1 **Exploring Viral Communities Associated With Terrestrial Cyanobacteria Metagenomes**
2
3

4 Cassandra L. Ettinger[a,#], Sudipto R. Paul[b], Neptali Flores[c], Ryan D. Ward[d], Nicole Pietrasiak[e],
5 Jason E. Stajich[a,f,#]
6
7
8 [a]Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology, University of California, Riverside, Riverside,
9 California, USA.
10
11 [b]Department of Biochemistry, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, California, USA.
12
13 [c]Department of Biological Sciences, San Jose State University, San Jose, California, USA.
14
15 [d]Laboratory of Genetics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
16
17 [e]School of Life Sciences, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA.
18
19 [f]Institute for Integrative Genome Biology, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA,
20 USA.
21

22 **Running Title:** Terrestrial Cyanophage Survey
23

24 [#]**Address correspondence to**: Cassandra L. Ettinger, cassande@ucr.edu; Jason E. Stajich,
25 jason.stajich@ucr.edu
26

27 **Keywords:** cyanophage, virus, phage, viral diversity, viral host, terrestrial, Cyanobacteria,
28 desert ecosystem

Abstract

Viruses are exceedingly common, but little is known about how they behave in extreme environments, and whether viruses facilitate adaptation of their hosts to harsh conditions. To understanding of these understudied viral-host interactions, we analyzed metagenomes from 50 unialgal but nonaxenic Cyanobacteria cultures with 47 representing various terrestrial habitats, including desert soil and rock surfaces, tropical soil, and vernal pools. These cultures represent low diversity microbial consortia dominated by the terrestrial Cyanobacteria and its associated cyanosphere microbiome containing heterotrophic microbes. We identified viral sequences in metagenomes, grouped these into viral operational taxonomic units (vOTUs) and then placed vOTUs into viral clusters (VCs). We also calculated vOTU relative abundance and predicted possible bacterial hosts In total we predicted 814 viral sequences representing 726 vOTUs. We assigned putative taxonomy to 72 of the 814 putative viral sequences; these were distributed into 15 VCs — mostly assigned to the Caudovirales order of viruses. We found that metagenomes were dominated by unclassified and unclustered viral sequences. Furthermore, we predicted bacterial hosts for 211 vOTUs, with the majority of viruses predicted to infect a Proteobacteria host, and only 3 vOTUs predicted to infect a Cyanobacteria host. Overall, these results are consistent with the notion that viruses in extreme environments are underrepresented in reference datasets. This work increases knowledge of viral diversity and sets a foundation for future work on viruses associated with terrestrial Cyanobacteria and their heterotroph associates, such as connecting specific viruses to critical cycling processes and investigating their metabolic functions.

Importance

Relatively little is known about Cyanobacteria that live on land, or their associated viral communities. To begin to address this knowledge gap, we identified viruses from metagenomes of multi-species cultures which contain mainly Cyanobacteria, but also associated heterotrophic

bacteria. The majority of surveyed viruses did not share similarity with reference viral genomes,

potentially indicating some viral novelty. Further, we found that for the viruses where we could

predict a putative bacterial host, most were not associated with the Cyanobacteria members in

these cultures. These results highlight how little is known about land-based Cyanobacteria or

their associated viruses. Given the role of some viruses in influencing ecosystem services and

enhancing host fitness, surveying viruses is foundational to understanding how Cyanobacteria

may have adapted to and survive in some of the most extreme environments on land.

Introduction

Viruses infect all domains of life and are thought to be the most abundant entities on Earth (1). Viruses rely on their hosts for replication, and thus are intricately entwined with their host communities. In the lytic life cycle viruses infect their hosts, hijack the cellular machinery to replicate, and induce host cell lysis for dispersal of the newly created viral particles (2). As a host defense mechanism, phage infections can be evidenced in host's CRISPR cassettes which resulted from past infection events building up hosts' phage immunity (3, 4). Frequently viruses can also integrate and persist in their host's genome as prophages, with many bacteria harboring at least one prophage (5). Prophages can have auxiliary metabolic genes (AMGs) or pathogenicity genes which they use to promote host growth (6–9). With such controls on host metabolism and fitness, viruses can have important and often underappreciated effects on bacterial population dynamics and turnover in microbial communities (10–12).

Viral discovery has long been hindered by the lack of universal gene markers, however, modern machine-learning based and k-mer approaches have enabled researchers to robustly search metagenomes for viral sequences (13–17). With these new methodologies, researchers can utilize available public sequencing data to discover and explore complex viral communities across previously uncharted ecosystems. However, virus discovery and potential host interactions and feedbacks to microbial communities in extreme environments, such as cave wall biofilms, biofilms of ephemeral waterfalls, temporal vernal pools, and dryland soil, are still notably understudied.

Cyanobacteria are keystone taxa of such polyextreme terrestrial environments due to their important roles in primary production and microbial organic matter build up, nitrogen fixation, bioweathering, and biofilm, microbial mat or biological soil crust formation (18–21). As essential ecosystem engineers, Cyanobacteria interact with a broad variety of other microbes. For

examples, filamentous biological soil crust cyanobacteria house their own set of associated

microbes established around the polysaccharide rich sheath material forming the cyanosphere, a

microbial community similar to the copiotrophic rhizosphere microbiomes around plant roots (22).

