Overlapping soil and gut microbiome compound processing potential in a gradient of

ecosystem quality and subjects with type 2 diabetes

Craig Liddicoat[a],* and Martin F. Breed[a]

[a]College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, Bedford Park, South Australia, Australia

Corresponding author: Craig Liddicoat; craig.liddicoat@flinders.edu.au

ORCIDs: CL: 0000-0002-4812-7524, MFB: 0000-0001-7810-9696

Competing Interest Statement: The authors declare no competing interest.

Keywords: Healthy microbiome, type 2 diabetes, metagenomics, compound processing potential, soil

ecology, human health

Abstract

Background: Type 2 diabetes (T2D) is a complex metabolic disease with uncertain pathogenesis,
including recognized influences from gut microbiome-host interactions and environmental factors.
Meanwhile, soil microbiomes are known to shift in their composition and functional capacities with
ecosystem condition, and represent an important environmental source for priming and resupplying the
human gut microbiome.

Objectives: We sought to examine overlapping functional capacities in model case study microbial
metagenomes from a gradient of soil ecosystem quality (disturbed to mature/natural sites under forest
ecosystem restoration) and gut microbiomes in T2D versus normal health, to investigate plausible
conceptual links (via ambient environmental exposures) between ecosystem degradation, soil
microbiome disturbance and metabolic anomalies encoded in T2D gut metagenomes.

Methods: We used a novel method to translate metagenome functional capacities (i.e., function
potential relative abundances %) to compound processing potential (CPP, %), reflecting potential
metabolism at the scale of individual compounds. Soil ecosystem and T2D case study datasets were
compared in terms of their potential metabolism for key metabolic compounds, via compound-wide
trend analysis and community-wide function and CPP composition analyses.

Results: Potential metabolism of several important groups of compounds in soils and T2D (e.g.,
sugars, starches, proteins involved in fatty acid biosynthesis, aromatics involved in energy regulation)
correlated strongly with soil disturbance and with T2D. Based on our findings, we derived a
preliminary gut microbiome index for T2D status informed by consistent CPP trends found in both
disturbed soils and T2D gut samples that was capable of discriminating T2D from normal healthy
subjects (Wilcox-Mann-Whitney W = 1001, P = <0.001).

Discussion: Our findings support the profound new hypothesis that soil microbiome exposures from
disturbed ecosystems, together with starch-rich diets, may bias the functional capacity profile of the

42   human gut microbiome in T2D. Our hypothesis, that ecosystem degradation and exposure to associated

43   disturbed soils contribute to T2D gut microbiomes which have (1) excessive potential to metabolise

44   compounds involved in energy harvesting, and (2) deficient potential to metabolise compounds

45   involved in energy management (e.g., storage, regulation), warrants further investigation.

Introduction

Environment and lifestyle exposures under the megatrends of rising urbanization and reducing nature

contact are associated with an array of non-communicable diseases including many with suspected

microbiome-mediated links (Flandroy et al. 2018; Flies et al. 2019; Frumkin et al. 2017; Sonnenburg

and Sonnenburg 2019). Among these, type 2 diabetes (T2D) is a major chronic multifaceted metabolic

disease with uncertain pathogenesis, characterized by insulin resistance, loss of insulin secretion, high

blood sugar levels and wider metabolic dysregulation (Beulens et al. 2022; Gonzalez et al. 2018; Lu et

al. 2024; Pearson 2019; Taylor 2024). A growing evidence base supports the influence of gut

microbiomes in human metabolic health and dysfunction, however there is a pressing need to better

understand the contribution of microbiomes in T2D (Cunningham et al. 2021; Gurung et al. 2020) due

to their potential mediating influence via diet, lifestyle and environmental factors. In particular, the

contribution of environmental microbiomes in a period of rapid global change (IPBES 2018), to the

maintenance of human metabolic health remains understudied (Flandroy et al. 2018). T2D is a major

contributor to the global non-communicable disease pandemic (Cheema et al. 2014). In 2021, T2D

affected ~96% of the total 529 million people (6.1% prevalence) with all forms of diabetes globally

(Ong et al. 2023). By 2050, more than 1.31 billion people are projected to have diabetes, with

prevalence rates expected to exceed 10% in 89 countries (Ong et al. 2023). The global cost of diabetes

was estimated at US$ 966 billion in 2021, and is projected to rise to US $1.05 trillion by 2045 (Sun et

al. 2022).

