A novel, tissue-associated and vertically transmitted bacterial symbiont in the coral

Pocillopora acuta

Justin Maire[1,*], Sarah Jane Tsang Min Ching[1], Katarina Damjanovic[1,2], Hannah E.

Epstein[2,3,#], Louise M. Judd[4], Linda L. Blackall[1], Madeleine J. H. van Oppen[1,2]

[1] School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, 3010, VIC, Australia.

[2] Australian Institute of Marine Science, PMB No 3, Townsville, 4810, QLD, Australia.

[3] ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville,

4811, QLD, Australia

[4] Doherty Applied Microbial Genomics, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The

University of Melbourne at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Parkville,

3010, VIC, Australia

[#] Present address: School of Life Sciences, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester,

Essex CO4 3SQ, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: justin.maire@unimelb.edu.au

Abstract

Coral microhabitats are colonized by a myriad of microorganisms, including diverse bacteria

which are essential for host functioning and survival. However, the location, transmission,

and functions of individual bacterial species living inside the coral tissues remain poorly

studied. Here, we show that a previously undescribed bacterial symbiont of the coral

Pocillopora acuta forms cell-associated microbial aggregates (CAMAs) within the

mesenterial filaments. CAMAs were found in both adults and larval offspring, providing

evidence of vertical transmission. *In situ* laser capture microdissection of CAMAs followed

by 16S rRNA gene metabarcoding and shotgun metagenomics produced a near complete

metagenome-assembled genome. We subsequently cultured the CAMA bacteria from *P. acuta*

colonies, and sequenced and assembled their genomes. Phylogenetic analyses showed that the

CAMA bacteria belong to an undescribed Endozoicomonadaceae genus and species, which

we propose to name *Sororendozoicomonas aggregata* gen. nov sp. nov. Metabolic pathway

reconstruction from its genome sequence suggests this species can synthesize most amino

acids, several B vitamins, and antioxidants, which may be beneficial to its coral hosts. This

study provides detailed insights into a new member of the widespread Endozoicomonadaceae

family, thereby improving our understanding of coral holobiont functioning. Vertically

transmitted, tissue-associated bacteria, such as *S. aggregata* may be key candidates for the

development of microbiome manipulation approaches with long-term positive effects on the

coral host.

Competing interests statement

43 The authors declare they have no competing interests.

Main text

Corals associate with diverse bacteria with essential functions, such as protection against pathogens and nutrient cycling [1]. Among these bacteria, a small portion resides within the coral tissues [2], sometimes forming cell-associated microbial aggregates (CAMAs) [3–6]. However, the identification and characterization of CAMA-forming bacteria in corals remains in its infancy. The most common CAMA bacteria belong to the *Endozoicomonas* genus [3, 4, 7], widespread coral symbionts generally considered to be mutualistic through sulfur cycling and B vitamin synthesis [3, 7–10]. *Simkania* sp. (Chlamydiota) was recently shown to also form CAMAs in *Pocillopora acuta* from Feather Reef (Great Barrier Reef [GBR], Australia; Figure S1) [3], although its function remains unclear.

Here, we characterized CAMAs present in *P. acuta* colonies from Orpheus Island, also in the GBR. *P. acuta* is an asexual brooder, producing fully formed, genetically identical larvae, and a sexual broadcast spawner [11]. The microbiome of Orpheus Island colonies is dominated by *Endozoicomonas* in early and adult life stages [6, 12], and CAMAs were detected in larvae, indicating possible vertical transmission [6]. Using samples from these two studies (Figure S2A-B), we verified by fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH) that both adults (X7 colony [12]) and larvae (OI2 and OI3 colonies [6]) possessed CAMAs (Figure 1A-E). In adult polyps, CAMAs localized to the mesenterial filaments (Figure 1A-C). In larvae, CAMAs were found in the gastrodermis (Figure 1D-E).

Figure 1: Location and identity of CAMAs in Orpheus Island *Pocillopora acuta*. A: CAMAs in an adult polyp (X7 colony) by whole-mount FISH. B-E: FISH images showing the location of CAMAs in sectioned adult polyps (B, C; X7 colony) and sectioned larvae (D, E; OI2 colony). White arrowheads point at CAMAs. Green: autofluorescence; red: EUB338-mix probe (all bacteria); white: non-EUB probe (negative control). Note the non-specific

binding in tentacles (red and white signal overlapping, white asterisks), often localized in

nematocysts. Tent: tentacle; Mes Fil: mesenterial filaments; Mes: mesenteries; Mes Pl:

mesogleal plates; cb: cnidoglandular band; Gast: gastrodermis; Epi: epidermis. Scale bars:

100 μm for A, B, D; 20 μm for C and E. F: Relative abundance of bacterial ASVs in CAMAs

of larvae (OI2 and OI3 colonies) and adult branches (X7 colony) isolated by LCM. Each bar

represents one replicate (either three pooled larvae or one adult branch). Detailed

composition is available in Table S2.

To taxonomically identify the bacteria present in the CAMAs, we excised CAMAs using

laser capture microdissection (LCM) , followed by 16S rRNA gene metabarcoding (Figure

S3, Table S1). Two ASVs assigned to *Kistimonas* (Endozoicomonadaceae ASVs 01 and 02)

made up most of the reads in OI2 larvae and X7 branches (Figure 1F, Table S2). While the

samples were collected at the same site, they originated from different host colonies and were

collected several months apart, highlighting the temporal stability of this association among

individuals and through ontogeny. *Kistimonas* is part of the Endozoicomonadaceae family

along with *Endozoicomonas*. Because of taxonomic discrepancies discussed below, we refer

to these two ASVs as Endozoicomonadaceae ASVs 01 and 02. The two ASVs were also

present in OI3 larvae at a lower relative abundance. In addition, three *Endozoicomonas* ASVs

were found in X7 and were identical to *Endozoicomonas* present in *P. acuta* from Feather

Reef [3]. FISH using an Endozoicomonadaceae probe provided additional support for this

taxonomy in both adult and larval CAMAs (Figure S4).

