomes (abundant with more than 5

genomes, rare with 5 genomes or less, and novel with no genomes in Gtdb).

Figure 4. Sulfur cycle in Zodletone spring. (A) Diagram of sulfur transformations predicted to

take place in the spring. Different sulfur species are shown in black boxes. Reduction reactions

are depicted by purple arrows, oxidation reactions are depicted by red arrows, while

disproportionation reactions are depicted by golden brown arrows. The gene(s) names are shown

on the arrows. (B) Phylum-level distribution of the S-cycling genes shown at the top of the figure

in sediment and water genomes. Processes involving more than one gene are highlighted by

horizontal bars and are color coded by reduction (purple), oxidation (red), or disproportionation

(golden brown), with the name of the process shown on top of the horizontal bar. (C) Family-

level distribution of the genomes involved in S cycling in the spring. The maximum likelihood

tree was constructed in FastTree [84] based on the concatenated alignments of 120 single-copy

genes obtained from Gtdb-TK [83]. The branches represent family-level taxonomy and are color

coded by phylum. For phyla with 2 families or less involved in S cycling, branches are labeled as

Phylum_Class_Order_Family. For phyla where 3 or more families are involved in S cycling, the

phylum is shown at the base of the colored wedge and the branches are labeled as

Class_Order_Family. Lineages staring with ZN depict novel lineages as follows: ZNC, novel

class; ZNO, novel order; and ZNF, novel family. Bootstrap support values are shown as bubbles

for nodes with >70% support. Tracks around the tree represent (from innermost to outermost):

heatmap for the number of genomes in each family, abundance in Gtdb based on the number of

available genomes (abundant with more than 5 genomes, rare with 5 genomes or less, and novel

with no genomes in Gtdb), pie charts of the breakdown of the number of genomes in the

sediment (cyan) versus water (magenta), sulfur reduction pathways (5 tracks in purple),

thiosulfate disproportionation pathways (1 track in golden brown), sulfur oxidation pathways (7

tracks in red), and substrates predicted to support growth depicted by colored stars (cyan, sugars;

lime green, complex carbohydrates; magenta, amino acids; orange, proteins; purple, CO_2

fixation; red, short-chain fatty acids (SCFA); blue, beta oxidation of long-chain fatty acids;

brown, anaerobic benzoate/aromatic hydrocarbon degradation; black, anaerobic alkane

degradation; and grey, Hydrogen oxidation).

Figure 5. Phylum-level distribution for transcribed sulfur cycling genes in Zodletone spring

sediment. RNA-seq reads were pseudo-aligned to the S-cycling genes predicted in Zodletone

genomes to detect exact matches using Kallisto [93]. The transcripts per million are shown on the

Y-axis for the gene/ group of genes depicted at the top of the figure.

References

References

1.   Jørgensen BB, Findlay AJ, Pellerin A. The biogeochemical sulfur-cycle in marine

sediments. *Front Microbiol* **10**, 849 (2019).

2.   Wasmund K, Mußmann M, Loy A. The life sulfuric: microbial ecology of sulfur cycling in

marine sediments. *Environ Microbiol Rep* **9**, 323-344 (2017).

3.   van Vliet DM*, et al.* The bacterial sulfur cycle in expanding dysoxic and euxinic marine

waters. *Environ Microbiol* doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.15265, (2020).

4.   Holmer M, Storkholm P. Sulphate reduction and sulphur cycling in lake sediments: a

review. *Freshw Biol* **46**, 431-451 (2001).

5.   Schmalenberger A, Drake HL, Küsel K. High unique diversity of sulfate-reducing

prokaryotes characterized in a depth gradient in an acidic fen. *Environ Microbiol* **9**, 1317–1328

(2007).

6.   Gieg LM, Davidova IA, Duncan KE, Suflita JM. Methanogenesis, sulfate reduction and

crude oil biodegradation in hot Alaskan oilfields. *Environ Microbiol* **12**, 3074-3086 (2010).

7.   Steudel R. Mechanism for the formation of elemental sulfur from aqueous sulfide in

chemical and microbiological desulfurization processes. *Ind Eng Chem Res* **35**, 1417–1423

(1996).

8.   Jelen B, Giovannelli D, Falkowski PG, Vetriani C. Elemental sulfur reduction in the deep ‑

sea vent thermophile, *Thermovibrio ammonificans*. *Environ Microbiol* **20**, 2301-2316 (2018).

9.   Zopfi J, Ferdelman TG, Fossing H. Distribution and fate of sulfur intermediates - sulfite,

tetrathionate, thiosulfate, and elemental sulfur in marine sediments. In: *In Sulfur*

Biogeochemistry – Past and Pre- sent. (eds Amend JP, Edwards KJ, Lyons TW). Geological

Society of America, (2004).