Cyanobacteria also influence free-living co-occurring microbes as shown in another study in which

cyanobacteria in hypersaline microbial mats generated fermentation byproducts that promoted

the metabolism of Chloroflexi and Sulfate-reducing bacteria (23). However, our knowledge on

Cyanobacteria phages, viruses that infect Cyanobacteria, is still largely based on prior

investigations of samples collected from aquatic ecosystems (24–28). Cyanophages in aquatic

ecosystems have shown to carry AMGs related to photosynthesis, phosphorus utilization, and

carbon metabolism which are thought to aid phage fitness (29–32). Yet, if Cyanophages have

similar dynamic roles in polyextreme terrestrial habitats, or how phages might impact

Cyanobacteria associated microbiomes is still virtually unknown.

Previously, Ward et al. generated 50 metagenomes from nonaxenic Cyanobacterial cultures,

which represented unialgal polycultures containing primarily Cyanobacteria and heterotrophic

microbial associates living in the cyanosphere. The majority of the metagenomes (47) were

obtained from cyanobacteria isolated from terrestrial habitats (24). In this study, we investigated

the viral diversity associated with these Cyanobacterial co-culture metagenomes. We sought to

(i) create a catalog of viral genomes present in these metagenomes, (ii) assess the relative

abundance of viral genomes across co-cultures, and (iii) explore possible bacterial hosts for these

viruses.

Results and Discussion

Successful viral identification from Cyanobacterial co-cultures

In total, 814 viral sequences were identified across the 50 cyanobacterial co-culture

metagenomes (Table S1), with each metagenome having on average 16.3 viral sequences

(range: 1-54). Of the 814 viral sequences, 188 were integrated prophages (Fig. 1A). CheckV

assigned viral quality to 712 of the 814 viral genomes with 465 predicted to be low-quality, 208 to

be medium-quality, 32 to be high-quality, and 7 to be complete (Fig. 1B). The mean length of

predicted viral sequences was 27,594 bp (range: 5,013–199,914 bp), with an average of 35.4

predicted genes per viral sequence. We clustered these 814 viral sequences at 95% identity into

726 viral operational taxonomic units (vOTUs). These numbers are similar to previous

metagenomic viral discovery efforts in cyanolichen metagenomes (33). While this work provides

a catalog of the dominant DNA viruses that infect terrestrial Cyanobacteria and associated

heterotrophs, it is likely that we are undersampling rare viruses which are better profiled using

virome data (34).

Clustering of viral sequences with reference data reveals possibly novel genera

To be able to assign putative taxonomy to vOTUs, we further used gene-sharing networks to

cluster them with publicly available reference data to form VCs which approximate genus-level

groupings. In total 305 vOTUs, representing 341 viral sequences, were placed in 111 VCs. Of

these 111 VCs, 26 included representatives from the reference dataset, while 79 represented

putatively novel genera. The majority of these 79 unique VCs originated from Cyanobacterial co-

cultures isolated from desert environments, which is not unexpected as the majority of co-cultures

were from these environments (56% of co-cultures) (Fig. 2A-B). This limited overlap with existing

reference data is similar to recent work on cyanolichen metagenomes, where only 28 of 133 VCs

included reference genomes (33). As viral exploration of cyanobacteria-dominated and other

extreme environments continues, we expect to see more sequences clustering with reference

genomes over time.

The 26 VCs that clustered with the reference data represented 75 of the 814 predicted viral

sequences in this dataset. Of these 26 VCs, the majority of these (15 VCs) were clustered with

members assigned to the Caudovirales order of tailed double-stranded DNA viruses, which have

also been observed to be the dominant viruses in cyanolichens, biocrusts, hypoliths, and aquatic

cyanobacteria-dominated metagenomes (33, 35–42). Within this, VCs were further classified as

belonging to the families Autographiviridae, Inoviridae, Microviridae, Myoviridae, Podoviridae, and

Siphoviridae (Fig. 2C-D). Only 15 of the 39 sequences representing high-quality or complete viral

genomes, which were made up of 14 vOTUS, came together to form 13 VCs. Of these, only five

VCs included representative viruses from the reference data, while 8 VCs were potentially novel

genera. Of the VCs that clustered with reference genomes, three were clustered with members

of the order Caudovirales, one with the order Petitvirales, and one with the order Tubulavirales.

Most abundant vOTUs are unclassified or unclustered

While the number of viral sequences recovered from each cyanobacterial co-culture varied (Fig.

3A), we were also curious about the distribution of viral sequences across co-cultures. Thus, we

mapped metagenomic reads from each sample to the entire catalog of vOTUs to calculate their

relative abundance across all co-cultures. Of 726 vOTUs, only 617 vOTUs had quality scores

from CheckV and were detected above thresholds set for inclusion. Looking at the relative

abundance of these remaining 617 vOTUs, we found that the majority of co-cultures were

dominated by unclustered vOTUs or by vOTUs that formed VCs that did not cluster with

reference genomes (Fig. 3B). Only a small portion, on average 8.2% (range: 0 - 100%), of

vOTU relative abundance in samples was from vOTUs in VCs that included reference genomes.