While *Kistimonas* was not reported in the original studies [6, 12], a re-analysis of both

previous studies reassigned three *Endozoicomonas* ASVs to *Kistimonas* (Figure S5, Table

S3), two of which were 100% identical to Endozoicomonadaceae ASVs 01 and 02 found in

our excised CAMA samples. Virtually no *Endozoicomonas* strains (only one ASV at 0.02-

0.04% relative abundance) were detected in whole larvae or recruits in our re-analysis of the

earlier datasets (Figure S5), suggesting that *Endozoicomonas* are acquired horizontally in

Orpheus Island *P. acuta*, as observed for Feather Reef *P. acuta* [3]. Conversely,

Endozoicomonadaceae ASVs 01 and 02 were present at all life stages (*i.e.* larvae, recruits and

adults of the same colonies, Figure S5) and formed CAMAs, confirming their vertical

transmission. Whether whole CAMAs or individual bacteria are transmitted from parent

colony to asexually produced larvae remains unknown. Strong evidence for vertical

transmission of bacteria in corals has only been reported twice before [13, 14].

Shotgun sequencing of the X7 CAMA samples yielded one metagenome-assembled genome

(MAG) (Pac_X7, Table S4), the 16S rRNA gene sequence of which was identical to

Endozoicomonadaceae ASV01. An additional *P. acuta* colony (P3, Figure S2C) was collected

from Orpheus Island in June 2023, from which we cultured ten bacterial isolates with 16S

rRNA gene sequences identical to Pac_X7, one of which was whole-genome sequenced

(Pac_P3-11-1, Table S4). Both assemblies had 99.8% Average Nucleotide Identity (ANI) and

99.6% Average Amino acid Identity (AAI) (Figure S6), confirming that the Pac_P3-11-1

isolate is indeed a CAMA bacterium. Phylogenetic analysis of 120 marker genes placed both

genomes separately from all described Endozoicomonadaceae genera (Figure 2A, Table S5),

along with Endozoicomonadaceae SCSIO12664 (99.6% 16S rRNA gene sequence identity,

99.2% ANI, 98.8% AAI), isolated from *Pocillopora damicornis* in the South China Sea [15].

This was supported by 16S rRNA gene phylogeny (Figure S7). Together with low AAI

(highest score of 60.1% with *E. elysicola*, Figure S6) and low 16S rRNA gene identity

(highest score of 93.97% with *E. gorgoniicola*), these data support the placement of Pac_P3-

11-1 and Endozoicomonadaceae SCSIO12664 in a new genus and species, which we propose

to name *Sororendozoicomonas aggregata*, gen. nov., sp. nov. This likely explains the

119   discrepancies observed with metabarcoding-based taxonomy, as taxonomy would be assigned

120   to a closely related taxon rather than an undescribed genus.

Figure 2: Taxonomy and functional potential of *Sororendozoicomonas aggregata*, CAMA member of Orpheus Island *Pocillopora acuta*. A: Maximum likelihood phylogeny of Endozoicomonadaceae based on 120 marker genes and 28 Endozoicomonadaceae genomes in addition to the two genomes recovered in this study. *Zooshikella* was chosen as the outgroup. Bootstrap support values based on 1000 replications are provided. Additional data on the reference genomes are available in Table S5. B: Overview of the metabolic potential from the genome sequence of Pac_P3-11-1 recovered from *P. acuta* CAMAs. The pathways represented here are at least 80% complete (Fig. S7). Dashed arrows represent hypotheticals. T2SS: type II secretion system; T3SS: type III secretion system; DMSP: dimethylsulfoniopropionate; LPS: lipopolysaccharide; NAD: nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide.

Genome annotation (Figures 2B and S8, Table S6) revealed Pac_P3-11-1 encodes several genes indicative of host-symbiont interactions, including type II and type III secretion systems, 35 eukaryotic-like proteins (Table S7), and three secondary metabolites with putative antimicrobial activity (Table S8). This gene repertoire is similar to that of other coral-associated Endozoicomonadaceae [3, 4, 8–10] and may regulate host colonization, aggregation, and vertical transmission. Additionally, we recovered pathways for the biosynthesis of all amino acids (except phenylalanine, tyrosine, and arginine), as well as riboflavin (vitamin B_2), pantothenate (B_5), pyridoxin (B_6), biotin (B_7), and folate (B_9), which could assist with coral metabolism [3, 4, 9, 10, 16]. Finally, Pac_P3-11-1 shows potential for the scavenging of reactive oxygen species, which are believed to drive coral bleaching when present in excess [17], as it possesses pathways for the synthesis of the antioxidants heme, lipoic acid, and glutathione, and the *dsyB* gene, essential for the synthesis of dimethylsulfonioproprionate [18].

In conclusion, we described and cultured the first coral tissue-associated, vertically

transmitted member of the Endozoicomonadaceae family. *Sororendozoicomonas* was not

found in other GBR *P. acuta* populations that harbor *Endozoicomonas* [3], suggesting

geographical location may impact Endozoicomonadaceae associations. Additionally,

Endozoicomonas CAMAs were previously found in pocilloporid tentacles [3, 4], contrasting

with *Sororendozoicomonas*' location in the mesenterial filaments.