10.   Mandal M*, et al.* Cryptic roles of tetrathionate in the sulfur cycle of marine sediments:

microbial drivers and indicators. *Biogeosciences* **17**, (2020).

11.   Canfield DE, Habicht KS, Thamdrup B. The Archean sulfur cycle and the early history of

atmospheric oxygen. *Science* **299**, 658-661 (2000).

12.   Ranjan S, Todd ZR, Sutherland JD, Sasselov DD. Sulfidic anion concentrations on early

earth for surficial origins-of-Life chemistry. *Astrobiology* **18**, 1023-1041 (2018).

13.   Canfield DE, Raiswell R. The evolution of the sulfur-cycle. *Am J Sci* **299**, 697-723 (1999).

14.   Habicht KS, M. Gade, Thamdrup B, Berg P, Canfield DE. Calibration of sulfate levels in

the Archean ocean. *Science* **298**, 2372-2374 (2002).

15. Habicht KS, Canfield DE, Rethmeier J. Sulfur isotope fractionation during bacterial

reduction and disproportionation of thiosulfate and sulfite. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* **62**, 2585-

2595 (1998).

16. Philippot P, Zuilen MV, Lepot K, Thomazo C, Farquhar J, Kranendonk MJV. Early

archaean microorganisms preferred elemental sulfur, not sulfate. *Science* **317**, 1534-1537 (2007).

17. Marin J, e *et al.* The timetree of Prokaryotes: New insights into their evolution and

speciation. *Mol Biol Evol* **34**, 437-446 (2016).

18. van der Valk T, Pecnerova P, *et al.* Million-year-old DNA sheds light on the genomic

history of mammoths. *Nature* https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03224-9, (2021).

19. Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Chaumeil P-A, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P. A complete

domain-to-species taxonomy for Bacteria and Archaea. *Nat Biotechnol***38**, 1079-1086 (2020).

20. Nayfach S*, et al.* A genomic catalog of Earth's microbiomes. *Nat Biotechnol*, (2020).

21. Vavourakis CD*, et al.* Metagenomes and metatranscriptomes shed new light on the

microbial-mediated sulfur cycle in a Siberian soda lake. *BMC Microbiol* **17**, 69 (2019).

22. Zecchin S*, et al*. Rice paddy *Nitrospirae* carry and express genes related to sulfate

respiration: Proposal of the new genus *Sulfobium*". *Appl Environ Microbiol* **84**, e02224-02217

(2018).

23. Venceslau SS, Stockdreher Y, Dahl C, Pereira IAC. The "bacterial heterodisulfide" DsrC is

a key protein in dissimilatory sulfur metabolism. *Biochim Biophys Acta* **1837**, 1148-1164 (2014).

24. Mussmann M*, et al*. Clustered genes related to sulfate respiration in uncultured prokaryotes

support the theory of their concomitant horizontal transfer. *J Bacteriol* **187**, 7126-7137 (2005).

25. Youssef NH*, et al*. *Candidatus* Krumholzibacterium zodletonense gen. nov., sp nov, the first

representative of the candidate phylum Krumholzibacteriota phyl. nov. recovered from an anoxic

sulfidic spring using genome resolved metagenomics. *Syst Appl Microbiol* **42**, 85-93 (2019).

26. Price-Carter M, Tingey J, Bobik TA, Roth JR. The alternative electron a*cceptor*

tetrathionate supports B12-dependent anaerobic growth of Salmonella enterica serovar

typhimurium on ethanolamine or 1,2-propanediol. *J Bacteriol* **183**, 2463-2475 (2001).

27. Kanao T, Kamimura K, Sugio T. Identification of a gene encoding a tetrathionate hydrolase

in *Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans*. *J Biotechnol* **132**, 16-22 (2007).

28. Achtnich C, Bak F, Conrad R. Competition for electron donors among nitrate reducers,

ferric iron reducers, sulfate reducers, and methanogens in anoxic paddy soil. *Biol Fertil Soils* **19**,

65-72 (1995).

29. Glombitza C, Egger M, Røy H, Jørgensen BB. Controls on volatile fatty acid concentrations

in marine sediments (Baltic Sea). *Geochim Cosmochim Acta*, 226-241 (2019).

30. Morrison JM, Baker KD, Zamor RM, Nikolai S, Elshhaed MS, Youssef NH. Spatiotemporal

analysis of microbial community dynamics during seasonal stratification events in a freshwater

lake (Grand Lake, OK, USA). *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0177488 (2017).