The human gut microbiome is directly involved in our metabolism, shaping the biochemical

profile of diet via an extensive metabolic repertoire that is distinct yet complementary to mammalian

digestive enzymes (Rowland et al. 2018). The gut microbiome and metabolites derived from digesting

host diet help to shape our physiological responses and energy regulation through modulation of

appetite, energy harvest, modulation of gene expression, gut motility, and forms of dietary energy

conversion and storage (Krajmalnik-Brown et al. 2012). Specifically in T2D, shifts in gut microbiome

community composition and function have been identified compared to normal healthy subjects, which

are in part alleviated by treatment with the antidiabetic drug metformin (Forslund et al. 2015). Gut

microbiome structures shift profoundly with long-term changes in diet (Gilbert et al. 2018). Such

remodelling of our metabolic machinery also occurs through diet and microbiome changes that modify

the expression and operation of intestinal enteroendocrine cells (EECs) responsible for sensing and

responding to nutrients (e.g., shifting from serotonin to peptide producing EECs, or microbiome-

dependent silencing of EECs; Aliluev et al. 2021; Ye et al. 2019). These are two-way interactions, as

loss of EECs and their secreted hormones also changes microbiome structures (Blot et al. 2023).

In contrast to the small scale activity of gut microbes and intestinal EECs, numerous

assessments attribute the majority of T2D burden to modifiable and environmental risk factors

(Beulens et al. 2022). The external exposome of possible contributors to T2D risk extends well beyond

lifestyle and dietary behaviors to include the built, natural, social, and physicochemical environments

(Beulens et al. 2022). Among this exposome, strong evidence links T2D to urbanization. In a country-

scale global ecological analysis, Gassasse et al. (2017) found urban concentration to be strongly

positively associated with T2D prevalence, while country-level sugar consumption was not directly

identified as a determinant. In rapidly modernizing China, Attard et al. (2012) found twofold higher

T2D prevalence in urban versus rural areas. In southern Asia, T2D prevalence in urban areas was more

than double the rate of rural areas in over 55 year olds (Cheema et al. 2014). In Peru, urban dwellers

had 4.3-fold higher risk for developing T2D compared to rural dwellers, while rural-to-urban migrants

with at least 30 years of urban exposure also had 2.7-fold higher risk (Ruiz-Alejos et al. 2018).

Microbiomes represent a key potential linkage mechanism between environmental exposures

consistent with T2D risk and metabolic processes occurring in the human gut. Gut microbiomes are

predominantly shaped by environments, not host genetics (Rothschild et al. 2018). In particular, soils

represent a rich source of environmental microbial exposures, providing home to ~59% of species on

Earth (Anthony et al. 2023). The gut is dominated by spore-forming bacteria capable of surviving and

dispersing through aerobic environments before re-establishing in suitable oxygen-deprived habitats

(Browne et al. 2016). Exposure to naturally biodiverse soil microbiomes shape and supplement gut

microbiome composition and functional capacity particularly from a young age (Liu et al. 2021;

Roslund et al. 2021; Zhou et al. 2024). Airborne microbial communities are also shaped by

environments (e.g., land use, green space, soils) (Mhuireach et al. 2016; Robinson et al. 2021) and can

at least partially transfer to the gut (Liddicoat et al. 2020). Consequently, soil microbes may be

introduced to the gut environment through direct soil contact, food-borne and airborne (dust)

microbiomes. Moreover, growing knowledge suggests that soil microbiome composition and functional

capacity may shift in generalizable ways with ecosystem quality, with potential to impact human health

(Delgado-Baquerizo et al. 2021; Liddicoat et al. 2022; Liddicoat et al. 2024). Therefore, as human

populations increasingly urbanize, unchecked processes of soil microbiome degradation in cities and

peri-urban landscapes will have increasing potential to negatively impact human health (Sun et al.

2023). Exploring overlaps in the functional capacities of (1) naturally biodiverse versus degraded soil

microbiomes (linked to aboveground disturbed versus intact ecosystem condition) and (2) normal

healthy versus T2D gut microbiomes may reveal previously unappreciated microbiome linkages

between environments and T2D.