As climate change increasingly triggers coral bleaching and mortality, novel methods are

urgently needed to increase coral climate resilience, including the manipulation of coral-

associated microorganisms. Endozoicomonadaceae are great candidates for coral microbiome

manipulation approaches [19, 20], due to their prevalence, tissue location (*i.e.* more stably

associated than bacteria residing in the mucus or skeleton), and putative benefits. The vertical

transmission and cultivability of *S. aggregata* make it an ideal candidate, ensuring its stability

within the coral holobiont across generations and thereby the long-term sustainability of

conservation/restoration approaches based on microbiome manipulation.

Description of *Sororendozoicomonas* gen. nov.

Sororendozoicomonas (So.ror.en.do.zo.i.co.mo'nas. L. fem. n. soror, sister; *Endozoicomonas*,

taxonomic name of a bacterial genus; *Sororendozoicomonas* referring to the close

relationship to the bacterial genus *Endozoicomonas*). The name was registered through

SeqCode [21].

The genus *Sororendozoicomonas* represents a distinct lineage within the

Endozoicomonadaceae family, sister to *Endozoicomonas*, supported by concatenated marker

gene phylogenies (Figures 2A) as well as 16S rRNA gene phylogeny (Figure S7) in the

present study. *Sororendozoicomonas* show similar functional and metabolic potential to

Endozoiocomonas species (Figure 2B). The new genus contains two strains isolated from

Pocillopora corals (Pac-P3-11-1, from the present study, and SCSIO12664 [15]) and

potentially additional strains isolated from Red Sea *Stylophora pistillata* [22] (only 16S

rRNA gene sequences are available - KC669256.1, KC669230.1, KC669217.1,

KC669131.1).

Description of *Sororendozoicomonas aggregata* sp. nov.

Sororendozoicomonas aggregata (ag.gre.ga'ta. L. fem. part. adj. *aggregata,* joined together,

referring to the ability to form aggregates within coral tissues). The name was registered

through SeqCode [21]. The new species contains two strains isolated from *Pocillopora* corals

(Pac-P3-11-1, from the present study, and SCSIO12664 [15]).

Type strain: Pac_P3-11-1, isolated from tissues of the coral *Pocillopora acuta*, collected from

Orpheus Island, Australia (18°36'16.26" S, 146°29'24.27" E). Taxonomic assignment based

on concatenated marker gene phylogenies (Figure 2A) as well as 16S rRNA gene phylogeny

(Figure S7). Grows on Marine Agar 2216 (Difco) between 23°C and 28°C, forming circular,

white, raised, sticky colonies with entire margins.

Acknowledgements

189   This research was supported by the Australian Research Council (FL180100036 to MJHvO;

190   DP160101468 to MJHvO and LLB), the Native Australian Animals Trust (to JM), Paul G.

191   Allen Philanthropies (to MJHvO), and AIMS@JCU, the joint venture between James Cook

192   University and the Australian Institute of Marine Science, as part of H.E.E's PhD research.

193   H.E.E acknowledges receipt of an AIMS@JCU Postgraduate Scholarship. We thank: Corinne

Data availability statement

Raw data are available under NCBI BioProject IDs PRJNA891898 (larvae CAMAs, MiSeq

raw data) and PRJNA974967 (adult CAMAs, MiSeq and NovaSeq raw data, Pac_X7 MAG

assembly; Pac_P3-11-1 NextSeq raw reads and assembly). The complete 16S rRNA gene

sequence of Pac_P3-11-1 is available under the accession number OR505856.

Author contribution

Conceptualization: JM, MvO, LB; Investigation: JM, SJTMC, KD, HE, LJ; Methodology:

JM; Resources: KD, HE; Formal analysis: JM; Visualization: JM; Funding acquisition: MvO,

LB, JM; Writing - Original Draft Preparation: JM, MvO. All authors reviewed and edited the

final manuscript.

Material and methods

Coral larvae collection (OI2 and OI3 colonies)

For OI2 and OI3, parent colonies were collected in 2017 from Orpheus Island (Little Pioneer Bay; 18°36'3.6"S 146°29'20.4"E), in the central Great Barrier Reef in Australia (Figure S1 and S2A), and maintained and sampled as part of a previous experiment [6]. Briefly, before planulation, colonies were maintained in individual acrylic aquaria that received indirect natural sunlight and 0.4 µm-filtered seawater. A filter was fitted at each outlet of the acrylic tank to collect released planulae. Larvae were washed with 0.22-µm filtered seawater (FSW), transferred from the filter into a microcentrifuge tube using a sterile pipette tip, and as much water as possible was removed from the tube without disturbing the larvae. Larvae were fixed for 10 hrs at 4°C in 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) prepared in FSW, rinsed twice in FSW, and stored in 50% ethanol-PBS at -20°C. Around 10 larvae per parent colony were fixed.

Adult coral collection (X7 and P3 colonies)

For the X7 colony (Figure S2B), coral fragments were sampled from the field in 2016 from the same site at Orpheus Island as part of a previous experiment (Figure S1) [12]. From this study, only samples collected in November 2016 were processed here. Four small coral fragments (2-5 cm in length) were snapped off the colonies with forceps, fixed for 24 hrs in 4% PFA in FSW, rinsed twice in FSW, and stored in 50% ethanol-PBS at -20°C. Following fixation, coral branches were decalcified in EDTA 10%. EDTA was renewed every two days, and samples were kept at 4°C on a rotating wheel, until there was no skeleton left (around two weeks). Samples were then rinsed in PBS 1X, and stored at 4°C in PBS 1X.

