Gallionellaceae pangenomic analysis reveals insight into phylogeny, metabolic flexibility, and iron oxidation mechanisms

Rene L. Hoover[a,b], Jessica L. Keffer[b], Shawn W. Polson[d,e], Clara S. Chan[a,b,c]

a Microbiology Graduate Program, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA

b Department of Earth Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA

c School of Marine Science and Policy, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA

d Department of Computer and Information Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA

e Center for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA

Corresponding author: Clara S. Chan, cschan@udel.edu

Abstract

The iron-oxidizing Gallionellaceae drive a wide variety of biogeochemical cycles through their metabolisms and biominerals. To better understand the environmental impacts of Gallionellaceae, we need to improve our knowledge of their diversity and metabolisms, especially any novel iron oxidation mechanisms. Here, we used a pangenomic analysis of 103 genomes to resolve Gallionellaceae phylogeny and explore the range of genomic potential. Using a concatenated ribosomal protein tree and key gene patterns, we determined Gallionellaceae has four genera, divided into two groups–iron-oxidizing bacteria (FeOB) *Gallionella*, *Sideroxydans*, and *Ferriphaselus* with known iron oxidases (Cyc2, MtoA) and nitrite-oxidizing bacteria (NOB) *Candidatus* Nitrotoga with nitrite oxidase (Nxr). The FeOB and NOB have similar electron transport chains, including genes for reverse electron transport and carbon fixation. Auxiliary energy metabolisms including S oxidation, denitrification, and organotrophy were scattered throughout the Gallionellaceae FeOB. Within FeOB, we found genes that may represent adaptations for iron oxidation, including a variety of extracellular electron uptake (EEU) mechanisms. FeOB genomes encoded more predicted *c*-type cytochromes overall, notably more multiheme *c*-type cytochromes (MHCs) with >10 CXXCH motifs. These include homologs of several predicted outer membrane porin-MHC complexes, including MtoAB and Uet. MHCs are known to efficiently conduct electrons across longer distances and function across a wide range of redox potentials that overlap with mineral redox potentials, which can help expand the range of usable iron substrates. Overall, the results of pangenome analyses suggest that the Gallionellaceae genera *Gallionella*, *Sideroxydans*, and *Ferriphaselus* are primarily iron oxidizers, capable of oxidizing dissolved Fe^{2+} as well as a range of solid iron or other mineral substrates.

Importance

Neutrophilic iron-oxidizing bacteria (FeOB) produce copious iron (oxyhydr)oxides that

can profoundly influence biogeochemical cycles, notably the fate of carbon and many metals. To

fully understand environmental microbial iron oxidation, we need a thorough accounting of iron

oxidation mechanisms. In this study we show the Gallionellaceae FeOB have both known iron

oxidases as well as uncharacterized multiheme cytochromes (MHCs). MHCs are predicted to

transfer electrons from extracellular substrates and likely confer metabolic capabilities that help

Gallionellaceae occupy a range of different iron- and mineral-rich niches. Gallionellaceae appear

to specialize in iron oxidation, so it makes sense that they would have multiple mechanisms to

oxidize various forms of iron, given the many iron minerals on Earth, as well as the

physiological and kinetic challenges faced by FeOB. The multiple iron/mineral oxidation

mechanisms may help drive the widespread ecological success of Gallionellaceae.

Introduction

Gallionella are one of the oldest known and most well studied iron-oxidizing bacteria

(FeOB), yet we are still learning how they oxidize iron and adapt to iron-rich niches. *Gallionella*

is the type genus of the family Gallionellaceae, which also includes *Sideroxydans*, *Ferriphaselus*,

and *Ferrigenium*. These Gallionellaceae FeOB are found in a wide range of environments,

including freshwater creeks, sediment, root rhizospheres, peat, permafrost, deep subsurface

aquifers, and municipal waterworks (1–18). FeOB potentially drive the fate of many metals and

nutrients via both metabolic reactions and forming iron oxyhydroxides that adsorb and react with

many solutes (19). To better understand the biogeochemical effects of Gallionellaceae, we need

to improve our knowledge of their phylogeny and metabolic mechanisms, especially for iron

oxidation. Recently, the rapid increase in metagenomes from iron-rich environments has

significantly expanded the number of available Gallionellaceae genomes, which makes it

possible to investigate diversity and mechanisms using genomic analyses of both cultured and

uncultured Gallionellaceae.

The Gallionellaceae are named after *Gallionella ferruginea*, first described by Ehrenberg

in 1838 (20), and recognizable by its distinctive, twisted iron oxyhydroxide stalk (21). While the

type strain, *G. ferruginea* Johan (22) no longer exists, there are seven iron-oxidizing

Gallionellaceae isolates (7, 11, 23–26). Some isolates, such as *Ferriphaselus* spp., appear to be

obligate iron oxidizers, while others also grow on non-iron substrates. In addition to iron, *S.*

lithotrophicus ES-1 grows by thiosulfate oxidation (24, 27) while *Sideroxydans* sp. CL21 shows

mixotrophic growth with either lactate or hydrogen (28). Some *Ferrigenium* can also reduce

nitrate (29, 30). It is unknown how common it is for Gallionellaceae to use electron

donors/acceptors besides Fe(II)/O$_2$, though these alternate metabolisms may help their success

across different environments and fluctuating conditions typical of many oxic-anoxic interfaces.

Even so, since all seven Gallionellaceae isolates are neutrophilic aerobic chemolithoautotrophic

iron oxidizers, this could be the dominant metabolic niche of Gallionellaceae.

In Gallionellaceae and other neutrophilic chemolithotrophic FeOB, there are two known

iron oxidases: Cyc2, a fused monoheme cytochrome-porin and MtoAB, a decaheme porin-

cytochrome complex (31–33). The *mtoA* (metal oxidation) gene was first identified and

characterized in FeOB *S. lithotrophicus* ES-1 (31). The *mtoA* gene is a homolog of both *pioA*

(phototrophic iron oxidation), which encodes the PioA iron oxidase in the photoferrotroph

Rhodopseudomonas palustris TIE-1 (34, 35), and *mtrA* (metal reduction), which encodes the

MtrA iron reductase in iron-reducing bacteria (FeRB) *Shewanella* (36). The *cyc2* gene is more

common than *mtoAB* and is found in nearly all well-characterized neutrophilic FeOB like the

Gallionellaceae (32) and Zetaproteobacteria (33), making it a suitable genetic marker for many

FeOB. Cyc2 has been demonstrated to oxidize aqueous Fe^{2+} (32), while Mto gene/protein

expression has been associated with the oxidation of solid iron minerals (37). However, Cyc2

and MtoA may not be the only mechanisms for neutrophilic iron oxidation. There are a number

of additional uncharacterized cytochromes and electron transport genes (27, 38) within

Gallionellaceae genomes such as isolate *S. lithotrophicus* ES-1 (27, 38), suggesting the existence

of novel iron oxidation genes and mechanisms within the family.

The Gallionellaceae also includes a recently identified genus, *Candidatus* Nitrotoga,

which are chemolithotrophic nitrite-oxidizing bacteria (NOB). Like the iron-oxidizing

Gallionellaceae, they are widespread in freshwater and engineered environments, including

permafrost (39), coastal sediments (40), freshwater (41), freshwater sediments (42), and the

activated sludge of wastewater treatment facilities (43, 44). There are only two isolates, *Ca.*

Nitrotoga fabula (43) and *Ca.* Nitrotoga sp. AM1P (45), along with four genomes from

enrichment cultures (42). *Ca.* Nitrotoga are adapted to niches with low nitrite, and oxidize it

using a distinct high-affinity Nxr nitrite oxidoreductase (39, 42, 46). Extensive iron uptake

mechanisms have been detected in *Ca.* Nitrotoga genomes, indicating the importance of iron for

growth, likely due to the FeS cluster of Nxr (42). However, neither the isolates nor enrichments

are known to oxidize Fe(II). If *Ca.* Nitrotoga lack the capacity to oxidize iron, then we can

investigate the iron-oxidizing mechanisms and adaptations of Gallionellaceae through a

comparative genomic analysis of iron- versus nitrite-oxidizing members.

Toward this goal, we took advantage of the growing number of environmental

metagenomes and collected 103 high quality Gallionellaceae genomes and metagenome

assembles genomes (MAGs). We used those sequences to resolve the Gallionellaceae phylogeny

and delineate groups of iron and nitrite oxidizers. We searched for known and novel iron

oxidation genes, other energy and nutrient metabolisms, and genes found exclusively in FeOB

that may represent adaptations for an iron-oxidizing lifestyle. This work increases our

understanding of Gallionellaceae family phylogeny and the metabolic traits of its genera. It also

highlights some of the key multiheme cytochromes in Gallionellaceae FeOB, which may

facilitate extracellular electron uptake (EEU) and the oxidation of different iron substrates.

Results

Phylogeny

We collected 103 high quality Gallionellaceae isolate genomes and metagenome

assembled genomes (MAGs) from various databases and collections (Table S1). Many of these

MAGs were only classified at the family level. To resolve the phylogeny, verify existing

classifications, and classify the unknown Gallionellaceae, we constructed a concatenated protein

tree (Figure 1) from 13 ribosomal protein sequences. Organisms in the tree formed distinct, well-

supported clades that corresponded to the major genera: *Gallionella*, *Sideroxydans*,

Ferriphaselus, and *Ca.* Nitrotoga (Figure 1). Most of the MAGs previously classified as

Gallionellaceae and Gallionellales were found to be either *Gallionella* or *Sideroxydans*, with the

exception of one that clustered with the *Ca*. Nitrotoga (*Ca*. Nitrotoga SL_21). Although some

genomes formed sub-clades, many were organized along a continuum. Near the base of the

Gallionella are *Ferrigenium kumadai* An22 and the nitrate-reducing iron-oxidizing bacteria

(NRFeOB) of the Straub (KS) and Bremen Pond (BP) enrichments (Figure 1). There is not a

clear boundary between the *Gallionella* and the relatively new *Ferrigenium* genus, so we

included the *Ferrigenium* and NRFeOB with the *Gallionella* grouping for our analyses. We also

constructed a 16S rRNA gene tree containing 24 sequences in our dataset along with 941 high-

quality, full-length Gallionellaceae sequences from the SILVA database (Fig. S1), but bootstrap

support was weaker and clades were less clearly resolved. Therefore, concatenated ribosomal

proteins are a more reliable determinant of Gallionellaceae phylogeny than 16S rRNA genes.

FIGURE 1 Concatenated ribosomal protein maximum likelihood tree of the Gallionellaceae

family showing the four distinct genera: *Gallionella, Sideroxydans, Ferriphaselus*, and *Ca.*

Nitrotoga. Isolates are labeled and annotated with stars. Support values from 1000 bootstraps

shown for major branching nodes (black dots). Detailed tree shown in Fig. 2.

FIGURE 2 Maximum likelihood tree of concatenated ribosomal proteins from the

Gallionellaceae annotated with source ecosystem and genes for iron oxidases (*cyc2, mtoA*),

nitrite oxidase (*nxrAB*), terminal oxidase (*ccoN*), stalk formation (*sfz*), and organic utilization

(*gtsABS*, *lutABCP*). The bar graph to the right shows the number multiheme cytochromes

CXXCH, CX_3CH, and CX_4CH heme-binding motifs. Phylogeny does not correlate to

environments, and key genes, including those for multiheme cytochromes, show distinct

distributions between iron and nitrite oxidizer clades. Isolates are shown in bold. % completeness

= genome completeness calculated with CheckM. Outgroup omitted for space.