The majority of vOTUs, 496 (80.4%), were singletons and only found in one sample. While a

total of 121 vOTUs and 86 VCs (13 of which clustered with reference data) were detected in two

or more samples. The most prevalent VC (714_0) did not cluster with reference genomes and

represented 25 vOTUS across 26 samples spanning different habitats and collection locations.

Using ViPTree, we found that vOTUs in this VC form a unique monophyletic clade within the

family, Siphoviridae (Fig. S1).

Proteobacteria, not Cyanobacteria, dominate host predictions

For the 617 vOTUs, we were able to predict possible bacterial hosts for 211 vOTUs to at least

the phylum-level (Fig. 3C). Of these predictions, we were able to classify the hosts for 151 to

genus-level. Thus, the majority of viral sequences (65.8%) had no host prediction. For those

viruses with a host prediction, largely these were projected to infect Proteobacterial hosts

(95.3%). Within the Proteobacteria, almost half (47.3%) of the predicted hosts were members of

the order Hyphomicrobiales. Further, 18 of the 25 vOTUs represented in the most shared VC

(714_0) were predicted to infect members of the order Hyphomicrobiales. Given that some

members of the Hyphomicrobiales fix nitrogen and often form symbiotic relationships (e.g.

Rhizobium (43)), we wonder if bacteria in this order may be acting in synergy with the

Cyanobacteria in these nonaxenic cultures.

Only 3 vOTUs (vOTU602, vOTU638, vOTU669), representing 3 unclassified viral sequences,

had Cyanobacterial host predictions. Of these two were predicted to be medium-quality

(vOTU602, vOTU669) and one complete (vOTU638). Two of the three vOTUs formed separate

VCs unique to this data (vOTU602 = VC 1342.0; vOTU638 = VC 1447.0). All three vOTUs were

predicted to have hosts in the order Nostocales. However for two vOTUs we were able to only

predict hosts to the order-level (vOTU602, vOTU638), while the third vOTU was predicted to

infect the genus *Calothrix* (vOTU669). These predictions match the taxonomy of the

Cyanobacterial member of the samples that they were obtained from. Two of these vOTUs

(vOTU602, vOTU669) originated from samples from desert environments, while the third

originated from a sample from tropical soil (vOTU638). Each of these three vOTUs was only

detected in the sample it originated from. Using ViPTree, we found that these vOTUs were

placed on long branches with limited similarity to reference genomes and that while some of the

reference genomes in the tree did have aquatic Cyanobacterial host predictions, none were

close relatives to the three vOTUs here (Fig. S2). While finding only three cyanophage vOTUs

was surprising given the predominance of Cyanobacteria in these cultures, previous work from

biocrusts and hypoliths have similarly reported a low abundance of cyanophage (40, 42). An

important caveat to remember is the reliance of host predictions on available genomes; as

Cyanobacterial genome availability increases, we expect that ability to link viruses to their hosts

in these ecosystems will increase as well.

Conclusion

To expand knowledge of Cyanobacteria viruses largely from terrestrial environments, we

employed viral discovery methods on existing metagenomes from nonaxenic Cyanobacterial

cultures (24). We were able to identify 814 viral sequences including sequences that formed

unique VC and which may represent novel viral genera. While this work provides a catalog of

viruses that infect terrestrial Cyanobacteria and associated heterotrophs, due to methodological

limitations, we are likely only sampling DNA phage and are undersampling rare viruses in these

samples. Future work should seek to profile these cultures using more comprehensive methods

such as through viromics sequencing. While we observed no wide scale habitat or Cyanobacterial

host patterns driving viral diversity, it is possible that this is due to incomplete sampling of the viral

community or the mixed nature of the nonaxenic cultures. Overall, future studies should include

a more extensive investigation of viral host interactions in extreme environments and profile the

auxiliary metabolic genes of viral genomes which may play roles in various cycling processes in

terrestrial Cyanobacteria-dominated environments.

Methods

Data collection

Publicly available metagenomic samples were downloaded from NCBI GenBank and imported

to the KBase platform using their respective SRA numbers (Table S1) (44). Sample data

associated with each metagenome was obtained from Table 1 of Ward et al (24).

Identification of viral contigs

Initial viral analysis was performed following the KBase "Viral Analysis End-to-End" workflow

(https://kbase.us/n/75811/85/). Sequence quality for each sample was assessed in KBase using

FastQC v0.11.5 (45). Afterwards, low-quality regions and residual Illumina adapters were trimmed

using Trimmomatic v0.36 (46). This step was followed by a reassessment of the quality of the

sequence data again using FastQC. Next, the reads were assembled into contigs with

MetaSPAdes v3.13.0 with k-mer sizes 21, 33, 55, 77, 99 and 127 (47). Three samples failed to

assemble at this stage using MetaSPAdes due to memory constraints in KBase; for these three

samples, MEGAHIT v1.2.9 was utilized instead (48). Subsequently, all contigs shorter than 5000

base pairs were filtered out using the KBase application "Filter Assembled Contigs By Length -

v1.1.2".