31. Daly RA*, et al.* Microbial metabolisms in a 2.5-km-deep ecosystem created by hydraulic

fracturing in shales. *Nat Microbiol* **1**, 16146 (2016).

32. Jørgensen BB, Marshall IPG. Slow microbial life in tthe seabed. *Ann Rev Mar Sci* **8**, 311-

332 (2016).

33. Jørgensen BB, Isaksen MF, Jannasch HW. Bacterial sulfate reduction above 100°C in deep-

sea hydrothermal vent sediments. *Science* **1756-1757**, (1992).

34. Scholze C, Jørgensen BB, Røy H. Psychrophilic properties of sulfate‐reducing bacteria in

Arctic marine sediments. *Limnol Oceanog* https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11586, (2020).

35. Sánchez-Andrea I, Sanz JL, Bijmans MF, Stams AJ. Sulfate reduction at low pH to

remediate acid mine drainage. *J Hazard Mater* **269**, 98-109 (2014).

36. Sorokin DY, Kuenen JG, Muyzer G. The microbial sulfur cycle at extremely haloalkaline

conditions of soda lakes. *Front Microbiol* **2**, 44 (2011).

37. Teske A*, et al.* Sulfate-reducing bacteria and their activities in cyanobacterial mats of Solar

Lake (Sinai, Egypt). *Appl Environ Microbiol* **1998**, 2943-2951 (1998).

38. Bell E*, et al.* Active sulfur cycling in the terrestrial deep subsurface. *ISME J* **14**, 1260-1272

(2020).

39. Rabus R, Venceslau SS, Wöhlbrand L, Voordouw G, Wall JD, Pereira IA. A post-genomic

view of the ecophysiology, catabolism and biotechnological relevance of sulphate-reducing

prokaryotes. *Adv Microb Physiol* **66**, 55-321 (2015).

40. Bertran E*, et al.* Deconstructing the dissimilatory sulfate reduction pathway: Isotope

fractionation of a mutant unable of growth on sulfate. *Front Microbiol* **9**, 3110 (2018).

41. Peck HD, Jr., LeGall J. Biochemistry of dissimilatory sulphate reduction. *Philos Trans R*

Soc Lond B Biol Sci **298**, 443-466 (1982).

42. Wenk CB, Wing BA, Halevy I. Electron carriers in microbial sulfate reduction inferred from

experimental and environmental sulfur isotope fractionations. *ISME J* **12**, 495-507 (2018).

43. Rabus R, Hansen TA, Widdel F. Dissimilatory sulfate- and sulfur-reducing prokaryotes. In:

The Prokaryotes: Prokaryotic physiology and biochemistry (eds Rosenberg E, DeLong EF, Lory

S, Stackebrandt E, Thompson F). Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2013).

44. Anantharaman K*, et al.* Expanded diversity of microbial groups that shape the dissimilatory

sulfur cycle. *ISME J* **12**, 1715-1728 (2018).

45. Hausmann B*, et al.* Peatland Acidobacteria with a dissimilatory sulfur metabolism. *ISME J*

12, 1729-1742 (2018).

46. Flieder M*, et al.* Novel taxa of Acidobacteriota implicated in seafloor sulfur cycling. *ISME*

J, doi: 10.1038/s41396-021-00992-0 (2021).

47. Villemur R, Lanthier M, Beaudet R, Lépine F. The *Desulfitobacterium* genus. *FEMS*

Microbiol Rev **30**, 706-733 (2006).

48. Huang CJ, Barrett EL. Sequence analysis and expression of the *Salmonella typhimurium asr*

operon encoding production of hydrogen sulfide from sulfite. *J Bacteriol* **173**, 1544-1553 (1991).

49. Shirodkar S, Reed S, Romine M, Saffarini D. The octahaem SirA catalyses dissimilatory

sulfite reduction in *Shewanella oneidensis* MR-1. *Environ Microbiol* **13**, 108-115 (2011).

50. Kern M, Klotz MG, Simon J. The Wolinella succinogenes mcc gene cluster encodes an

unconventional respiratory sulphite reduction system. *Mol Microbiol* **82**, 1515-1530 (2011).

51. Colman DR, Lindsay MR, Amenabar MJ, Fernandes-Martins MC, Roden ER, Boyd ES.

Phylogenomic analysis of novel Diaforarchaea is consistent with sulfite but not sulfate reduction

in volcanic environments on early Earth. *ISME J* **14**, 1316-1331 (2020).

52. Finster K, Liesack W, Thamdrup B. Elemental sulfur and thiosulfate disproportionation by

Desulfocapsa sulfoexigens sp. nov., a new anaerobic bacterium isolated from marine surface

sediment. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **64**, 119-125 (1998).