We assessed whether there was a relationship between phylogeny and environment. Each

genome and MAG was classified with the GOLD classification schema (47) based on pre-

existing GOLD classifications, available metadata and publications (Fig. 2, Table S2). The

majority of aquatic genomes were from freshwater and groundwater environments while

terrestrial genomes were mostly found in soil, peat, and rhizosphere environments. However,

some genomes were sequenced from more extreme environments such as thermal hot springs

(ENVO:00002181) and acid mine drainage (ENVO:00001997) (Table S2). Gallionellaceae are

widespread and can inhabit many different environments, but there was no clear pattern between

GOLD Ecosystem Type and broad phylogenetic groupings (Fig. 2). Different Gallionellaceae

appear to co-exist in some environments, suggesting niches not captured in the ecosystem

classification are controlling Gallionellaceae diversity and environmental distribution.

Metabolic potential and diversity

The Gallionellaceae family has few isolates, so to uncover the shared metabolic traits of

its FeOB members, we compared and contrasted *Gallionella*, *Sideroxydans*, and *Ferriphaselus*

genomes to those of the nitrite-oxidizing *Ca.* Nitrotoga. We identified key genes within the

pangenome for iron oxidation (including predicted *c*-type cytochromes), carbon fixation, and

respiration using a combination of DRAM (48), FeGenie (49), MagicLamp (50), a heme motif

counter script (51), and BLAST (52, 53). To further uncover genes and pathways specifically

enriched in the iron oxidizers, we used Anvi'o (54–56) to analyze a filtered dataset of only

Gallionella, *Sideroxydans*, and *Ca*. Nitrotoga genomes that were >97% complete. This approach

enabled us to create a comprehensive picture of Gallionellaceae metabolic diversity and pinpoint

promising gene clusters that may be adaptations for an iron-oxidizing lifestyle.

Primary energy metabolisms — iron and nitrite oxidation

Known metabolisms for the few Gallionellaceae isolates suggest *Ca*. Nitrotoga are nitrite

oxidizers, while *Sideroxydans*, *Ferriphaselus*, and *Gallionella* are iron oxidizers. We examined

the pangenome for the presence of *cyc2* and *mtoA* iron oxidase genes and *nxrAB* nitrite oxidase

genes to determine if that pattern also holds throughout the uncultured Gallionellaceae. As with

the isolates, there is a clear delineation between organisms with marker genes for iron versus

nitrite oxidation, which corresponds to the phylogenetic groups (Fig. 2, Fig. 3).

The *cyc2* gene is widespread among clades of iron oxidizers, with at least one copy

detected in 83% of the FeOB genomes (Fig. 3, Table S3). The *mtoA* gene is found in 41% of the

FeOB genomes, and 37% of genomes have both *mtoA* and *cyc2*. In total, 89% have at least one

iron oxidase gene, either *cyc2* or *mtoA* (Table S3). Since the dataset includes multiple MAGs

with a mean completeness score of 95%, it appears that almost all Gallionellaceae FeOB contain

one of these two known mechanisms for iron oxidation. Overall, *cyc2* homologs are more

common than *mtoA* (Fig. 2, Fig. 3) and some genomes encode multiple copies of *cyc2* (Table

S3). All of the FeOB Gallionellaceae with *cyc2* encode at least one copy of a Cluster 1 Cyc2

(classified as in McAllister, et al. (33)), that is closely related to a functionally verified Cluster 1

Cyc2 iron oxidase (32).

The *Ca.* Nitrotoga SL_21 MAG contains only a predicted Cluster 2 Cyc2 homolog.

Confidently assigning iron oxidation function to Cluster 2 Cyc2s depends on supporting context,

which is lacking in this case. *Ca.* Nitrotoga SL_21 is not from a typical iron-oxidizing

environment (permanently stratified, non-marine, saline lake) and it is not closely related to the

functionally verified Cluster 2 Cyc2 representative from *Acidithiobacillus*. Currently, there is no

evidence that this sole *Ca.* Nitrotoga Cyc2 is an iron oxidase.

In contrast, *nxrAB* genes are exclusive to the *Ca.* Nitrotoga and copies are present in 85%

of the genomes (Fig. 2, Fig. 3). Given that many of the genomes are MAGs with a mean

completeness of 94%, distribution of *nxrAB* appears to indicate nitrate oxidation is the main

metabolism of *Ca.* Nitrotoga. Thus, our pangenome analysis confirms Gallionellaceae can be

divided into two main groups based on primary energy metabolism – FeOB and NOB.

FIGURE 3 Plot showing the percent of genomes in each genus/group with genes for key

metabolic pathways. The plot indicates the Gallionellaceae are aerobic lithoautotrophs with two

main energy metabolisms, iron or nitrite oxidation. Some members also have metabolic potential

for S oxidation and/or denitrification. Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of

genomes in each group. Color is used to distinguish groups, while dot size and opacity indicate

% presence in the genome groups.

FIGURE 4 Maximum likelihood tree of concatenated ribosomal proteins from the

Gallionellaceae that shows the distribution of MMSeqs2 Clusters that represent predicted

cytochromes Cyc2, MtoA, MtoC, PCC3, Uet, and Slit_1324. Asterisk (*) for

Gallionella_BEO_15 indicates a partial MtoA sequence was detected using HMMs and verified

with BLAST, but was too short to bin into the MMseqs2 MtoA clusters. Isolates are shown in

bold. % completeness = genome completeness calculated with CheckM. Outgroup omitted for

space.

***c*-type cytochromes**

Both known iron oxidases (Cyc2 and MtoA) in Gallionellaceae are *c*-type cytochromes

that transport electrons across the outer membrane. FeOB use additional *c*-type cytochromes to

transport electrons through the periplasm to the rest of the electron transport chain. We reasoned

that novel iron oxidation mechanisms may also utilize *c*-type cytochromes, so we searched the

Gallionellaceae genomes for proteins containing the CXXCH, CX_3CH, and CX_4CH heme-

binding motifs (abbreviated hereafter as CXXCH). There is a stark difference between FeOB and

NOB in the distribution of predicted *c*-type cytochromes. FeOB genomes have an average of

1.5x more CXXCH-containing proteins than NOB, and only non-NOB genomes encoded

proteins with ten or more CXXCH motifs (Fig. 2). The abundance of genes for potential *c*-type

cytochromes, in particular multiheme cytochromes (MHCs), suggest the presence of additional

iron oxidation mechanisms in the Gallionellaceae FeOB.

To find *c*-type cytochromes of interest, all CXXCH-containing proteins were clustered

using MMSeqs2 with bidirectional coverage and an 80% alignment cutoff. Clusters of sequences

were then classified with representative sequences from isolates using BLAST to query the

Uniprot database. If the cluster did not contain a sequence from an isolate, a consensus

classification was used. A cluster of monoheme proteins (Cluster 313) was classified as Cyc2

and three clusters of decaheme proteins were classified as MtoA (Clusters 335 and 451) and

MtrC (Cluster 50) (Fig. 2, Fig. 4, Table 1). These Cyc2, MtoA, and MtrC clusters largely agree

with FeGenie's HMM-based predicted distributions. Since MMSeqs2 generated two clusters of

MtoA sequences, we sought to further verify the classifications. We constructed a tree of all

Gallionellaceae MtoA sequences along with reference sequences of MtrA from iron-reducing

bacteria (Fig. 5) (57). Although there is some separation of Cluster 335 and Cluster 451 MtoA

sequences, many clades are not well defined or supported. In fact, backbone support throughout

the tree is poor and the tree does not indicate a clear separation of the MtoA and MtrA sequences

(Fig. 5). There is some evidence that the direction of electron flow through Mto/Mtr can be

reversible (31, 58). So, it may be that the functions of MtoA and MtrA are interchangeable, and

in fact they may be indistinguishable proteins that can conduct electrons across the outer

membrane in either direction.

The decaheme cytochrome MtrC is the extracellular partner of the iron-reducing MtrAB

complex of *Shewanella*. The MtrAB complex is a homolog of the MtoAB complex of FeOB, but

MtrC was thought to be exclusive to iron-reducers because there is no MtrC homolog in *S.*

lithotrophicus ES-1. However, we found seven MAGs within both *Gallionella* and *Sideroxydans*

that encode MtrC (Table S3), suggesting it may also have a role in the energy metabolism of iron

oxidizers.

FIGURE 5 Maximum likelihood tree of the predicted MtoA sequences identified in MMSeqs2

Cluster 335 and Cluster 451 along with MtoA reference sequences from NCBI and MtrA

reference sequences from Baker, et al. 2022. Numbers (1a, 1b, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7) appended after

Mtr denote reference sequences from the seven MtrA groups defined by Baker, et al., 2022.

MtrA-4 indicates the Group 4 Betaproteobacteria. Tree is rooted using MtrC. Support is the

result of 500 bootstrap replicates.

TABLE 1 Clusters of predicted *c*-type cytochromes and other heme-containing proteins of

interest from MMSeqs2. Functional predictions are based on ‡ isolate annotations and NCBI

BLAST or † BLAST of sequences from metagenomes in Uniprot.

Cluster	Functional prediction	# CXXCH, CX$_3$CH, or CX$_4$CH motifs per protein	# FeOB (of 87)
Iron oxidation/reduction proteins			
313	Iron oxidase Cyc2[‡]	1	70
451	Decaheme c-type cytochrome, DmsE family, MtoA[‡]	10	19
335	Decaheme c-type cytochrome, DmsE family, MtoA[‡]	10	17
50	Decaheme c-type cytochrome, OmcA/MtrC family[†]	10	7
Potential EET/EEU pathway proteins			
20	Cytochrome C family protein; potential periplasmic PCC3 subunit[‡]	21, 24, 27	42
241	Cytochrome C family protein; potential extracellular PCC3 subunit[‡]	10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18	34
242	Cytochrome C family protein; potential extracellular PCC3 subunit[‡]	26, 28, 29, 33, 35	7
331	Cytochrome C family protein; potential extracellular PCC3 subunit[‡]	15, 17	5
65	Doubled CXXCH motif-containing protein; Cytochrome c3 family protein[†], potential UetJ subunit	11, 12	6
479	Tetraheme cytochrome - potential UetA subunit	4	6
330	Cytochrome C7 domain-containing protein; Triheme cytochrome - potential UetDEG subunit	3	5
94	Cytochrome C7 domain-containing protein; Triheme cytochrome - potential UetDEG subunit	3	5
446	Diheme cytochrome c[‡] - potential Slit_1324	2	51
Sensory proteins			
152	Methyl-accepting chemotaxis sensory transducer; YoaH [‡]	1	54
40	Methyl-accepting chemotaxis sensory transducer with Pas/Pac sensor; Aerotaxis receptor [‡]	1	43
400	Diguanylate cyclase with PAS/PAC sensor; Cyclic di-GMP phosphodiesterase Gmr [‡]	1	36
Other			
433	2Fe-2S ferredoxin[‡]	1, 2	72
360	4Fe-4S ferredoxin iron-sulfur binding domain protein	1	41
403	Forkhead-associated protein[‡]	10	27
146	Cytochrome c; Octaheme tetrathionate reductase[†]	8	25
253	Sulfite reductase, dissimilatory-type, subunit DsrJ[†]	3	17

Multiheme porin-cytochrome *c* complexes have been proposed to play roles in

extracellular electron transport and/or metal oxidation because they provide a conduit for

electrons to cross the outer membrane and participate in cellular metabolism (59, 60). One

example is the PCC3 complex, identified through bioinformatic analyses of genomes of several

FeOB including *S. lithotrophicus* ES-1, which contains a periplasmic MHC, an extracellular

MHC, an outer membrane porin, and a conserved inner membrane protein (38). We identified 26

Gallionellaceae FeOB genomes with a complete predicted PCC3 complex, an additional 11

genomes with a partial complex, and four instances where a genome's PCC3 gene cluster

encodes two predicted periplasmic cytochromes instead of one (Fig. 4, Table S3). The predicted

periplasmic MHCs grouped in MMSeqs2 Cluster 20, while predicted extracellular MHCs

grouped in Clusters 241, 242, and 331. The extracellular MHCs exhibited variability in the

number of CXXCH heme motifs (10-35; Table 1), which suggests a range of functions in the

extracellular PCC3 MHCs. Based on *in silico* protein structure models, PCC3 MHCs appear long

and mostly linear (Fig. 6, Fig. S2), suggesting an extended conduction range both intra- and

extracellularly.