Next, VirSorter v1.0.5 was used to predict the viral genomes in each sample and categorize them

into six categories based on their predicted length and viral characteristics (49). Viral contigs from

VirSorter categories 1-2 (high-confidence lytic viruses) and 4-5 (high-confidence prophages) were

merged into one file using the KBase application "Modify Bins in BinnedContigs - v1.0.2" and then

extracted using the "Extract Bins as Assemblies from BinnedContigs - v1.0.2" application. The

assembly file for each sample was then exported from KBase. All assemblies were combined into

a single file and then run through VIBRANT v1.2.1 in "virome" mode (14). This second viral

identification step was performed to ensure proper trimming of prophage. CheckV v0.8.1 was then

run on the resulting file of predicted viral genomes using the "end_to_end" workflow to calculate

viral genome quality (50).

Clustering of viral contigs across all samples & relative abundance

Viral genomes were then clustered into 95% identity vOTUs using CD-HIT using the following

options: -c 0.95 -aS 0.85 -M 0 -d 0 (51). In order to assign a putative taxonomy to vOTUs, we

first used Prodigal v. 2.6.3 to predict open reading frames in vOTU representative genomes

using the -p meta option (52). We then used VContact2 to cluster vOTUs with the INPHARED

August 2022 reference database into viral clusters (VCs) (53, 54) and assigned predicted

taxonomy to viruses based on cluster membership as in Santos-Medellin et al (34). For vOTUs

in VCs of interest, ViPTree was further used to place vOTUs into proteomic trees with viral

reference genomes from RefSeq release 212 (55).

To quantify the relative abundance of vOTUs across samples, we mapped reads from each

metagenome to vOTUs using BBMap with a minid=0.90 (56). We used SAMtools to convert

sam files to bam files and BEDTools genomecov to get coverage information for each vOTU

across each sample from the bam files (57, 58). We also used bamM to parse the bam files to

calculate the trimmed pileup coverage (tpmean), which we used to assess viral relative

abundance (59). We then filtered out vOTUs which displayed < 75% coverage over the length of

the viral sequence in R (60). Thresholds for analysis of relative abundance of vOTUs were

based on previous community guidelines for identity (i.e. ≥ 95% identity) and detection (i.e. ≥

75% of the viral genome length covered ≥ 1x by reads at ≥ 90% average nucleotide identity)

(61, 62). We further removed vOTUs that CheckV could not make quality predictions for (i.e.

where quality was "not-determined") prior to downstream analyses. Viral relative abundance

was visualized in R using many packages including tidyverse and phyloseq (63, 64). Analysis

scripts for the post-KBase portions of this work are available on GitHub

(https://github.com/stajichlab/Terrestrial_Cyanophage) and archived in Zenodo (65).

Putative identification of hosts

In order to predict possible microbial hosts for the viral genomes identified, we downloaded all

complete bacterial and archaeal genomes, as of April 7, 2022, from NCBI RefSeq using "ncbi-

genome-download" (66). In total this amounted to 25,984 bacterial and 416 archaeal genomes.

We then used "makeblastdb" from NCBI BLAST 2.12.0+ to convert these complete genomes

into a blast database and "blastn" to compare vOTUs to this reference (67). We filtered the

results of this analysis in R based on guidelines used previously (68, 69). Matches had to share

≥ 2000 bp region with ≥ 70% sequence identity to the viral genome and possible host matches

needed to have a bit score of ≥ 50 and minimum e value of 0.001. Only the top five hits

matching these thresholds were considered when predicting a host for each viral genome, with

host predictions made at each taxonomic level only if all hits were in agreement. Discrepancies

in taxonomy between hits resulted in a "mixed" assignment for that taxonomic level. Based on

this method, the lowest level of host prediction was genus level, with some predictions only able

to be made at higher taxonomic levels (e.g. class or order).

Acknowledgements

S.P. was supported by UC Riverside's Research in Science Experience (RISE;

https://rise.ucr.edu/) program which received funding from UC Riverside College of Natural and

Agricultural Sciences and the National Science Foundation (NSF) PERSIST, Award No.

1565140. N.F. was supported by the National Summer Undergraduate Research Project

(NSURP; https://nsurp.org/) which was supported by NSF RAPID: The National Summer

Undergraduate Research Project, Award No. 2128247. J.E.S. is a CIFAR Fellow in the program

Fungal Kingdom: Threats and Opportunities and partially supported by USDA Agriculture

Experimental Station at the University of California, Riverside and NIFA Hatch projects CA-R-

PPA-5062-H.

We are thankful to DOE Systems Biology Knowledgebase (KBase) which is supported as part of

the BER Genomic Science Program, and is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of

Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research under Award Numbers DE-AC02-

05CH11231, DE-AC02-06CH11357, DE-AC05-00OR22725, and DE-AC02-98CH10886. Data

analyses performed at the High-Performance Computing Cluster at the University of California

Riverside in the Institute of Integrative Genome Biology were supported by NSF grant DBI-

1429826 and NIH grant S10-OD016290. Metagenomic sequencing of the cyanobacteria

cultures was supported by JGI-CSP-503837 awarded to N.P. The work (proposal:

10.46936/10.25585/60001171) conducted by the U.S. Department of Energy Joint Genome

Institute (https://ror.org/04xm1d337), a DOE Office of Science User Facility, is supported by the

Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy operated under Contract No. DE-AC02-

05CH11231. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the

decision to submit the work for publication. We also thank Jeffrey R. Johansen for being a

lifelong mentor, collaborator, and friend to N.P. Jeff initiated a culture collection of terrestrial

cyanobacteria at JCU from which subcultures of at least half of the investigated strains were

obtained and investigated in Ward et al. (2021).