53. Frederiksen TM, Finster K. Sulfite-oxido-reductase is involved in the oxidation of sulfite in

Desulfocapsa sulfoexigens during disproportionation of thiosulfate and elemental sulfur.

Biodegradation **14**, 189-198 (2003).

54. Sun B, Cole JR, Tiedje JM. *Desulfomonile limimaris* sp. nov., an anaerobic dehalogenating

bacterium from marine sediments. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **51**, 365-371 (2001).

55. Townsend GT, Suflita JM. Influence of sulfur oxyanions on reductive dehalogenation

activities in *Desulfomonile tiedjei*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **63**, 3594-3599 (1997).

56. Haschke RH, Campbell LL. Thiosulfate reductase of *Desulfovibrio vulgaris*. *J Bacteriol*

106, 603-607 (1971).

57. Obraztsova AY, Francis CA, Tebo BM. Sulfur disproportionation by the facultative

anaerobe *Pantoea agglomerans* SP1 as a mechanism for chromium(VI) reduction. *Geomicrobiol*

J **19**, 121-132 (2002).

58. Mardanov AV, Beletsky AV, Kadnikov VV, Slobodkin AI, Ravin NV. Genome analysis of

Thermosulfurimonas dismutans, the first thermophilic sulfur-disproportionating bacterium of the

phylum Thermodesulfobacteria. *Front Microbiol* **7**, 950 (2016).

59. Jackson BE, McInerney MJ. Thiosulfate disproportionation by *Desulfotomaculum*

thermobenzoicum. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **66**, 3650-3653 (2000).

60. Jørgensen BB. A thiosulfate shunt in the sulfur cycle of marine sediments. *Science* **249**,

152-154 (1990).

61. Jørgensen BB. The sulfur cycle of freshwater sediments: Role of thiosulfate. *Limnol*

Oceanogr **35**, 1329-1342 (1990).

62. Marin J, Battistuzzi FU, Brown AC, Hedges SB. The timetree of prokaryotes: New insights

into their evolution and speciation. *Mol Biol Evol* **34**, 437-446 (2017).

63. Lyons TW, Reinhard CT, Planavsky NJ. The rise of oxygen in Earth's early ocean and

atmosphere. *Nature* **506**, 307-315 (2014).

64. Killingsworth BA, Sansjofre P, Philippot P, Cartigny P, Thomazo C, Lalonde V.

Constraining the rise of oxygen with oxygen isotopes. *Nature Comm* **10**, 4924 (2019).

65. Holland HD. Some applications of thermochemical data to problems of ore deposits; part 2,

mineral assemblages and the com- position of ore forming fluids. *Econ Geol* **60**, 1101–1166.

(1995).

66. Buhring SI*, et al.* Insights into chemotaxonomic composition and carbon cycling of

phototrophic communities in an artesian sulfur‐rich spring (Zodletone, Oklahoma, USA), a

possible analog for ancient microbial mat systems. *Geobiology* **9**, 166-179 (2011).

67. Elshahed MS*, et al.* Bacterial diversity and sulfur cycling in a mesophilic sulfide-rich

spring. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **69**, 5609-5621 (2003).

68. Senko JM, Campbell BS, Henricksen JR, Elshahed MS, Dewers TA, Krumholz LR. Barite

deposition mediated by photootrophic sulfide-oxidizing bacteria. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* **68**,

773-780 (2004).

69.   Spain AM, Najar FZ, Krumholz LR, Elshahed MS. Metatranscriptomic analysis of a high-

sulfide aquatic spring reveals insights into sulfur cycling and unexpected aerobic metabolism.

Peer J. **3**, e1259 (2015).

70.   Caporaso JG*, et al.* Global patterns of 16S rRNA diversity at a depth of millions of

sequences per sample. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* **108**, 4516-4522 (2011).

71.   Parada AE, Needham DM, Fuhrman JA. Every base matters: assessing small subunit rRNA

primers for marine microbiomes with mock communities, time series and global field samples.

Environ Microbiol **18**, 1403-1414 (2016).

72.   Podar PT, Yang Z, BjˆrnsdÛttir SH, Podar M. Comparative analysis of microbial diversity

across temperature gradients in hot springs from Yellowstone and Iceland. *Front Microbiol* **11**,

(2020).

73.   Cross KL*, et al.* Targeted isolation and cultivation of uncultivated bacteria by reverse

genomics. *Nat Biotechnol* **37**, 1314-1321 (2019).