FIGURE 6 Models of potential Gallionellaceae extracellular electron transfer mechanisms. All

sizes are approximated. Dimensions of Cyc2 with its fused cytochrome-porin and the porin-

cytochrome complexes MtoAB, MtoAB+MtrC, MtoD and Uet drawn from models and

measurements in previous literature (32, 38, 61–63). Illustration of PCC3 is based on

AlphaFold2 predictions (Fig. S2). The number of hemes and size of PCC3 can vary. The 21/18

heme complex of *S. lithotrophicus* ES-1 is depicted along with the estimated length of the 10 and

35 heme variants of the extracellular cytochrome.

Another recently described multiheme porin-cytochrome *c* complex is the undecaheme

electron transfer (Uet) complex, found in the cathode-oxidizing Tenderiales (61) (Fig. 6). We

used a combination of MMSeqs2 and BLAST to identify Uet genes in the Gallionellaceae. While

PCC3 is more common to *Sideroxydans* (59%) than *Gallionella* (12%), the Uet pathway appears

exclusive to *Gallionella* and two unclassified outliers (Fig. 4). Six *Gallionella* have predicted

undecaheme cytochrome (UetJ), extracellular tetraheme cytochrome (UetA), three predicted

periplasmic triheme cytochromes (UetDEG), peptidylprolyl isomerase (UetB), and NHL repeat

units (UetHI) (Fig. 4, Table S3). We checked for genes encoding the β-barrel porin UetC and

found BLAST hits in four of the six genomes (Table S3).

S. lithotrophicus ES-1 has a set of periplasmic cytochrome genes without a predicted

porin that were highly upregulated during growth on iron, and therefore thought to be involved in

iron oxidation (27). The genes encode a cytochrome b (Slit_1321), a hypothetical extracellular

protein (Slit_1322), a monoheme cytochrome class I (Slit_1323), a periplasmic diheme

cytochrome (Slit_1324; Cluster 446 in Table 1), and a molecular chaperone Hsp33 (Slit_1325).

We found homologs of the Slit_1321-1324 gene cluster are common and well-conserved among

Gallionellaceae FeOB, present in 50 genomes (Fig. 4, Table S3). These genes may represent a

mechanism of periplasmic electron transport, perhaps as part of an iron oxidation/extracellular

electron uptake pathway.

Electron transport chains

We compared electron transport chain component genes of the iron and nitrite oxidizer

groups and found them to be largely similar (Fig. 7). High-affinity cbb_3-type oxidases are

common (Fig. 3), with most genomes containing either the proximal or distal form of *ccoN* (Fig.

2) (64). Even the four NRFeOB genomes contain *ccoNO* genes, indicating a potential for both

oxygen and nitrate respiration. In contrast, few Gallionellaceae genomes contain *narGH* or

napAB (6 and 10 genomes, respectively, with no overlap), indicating nitrate respiration is

relatively rare overall (Fig. 3, Table S3).

In addition to the cbb_3-type oxidase genes, 34.5% of iron oxidizers and 15.4% of nitrite

oxidizers possess genes for cytochrome bd-type oxidases ($cydAB$) (Fig. 7). The presence of bd-

type oxidase genes often overlaps with cbb_3-type oxidase genes (Table S3). Like cbb_3-type

oxidases, cytochrome bd-type oxidases have a high affinity for oxygen and recent studies show

they can be more highly expressed than cbb_3-type oxidases under low-oxygen, organic-rich

conditions (65). Both FeOB and NOB have genes for cytochrome bc_1 and Alternative complex

III (ACIII) quinol oxidase complexes. However, bc_1 is more common in FeOB (85.1%)

compared to NOB (7.7%), while ACIII is more common in NOB (100%) than FeOB (55.2%)

(Fig. 7, Table S3). Like the bd- and cbb_3-type oxidases, presence of bc_1 and ACIII often overlaps

in a single organism, especially in FeOB (Table S3). Possessing both bd- and cbb_3-type oxidases,

and/or having both bc_1 and ACIII contributes to flexibility within the electron transport chains of

Gallionellaceae. The presence of various terminal oxidases implies adaptation to niches where

oxygen and organic carbon availability differ or fluctuate.

Carbon fixation

Gallionellaceae isolates grow autotrophically. To determine if the capacity for

autotrophic growth is widespread, we analyzed the pangenome for RuBisCo genes ($cbbLS$,

$cbbMQ$). Most genomes in the dataset (>91%; 94 of 103 genomes) contain genes for either Form

I or Form II RuBisCo (Fig. 3, Table S3). FeOB more commonly have Form II, while NOB only

have Form I. Form II enzymes are adapted for medium to high CO_2 and low O_2 concentrations

(66) and their predominance in FeOB may correspond to different oxygen niches of FeOB and

NOB. The prevalence of RuBisCo genes indicates both iron- and nitrite-oxidizing

Gallionellaceae have the capacity to grow autotrophically.

FIGURE 7 Diagram showing the similarities and differences between the electron transport

chains of (A) iron- versus (B) nitrite-oxidizing Gallionellaceae. Pink numbers indicate the

percent of FeOB (A) or NOB (B) genomes that encoded each part of the electron transport chain

or RuBisCo.

Auxiliary energy metabolisms

Previous studies showed some Gallionellaceae FeOB possess alternate energy

metabolisms such as thiosulfate and lactate oxidation (27, 28). We searched the pangenome for

key genes of sulfur, manganese, and organic substrate oxidation pathways to determine how

common alternate metabolisms are among Gallionellaceae FeOB. Sulfide:quinone reductase

(*sqr*) is common to both FeOB and NOB (Fig. 3, Table S3). Sqr can oxidize sulfide, transporting

electrons to the quinone pool, although it may be a means of detoxification rather than energy

conservation (67, 68). In contrast, both *soxABXYZ* and *dsrAB* are detected exclusively in the

iron-oxidizing Gallionellaceae genomes (Fig. 3, Table S3). To predict the oxidative vs. reductive

function of *dsrAB,* we constructed a tree using reference sequences from Loy, et al. (69, 70).

Gallionellaceae sequences form a discrete clade within the sulfur-oxidizing group (Fig. S3),

indicating the DsrAB of Gallionellaceae is likely a reverse dissimilatory sulfite reductase

(rDSR). In contrast, the *Ca.* Nitrotoga genomes do not contain *dsr* or *sox* genes. Instead, *Ca.*

Nitrotoga have *sorAB*, which may enable oxidation of sulfite to sulfate (Fig. 3). Together these

results indicate that although sulfur oxidation is an accessory trait of both iron- and nitrite-

oxidizing Gallionellaceae, only certain FeOB appear capable of oxidizing S(0) or thiosulfate.

We analyzed the pangenome for signs of organic utilization. Although not widely

distributed, the most common genes were for lactate utilization (*lutABCP*) and sugar transport

(*msmX, gtsABC*). Only eight *Gallionella* and five *Sideroxydans* genomes, including

Sideroxydans sp. CL21, have *lutABC* along with the *lutP* lactate permease gene (Fig. 2, Fig. 3,

Table S3). Likewise, only six genomes contain *gtsABC* genes for glucose/mannose uptake. None

of the NOB contain the *lut* or *gts* genes for organic utilization.

We used BLAST to evaluate the Gallionellaceae genomes for manganese oxidase genes

mcoA, *moxA*, *mofA*, and *mnxG*. There are a few hits for *mcoA*, *moxA*, and *mofA* genes, but none

for *mnxG* (Table S3). Since manganese oxidation activity has not been shown in any of the

Gallionellaceae isolates, additional verification is needed to determine whether the genes

identified by BLAST are truly Mn oxidases.

Other genes distinct to FeOB, potentially related to iron oxidation

We searched the pangenome for the candidate genes for stalk formation (*sfz/sfb*) identified in the stalk-forming *Ferriphaselus* and Zetaproteobacteria isolates (71, 72). Twelve genomes, restricted to *Gallionella* (9) and *Ferriphaselus* (3) contain the four *sfz/sfb* genes (Fig. 2, Table S3). Thus far, all cultured Gallionellaceae stalk formers belong to these two genera, suggesting stalk formation may be limited and not a trait of *Sideroxydans*.

Using the Anvi'o subset of only genomes >97% complete, we identified several gene clusters that were present and abundant only in *Gallionella* and *Sideroxydans*, but lacked prior connection to an iron-oxidizing lifestyle. These included distinct gene clusters with COG functional annotations for: Cell Wall/Membrane/Envelope Biogenesis, Cytoskeleton formation, Signal Transduction Mechanisms, and Energy Production and Conversion (Table 2, Table S4). Clusters for Cell Wall/Membrane/Envelope Biogenesis may indicate FeOB have specific adaptations for housing *c*-type cytochromes and EET mechanisms in the outer membrane, or to avoid encrustation by iron oxides. Clusters for Energy Production and Conversion included ferredoxin (Fdx) and subunits of the RnfABCDEG complex. The Rnf complex was originally discovered for its role in N fixation, in which it oxidizes NADH and generates reduced ferredoxin that donates electrons to nitrogenase (73). More recent studies have shown Rnf complexes can conserve energy under anaerobic conditions (74–76) and, as a low potential electron donor, ferredoxin can transfer electrons to many metabolic pathways including some that produce secondary metabolites (77). Not all Gallionellaceae with Rnf complex genes have *nifDHK* nitrogenase genes, implying Gallionellaceae Rnf and ferredoxin have functions beyond N fixation. Although their specific function in Gallionellaceae FeOB are unknown, their ubiquity implies utility for FeOB and an area for additional research.

376 **TABLE 2** Gene clusters of interest from the Anvi'o pangenome subset that were present in iron-

377 oxidizing *Gallionella* and *Sideroxydans*, but absent in nitrite-oxidizing *Ca.* Nitrotoga.