360
References

1.   Paez-Espino D, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, Pavlopoulos GA, Thomas AD, Huntemann M, Mikhailova

N, Rubin E, Ivanova NN, Kyrpides NC. 2016. Uncovering Earth's virome. Nature 536:425–

430.

2.   Guttman B, Raya R, Kutter E. 2004. Basic Phage Biology. Bacteriophages

https://doi.org/10.1201/9780203491751.ch3.

3. Barrangou R, Fremaux C, Deveau H, Richards M, Boyaval P, Moineau S, Romero DA,

Horvath P. 2007. CRISPR provides acquired resistance against viruses in prokaryotes.

Science 315:1709–1712.

4. Hampton HG, Watson BNJ, Fineran PC. 2020. The arms race between bacteria and their

phage foes. Nature 577:327–336.

5. Casjens S. 2003. Prophages and bacterial genomics: what have we learned so far? Mol

Microbiol 49:277–300.

6. Fortier L-C, Sekulovic O. 2013. Importance of prophages to evolution and virulence of

bacterial pathogens. Virulence 4:354–365.

7. Hurwitz BL, Hallam SJ, Sullivan MB. 2013. Metabolic reprogramming by viruses in the

sunlit and dark ocean. Genome Biol 14:R123.

8. Thompson LR, Zeng Q, Kelly L, Huang KH, Singer AU, Stubbe J, Chisholm SW. 2011.

Phage auxiliary metabolic genes and the redirection of cyanobacterial host carbon

metabolism. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 108:E757–64.

9. Bragg JG, Chisholm SW. 2008. Modeling the fitness consequences of a cyanophage-

encoded photosynthesis gene. PLoS One 3:e3550.

10. Hurwitz BL, Westveld AH, Brum JR, Sullivan MB. 2014. Modeling ecological drivers in

marine viral communities using comparative metagenomics and network analyses. Proc

Natl Acad Sci U S A 111:10714–10719.

11. Crummett LT, Puxty RJ, Weihe C, Marston MF, Martiny JBH. 2016. The genomic content

and context of auxiliary metabolic genes in marine cyanomyoviruses. Virology 499:219–

229.

12. Hurwitz BL, U'Ren JM. 2016. Viral metabolic reprogramming in marine ecosystems. Curr

Opin Microbiol 31:161–168.

13. Sullivan MB. 2015. Viromes, Not Gene Markers, for Studying Double-Stranded DNA Virus

Communities. Journal of Virology https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.03289-14.

14. Kieft K, Zhou Z, Anantharaman K. 2020. VIBRANT: automated recovery, annotation and

curation of microbial viruses, and evaluation of viral community function from genomic

sequences. Microbiome 8:90.

15. Guo J, Bolduc B, Zayed AA, Varsani A, Dominguez-Huerta G, Delmont TO, Pratama AA,

Gazitúa MC, Vik D, Sullivan MB, Roux S. 2021. VirSorter2: a multi-classifier, expert-guided

approach to detect diverse DNA and RNA viruses. Microbiome 9:37.

16. Amgarten D, Braga LPP, da Silva AM, Setubal JC. 2018. MARVEL, a Tool for Prediction of

Bacteriophage Sequences in Metagenomic Bins. Frontiers in Genetics

https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2018.00304.

17. Ren J, Ahlgren NA, Lu YY, Fuhrman JA, Sun F. 2017. VirFinder: a novel k-mer based tool

for identifying viral sequences from assembled metagenomic data. Microbiome 5:69.

18. Pombubpa N, Pietrasiak N, De Ley P, Stajich JE. 2020. Insights into dryland biocrust

microbiome: geography, soil depth and crust type affect biocrust microbial communities and

networks in Mojave Desert, USA. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 96.

19. Paerl HW, Pinckney JL, Steppe TF. 2000. Cyanobacterial-bacterial mat consortia:

examining the functional unit of microbial survival and growth in extreme environments.

Environ Microbiol 2:11–26.

20. Perera I, Subashchandrabose SR, Venkateswarlu K, Naidu R, Megharaj M. 2018.

Consortia of cyanobacteria/microalgae and bacteria in desert soils: an underexplored

microbiota. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 102:7351–7363.

21. Velichko N, Smirnova S, Averina S, Pinevich A. 2021. A survey of Antarctic cyanobacteria.

Hydrobiologia 848:2627–2652.

22. Couradeau E, Giraldo-Silva A, De Martini F, Garcia-Pichel F. 2019. Spatial segregation of

the biological soil crust microbiome around its foundational cyanobacterium, Microcoleus

vaginatus, and the formation of a nitrogen-fixing cyanosphere. Microbiome 7:55.