74.   Walters W*, et al.* Improved bacterial 16S rRNA gene (V4 and V4-5) and fungal internal

transcribed spacer marker gene primers for microbial community surveys. *mSystems* **1**, e00009-

00015 (2016).

75. Bolyen E*, et al.* Reproducible, interactive, scalable and extensible microbiome data science

using QIIME 2. *Nat Biotechnol* **37**, 852-857 (2019).

76. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence

data. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **30**, 2114-2120 (2014).

77. Diamond S*, et al.* Mediterranean grassland soil C–N compound turnover is dependent on

rainfall and depth, and is mediated by genomically divergent microorganisms. *Nat Microbiol* **4**,

1356-1367 (2019).

78. Kang DD*, et al.* MetaBAT 2: an adaptive binning algorithm for robust and efficient genome

reconstruction from metagenome assemblies. *PeerJ* **7**, e7359-e7359 (2019).

79. Wu Y-W, Simmons BA, Singer SW. MaxBin 2.0: an automated binning algorithm to

recover genomes from multiple metagenomic datasets. *Bioinformatics* **32**, 605-607 (2015).

80. Sieber CMK*, et al.* Recovery of genomes from metagenomes via a dereplication,

aggregation and scoring strategy. *Nat Microbiol* **3**, 836-843 (2018).

81. Parks DH, Imelfort M, Skennerton CT, Hugenholtz P, Tyson GW. CheckM: assessing the

quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and metagenomes. *Genome*

Res **25**, 1043-1055 (2015).

82. Parks DH, *et al.* Recovery of nearly 8,000 metagenome-assembled genomes substantially

expands the tree of life. *Nat Microbiol* **2**, 1533-1542 (2017).

83. Chaumeil P-A, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P, Parks DH. GTDB-Tk: a toolkit to classify

genomes with the Genome Taxonomy Database. *Bioinformatics* **36**, 1925-1927 (2019).

84. Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP. FastTree 2 – Approximately Maximum-Likelihood Trees

for Large Alignments. *PLOS ONE* **5**, e9490 (2010).

85. Hyatt D, Chen G-L, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. Prodigal: prokaryotic

gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. *BMC Bioinformatics* **11**, 119-119

(2010).

86. Kanehisa M, Sato Y, Morishima K. BlastKOALA and GhostKOALA: KEGG tools for

functional characterization of genome and metagenome sequences. *J Mol Biol* **428**, 726-731

(2016).

87. Sievers F, *et al.* Fast, scalable generation of high-quality protein multiple sequence

alignments using Clustal Omega. *Mol Syst Biol* **7**, 539-539 (2011).

88. Mistry J, Finn RD, Eddy SR, Bateman A, Punta M. Challenges in homology search:

HMMER3 and convergent evolution of coiled-coil regions. *Nucleic Acids Res* **41**, e121 (2013).

89. Katoh K, Misawa K, Kuma K-i, Miyata T. MAFFT: a novel method for rapid multiple

sequence alignment based on fast Fourier transform. *Nucleic Acids Res* **30**, 3059-3066 (2002).

90. Kumar S, Stecher G, Li M, Knyaz C, Tamura K. MEGA X: Molecular Evolutionary

Genetics Analysis across Computing Platforms. *Mol Biol Evol* **35**, 1547-1549 (2018).

91. Kozlov AM, Darriba D, Flouri T, Morel B, Stamatakis A. RAxML-NG: a fast, scalable and

user-friendly tool for maximum likelihood phylogenetic inference. *Bioinformatics* **35**, 4453-4455

(2019).

92. Guy L, Kultima JR, Andersson SGE. genoPlotR: comparative gene and genome

visualization in R. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **26**, 2334-2335 (2010).

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

quantification. *Nat Biotechnol* **34**, 525-527 (2016).

94. Graham ED, Heidelberg JF, Tully BJ. Potential for primary productivity in a globally-

distributed bacterial phototroph. *ISME J* **12**, 1861-1866 (2018).

95. Rawlings ND, Barrett AJ, Thomas PD, Huang X, Bateman A, Finn RD. The MEROPS

database of proteolytic enzymes, their substrates and inhibitors in 2017 and a comparison with

peptidases in the PANTHER database. *Nucleic Acids Res* **46**, D624-D632 (2017).

96. Huang L*, et al.* dbCAN-seq: a database of carbohydrate-active enzyme (CAZyme) sequence

and annotation. *Nucleic Acids Res* **46**, D516-D521 (2017).

97. Garber AI*, et al.* FeGenie: A comprehensive tool for the identification of iron genes and iron

gene neighborhoods in genome and metagenome assemblies. *Front Microbiol* **11**, (2020).

930
931

Figure 2

Figure 6