For the P3 colony (Figure S2C), coral colonies were collected at 1-4 m depth with a chisel and hammer from Orpheus Island (Little Pioneer Bay, 18°36'16.26" S, 146°29'24.27" E,

241 Collection permit G22/46479.1) in June 2023. Four colonies were brought back to the

242 Australian Institute of Marine Science for overnight holding before being shipped to the

243 University of Melbourne the next day. On arrival, the corals were placed in 130 L

244 recirculating system tanks and kept there overnight for 10 h at 25 °C in 35 p.p.t. reconstituted

245 sea water (Red Sea Salt™, R11065, Red Sea, USA).

Fluorescence *in situ* Hybridization (sections)

Sample processing, embedding, and sectioning (3-µm thickness) were performed by the

Melbourne Histology Platform (University of Melbourne) as previously described [3].

Fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH) was then performed as previously described [6],

but final probe concentration during hybridization was 5 ng/µL. See Table S9 for probe

sequences, fluorophores, and formamide concentrations. Slides were mounted in CitiFluor™

CFM3 mounting medium (proSciTech, Australia), covered with a coverslip and sealed with

clear nail polish. Slides were kept at 4°C until observation.

Fluorescence *in situ* Hybridization (whole-mount)

Single polyps of the X7 colony were dissected in PBS 1X using Dumont tweezers under a

dissecting microscope. Samples were cleared of autofluorescence by incubating polyps in

methanol-PBS 1X (50:50 v/v) for 10 min, methanol-PBS 1X (75:25 v/v) for 10 min,

methanol-PBS 1X (90:10 v/v) for 10 min, 100% methanol for 10 min, methanol-PBS 1X +

Triton X-100 0.2% (90:10 v/v) for 10 min, methanol-PBS 1X + Triton X-100 0.2% (75:25

v/v) for 10 min, methanol-PBS 1X + Triton X-100 0.2% (50:50 v/v) for 10 min, PBS 1X +

0.2% Triton X-100 for 10 min, and stored at 4°C in PBS 1X. FISH was performed on whole

polyps as previously described [3], with the probes shown in Table S9. Before observation,

single polyps were cut in half to expose the gastric cavity and mesenteries, and deposited

onto 8-well coverslip-bottom slides (ibidi, USA) with a drop of milliQ water to avoid drying.

Confocal Laser Scanning Microscopy

Slides were observed on a Nikon A1R confocal laser scanning microscope (Nikon, Japan)

with the NIS325 Element software. Virtual band mode was used to acquire variable emission

bandwidth to tailor acquisition for specific fluorophores. The fluorophores Atto550 were

excited using the 561 nm laser line, Atto647 using the 640 nm laser line, and the coral

autofluorescence using the 488 nm laser line with a detection range of 570-620 nm for

Atto550, 660-710 nm for Atto647, and 500-550 nm for coral autofluorescence. For three-

dimensional reconstructions of Z-stacks (for whole polyps), sections were acquired using Z

steps of 3.2 μM with the 10X objective. Nd2 files were processed using ImageJ. Z-stacks

were projected in two-dimensional images using the 'Max Intensity' projection type. Linear

adjustments of brightness and contrast were performed when necessary and applied to the

entire image and to each channel independently. Channels were then given artificial colors

(see figure legends) and merged.

Laser Capture Microdissection of CAMAs and DNA extraction

Laser capture microdissection (LCM) of CAMAs in OI2, OI3, and X7 samples was

performed as previously described [3]. For OI2 and OI3 larvae, three replicates each

containing three larvae were processed. For each replicate, ten slides each containing eight

sections were processed (~80 3-μm sections per replicate in total). For X7 branches, three

replicates each containing one branch were processed. For each replicate, 15 slides each

containing four sections were processed (~60 3-μm sections per replicate in total). Tissue

areas without CAMAs were also separately captured as a negative control. DNA extraction

was then conducted as previously described [3], using the Arcturus® PicoPure® DNA

Extraction Kit (Applied Biosystems, USA). Three caps containing no captured tissue, but that

were open in the LCM facility to capture air contamination, were also included as extraction

blanks.

16S rRNA gene metabarcoding

Hypervariable regions V5-V6 of the 16S rRNA genes were amplified using the primer set

784F (5′ GTGACCTATGAACTCAGGAGTCAGGATTAGATACCCTGGTA 3′) and 1061R

(5′ CTGAGACTTGCACATCGCAGCCRRCACGAGCTGACGAC 3′). Adapters were

attached to the primers and are underlined. Bacterial 16S rRNA genes were PCR-amplified

on a SimpliAmp Thermal Cycler (Applied Biosystems, ThermoFisher Scientific). Each

reaction contained 1 μL of DNA template, 1.5 μL of forward primer (10 μM stock), 1.5 μL of

reverse primer (10 μM stock), 7.5 μL of 2x QIAGEN Multiplex PCR Master Mix (Qiagen,

Germany) and 3.5 μL of nuclease-free water (Thermofisher), with a total volume of 15 μL per

reaction. Three triplicate PCRs were conducted for each sample and three no-template PCRs

were conducted as negative controls. PCR conditions for the 16S rRNA genes were as

follows: initial denaturation at 95°C for 3 min, then 18 cycles of: denaturation at 95°C for 15

s, annealing at 55°C for 30 s, and extension at 72°C for 30 s; with a final extension at 72°C for

7 minutes. Samples were then held at 4°C. Following PCR, triplicates were pooled, resulting

in 45 μL per sample. Metabarcoding library preparation was conducted as previously

described [23] and sequencing was performed at the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute (WEHI)

in Melbourne, Australia on one MiSeq V3 system (Illumina) with 2x300bp paired-end reads.