23. Lee JZ, Burow LC, Woebken D, Everroad RC, Kubo MD, Spormann AM, Weber PK, Pett-

Ridge J, Bebout BM, Hoehler TM. 2014. Fermentation couples Chloroflexi and sulfate-

reducing bacteria to Cyanobacteria in hypersaline microbial mats. Front Microbiol 5:61.

24. Ward RD, Stajich JE, Johansen JR, Huntemann M, Clum A, Foster B, Foster B, Roux S,

Palaniappan K, Varghese N, Mukherjee S, Reddy TBK, Daum C, Copeland A, Chen I-MA,

Ivanova NN, Kyrpides NC, Shapiro N, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, Pietrasiak N. 2021. Metagenome

Sequencing to Explore Phylogenomics of Terrestrial Cyanobacteria. Microbiol Resour

Announc 10:e0025821.

25. Pietrasiak N, Reeve S, Osorio-Santos K, Lipson DA, Johansen JR. 2021. *Trichotorquatus*

gen. nov. - a new genus of soil cyanobacteria discovered from American drylands. J Phycol

57:886–902.

26. Pietrasiak N, Osorio-Santos K, Shalygin S, Martin MP, Johansen JR. 2019. When Is A

Lineage A Species? A Case Study In *Myxacorys* gen. nov. (Synechococcales:

Cyanobacteria) With The Description of Two New Species From The Americas. J Phycol

55:976–996.

27. Baldarelli LM, Pietrasiak N, Osorio-Santos K, Johansen JR. 2022. *Mojavia aguilerae* and *M.*

dolomitestris - two new Nostocaceae (Cyanobacteria) species from the Americas. J Phycol

58:502–516.

28. Patzelt DJ, Hodač L, Friedl T, Pietrasiak N, Johansen JR. 2014. Biodiversity of soil

cyanobacteria in the hyper-arid Atacama Desert, Chile. J Phycol 50:698–710.

29. Sullivan MB, Coleman ML, Weigele P, Rohwer F, Chisholm SW. 2005. Three

Prochlorococcus cyanophage genomes: signature features and ecological interpretations.

PLoS Biol 3:e144.

30. Bailey S, Clokie MRJ, Millard A, Mann NH. 2004. Cyanophage infection and photoinhibition

in marine cyanobacteria. Res Microbiol 155:720–725.

31. Sullivan MB, Huang KH, Ignacio-Espinoza JC, Berlin AM, Kelly L, Weigele PR,

DeFrancesco AS, Kern SE, Thompson LR, Young S, Yandava C, Fu R, Krastins B, Chase

M, Sarracino D, Osburne MS, Henn MR, Chisholm SW. 2010. Genomic analysis of oceanic

cyanobacterial myoviruses compared with T4-like myoviruses from diverse hosts and

environments. Environ Microbiol 12:3035–3056.

32. Millard AD, Zwirglmaier K, Downey MJ, Mann NH, Scanlan DJ. 2009. Comparative

genomics of marine cyanomyoviruses reveals the widespread occurrence of

Synechococcus host genes localized to a hyperplastic region: implications for mechanisms

of cyanophage evolution. Environ Microbiol 11:2370–2387.

33. Ponsero AJ, Hurwitz BL, Magain N, Miadlikowska J, Lutzoni F, U'Ren JM. 2021.

Cyanolichen microbiome contains novel viruses that encode genes to promote microbial

metabolism. ISME Communications 1:1–4.

34. Santos-Medellin C, Zinke LA, Ter Horst AM, Gelardi DL, Parikh SJ, Emerson JB. 2021.

Viromes outperform total metagenomes in revealing the spatiotemporal patterns of

agricultural soil viral communities. ISME J 15:1956–1970.

35. Sabehi G, Shaulov L, Silver DH, Yanai I, Harel A, Lindell D. 2012. A novel lineage of

myoviruses infecting cyanobacteria is widespread in the oceans. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A

109:2037–2042.

36. Guajardo-Leiva S, Pedrós-Alió C, Salgado O, Pinto F, Díez B. 2018. Active Crossfire

Between Cyanobacteria and Cyanophages in Phototrophic Mat Communities Within Hot

Springs. Front Microbiol 9:2039.

37. Skvortsov T, de Leeuwe C, Quinn JP, McGrath JW, Allen CCR, McElarney Y, Watson C,

Arkhipova K, Lavigne R, Kulakov LA. 2016. Metagenomic Characterisation of the Viral

Community of Lough Neagh, the Largest Freshwater Lake in Ireland. PLoS One

11:e0150361.

38. Zeigler Allen L, McCrow JP, Ininbergs K, Dupont CL, Badger JH, Hoffman JM, Ekman M,

Allen AE, Bergman B, Venter JC. 2017. The Baltic Sea Virome: Diversity and

Transcriptional Activity of DNA and RNA Viruses. mSystems 2.

39. Adriaenssens EM, Van Zyl L, De Maayer P, Rubagotti E, Rybicki E, Tuffin M, Cowan DA.

2015. Metagenomic analysis of the viral community in Namib Desert hypoliths.

Environmental Microbiology https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.12528.