COG20 Category	COG20 Function	Gene Cluster ID
Cell wall/ membrane/ envelope biogenesis	Lipid carrier protein ElyC involved in cell wall biogenesis, DUF218 family (ElyC)	GC_00001120
	ABC-type lipoprotein export system, ATPase component (LolD)	GC_00000969
	ADP-heptose synthase, bifunctional sugar kinase/ adenylyltransferase (RfaE)	GC_00001059, GC_00001084
	ADP-heptose:LPS heptosyltransferase (RfaF)	GC_00001100
	Glycosyltransferase involved in cell wall biosynthesis (RfaB)	GC_00001179
	Outer membrane protein TolC	GC_00000022, GC_00000920
	Glutamate racemase (MurI)	GC_00001047
	Murein L,D-transpeptidase YafK	GC_00001108
Cytoskeleton	Cytoskeletal protein CcmA, bactofilin family	GC_00000987
Energy production and conversion	Na+ translocating ferredoxin: NAD+ oxidoreductase RNF, RnfA	GC_00000042
	Na+ translocating ferredoxin: NAD+ oxidoreductase RNF, RnfB	GC_00001082
	Na+ translocating ferredoxin: NAD+ oxidoreductase RNF, RnfC	GC_00001069
	Na+ translocating ferredoxin: NAD+ oxidoreductase RNF, RnfD	GC_00001055
	Na+ translocating ferredoxin: NAD+ oxidoreductase RNF, RnfE	GC_00001071
	Na+ translocating ferredoxin: NAD+ oxidoreductase RNF, RnfG	GC_00001096
	Ferredoxin (Fdx)	GC_00001052
	Cytochrome c-type biogenesis protein CcmH/NrfF	GC_00001058
	Cytochrome c-type biogenesis protein CcmH/NrfG	GC_00001078
Signal transduction mechanisms	PAS domain | GAF domain | HAMP domain | Cyclic di-GMP metabolism protein	GC_00000006
	cAMP-binding domain of CRP or a regulatory subunit of cAMP-dependent protein kinases | Small-conductance mechanosensitive channel MscK	GC_00001152

Discussion

The Gallionellaceae family is historically known for its iron-oxidizing members, but

recently a new candidate genus of nitrite oxidizers, *Ca.* Nitrotoga, was identified (39).

Comparing their genomes to those of FeOB genera has helped identify genes and pathways

related to iron oxidation since *Ca.* Nitrotoga isolates have no documented capacity for that

metabolism (39, 40, 42, 43, 45). We resolved the phylogeny of the Gallionellaceae and verified

Ca. Nitrotoga lacked iron oxidation marker genes. Given separate groups of FeOB and NOB, we

used a pangenomic approach to identify shared features of the Gallionellaceae, as well as FeOB-

specific genes that may represent novel iron oxidation pathways.

Phylogeny

The Gallionellaceae is composed of four genera: *Gallionella, Sideroxydans*,

Ferriphaselus, and *Ca.* Nitrotoga, based on a concatenated ribosomal protein tree. In

comparison, 16S rRNA phylogeny did a poorer job of resolving these genera, so 16S-based

identification should be considered tentative, pending availability of genomes. To facilitate

consistent classification, the protein sequences and alignments used here (Fig. 1) are available at

(https://figshare.com/projects/Gallionellaceae_Ribosomal_Proteins_for_Concatenated_Tree/157

347).

The new phylogeny provides a framework for understanding the diversity and major

metabolisms of the Gallionellaceae. They are members of Nitrosomonadales, which contain

many chemolithotrophic S and N oxidizers. Like their closest relatives, the Sulfuricellaceae (78),

many Gallionellaceae retain the ability to oxidize sulfur (Fig. 3, Fig. S3). The Gallionellaceae

tree (Fig. 1) shows a deeply branching split between genera, with each of the two major genera,

Gallionella and *Sideroxydans*, containing a continuum of diversity. Within the *Gallionella*, the

isolates *G. capsiferriformans* ES-2 and *Ferrigenium kumadai* An22 bracket the *Gallionella*, with

An22 deeply branching and ES-2 at the crown. *F. kumadai* An22 was originally classified as

Ferrigenium based on 16S rRNA distance (25). However, our analyses do not show any clear

phylogenetic clustering or functional distinction, with which we could draw a line between

Gallionella and *Ferrigenium*. Moreover, the tree topology suggests continued diversification

within both *Gallionella* and *Sideroxydans* largely without the formation of subclades that

represent distinct niches. There is one subclade of *Sideroxydans* that corresponds to the GTDB

genus level designation PALSA-1006 (Fig. 1). However, ANI/AAI results (Table S5) indicate

there is not enough diversity within the Gallionellaceae to justify further splitting the four major

genera any further. Additionally, we did not detect any obvious functional difference in PALSA-

1006. Given our phylogenetic analysis, ANI/AAI, and similar functional profiles, we recommend

keeping them within *Sideroxydans*. Based on the above classification scheme, most of the

genomes (84 of 103) fall into either *Gallionella* or *Sideroxydans*.

Phylogenetic diversity corresponds to functional diversity that can drive Gallionellaceae

success in a variety of environments. Many *Gallionella* and *Sideroxydans* do not appear to be

obligate iron oxidizers, and some may not be obligate aerobes. Auxiliary metabolisms for S, N,

and C are present to varying degrees throughout the iron-oxidizing genera and are not associated

with specific sub-groups. Some FeOB from organic-rich environments, such as *Sideroxydans* sp.

CL21, have genes for organoheterotrophy. Other FeOB show metabolic flexibility in additional

lithotrophic metabolisms, such as oxidation of S or potentially Mn, elements that often co-occur

with Fe in the environment. Some Gallionellaceae may also thrive in oxygen-poor environments

by reducing nitrate, although this capability appears rare. Such traits contribute to diversity in the

Gallionellaceae FeOB genera, which appear to acquire and/or retain additional energy and

nutrient metabolisms to adapt to a range of environments.

Ca. Nitrotoga stands out as an exception within the Gallionellaceae. The pangenome

analysis shows that *Ca.* Nitrotoga have distinctive genomic content (Fig. S4). They do not appear

to have the capacity for iron oxidation based on available physiological evidence and the

genomic analyses presented here. The similarities in Gallionellaceae FeOB and *Ca*. Nitrotoga

electron transport chains enable them to meet the shared challenge of conserving energy from

high-potential electron donors. However, *Ca*. Nitrotoga are a distinct clade that appear to have

evolved from the FeOB to occupy a nitrite oxidation niche.

Iron oxidation and extracellular electron uptake mechanisms

The Gallionellaceae FeOB genomes encode a wide variety of predicted *c*-type

cytochromes. Of these cytochromes, many appear to be associated with the outer membrane,

implying a role in extracellular electron transport. Cyc2 is present in the majority of

Gallionellaceae FeOB genomes, while multiheme cytochromes (MHC) Mto/Mtr, Uet, and PCC3

are less common, each with different distribution patterns (Fig. 4), suggesting the different

cytochromes play distinct roles.

Cyc2 has been shown to oxidize dissolved Fe(II) (27, 32, 37). The monoheme Cyc2 is a

small fused cytochrome-porin and since aqueous Fe^{2+} is common to many redox transition zones,

it makes sense that most FeOB would retain and use the simplest tool. But in Earth's various

environments, iron is largely available as minerals (clays, oxides, sulfides) and also bound to

organics (e.g. humic substances). The decaheme MtoA has been shown to play roles in the

oxidation of mineral-bound Fe(II), specifically Fe(II) smectite clay (37). As a MHC, MtoA may

have multiple benefits that help in oxidizing minerals. MtoA has a large redox potential window

(-350 to +30 mV; (31, 60)), which could help with oxidation of solids, like smectite, that also

have a range of redox potentials (e.g., −600 to +0 mV for SWa-1 vs. −400 to +400 mV for SWy-

2; (79)), which change as mineral-bound iron is oxidized or reduced. Assuming the MtoA

structure is similar to MtrA, the ten hemes span the membrane, making a wire that conducts from

extracellular substrates to periplasmic proteins (62, 80). The multiple hemes allow for transfer of

multiple electrons at a time (59). Some MAGs with *mtoAB* also encode the extracellular

decaheme cytochrome MtrC. In *Shewanella,* the MtrCAB complex requires MtrC to reduce solid

minerals (ferrihydrite), while MtrAB alone can only reduce dissolved Fe(III) and electrodes (81–

83). Likewise, Gallionellaceae MtrC may help increase interactions with different minerals.

Some Gallionellaceae FeOB may retain genes for both Cyc2 and MtoAB (with or without MtrC)

to oxidize different Fe(II) substrates in their environments.

Like MtrCAB, the predicted PCC3 complex includes both periplasmic and extracellular

MHCs and a porin. A key difference is that the PCC3 cytochromes often have more hemes than

MtoA/MtrA and MtrC. The greater number of hemes may serve to store electrons, as in a

capacitor. They may also conduct across a greater distance; the PCC3 periplasmic MHC, with

21-27 hemes, is potentially long enough to span the entire periplasm (as noted by Edwards et al.,

(84)). Intraprotein electron transfer between hemes is rapid (85–87); therefore the periplasm-

spanning MHC of PCC3 may allow for faster electron transfer compared to complexes

containing smaller periplasmic cytochromes like the monoheme MtoD. The extracellular PCC3

MHC contains between 10 and 35 hemes, which could extend further from the outer membrane

compared to MtrC. Not only would this extend the range of electron transfer, but may also be

faster than a "wire" of smaller cytochromes (e.g. *Geobacter* hexaheme OmcS (88)). Increasing

oxidation rates via larger MHCs would allow FeOB to oxidize substrates faster. Given that Fe(II)

is subject to abiotic oxidation under certain conditions and other organisms may compete for

EEU, such kinetic advantages would give FeOB a competitive edge.

Conclusions

Gallionellaceae, specifically *Gallionella*, is best known for lithoautotrophically oxidizing

iron to make mineral stalks that come together to form microbial mats at groundwater seeps (18,

89, 90). Although this may contribute to an impression that the niche was relatively restricted,

16S rRNA sequencing of cultures and environmental samples has revealed both the diversity of

Gallionellaceae as well as its prevalence across practically any freshwater and some brackish

environments where Fe(II) and O_2 meet. The pangenome shows that Gallionellaceae possess

metabolic flexibility to use non-iron substrates, notably sulfur, and the MHCs likely also confer

further metabolic capabilities that may help them occupy a range of different iron- and mineral-

rich niches. Gallionellaceae thrive in aquifers, soil, and wetlands, all of which have substantial

mineral content. Thus, the widespread ecological success of Gallionellaceae may well

correspond to genomes that encode a range of iron oxidation mechanisms as well as adaptations

for varied environments.

It is becoming clear that there are multiple ways to oxidize iron, though we have varying

levels of evidence for gene/protein function (60, 91, 92). Validating iron oxidation

genes/proteins is painstaking work due to challenging cultures, low yield, few genetic systems,

and the fact that iron interferes with many molecular extractions and assays. And yet, there are

likely even more iron oxidation mechanisms, so we need to be strategic about choosing

genes/proteins for deeper characterization. Our pangenome analysis gives a wider view of the

distribution and frequency of potentially novel iron oxidation genes, which will help us to

prioritize investigations. Furthermore, the varied outer membrane-associated cytochromes inspire

us to investigate relationships between structure and function. Why are there so many different

multiheme cytochromes? Is there substrate specificity, kinetic advantages, battery-like functions,

or some utility we have yet to consider? Addressing these questions will help us understand how

these proteins and pathways shape microbial transformations of varied Earth materials.