16S rRNA gene metabarcoding analysis

QIIME2 v 2021.8 [24] was used for processing 16S rRNA gene sequences. The plugin demux
[24] was used to create an interactive plot to visualize the data and assess the quality, for
demultiplexing and quality filtering of raw sequences. The plugin cutadapt [25] was used to
remove the primers and MiSeq adapters. DADA2 [26] was used for denoising and chimera
checking, trimming, dereplication, generation of a feature table, joining of paired-end reads,
correcting sequencing errors, and removing low quality reads (Q-score < 30). Summary
statistics were obtained using the feature-table to ensure processing was successful.
Taxonomy was assigned by training a naive Bayes classifier with the feature-classifier plugin
[24], based on a 99% similarity to the V5-V6 region of the 16S rRNA gene in the SILVA 138
database to match the 784F/1061R primer pair used [27]. Mitochondria and chloroplast reads
were filtered out. Analyses were performed using Rstudio version 2022.02.2 and the phyloseq
package [28]. Metadata file, taxonomy table, phylogenetic tree and ASV table were imported
into R to create a phyloseq object. Contaminant ASVs, arising from kit reagents and sample
manipulation, were identified using the package decontam [29]. The function
'isNotContaminant' was used as it is more stringent and more adequate for low-biomass
samples. One replicate for each OI2 and OI3 were removed because of heavy contamination.
It is worth noting that bacteria belonging to the *Brachybacterium* genus accounted for more
than 90% of the contamination (Table S1), which were contaminants of the Qiagen PCR kit
previously observed [3]. For the re-analysis of previously acquired data, raw reads were
downloaded from SRA (SRP150755 for X7, and SRP187380 for OI2 and OI3). Data was re-
analyzed as described above. Plots were generated using GraphdPad Prism 9.

Genome amplification of LCM samples and shotgun sequencing

To reach sufficient quantities for shotgun sequencing, DNA samples obtained through LCM

were amplified as previously described [3], using a SeqPlex DNA Amplification Kit (Sigma-

Aldrich, USA), which is specifically designed for low-quantity, fragmented DNA. The same

DNA samples that were used for 16S rRNA gene metabarcoding were used and, for each

sample, 1 µL (OI2 and OI3) or 3 µL (X7) of each of the three replicates were pooled before

amplification. Only the X7 sample yielded sufficient DNA for sequencing. Samples were

then sent to the Australian Genomic Research Facility (Melbourne, Australia) for sequencing.

Library preparation was performed with an IDT xGen cfDNA & FFPE DNA Library Prep kit

(Integrated DNA Technologies, USA) and samples were sequenced on a NovaSeq 6000 S4

2×150 bp Flowcell Illumina platform.

348   Metagenomic data analysis

Quality control was performed using FastQC v0.11.9 [30]. Adapters, low-quality sequences

(phred score < 30), as well as the first and last 10 bp were trimmed using Trim Galore v0.6.2

[31]. High-quality reads were mapped against a *P. acuta* draft genome [32] using Bowtie2

v2.4.2 with default parameters [33] to remove host-related reads from the data. Mapped reads

were then removed using Samtools v1.11 [34]. Only paired-end host-removed reads were

used for metagenome assembly. Metagenome assembly was carried out using MEGAHIT

v1.2.9 [35] with a minimum contig length of 1000 bp and the following k-mers: 21, 33, 55,

77, 99. Contigs from kmer 99 were used for all downstream processing. Contig taxonomy

was assessed using CAT/BAT v5.2.3 [36], and contigs assigned to Eukarya, Archea, or Virus

were removed. Assembled contigs were binned using the binning (with metabat2, concoct

and maxbin2 tools) and bin_refinement (with >70% completeness and <10% contamination

as cut-off parameters) modules of MetaWRAP v1.3.2 [38]. Bin quality and taxonomy were

assessed using CheckM v1.2.2 [39] and GTDB-Tk v2.3.0 [40], respectively. These bins were

reassembled to further improve the contiguity and bin completeness and contamination stats

using the reassemble_bins module implemented in MetaWRAP v1.3.2. The final taxonomy of

individual contigs on a per bin level was assessed using CAT/BAT v5.2.3 [36], and any contig

belonging to a different phylum than the taxonomy assigned by GTDB-Tk was manually

removed. Bin coverage was obtained using CoverM v0.6.1

(https://github.com/wwood/CoverM) using the "genome" option. The full sequence of the

16S rRNA gene (1569 bp) was obtained using Barrnap v0.9 [41].