40. Zablocki O, Adriaenssens EM, Cowan D. 2016. Diversity and Ecology of Viruses in

Hyperarid Desert Soils. Appl Environ Microbiol 82:770–777.

41. Zablocki O, van Zyl L, Adriaenssens EM, Rubagotti E, Tuffin M, Cary SC, Cowan D. 2014.

High-level diversity of tailed phages, eukaryote-associated viruses, and virophage-like

elements in the metaviromes of antarctic soils. Appl Environ Microbiol 80:6888–6897.

42. Van Goethem MW, Swenson TL, Trubl G, Roux S, Northen TR. 2019. Characteristics of

Wetting-Induced Bacteriophage Blooms in Biological Soil Crust. MBio 10.

43. Poole P, Ramachandran V, Terpolilli J. 2018. *Rhizobia*: from saprophytes to

endosymbionts. Nat Rev Microbiol 16:291–303.

44. Arkin AP, Cottingham RW, Henry CS, Harris NL, Stevens RL, Maslov S, Dehal P, Ware D,

Perez F, Canon S, Sneddon MW, Henderson ML, Riehl WJ, Murphy-Olson D, Chan SY,

Kamimura RT, Kumari S, Drake MM, Brettin TS, Glass EM, Chivian D, Gunter D, Weston

DJ, Allen BH, Baumohl J, Best AA, Bowen B, Brenner SE, Bun CC, Chandonia J-M, Chia J-

M, Colasanti R, Conrad N, Davis JJ, Davison BH, DeJongh M, Devoid S, Dietrich E,

Dubchak I, Edirisinghe JN, Fang G, Faria JP, Frybarger PM, Gerlach W, Gerstein M,

Greiner A, Gurtowski J, Haun HL, He F, Jain R, Joachimiak MP, Keegan KP, Kondo S,

Kumar V, Land ML, Meyer F, Mills M, Novichkov PS, Oh T, Olsen GJ, Olson R, Parrello B,

Pasternak S, Pearson E, Poon SS, Price GA, Ramakrishnan S, Ranjan P, Ronald PC,

Schatz MC, Seaver SMD, Shukla M, Sutormin RA, Syed MH, Thomason J, Tintle NL, Wang

D, Xia F, Yoo H, Yoo S, Yu D. 2018. KBase: The United States Department of Energy

Systems Biology Knowledgebase. Nat Biotechnol 36:566–569.

45. Andrews S. FastQC A Quality Control tool for High Throughput Sequence Data.

https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/. Retrieved 20 September 2022.

46. Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. Bioinformatics 30:2114–2120.

47. Nurk S, Meleshko D, Korobeynikov A, Pevzner PA. 2017. metaSPAdes: a new versatile

metagenomic assembler. Genome Res 27:824–834.

48. Li D, Liu C-M, Luo R, Sadakane K, Lam T-W. 2015. MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-node

solution for large and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph.

Bioinformatics 31:1674–1676.

49. Roux S, Enault F, Hurwitz BL, Sullivan MB. 2015. VirSorter: mining viral signal from

microbial genomic data. PeerJ 3:e985.

50. Nayfach S, Camargo AP, Schulz F, Eloe-Fadrosh E, Roux S, Kyrpides NC. 2021. CheckV

assesses the quality and completeness of metagenome-assembled viral genomes. Nat

Biotechnol 39:578–585.

51. Li W, Godzik A. 2006. Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets of

protein or nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics 22:1658–1659.

52. Hyatt D, Chen G-L, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ. 2010. Prodigal:

prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC Bioinformatics

11:119.

53. Cook R, Brown N, Redgwell T, Rihtman B, Barnes M, Clokie M, Stekel DJ, Hobman J,

Jones MA, Millard A. 2021. INfrastructure for a PHAge REference Database: Identification

of Large-Scale Biases in the Current Collection of Cultured Phage Genomes. PHAGE

https://doi.org/10.1089/phage.2021.0007.

54. Bin Jang H, Bolduc B, Zablocki O, Kuhn JH, Roux S, Adriaenssens EM, Brister JR,

Kropinski AM, Krupovic M, Lavigne R, Turner D, Sullivan MB. 2019. Taxonomic assignment

of uncultivated prokaryotic virus genomes is enabled by gene-sharing networks. Nat

Biotechnol 37:632–639.

55. Nishimura Y, Yoshida T, Kuronishi M, Uehara H, Ogata H, Goto S. 2017. ViPTree: the viral

proteomic tree server. Bioinformatics 33:2379–2380.

56.   Bushnell B. 2022. BBMap. SourceForge. https://sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap/. Retrieved

525   20 September 2022.

526   57.   Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic

527   features. Bioinformatics 26:841–842.

528   58.   Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin

529   R, 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map

530   format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078–2079.

531   59.   Ecogenomics/BamM: Metagenomics-focused BAM file manipulation. GitHub.

532   https://github.com/Ecogenomics/BamM. Retrieved 20 September 2022.

533   60.   R Core Team. 2021. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

534   https://www.r-project.org/. Retrieved 2022.