Methods

Data collection and curation

Gallionellaceae genomes were collected from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) Entrez database (93), the Joint Genome Institute Integrated Microbial Genomes (JGI IMG) database (94), and the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA) at EMBL-EBI database (*Sideroxydans* sp. CL21, *Ca.* Nitrotoga fabula KNB, and the "IN" MAGs (17, 43, 95)) (Table S6). We also received non-public genomes from the Ménez Lab at the Université de Paris (3 genomes reconstructed by Aurélien Lecoeuvre from the Carbfix study in Hengill, Iceland (2); metagenomes available at Sequence Read Archive SRR3731039, SRR3731040, SRR4188484, and SRR4188643), and the Banfield Lab at the University of California, Berkeley (3 genomes reconstructed by Alex Probst from Crystal Geyser in Utah, USA (96)) (Table S6). This initial 230-genome dataset included isolate genomes, metagenome assembled genomes (MAGs), and single-cell amplified genomes (SAGs) that were taxonomically classified as members of the Gallionellales order; Gallionellaceae family; or the *Gallionella, Sideroxydans, Ferriphaselus, Ferrigenium,* or *Ca.* Nitrotoga genera in their respective databases. Duplicate genomes were identified and removed if they had identical accession numbers or their average nucleotide identities (ANI) were 100%. CheckM v1.1.2 (97) was used to assess genome quality. Genomes with lower than 80% completeness and greater than 7% contamination were removed from the dataset. The final filtered dataset, referred to as "the Gallionellaceae" or "the dataset" contained 103 genomes, including six of the Gallionellaceae FeOB isolates (Table S1). The seventh isolate, *Sideroxyarcus emersonii* (26), was not published at the time of our main analysis, but a

517 supplemental of its key metabolic genes and MHCs (Table S7) shows it has similar patterns to

518 *Sideroxydans*.

Naming conventions

To assign simple, unique names to the metagenomes, codes were appended to genus-level

names based on sample location and bin IDs (Table S1, Table S6, Table S8). Isolates retained

their own unique names. Organisms that were taxonomically classified in their original databases

at the family Gallionellaceae or order Gallionellales were, if possible, classified at lower

taxonomic levels using a combination of AAI, 16S rRNA (if available), classification through

the Genome Taxonomy Database Toolkit (GTDB-Tk) (98), and placement in the concatenated

ribosomal protein tree (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2).

Ecosystem classifications

To assess whether metabolic diversity correlated to ecosystem type, each genome was

assigned to an ecosystem based on the Genomes OnLine Database (GOLD) (99) schema which

leverages Environmental Ontology (EnvO) classifications (100). A genome's pre-existing

classification from IMG was used if available. Genomes without prior classification were

categorized based on published descriptions of their sample sites and "habitat" information listed

in their database of origin. Based on the GOLD classifications (Table S2), genomes were

examined for patterns of correspondence between ecosystems and phylogenetic and/or metabolic

diversity.

Calculation of average amino acid and nucleotide identities

537 Average amino acid identity (AAI) and average nucleotide identities (ANI) were

538 computed to assess the similarity of genomes in the curated data set (Table S5). AAI was

539   calculated using CompareM (101). ANI was calculated using FastANI in Kbase (102). Final AAI

540   and ANI tables were formatted using Microsoft Excel.

Tree construction

Concatenated ribosomal protein tree

A concatenated tree of ribosomal proteins (Fig. 1) was constructed to determine the

phylogenetic relationships of genomes in the Gallionellaceae dataset. Two *Sulfuricella* genomes,

Sulfuricella sp. T08 and *Sulfuricella* 3300027815, where included as an outgroup to root the tree.

Use of a *Sulfuricella* outgroup was based on previous literature (103, 104), which identified

Sulfuricella and other members of the Sulfuricellaceae family as near neighbors of

Gallionellaceae. The concatenated sequences were composed of 13 small and large ribosomal

proteins (L19, L20, L28, L17, L9_C, S16, L21p, L27, L35p, S11, S20p, S6, S9) present in 94 or

more of the 105 genomes including the outgroup. Protein sequences were aligned in Geneious

v.10.2.6 (105) using MUSCLE (106). Ends of the alignments were manually trimmed and

regions with over 70% gaps were masked, after which sequences were concatenated. The tree

was constructed using RAxML-NG v1.0.3 (107) with the maximum likelihood method, LG+G

model, and 1000 bootstraps. The final tree was visualized and annotated with iTOL (108).

16S rRNA gene tree

We constructed a 16S rRNA gene tree (Fig. S1) composed of sequences from our dataset

combined with a selection of sequences from the SILVA database to determine how well 16S

rRNA resolves Gallionellaceae phylogeny compared to the concatenated ribosomal protein tree.

Full length (~1500 bp) 16S rRNA genes were retrieved from 24 of the Gallionellaceae genomes

using Anvio's 'anvi-get-sequences-for-hmm-hits' command for "Ribosomal_RNA_16S." These

genes were aligned in SINA (109) along with Gallionellaceae sequences from the Silva database

(110) that had >1475 bp and >85-90 sequence quality score. The outgroup is composed of

Thiobacillus, *Ferritrophicum*, *Sulfuricella*, *Sulfuriferula*, and *Nitrosomonas* sequences acquired

from the Silva database. The final alignment contained 965 non-redundant sequences and

alignment length was 1500 positions after trimming and masking all sequence gaps greater than

70%. A maximum likelihood tree was constructed using RAxML-NG v1.0.3 (107) with the

GTR+G model and 300 bootstraps. Family and genus level classifications from the SILVA

database were used to annotate the tree in Iroki (111).

Individual protein trees

Trees for DsrAB (Fig. S3) and Mto/Mtr (Fig. 5) were constructed from Gallionellaceae

protein sequences along with reference sequences from NCBI, Loy, et al. and Baker, et al. (57,

69). Sequences were aligned with MUSCLE (106), ends were manually trimmed, and regions

with over 70% sequence gaps were masked in Geneious v.10.2.6 (105). For the Dsr tree, DsrA

and DsrB sequences were concatenated. Trees were constructed using RAxML-NG v1.0.3 (107)

with the LG+G model. Branch support for Mto/Mtr tree is based on 500 bootstraps and support

for the DsrAB tree is based on 300 bootstraps. Final trees were visualized and annotated with

Iroki (111).

Pangenome analysis

Metabolic gene analysis

We used the Distilled and Refined Annotation of Metabolism (DRAM) v0.0.2 (48) within

KBase (102), LithoGenie within MagicLamp (50), and FeGenie (49) to identify key metabolic

genes indicative of various oxidation, respiration, and carbon utilization pathways. NCBI

BLAST+ (53) was used to identify additional genes for eNOR, cNOR, SorAB, Mn oxidases,

LutABCP, and stalk formation. We then analyzed the presence/absence of the metabolic genes

and looked for patterns across the concatenated protein tree, between genera, and between FeOB

versus NOB.

Multiheme cytochrome analysis

To identify potential c-type cytochromes we used a modified heme counter script (54) to

search for CXXCH, CXXXCH and CXXXXCH motifs within the protein sequences of each

genome. The search identified 5,929 protein sequences with one or more $CX_{2-4}CH$-motifs. To

determine which protein sequences were shared between genomes, sequences were clustered

using MMSeqs2 (112) with coverage mode 0 for bidirectional coverage of at least 80% of the

query and target sequences. Several clusters of interest were identified based on either the

number of $CX_{2-4}CH$-motifs in each sequence or the relative abundance of FeOB sequences in the

cluster. Querying with BLASTp (52) against the Uniprot (113) database was used to classify

sequences from clusters of interest thereby identifying clusters of predicted c-type cytochromes.

Isolate sequences were used as representative sequences for cluster classification. If a cluster did

not contain an isolate sequence, a consensus classification was used. The subcellular localization

of proteins was predicted using a combination of PSORTb v3.0.3 (114) and LocTree3 (115).

Some MHCs were predicted to be part of Mto, PCC3, or Uet porin-cytochrome

complexes. Therefore, we wanted to determine if the genes for these MHCs were colocalized in

their respective genomes with genes for β-barrel porins, periplasmic proteins, and inner

membrane proteins previously identified in the literature (38, 61). We searched for the associated

genes using BLASTp and amino acid reference sequences from *S. lithotrophicus* ES-1 (MtoB,

MtoD, CymA), *Gallionella* AHS-4737 (MtoC), and *Ca.* Tenderia electrophaga

(UetBCDEFGHI). The locus tags of BLASTp hits were then compared to locus tags of the

MHCs to evaluate synteny and colocalization. The same method was used to determine if

diheme *c*-type cytochromes from MMseqs2 cluster 446 which includes Slit_1324 were

colocalized with a cytochrome b (Slit_1321), hypothetical extracellular protein (Slit_1322),

monoheme cytochrome class I (Slit_1323), and molecular chaperone Hsp33 (Slit_1325).

PCC3 modeling

To model predicted PCC3 proteins, we used ColabFold: AlphaFold2 using MMseqs2

(116). Setting included using MSA mode "MMseqs2 (UniRef+environmental)," pair mode

"unpaired+paired," protein structure prediction with "AlphaFold2-ptm," and complex prediction

with "AlphaFold-multimer-v2" (117, 118). The best scoring model was rendered in PyMol

v2.5.4 (119).

Anvi'o subset analysis

We used the Anvi'o v7 (54, 56) to build a pangenome database of all *Gallionella* (16),

Sideroxydans (15), and *Ca.* Nitrotoga (6) genomes that were over 97% complete (Fig. S4) to

analyze for additional genes important to FeOB lifestyles. Genes were clustered within the

Anvi'o pangenome using a min-bit parameter of 0.5 and an mcl inflation parameter of 2. The

Anvi'o pangenome was used to compare gene clusters across the dataset and to bin: 1) near-core

(found in >85% of genomes), 2) accessory (found in >1 but <85% of genomes), and 3) strain

specific (found in a single genome) sets of gene clusters. Gene annotations were assigned in

Anvi'o using Prodigal (120) and functional annotations for Anvi'o gene clusters were assigned

using the NCBI's Database of Clusters of Orthologous Genes (COGs) (121, 122). Data tables of

the binned Anvi'o gene clusters were analyzed to identify gene clusters found in the near-core

genomes of *Gallionella* and *Sideroxydans* but absent in *Ca.* Nitrotoga.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the National Science Foundation (EAR-1833525 to C.S.C.

and S.W.P., MCB-1817651 to C.S.C.) and the Office of Naval Research (N00014-17-1-2640

C.S.C.). R. H. was also supported by fellowships from University of Delaware Graduate College

and the Microbiology Program/Unidel Foundation. Support from the University of Delaware

Center for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Core Facility (RRID:SCR_017696)

including use of the BIOMIX compute cluster was made possible through funding from

Delaware INBRE (NIH P20GM103446), the State of Delaware, and the Delaware Biotechnology

Institute.

We thank Aurélien Lecoeuvre, Emmanuelle Gérard, Bénédicte Ménez, Alex Probst, and

Jill Banfield for allowing us to use unpublished genomes from their private collections; and all

those who granted us permission to use their publically available, unpublished genomes from the

NCBI and IMG databases (Table S1, Table S6).