Pure culturing of bacteria from *Pocillopora acuta*

Using clean bone cutters, fragments between 3 and 7 cm in length were sampled from the P3

colony, rinsed in FSW, and placed in sterile zip-lock bags containing FSW. Using a water

flosser (Waterpik® Water Flosser) fitted with a clean nozzle, coral tissue was blasted off the

skeleton. The resulting slurry was collected in a sterile zip-lock bag and transferred to 50 mL

Falcon tubes. The tubes were centrifuged at $3750 \times g$ for 10 min (Allegra X-12R, Beckman

Coulter, USA) to obtain coral tissue pellets. The pellets were resuspended in 1 mL FSW and

transferred to a single 1.5 mL tube per colony and centrifuged at $5000 \times g$ for 10 min to

remove any residual mucus from the sample. The tissue pellets were resuspended in 1 ml of

FSW using a tissue lyser (Tissue-Lyser II, Qiagen, Australia) and the resuspension was

homogenized using sterile glass homogenizers for 30 s. The resulting tissue homogenates

were each serially diluted from 10^{-1} to 10^{-7} and plated in triplicates onto Marine Agar 2216

(MA, BD Difco). Following one week of incubation at 23 °C, individual bacterial colonies

were selected and streaked onto fresh MA plates. Purified bacterial isolates were obtained

after a further 2 rounds of sub-culturing onto fresh MA plates following a weekly incubation

period at 25 °C and 26 °C, respectively.

387   16S rRNA gene sequencing of cultured bacteria

Individual, pure, freshly grown bacterial colonies were suspended in 20 μL sterile Milli-Q®

water, incubated for 10 min at 95°C then used as templates in colony PCRs. PCR

amplification of the bacterial 16S rRNA gene was with primers 27F and 1492R [42]. The

PCR was performed with 20 μl Mango Mix™ (Bioline, UK), 0.25 μM of each primer and

2 μl of DNA template in a final volume of 40 μl with nuclease free water (Ambion, Thermo

Fisher Scientific Inc., TX, USA). The thermal cycling protocol was as follows: 94°C for

5 min; 30 cycles of 94°C for 1 min, 50°C for 45 s and 72°C for 90 s; and a final extension of

10 min at 72°C. Amplicons were purified and sequenced on an ABI sequencing instrument by

Macrogen (Seoul, South Korea). Trimmed high-quality read data from each isolate were used

for presumptive identification by querying the 16S rRNA gene sequences via Blastn and

compared to other 16S rRNA gene sequences obtained in this study.

400   DNA extraction and whole-genome sequencing

401   The P3-11-1 isolate was selected for whole-genome sequencing. A single colony was picked

402   with an inoculation loop and DNA extraction was performed on the QIAsymphony using the

403   DSP Virus/Pathogen Mini Kit (Qiagen). Library preparation performed using Nextera XT

404   (Illumina Inc.) according to manufacturer's instructions. Whole-genome sequencing was

405   performed on NextSeq 500/550 with a 150bp PE kit.

Genome assembly, taxonomy, and annotation

Raw reads were trimmed and quality-filtered using Trimmomatic v0.36 [43]

(HEADCROP:10 LEADING:5 TRAILING:5 SLIDINGWINDOW:4:28 MINLEN:30). The

quality of raw reads before and after trimming was checked with FASTQC v0.11.9 [30].

Trimmed and quality-filtered reads were de novo assembled into contigs using SPAdes

v3.15.5 [44] with 21, 33, 55, 77 and 99 k-mers, and the option "--careful" was applied to

minimise the number of mismatches and short indels. All contigs with a length of <1000 bp

were removed using BBMap v38.96 [45]. Subsequently, the levels of completeness and

contamination of assembled genomes were assessed using CheckM v1.2.2 using the

"lineage_wf" workflow [39]. Coverage was obtained using CoverM v0.6.1

(https://github.com/wwood/CoverM) using the "genome" option.

Taxonomic assignment of all assembled genomes was carried out using GTDB-Tk v2.3.0

[40] using the "classify_wf" workflow. GTDB-Tk assigned the taxonomy of the genomes

based on 120 bacterial marker genes. Based on the GTDB-Tk alignment of the two genomes

from this study and 28 additional genomes (Table S5), a phylogenetic tree was built in IQ-

Tree v2.2.2.3 [46] using the best model Q.insect+F+R4, selected by ModelFinder wrapped in

IQ-tree [47], and 1000 ultrafast bootstrap replicates [48]. The tree was visualized in iTOL v6

[49]. *Zookishella* was chosen as an outgroup. Average Nucleotide Identities (ANI) and

Average Amino acid Identities (AAI) were calculated using a genome-based matrix calculator

[50] and plotted in R using the pheatmap package [51]. Gene prediction was performed in

Bakta v1.7.0 [52], KEGG-mapper Reconstruct [53], and InterProScan v5.55 with Pfam

domain annotations [54]. Pfam annotations were used to look for eukaryotic-like proteins

(ankyrin-repeat domains, WD40 domains, tetratricopeptide repeat) and the *dsyB* gene

(PF00891). Secondary metabolites were predicted using antiSMASH v7.0.0 [55].

The 16S rRNA gene phylogenetic tree of the Endozoicomonadaceae family was constructed

using 38 published, full-length 16S rRNA gene sequences from the Endozoicomonadaceae

family. The full-length 16S rRNA gene (1572 bp) obtained from the P3-11-1 assembly was

used for the phylogenetic tree construction. A MAFFT alignment was created using Geneious

Prime v2019.1.3. The full alignment was stripped of columns containing 99% or more gaps.

This alignment was used to generate a maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree with 1000

ultrafast bootstraps using IQ-Tree v2.2.2.3 [46] with the best model TIM3+F+I+G4, selected

by ModelFinder wrapped in IQ-tree [47]. Sequences belonging to the *Zookishella* genus were

chosen as an outgroup.

References

1. Bourne DG, Morrow KM, Webster NS. Insights into the coral microbiome: Underpinning the

health and resilience of reef ecosystems. *Annual Review of Microbiology* 2016; **70**: 317–340.