535   61.   Roux S, Adriaenssens EM, Dutilh BE, Koonin EV, Kropinski AM, Krupovic M, Kuhn JH,

536   Lavigne R, Brister JR, Varsani A, Amid C, Aziz RK, Bordenstein SR, Bork P, Breitbart M,

537   Cochrane GR, Daly RA, Desnues C, Duhaime MB, Emerson JB, Enault F, Fuhrman JA,

538   Hingamp P, Hugenholtz P, Hurwitz BL, Ivanova NN, Labonté JM, Lee K-B, Malmstrom RR,

539   Martinez-Garcia M, Mizrachi IK, Ogata H, Páez-Espino D, Petit M-A, Putonti C, Rattei T,

540   Reyes A, Rodriguez-Valera F, Rosario K, Schriml L, Schulz F, Steward GF, Sullivan MB,

541   Sunagawa S, Suttle CA, Temperton B, Tringe SG, Thurber RV, Webster NS, Whiteson KL,

542   Wilhelm SW, Wommack KE, Woyke T, Wrighton KC, Yilmaz P, Yoshida T, Young MJ, Yutin

543   N, Allen LZ, Kyrpides NC, Eloe-Fadrosh EA. 2018. Minimum Information about an

544   Uncultivated Virus Genome (MIUViG). Nat Biotechnol 37:29–37.

545   62.   Roux S, Emerson JB, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, Sullivan MB. 2017. Benchmarking viromics: an

546   evaluation of metagenome-enabled estimates of viral community composition and diversity.

PeerJ 5:e3817.

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

Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. PLoS One 8:e61217.

64. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan LD, François R, Grolemund G,

Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J, Kuhn M, Pedersen TL, Miller E, Bache SM, Müller K, Ooms J,

Robinson D, Seidel DP, Spinu V, Takahashi K, Vaughan D, Wilke C, Woo K, Yutani H.

2019. Welcome to the Tidyverse. Journal of Open Source Software 4:1686.

65. Ettinger C, Pietrasiak N, Stajich J. stajichlab/Terrestrial_Cyanophage: v1.

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7272374.

66. kblin/ncbi-genome-download: Scripts to download genomes from the NCBI FTP servers.

GitHub. https://github.com/kblin/ncbi-genome-download. Retrieved 20 September 2022.

67. Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. 2009.

BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10:1–9.

68. Edwards RA, McNair K, Faust K, Raes J, Dutilh BE. 2016. Computational approaches to

predict bacteriophage-host relationships. FEMS Microbiol Rev 40:258–272.

69. Kothari A, Roux S, Zhang H, Prieto A, Soneja D, Chandonia J-M, Spencer S, Wu X,

Altenburg S, Fields MW, Deutschbauer AM, Arkin AP, Alm EJ, Chakraborty R,

Mukhopadhyay A. 2021. Ecogenomics of Groundwater Phages Suggests Niche

Differentiation Linked to Specific Environmental Tolerance. mSystems e0053721.

567
568
569

Figures and Tables:

Figure 1: Viral sequences identified from Cyanobacterial co-cultures. (A) The proviral status of

predicted viral genomes is shown as a bar graph, with the number above the bar representing

the total number of sequences. (B) CheckV quality predictions for viral sequences are shown as

a bar graph with bars colored by quality and the number above the bar representing the total

number of sequences in each bar.

577
578

Figure 2: Gene-sharing networks of vOTUs that formed viral clusters (VCs). (A) Network of

VCs, including VCs unique to this dataset. Each node is a viral sequence and is colored by the

habitat of the Cyanobacterial co-culture. Edges connect sequences with overlap in predicted

protein content. (B) Bar charts displaying the number of viral sequences in VCs from this study

colored by habitat and shown facetted by whether the VC clustered with reference data. Bars

are colored by habitat, as in A, and the number next to the bar represents the total number of

sequences it represents. (C) Subnetwork of VCs with members that include reference genomes

obtained from INPHARED. Each node is a viral sequence and is colored by the predicted viral

taxonomic family for the VC, with the exception of sequences identified in this study which are

colored in black. Edges connect sequences with overlap in predicted protein content. (D) Bar

chart displaying the number of viral sequences from this study assigned to viral families based

on VC membership with reference genomes from INPHARED. Bars are colored by viral families,

as in C, and the number above the bar represents the total number of sequences it represents.

For A-D, only viral sequences generated in this study where CheckV was able to predict quality

are shown.

Figure 3: Viral communities across Cyanobacterial co-cultures. (A) The number of viral

sequences predicted from each co-culture metagenome. Bars are arranged and colored based

on the taxonomic order the Cyanobacteria in the co-culture is taxonomically classified as. (B)

Stacked bar charts displaying the relative abundance of vOTUs in each co-culture. Bars are

colored based on predicted viral taxonomic families. Viral sequences that clustered into VCs,

but that lack taxonomy (i.e., unique VCs that lack reference data, or VCs where reference data

taxonomy is unclear) are labeled "Unassigned", while viral sequences that did not cluster into

VCs are labeled "Unclustered". (C) Stacked bar charts of the relative abundance of vOTUs in

each co-culture. Bars are colored based on the predicted host taxonomy, at the phylum level, of

each vOTU . For A-C, only viral sequences where CheckV was able to predict quality are

shown.