We declare that we have no conflicts of interest.

References

1.   Emerson D, Fleming EJ, McBeth JM. 2010. Iron-Oxidizing Bacteria: An Environmental

and Genomic Perspective. Annu Rev Microbiol 64:561–583.

2.   Trias R, Ménez B, le Campion P, Zivanovic Y, Lecourt L, Lecoeuvre A, Schmitt-Kopplin

P, Uhl J, Gislason SR, Alfreðsson HA, Mesfin KG, Snæbjörnsdóttir SÓ, Aradóttir ES,

Gunnarsson I, Matter JM, Stute M, Oelkers EH, Gérard E. 2017. High reactivity of deep

biota under anthropogenic CO2 injection into basalt. Nat Commun 8:1063.

3.   Jewell TNM, Karaoz U, Brodie EL, Williams KH, Beller HR. 2016. Metatranscriptomic

evidence of pervasive and diverse chemolithoautotrophy relevant to C, S, N and Fe cycling

in a shallow alluvial aquifer. 9. The ISME Journal 10:2106–2117.

4.   Emerson D, Moyer CL. 2002. Neutrophilic Fe-Oxidizing Bacteria Are Abundant at the

Loihi Seamount Hydrothermal Vents and Play a Major Role in Fe Oxide Deposition.

Applied and Environmental Microbiology 68:3085–3093.

5.   Emerson D, Vet WD. 2015. The Role of FeOB in Engineered Water Ecosystems: A

Review. Journal AWWA 107:E47–E57.

6.   Wang J, Sickinger M, Ciobota V, Herrmann M, Rasch H, Rösch P, Popp J, Küsel K. 2014.

Revealing the microbial community structure of clogging materials in dewatering wells

differing in physico-chemical parameters in an open-cast mining area. Water Research

63:222–233.

7.   Kato S, Krepski S, Chan C, Itoh T, Ohkuma M. 2014. Ferriphaselus amnicola gen. nov., sp.

nov., a neutrophilic, stalk-forming, iron-oxidizing bacterium isolated from an iron-rich

groundwater seep. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology

64:921–925.

8.   Fabisch M, Beulig F, Akob DM, Küsel K. 2013. Surprising abundance of Gallionella-

related iron oxidizers in creek sediments at pH 4.4 or at high heavy metal concentrations.

Front Microbiol 4.

9.   Fabisch M, Freyer G, Johnson CA, Büchel G, Akob DM, Neu TR, Küsel K. 2016.

Dominance of 'Gallionella capsiferriformans' and heavy metal association with

Gallionella-like stalks in metal-rich pH 6 mine water discharge. Geobiology 14:68–90.

10. Weiss JV, Rentz JA, Plaia T, Neubauer SC, Merrill-Floyd M, Lilburn T, Bradburne C,

Megonigal JP, Emerson D. 2007. Characterization of Neutrophilic Fe(II)-Oxidizing

Bacteria Isolated from the Rhizosphere of Wetland Plants and Description of

Ferritrophicum radicicola gen. nov. sp. nov., and Sideroxydans paludicola sp. nov.

Geomicrobiology Journal 24:559–570.

11. Lüdecke C, Reiche M, Eusterhues K, Nietzsche S, Küsel K. 2010. Acid-tolerant

microaerophilic Fe(II)-oxidizing bacteria promote Fe(III)-accumulation in a fen: Acid-

tolerant Fe(II)-oxidizers in a fen. Environmental Microbiology 12:2814–2825.

12. Buongiorno J, Herbert LC, Wehrmann LM, Michaud AB, Laufer K, Røy H, Jørgensen BB,

Szynkiewicz A, Faiia A, Yeager KM, Schindler K, Lloyd KG. 2019. Complex Microbial

Communities Drive Iron and Sulfur Cycling in Arctic Fjord Sediments. Appl Environ

Microbiol 85:e00949-19, /aem/85/14/AEM.00949-19.atom.

13.   Patzner MS, Logan M, McKenna AM, Young RB, Zhou Z, Joss H, Mueller CW, Hoeschen

C, Scholten T, Straub D, Kleindienst S, Borch T, Kappler A, Bryce C. 2022. Microbial iron

cycling during palsa hillslope collapse promotes greenhouse gas emissions before complete

permafrost thaw. 1. Commun Earth Environ 3:1–14.

14.   Neubauer SC, Emerson D, Megonigal JP. 2002. Life at the Energetic Edge: Kinetics of

Circumneutral Iron Oxidation by Lithotrophic Iron-Oxidizing Bacteria Isolated from the

Wetland-Plant Rhizosphere. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 68:3988–3995.

15.   de Vet W w. j. m., Dinkla I j. t., Abbas B a., Rietveld L c., van Loosdrecht M c. m. 2012.

Gallionella spp. in trickling filtration of subsurface aerated and natural groundwater.

Biotechnology and Bioengineering 109:904–912.

16.   Eichinger S, Boch R, Leis A, Koraimann G, Grengg C, Domberger G, Nachtnebel M,

Schwab C, Dietzel M. 2020. Scale deposits in tunnel drainage systems – A study on fabrics

and formation mechanisms. Science of The Total Environment 718:137140.

17.   Bethencourt L, Bochet O, Farasin J, Aquilina L, Borgne TL, Quaiser A, Biget M, Michon-

Coudouel S, Labasque T, Dufresne A. 2020. Genome reconstruction reveals distinct

assemblages of Gallionellaceae in surface and subsurface redox transition zones. FEMS

Microbiol Ecol 96.

18. Emerson D, Revsbech NP. 1994. Investigation of an Iron-Oxidizing Microbial Mat

Community Located near Aarhus, Denmark: Field Studies. Applied and Environmental

Microbiology 60:4022–4031.

19. Kappler A, Bryce C. 2017. Cryptic biogeochemical cycles: unravelling hidden redox

reactions. Environmental Microbiology 19:842–846.

20. Ehrenberg C. 1838. Die infusionsthierchen Als vollkommene organismen. Leipzig: Leopold

Voss.

21. Ghiorse WC. 1984. Biology of iron- and manganese-depositing bacteria. Annual Review of

Microbiology 38:515–550.

22. Hallbeck L, Pedersen K. 1991. Autotrophic and mixotrophic growth of Gallionella

ferruginea. Microbiology, 137:2657–2661.

23. Krepski ST, Hanson TE, Chan CS. 2012. Isolation and characterization of a novel

biomineral stalk-forming iron-oxidizing bacterium from a circumneutral groundwater seep:

A novel stalk-forming Fe-oxidizing bacterium. Environmental Microbiology 14:1671–

1680.

24. Emerson D, Moyer C. 1997. Isolation and Characterization of Novel Iron-Oxidizing

Bacteria That Grow at Circumneutral pH. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 63:9.

25. Khalifa A, Nakasuji Y, Saka N, Honjo H, Asakawa S, Watanabe T. 2018. Ferrigenium

kumadai gen. nov., sp. nov., a microaerophilic iron-oxidizing bacterium isolated from a

paddy field soil. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology

68:2587–2592.

26. Kato S, Itoh T, Iino T, Ohkuma M. 2022. Sideroxyarcus emersonii gen. nov. sp. nov., a

neutrophilic, microaerobic iron- and thiosulfate-oxidizing bacterium isolated from iron-rich

wetland sediment. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology 72.

27. Zhou N, Keffer JL, Polson SW, Chan CS. 2022. Unraveling Fe(II)-Oxidizing Mechanisms

in a Facultative Fe(II) Oxidizer, Sideroxydans lithotrophicus Strain ES-1, via Culturing,

Transcriptomics, and Reverse Transcription-Quantitative PCR. Applied and Environmental

Microbiology 88:e01595-21.

28. Cooper RE, Finck J, Chan C, Küsel K. 2023. Mixotrophy broadens the ecological niche

range of the iron oxidizer Sideroxydans sp. CL21 isolated from an iron-rich peatland.

FEMS Microbiology Ecology fiac156.

29. Huang Y-M, Jakus N, Straub D, Konstantinidis KT, Blackwell N, Kappler A, Kleindienst

S. 2022. 'Candidatus ferrigenium straubiae' sp. nov., 'Candidatus ferrigenium bremense'

sp. nov., 'Candidatus ferrigenium altingense' sp. nov., are autotrophic Fe(II)-oxidizing

bacteria of the family Gallionellaceae. Systematic and Applied Microbiology 45:126306.

30. Straub KL, Benz M, Schink B, Widdel F. 1996. Anaerobic, nitrate-dependent microbial

oxidation of ferrous iron. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 62:1458–1460.

31. Liu J, Wang Z, Belchik SM, Edwards MJ, Liu C, Kennedy DW, Merkley ED, Lipton MS,

Butt JN, Richardson DJ, Zachara JM, Fredrickson JK, Rosso KM, Shi L. 2012.

Identification and Characterization of MtoA: A Decaheme c-Type Cytochrome of the

Neutrophilic Fe(II)-Oxidizing Bacterium Sideroxydans lithotrophicus ES-1. Front Microbio

3.

32. Keffer JL, McAllister SM, Garber AI, Hallahan BJ, Sutherland MC, Rozovsky S, Chan CS.

2021. Iron Oxidation by a Fused Cytochrome-Porin Common to Diverse Iron-Oxidizing

Bacteria. mBio 0:e01074-21.

33. McAllister SM, Polson SW, Butterfield DA, Glazer BT, Sylvan JB, Chan CS. 2020.

Validating the Cyc2 Neutrophilic Iron Oxidation Pathway Using Meta-omics of

Zetaproteobacteria Iron Mats at Marine Hydrothermal Vents. mSystems 5:e00553-19,

/msystems/5/1/msys.00553-19.atom.

34. Jiao Y, Newman DK. 2007. The pio Operon Is Essential for Phototrophic Fe(II) Oxidation

in Rhodopseudomonas palustris TIE-1. Journal of Bacteriology 189:1765–1773.

35. Bose A, Gardel EJ, Vidoudez C, Parra EA, Girguis PR. 2014. Electron uptake by iron-

oxidizing phototrophic bacteria. Nat Commun 5:3391.

36. Beliaev AS, Saffarini DA. 1998. Shewanella putrefaciens mtrB Encodes an Outer

Membrane Protein Required for Fe(III) and Mn(IV) Reduction. Journal of Bacteriology

180:6292–6297.

37. Zhou N, Kupper RJ, Catalano JG, Thompson A, Chan CS. 2022. Biological Oxidation of

Fe(II)-Bearing Smectite by Microaerophilic Iron Oxidizer Sideroxydans lithotrophicus

Using Dual Mto and Cyc2 Iron Oxidation Pathways. Environ Sci Technol

https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c05142.

38. He S, Barco RA, Emerson D, Roden EE. 2017. Comparative Genomic Analysis of

Neutrophilic Iron(II) Oxidizer Genomes for Candidate Genes in Extracellular Electron

Transfer. Front Microbiol 8.

39. Alawi M, Lipski A, Sanders T, Eva-Maria-Pfeiffer, Spieck E. 2007. Cultivation of a novel

cold-adapted nitrite oxidizing betaproteobacterium from the Siberian Arctic. 3. The ISME

Journal 1:256–264.