2. Maire J, Blackall LL, van Oppen MJH. Intracellular Bacterial Symbionts in Corals: Challenges and

Future Directions. *Microorganisms* 2021; **9**: 2209.

3. Maire J, Tandon K, Collingro A, van de Meene A, Damjanovic K, Gotze CR, et al. Colocalization

and potential interactions of Endozoicomonas and chlamydiae in microbial aggregates of the

coral Pocillopora acuta. *Science Advances* 2023; **9**: eadg0773.

4. Wada N, Hsu M-T, Tandon K, Hsiao SS-Y, Chen H-J, Chen Y-H, et al. High-resolution spatial and

genomic characterization of coral-associated microbial aggregates in the coral Stylophora

pistillata. *Science Advances* 2022; **8**: eabo2431.

5. Work T, Aeby G. Microbial aggregates within tissues infect a diversity of corals throughout the

Indo-Pacific. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 2014; **500**: 1–9.

6. Damjanovic K, Menéndez P, Blackall LL, van Oppen MJH. Mixed-mode bacterial transmission in

the common brooding coral Pocillopora acuta. *Environmental Microbiology* 2020; **22**: 397–412.

7.   Neave MJ, Apprill A, Ferrier-Pagès C, Voolstra CR. Diversity and function of prevalent symbiotic

marine bacteria in the genus Endozoicomonas. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* 2016;

100: 8315–8324.

8.   Tandon K, Lu C-Y, Chiang P-W, Wada N, Yang S-H, Chan Y-F, et al. Comparative genomics:

Dominant coral-bacterium Endozoicomonas acroporae metabolizes dimethylsulfoniopropionate

(DMSP). *The ISME Journal* 2020; **14**: 1290–1303.

9.   Pogoreutz C, Oakley CA, Rädecker N, Cárdenas A, Perna G, Xiang N, et al. Coral holobiont cues

prime Endozoicomonas for a symbiotic lifestyle. *The ISME Journal 2022* 2022; 1–13.

10.   Hochart C, Paoli L, Ruscheweyh H-J, Salazar G, Boissin E, Romac S, et al. Ecology of

Endozoicomonadaceae in three coral genera across the Pacific Ocean. *Nat Commun* 2023; **14**:

3037.

11.   Smith HA, Moya A, Cantin NE, van Oppen MJH, Torda G. Observations of Simultaneous Sperm

Release and Larval Planulation Suggest Reproductive Assurance in the Coral Pocillopora acuta.

Frontiers in Marine Science 2019; **6**: 362.

12.   Epstein HE, Torda G, van Oppen MJH. Relative stability of the Pocillopora acuta microbiome

throughout a thermal stress event. *Coral Reefs* 2019; **38**: 373.

13.   Sharp KH, Distel D, Paul VJ. Diversity and dynamics of bacterial communities in early life stages

of the Caribbean coral Porites astreoides. *The ISME journal* 2012; **6**: 790–801.

14.   Ceh J, van Keulen M, Bourne DG. Intergenerational transfer of specific bacteria in corals and

possible implications for offspring fitness. *Microb Ecol* 2013; **65**: 227–231.

15.   Li J, Zou Y, Yang J, Li Q, Bourne DG, Sweet M, et al. Cultured Bacteria Provide Insight into the

Functional Potential of the Coral-Associated Microbiome. *mSystems* 2022; **7**: e00327-22.

16.   Neave MJ, Michell CT, Apprill A, Voolstra CR. Endozoicomonas genomes reveal functional

adaptation and plasticity in bacterial strains symbiotically associated with diverse marine hosts.

Scientific Reports 2017; **7**: 1–12.

17. Szabó M, Larkum AWD, Vass I. A Review: The role of reactive oxygen species in mass coral

bleaching. *Advances in Photosynthesis and Respiration*. 2020. Springer, pp 459–488.

18. Curson ARJ, Liu J, Bermejo Martínez A, Green RT, Chan Y, Carrión O, et al.

Dimethylsulfoniopropionate biosynthesis in marine bacteria and identification of the key gene

in this process. *Nature Microbiology* 2017; **2**: 17009.

19. Doering T, Maire J, Oppen MJH van, Blackall LL. Advancing coral microbiome manipulation to

build long-term climate resilience. *Microbiol Aust* 2023; **44**: 36–40.

20. Maire J, van Oppen MJH. A role for bacterial experimental evolution in coral bleaching

mitigation? *Trends in Microbiology* 2022; **30**: 217–228.

21. Hedlund BP, Chuvochina M, Hugenholtz P, Konstantinidis KT, Murray AE, Palmer M, et al.

SeqCode: a nomenclatural code for prokaryotes described from sequence data. *Nat Microbiol*

2022; **7**: 1702–1708.

22. Bayer T, Neave MJ, Alsheikh-Hussain A, Aranda M, Yum LK, Mincer T, et al. The microbiome of

the red sea coral stylophora pistillata is dominated by tissue-associated endozoicomonas

bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 2013; **79**: 4759–4762.

23. Maire J, Blackall LL, van Oppen MJH. Microbiome characterization of defensive tissues in the

model anemone Exaiptasia diaphana. *BMC Microbiology* 2021; **21**: 152.

24. Bolyen E, Rideout JR, Dillon MR, Bokulich NA, Abnet CC, Al-Ghalith GA, et al. Reproducible,

interactive, scalable and extensible microbiome data science using QIIME 2. *Nature*

Biotechnology 2019; **37**: 852–857.

25. Martin M. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.

EMBnet.journal 2011; **17**: 10.

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

sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nature Methods* 2016; **13**: 581–583.

27. Bokulich NA, Kaehler BD, Rideout JR, Dillon M, Bolyen E, Knight R, et al. Optimizing taxonomic

classification of marker-gene amplicon sequences with QIIME 2's q2-feature-classifier plugin.

Microbiome 2018; **6**: 90.

28. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. phyloseq: An R package for reproducible interactive analysis and

graphics of microbiome census data. *PLoS ONE* 2013; **8**: e61217.

29. Davis NM, Proctor DiM, Holmes SP, Relman DA, Callahan BJ. Simple statistical identification and

removal of contaminant sequences in marker-gene and metagenomics data. *Microbiome* 2018;

6: 226.

30. Andrews S. FASTQC. A quality control tool for high throughput sequence data.

https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/. Accessed 17 Oct 2022.

31. Krueger F, James F, Ewels P, Afyounian E, Weinstein M, Schuster-Boeckler B, et al. TrimGalore:

v0.6.10 - add default decompression path. 2023. Zenodo.

32. Vidal-Dupiol J, Chaparro C, Pratlong M, Pontarotti P, Grunau C, Mitta G. Sequencing, de novo

assembly and annotation of the genome of the scleractinian coral, Pocillopora acuta. *bioRxiv*

2020; 698688.

33. Langmead B, Salzberg SL. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nature methods* 2012; **9**:

357–9.

34. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The Sequence Alignment/Map

format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* 2009; **25**: 2078–2079.

35. Li D, Liu CM, Luo R, Sadakane K, Lam TW. MEGAHIT: an ultra-fast single-node solution for large

and complex metagenomics assembly via succinct de Bruijn graph. *Bioinformatics (Oxford,*

England) 2015; **31**: 1674–1676.

36. Von Meijenfeldt FAB, Arkhipova K, Cambuy DD, Coutinho FH, Dutilh BE. Robust taxonomic

classification of uncharted microbial sequences and bins with CAT and BAT. *Genome Biology*

2019; **20**: 1–14.

37.   Gurevich A, Saveliev V, Vyahhi N, Tesler G. QUAST: Quality assessment tool for genome

assemblies. *Bioinformatics* 2013; **29**: 1072–1075.

38.   Uritskiy GV, Diruggiero J, Taylor J. MetaWRAP - A flexible pipeline for genome-resolved

metagenomic data analysis. *Microbiome* 2018; **6**: 158.

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

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

2015; **25**: 1043–1055.

40.   Chaumeil PA, Mussig AJ, Hugenholtz P, Parks DH. GTDB-Tk: a toolkit to classify genomes with

the Genome Taxonomy Database. *Bioinformatics* 2020; **36**: 1925–1927.

41.   Seemann T. barrnap 0.9: rapid ribosomal RNA prediction.

https://github.com/tseemann/barrnap. .

42.   Lane D. 16S/23S rRNA sequencing. In: Stackebrandt E, Goodfellow M (eds). *Nucleic Acid*

techniques in bacterial systematics. 1991. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp 115–47.

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

Bioinformatics (Oxford, England) 2014; **30**: 2114–2120.

44.   Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, Gurevich AA, Dvorkin M, Kulikov AS, et al. SPAdes: a new

genome assembly algorithm and its applications to single-cell sequencing. *J Comput Biol* 2012;

19: 455–477.

45.   Bushnell B, Rood J, Singer E. BBMerge – Accurate paired shotgun read merging via overlap.

PLOS ONE 2017; **12**: e0185056.

46.   Minh BQ, Schmidt HA, Chernomor O, Schrempf D, Woodhams MD, Von Haeseler A, et al. IQ-

TREE 2: New Models and Efficient Methods for Phylogenetic Inference in the Genomic Era.

Molecular Biology and Evolution 2020; **37**: 1530–1534.

47.   Kalyaanamoorthy S, Minh BQ, Wong TKF, von Haeseler A, Jermiin LS. ModelFinder: fast model

selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nat Methods* 2017; **14**: 587–589.

48.   Hoang DT, Chernomor O, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ, Vinh LS. UFBoot2: Improving the Ultrafast

556   Bootstrap Approximation. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 2018; **35**: 518–522.

557   49.   Letunic I, Bork P. Interactive Tree Of Life (iTOL) v5: an online tool for phylogenetic tree display

558   and annotation. *Nucleic Acids Research* 2021; **49**: W293–W296.

559   50.   Rodriguez-R LM, Konstantinidis KT. The enveomics collection: a toolbox for specialized analyses

560   of microbial genomes and metagenomes. 2016.

561   51.   Kolde R. Pheatmap: pretty heatmaps. 2017.

562   52.   Schwengers O, Jelonek L, Dieckmann MA, Beyvers S, Blom J, Goesmann A. Bakta: rapid and

563   standardized annotation of bacterial genomes via alignment-free sequence identification.

564   *Microb Genom* 2021; **7**: 000685.

565   53.   Kanehisa M, Sato Y. KEGG Mapper for inferring cellular functions from protein sequences.

566   *Protein Sci* 2020; **29**: 28–35.

567   54.   Jones P, Binns D, Chang HY, Fraser M, Li W, McAnulla C, et al. InterProScan 5: genome-scale

568   protein function classification. *Bioinformatics* 2014; **30**: 1236–1240.

569   55.   Blin K, Shaw S, Augustijn HE, Reitz ZL, Biermann F, Alanjary M, et al. antiSMASH 7.0: new and

570   improved predictions for detection, regulation, chemical structures and visualisation. *Nucleic*

571   *Acids Research* 2023; **51**: W46–W50.