40. Ishii K, Fujitani H, Soh K, Nakagawa T, Takahashi R, Tsuneda S. 2017. Enrichment and

Physiological Characterization of a Cold-Adapted Nitrite-Oxidizing Nitrotoga sp. from an

Eelgrass Sediment. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 83:e00549-17,

/aem/83/14/e00549-17.atom.

41. Podowski JC, Paver SF, Newton RJ, Coleman ML. 2022. Genome Streamlining,

Proteorhodopsin, and Organic Nitrogen Metabolism in Freshwater Nitrifiers. mBio

13:e02379-21.

42. Boddicker AM, Mosier AC. 2018. Genomic profiling of four cultivated Candidatus

Nitrotoga spp. predicts broad metabolic potential and environmental distribution. The ISME

Journal 12:2864–2882.

43. Kitzinger K, Koch H, Lücker S, Sedlacek CJ, Herbold C, Schwarz J, Daebeler A, Mueller

AJ, Lukumbuzya M, Romano S, Leisch N, Karst SM, Kirkegaard R, Albertsen M, Nielsen

PH, Wagner M, Daims H. 2018. Characterization of the First " *Candidatus* Nitrotoga"

Isolate Reveals Metabolic Versatility and Separate Evolution of Widespread Nitrite-

Oxidizing Bacteria. mBio 9:e01186-18, /mbio/9/4/mBio.01186-18.atom.

44. Lücker S, Schwarz J, Gruber-Dorninger C, Spieck E, Wagner M, Daims H. 2015. Nitrotoga

-like bacteria are previously unrecognized key nitrite oxidizers in full-scale wastewater

treatment plants. 3. The ISME Journal 9:708–720.

45. Ishii K, Fujitani H, Sekiguchi Y, Tsuneda S. 2020. Physiological and genomic

characterization of a new 'Candidatus Nitrotoga' isolate. Environmental Microbiology 22.

46. Daims H, Lücker S, Wagner M. 2016. A New Perspective on Microbes Formerly Known as

Nitrite-Oxidizing Bacteria. Trends in Microbiology 24:699–712.

47. Ivanova N, Tringe SG, Liolios K, Liu W-T, Morrison N, Hugenholtz P, Kyrpides NC.

2010. A call for standardized classification of metagenome projects. Environmental

Microbiology 12:1803–1805.

48. Shaffer M, Borton MA, McGivern BB, Zayed AA, La Rosa SL, Solden LM, Liu P,

Narrowe AB, Rodríguez-Ramos J, Bolduc B, Gazitúa MC, Daly RA, Smith GJ, Vik DR,

Pope PB, Sullivan MB, Roux S, Wrighton KC. 2020. DRAM for distilling microbial

metabolism to automate the curation of microbiome function. Nucleic Acids Res 48:8883–

8900.

49. Garber AI, Nealson KH, Okamoto A, McAllister SM, Chan CS, Barco RA, Merino N.

2020. FeGenie: A Comprehensive Tool for the Identification of Iron Genes and Iron Gene

Neighborhoods in Genome and Metagenome Assemblies. Frontiers in Microbiology 11.

50. Garber AI. 2020. MagicLamp: toolkit for annotation of 'omics datasets using curated HMM

sets (2020: MagicLamp). GitHub repository. https://github.com/Arkadiy-

Garber/MagicLamp.

51.   McAllister SM. 2016. Heme Counter. GitHub repository.

804   https://github.com/seanmcallister/heme_counter.

805   52.   Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment search

806   tool. J Mol Biol 215:403–410.

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

808   BLAST+: architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10:421.

809   54.   Eren AM, Esen ÖC, Quince C, Vineis JH, Morrison HG, Sogin ML, Delmont TO. 2015.

810   Anvi'o: an advanced analysis and visualization platform for 'omics data. PeerJ 3:e1319.

811   55.   Shaiber A, Willis AD, Delmont TO, Roux S, Chen L-X, Schmid AC, Yousef M, Watson

812   AR, Lolans K, Esen ÖC, Lee STM, Downey N, Morrison HG, Dewhirst FE, Mark Welch

813   JL, Eren AM. 2020. Functional and genetic markers of niche partitioning among enigmatic

814   members of the human oral microbiome. Genome Biology 21:292.

815   56.   Eren AM, Kiefl E, Shaiber A, Veseli I, Miller SE, Schechter MS, Fink I, Pan JN, Yousef

816   M, Fogarty EC, Trigodet F, Watson AR, Esen ÖC, Moore RM, Clayssen Q, Lee MD,

817   Kivenson V, Graham ED, Merrill BD, Karkman A, Blankenberg D, Eppley JM, Sjödin A,

818   Scott JJ, Vázquez-Campos X, McKay LJ, McDaniel EA, Stevens SLR, Anderson RE,

819   Fuessel J, Fernandez-Guerra A, Maignien L, Delmont TO, Willis AD. 2021. Community-

820   led, integrated, reproducible multi-omics with anvi'o. 1. Nature Microbiology 6:3–6.

821   57.   Baker IR, Conley BE, Gralnick JA, Girguis PR. 2022. Evidence for Horizontal and Vertical

822   Transmission of Mtr-Mediated Extracellular Electron Transfer among the Bacteria. mBio

823   https://doi.org/10.1128/mbio.02904-21.

824   58.   Ross DE, Flynn JM, Baron DB, Gralnick JA, Bond DR. 2011. Towards Electrosynthesis in

825   Shewanella: Energetics of Reversing the Mtr Pathway for Reductive Metabolism. PLOS

826   ONE 6:e16649.

827   59.   Salgueiro CA, Dantas JM. 2016. Multiheme Cytochromes, 1st ed. Springer Berlin

828   Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-44961-1.

829   60.   Paquete CM, Morgado L, Salgueiro CA, Louro RO. 2022. Molecular Mechanisms of

830   Microbial Extracellular Electron Transfer: The Importance of Multiheme Cytochromes. 6.

831   Frontiers in Bioscience-Landmark 27:174.

832   61.   Eddie BJ, Bird LJ, Pelikan C, Mussmann M, Martínez-Pérez C, Pinamang P, Malanoski

833   AP, Glaven SM. 2022. Conservation of Energetic Pathways for Electroautotrophy in the

834   Uncultivated Candidate Order Tenderiales. mSphere 0:e00223-22.

835   62.   Edwards MJ, White GF, Butt JN, Richardson DJ, Clarke TA. 2020. The Crystal Structure

836   of a Biological Insulated Transmembrane Molecular Wire. Cell 181:665-673.e10.

837   63.   Beckwith CR, Edwards MJ, Lawes M, Shi L, Butt JN, Richardson DJ, Clarke TA. 2015.

838   Characterization of MtoD from Sideroxydans lithotrophicus: a cytochrome c electron

839   shuttle used in lithoautotrophic growth. Frontiers in Microbiology 6.

840   64.   Ducluzeau A-L, Ouchane S, Nitschke W. 2008. The cbb3 Oxidases Are an Ancient

841   Innovation of the Domain Bacteria. Molecular Biology and Evolution 25:1158–1166.

842   65.   Trojan D, Garcia-Robledo E, Meier DV, Hausmann B, Revsbech NP, Eichorst SA,

843   Woebken D. 2021. Microaerobic Lifestyle at Nanomolar O2 Concentrations Mediated by

844  Low-Affinity Terminal Oxidases in Abundant Soil Bacteria. mSystems

845  https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00250-21.

846 66. Badger MR, Bek EJ. 2008. Multiple Rubisco forms in proteobacteria: their functional

847  significance in relation to CO2 acquisition by the CBB cycle. J Exp Bot 59:1525–1541.

848 67. Griesbeck C, Schütz M, Schödl T, Bathe S, Nausch L, Mederer N, Vielreicher M, Hauska

849  G. 2002. Mechanism of Sulfide-Quinone Reductase Investigated Using Site-Directed

850  Mutagenesis and Sulfur Analysis. Biochemistry 41:11552–11565.

851 68. Marcia M, Ermler U, Peng G, Michel H. 2009. The structure of Aquifex aeolicus

852  sulfide:quinone oxidoreductase, a basis to understand sulfide detoxification and respiration.

853  Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106:9625–9630.

854 69. Loy A, Duller S, Baranyi C, Mußmann M, Ott J, Sharon I, Béjà O, Le Paslier D, Dahl C,

855  Wagner M. 2009. Reverse dissimilatory sulfite reductase as phylogenetic marker for a

856  subgroup of sulfur-oxidizing prokaryotes. Environmental Microbiology 11:289–299.

857 70. Müller AL, Kjeldsen KU, Rattei T, Pester M, Loy A. 2015. Phylogenetic and

858  environmental diversity of DsrAB-type dissimilatory (bi)sulfite reductases. 5. ISME J

859  9:1152–1165.

860 71. Kato S, Ohkuma M, Powell DH, Krepski ST, Oshima K, Hattori M, Shapiro N, Woyke T,

861  Chan CS. 2015. Comparative Genomic Insights into Ecophysiology of Neutrophilic,

862  Microaerophilic Iron Oxidizing Bacteria. Front Microbiol 6.

72. Koeksoy E, Bezuidt OM, Bayer T, Chan CS, Emerson D. 2021. Zetaproteobacteria Pan-

Genome Reveals Candidate Gene Cluster for Twisted Stalk Biosynthesis and Export. Front

Microbiol 12:1374.

73. Schmehl M, Jahn A, Meyer zu Vilsendorf A, Hennecke S, Masepohl B, Schuppler M,

Marxer M, Oelze J, Klipp W. 1993. Identification of a new class of nitrogen fixation genes

in Rhodobacter capsalatus: a putative membrane complex involved in electron transport to

nitrogenase. Molec Gen Genet 241:602–615.

74. Tremblay P-L, Zhang T, Dar SA, Leang C, Lovley DR. 2012. The Rnf Complex of

Clostridium ljungdahlii Is a Proton-Translocating Ferredoxin:NAD+ Oxidoreductase

Essential for Autotrophic Growth. mBio 4:e00406-12.

75. Downing BE, Gupta D, Nayak DD. 2022. The dual role of a multi-heme cytochrome in

methanogenesis: MmcA is important for energy conservation and carbon metabolism in

Methanosarcina acetivorans. bioRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.20.500911.

76. Liu Y, Chen H, Van Treuren W, Hou B-H, Higginbottom SK, Dodd D. 2022. Clostridium

sporogenes uses reductive Stickland metabolism in the gut to generate ATP and produce

circulating metabolites. 5. Nat Microbiol 7:695–706.

77. Child SA, Bradley JM, Pukala TL, Svistunenko DA, Le Brun NE, Bell SG. 2018. Electron

transfer ferredoxins with unusual cluster binding motifs support secondary metabolism in

many bacteria. Chem Sci 9:7948–7957.

78.   Watanabe T, Kojima H. 2019. Sulfuricella, p. 1–6. *In* Whitman, WB, Rainey, F, Kämpfer,

P, Trujillo, M, Chun, J, DeVos, P, Hedlund, B, Dedysh, S (eds.), Bergey's Manual of

Systematics of Archaea and Bacteria, 1st ed. Wiley.

79.   Gorski CA, Klüpfel LE, Voegelin A, Sander M, Hofstetter TB. 2013. Redox Properties of

Structural Fe in Clay Minerals: 3. Relationships between Smectite Redox and Structural

Properties. Environ Sci Technol 47:13477–13485.

80.   Gupta D, Sutherland MC, Rengasamy K, Meacham JM, Kranz RG, Bose A. 2019.

Photoferrotrophs Produce a PioAB Electron Conduit for Extracellular Electron Uptake.

mBio 10:e02668-19.

81.   Coursolle D, Baron DB, Bond DR, Gralnick JA. 2010. The Mtr Respiratory Pathway Is

Essential for Reducing Flavins and Electrodes in Shewanella oneidensis. Journal of

Bacteriology 192:467–474.

82.   Beliaev AS, Saffarini DA, McLaughlin JL, Hunnicutt D. 2001. MtrC, an outer membrane

decahaem c cytochrome required for metal reduction in Shewanella putrefaciens MR-1.

Molecular Microbiology 39:722–730.

83.   Gorby YA, Yanina S, McLean JS, Rosso KM, Moyles D, Dohnalkova A, Beveridge TJ,

Chang IS, Kim BH, Kim KS, Culley DE, Reed SB, Romine MF, Saffarini DA, Hill EA, Shi

L, Elias DA, Kennedy DW, Pinchuk G, Watanabe K, Ishii S, Logan B, Nealson KH,

Fredrickson JK. 2006. Electrically conductive bacterial nanowires produced by Shewanella

oneidensis strain MR-1 and other microorganisms. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences 103:11358–11363.

84.   Edwards MJ, Richardson DJ, Paquete CM, Clarke TA. 2020. Role of multiheme
cytochromes involved in extracellular anaerobic respiration in bacteria. Protein Science
29:830–842.

85.   Richardson DJ, Butt JN, Fredrickson JK, Zachara JM, Shi L, Edwards MJ, White G, Baiden
N, Gates AJ, Marritt SJ, Clarke TA. 2012. The 'porin–cytochrome' model for microbe-to-
mineral electron transfer. Molecular Microbiology 85:201–212.

86.   White GF, Shi Z, Shi L, Wang Z, Dohnalkova AC, Marshall MJ, Fredrickson JK, Zachara
JM, Butt JN, Richardson DJ, Clarke TA. 2013. Rapid electron exchange between surface-
exposed bacterial cytochromes and Fe(III) minerals. Proceedings of the National Academy
of Sciences 110:6346–6351.

87.   van Wonderen JH, Adamczyk K, Wu X, Jiang X, Piper SEH, Hall CR, Edwards MJ, Clarke
TA, Zhang H, Jeuken LJC, Sazanovich IV, Towrie M, Blumberger J, Meech SR, Butt JN.
2021. Nanosecond heme-to-heme electron transfer rates in a multiheme cytochrome
nanowire reported by a spectrally unique His/Met-ligated heme. Proceedings of the
National Academy of Sciences 118:e2107939118.

88.   Wang F, Gu Y, O'Brien JP, Yi SM, Yalcin SE, Srikanth V, Shen C, Vu D, Ing NL,
Hochbaum AI, Egelman EH, Malvankar NS. 2019. Structure of Microbial Nanowires
Reveals Stacked Hemes that Transport Electrons over Micrometers. Cell 177:361-369.e10.

89.   Chan CS, McAllister SM, Leavitt AH, Glazer BT, Krepski ST, Emerson D. 2016. The
Architecture of Iron Microbial Mats Reflects the Adaptation of Chemolithotrophic Iron
Oxidation in Freshwater and Marine Environments. Front Microbiol 7.

90.   Hallbeck L, Pedersen K. 2014. The Family Gallionellaceae, p. 853–858. *In* Rosenberg, E,

925   DeLong, EF, Lory, S, Stackebrandt, E, Thompson, F (eds.), The Prokaryotes:

926   Alphaproteobacteria and Betaproteobacteria. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

927   91.   Hedrich S, Schlömann M, Johnson DB. 2011. The iron-oxidizing proteobacteria.

928   Microbiology 157:1551–1564.

929   92.   Ilbert M, Bonnefoy V. 2013. Insight into the evolution of the iron oxidation pathways.

930   Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Bioenergetics 1827:161–175.

931   93.   Geer LY, Marchler-Bauer A, Geer RC, Han L, He J, He S, Liu C, Shi W, Bryant SH. 2010.

932   The NCBI BioSystems database. Nucleic Acids Res 38:D492–D496.

933   94.   Chen I-MA, Chu K, Palaniappan K, Ratner A, Huang J, Huntemann M, Hajek P, Ritter S,

934   Varghese N, Seshadri R, Roux S, Woyke T, Eloe-Fadrosh EA, Ivanova NN, Kyrpides NC.

935   2021. The IMG/M data management and analysis system v.6.0: new tools and advanced

936   capabilities. Nucleic Acids Research 49:D751–D763.

937   95.   Cooper RE, Wegner C-E, McAllister SM, Shevchenko O, Chan CS, Küsel K. 2020. Draft

938   Genome Sequence of *Sideroxydans* sp. Strain CL21, an Fe(II)-Oxidizing Bacterium.

939   Microbiol Resour Announc 9:e01444-19.

940   96.   Probst AJ, Ladd B, Jarett JK, Geller-McGrath DE, Sieber CMK, Emerson JB,

941   Anantharaman K, Thomas BC, Malmstrom RR, Stieglmeier M, Klingl A, Woyke T, Ryan

942   MC, Banfield JF. 2018. Differential depth distribution of microbial function and putative

943   symbionts through sediment-hosted aquifers in the deep terrestrial subsurface. Nat

944   Microbiol 3:328–336.

97. Parks DH, Imelfort M, Skennerton CT, Hugenholtz P, Tyson GW. 2015. CheckM:

assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and

metagenomes. Genome Res 25:1043–1055.

98. Chaumeil P-A, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P, Parks DH. 2020. GTDB-Tk: a toolkit to classify

genomes with the Genome Taxonomy Database. Bioinformatics 36:1925–1927.

99. Mukherjee S, Stamatis D, Bertsch J, Ovchinnikova G, Sundaramurthi JC, Lee J,

Kandimalla M, Chen I-MA, Kyrpides NC, Reddy TBK. 2021. Genomes OnLine Database

(GOLD) v.8: overview and updates. Nucleic Acids Research 49:D723–D733.

100. Buttigieg PL, Morrison N, Smith B, Mungall CJ, Lewis SE, the ENVO Consortium. 2013.

The environment ontology: contextualising biological and biomedical entities. Journal of

Biomedical Semantics 4:43.

101. Parks D. 2014. CompareM. Github repository. https://github.com/dparks1134/CompareM.

102. 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. 7. Nature Biotechnology 36:566–569.

103. Watanabe T, Kojima H, Fukui M. 2015. Sulfuriferula multivorans gen. nov., sp. nov.,

isolated from a freshwater lake, reclassification of 'Thiobacillus plumbophilus' as

Sulfuriferula plumbophilus sp. nov., and description of Sulfuricellaceae fam. nov. and

Sulfuricellales ord. nov. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary

Microbiology, 65:1504–1508.

104. Kojima H, Fukui M. 2010. Sulfuricella denitrificans gen. nov., sp. nov., a sulfur-oxidizing

autotroph isolated from a freshwater lake. International Journal of Systematic and

Evolutionary Microbiology, 60:2862–2866.

105. Geneious v.10.2.6. https://www.geneious.com.

106. Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high

throughput. Nucleic Acids Research 32:1792–1797.

107. Kozlov AM, Darriba D, Flouri T, Morel B, Stamatakis A. 2019. RAxML-NG: a fast,

scalable and user-friendly tool for maximum likelihood phylogenetic inference.

Bioinformatics 35:4453–4455.

108. Letunic I, Bork P. 2021. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for phylogenetic

tree display and annotation. Nucleic Acids Research 49:W293–W296.

109. Pruesse E, Peplies J, Glöckner FO. 2012. SINA: Accurate high-throughput multiple

sequence alignment of ribosomal RNA genes. Bioinformatics 28:1823–1829.

110. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, Peplies J, Glöckner FO.

2013. The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and

web-based tools. Nucleic Acids Res 41:D590–D596.

111. Moore RM, Harrison AO, McAllister SM, Polson SW, Wommack EK. 2020. Iroki:

automatic customization and visualization of phylogenetic trees. PeerJ e8584.

112. Steinegger M, Söding J. 2017. MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching for

the analysis of massive data sets. 11. Nat Biotechnol 35:1026–1028.

113. The UniProt Consortium. 2021. UniProt: the universal protein knowledgebase in 2021.

Nucleic Acids Research 49:D480–D489.

114. Yu NY, Wagner JR, Laird MR, Melli G, Rey S, Lo R, Dao P, Sahinalp SC, Ester M, Foster

LJ, Brinkman FSL. 2010. PSORTb 3.0: improved protein subcellular localization prediction

with refined localization subcategories and predictive capabilities for all prokaryotes.

Bioinformatics 26:1608–1615.

115. Goldberg T, Hecht M, Hamp T, Karl T, Yachdav G, Ahmed N, Altermann U, Angerer P,

Ansorge S, Balasz K, Bernhofer M, Betz A, Cizmadija L, Do KT, Gerke J, Greil R,

Joerdens V, Hastreiter M, Hembach K, Herzog M, Kalemanov M, Kluge M, Meier A, Nasir

H, Neumaier U, Prade V, Reeb J, Sorokoumov A, Troshani I, Vorberg S, Waldraff S, Zierer

J, Nielsen H, Rost B. 2014. LocTree3 prediction of localization. Nucleic Acids Research

42:W350–W355.

116. Mirdita M, Schütze K, Moriwaki Y, Heo L, Ovchinnikov S, Steinegger M. 2022.

ColabFold: making protein folding accessible to all. 6. Nat Methods 19:679–682.

117. Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, Tunyasuvunakool K,

Bates R, Žídek A, Potapenko A, Bridgland A, Meyer C, Kohl SAA, Ballard AJ, Cowie A,

Romera-Paredes B, Nikolov S, Jain R, Adler J, Back T, Petersen S, Reiman D, Clancy E,

Zielinski M, Steinegger M, Pacholska M, Berghammer T, Bodenstein S, Silver D, Vinyals

O, Senior AW, Kavukcuoglu K, Kohli P, Hassabis D. 2021. Highly accurate protein

structure prediction with AlphaFold. 7873. Nature 596:583–589.

118. Evans R, O'Neill M, Pritzel A, Antropova N, Senior A, Green T, Žídek A, Bates R,

Blackwell S, Yim J, Ronneberger O, Bodenstein S, Zielinski M, Bridgland A, Potapenko A,

Cowie A, Tunyasuvunakool K, Jain R, Clancy E, Kohli P, Jumper J, Hassabis D. 2022.

Protein complex prediction with AlphaFold-Multimer. bioRxiv

https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.04.463034.

119. Schrodinger, LLC. 2010. The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System (2.5.4).

120. 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.

121. Galperin MY, Kristensen DM, Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. 2019. Microbial

genome analysis: the COG approach. Brief Bioinform 20:1063–1070.

122. Galperin MY, Wolf YI, Makarova KS, Vera Alvarez R, Landsman D, Koonin EV. 2021.

COG database update: focus on microbial diversity, model organisms, and widespread

pathogens. Nucleic Acids Research 49:D274–D281.

1028