Despite their importance, the measurement and definition of "healthy microbiomes" remain

uncertain (Van Hul et al. 2024). Community-scale microbial metabolism, where bioenergetic

machinery and resources (including metabolites and electron transfer) are shared in the extracellular

space (Daisley et al. 2021) adds complexity and means that multiple taxa may often combine to

perform functional roles of interest. The need for improved insight into the contributions of

microbiomes in health and disease, and spanning ecosystems to humans, has motivated efforts to

analyze soil and gut metagenomes through the lens of their *compound processing potential* (CPP)

(Liddicoat et al. 2024; Figure S1). A compound-oriented approach to the analysis of functional roles of

microbiomes carries promise because we typically possess richer knowledge of bioenergetic and health

associations with chemical compounds (e.g., microbial substrates, feedstocks and metabolites such as

carbohydrates, lipids, proteins, amino-sugars, vitamins, phytochemicals and pharmaceuticals)

compared to tens of thousands of poorly characterized taxa. New insights into differential compound

processing by microbiomes may also point to mechanistic hypotheses and/or possible therapeutic

targets. Microbial metagenomes (entire collective DNA) are used to examine functions, however

existing approaches require specialized knowledge of complex biochemical pathways and do not

provide resolution at the deeper fundamental level of the chemical compounds involved. Existing

metabolite prediction frameworks are also unsuited to highly biodiverse and varying environments such

as soils (Liddicoat et al. 2024).

The goal of this study was to explore and compare model case study soil and gut metagenome

datasets from a gradient of ecosystem quality and in subjects with T2D versus normal health through

quantifying their genomic potential to metabolize an array of chemical compounds. Specifically, the

aims were to improve functional and metabolic insights to the role of microbiomes in ecosystems and

T2D, and their potential overlaps, through identifying: (1) compounds with differential potential

metabolism (i.e., with trending CPP) based on analysis of soil metagenomes across an ecosystem

disturbance-quality gradient; (2) compounds with differential potential metabolism (based on CPP

values) from gut metagenomes in health versus untreated T2D; and (3) overlapping compounds and

biochemical/functional pathways between (1) and (2) that may reveal new insights to potential

environmental microbiome contributions to T2D.

Methods

Case study data

We examined two model case study datasets (Table 1) comprising previously published (1) soil

metagenomes from degraded post-mining to reforested and unmined natural reference sites (Sun and

Badgley 2019), and (2) gut metagenomes from subjects with T2D and normal healthy controls

(Forslund et al. 2015).

Table 1. Description of case study metagenome datasets.

Case study focus	Main comparison groups (and sample/subject numbers)	Metagenome functional profile characteristics (sample mean ± s.d.)	Source data reference	Study nation of origin
Soil				
Post-mining forest ecosystem restoration	Soil samples spanned revegetation ages of 6, 12, 22, 31 years, and unmined (UM) samples (treated as ordinal variables). Comprising five age-based groups, each with three replicates. Total n = 15	Functions from SUPER-FOCUS profiling: n = 30,125 (20,328 ± 767). Functional % all sum to 100%. Compounds from CPP profiling: n = 8,370 (7,777 ± 92). CPP (%): (67 ± 0.4 %)	MG-RAST project mgp16379 (Sun and Badgley 2019)	United States
Human gut				
Type 2 diabetes (T2D) vs. Normal	T2D with no metformin treatment (T2D met-, n = 33), vs. normal healthy (n = 43). Subjects are females only. Ages: 69-72 years	Functions from SUPER-FOCUS profiling: n = 17,962 (7861 ± 1699). Functional % all sum to 100%. Compounds from CPP profiling: n = 7,031 (5,292 ± 584). CPP (%): (70.5 ± 2.9 %)	SRA accession PRJEB1786 (Forslund et al. 2015; Karlsson et al. 2013)[a]	Sweden

151 Note: [a]Forslund et al. (2015) applied metformin treatment data in a reanalysis of metagenome data

152 from Karlsson et al. (2013). A subset of the Swedish cohort is analyzed here, excluding subjects that

153 were treated with metformin or diagnosed with impaired glucose tolerance (prediabetes).

Metagenome functional profiling via compound processing potential (CPP)

CPP measures were derived following steps outlined in Figure 1. Initially, following Liddicoat et al.

(2024), raw metagenomic sequences were accessed, trimmed for quality control, then classified to

SEED subsystem (Overbeek et al. 2013) functional annotations and relative abundances using SUPER-

FOCUS software (Silva et al. 2015). Every SUPER-FOCUS function (output row) was translated to

one or more corresponding chemical reaction(s) using a purpose-built R- script algorithm based on

ModelSEED database lookup tables (from https://github.com/ModelSEED/ModelSEEDDatabase;

accessed 10 Aug 2022). Linking of functions to chemical reactions was based on either: full matching

of functional hierarchies (using subsystem-class, -subclass, -name and -role); detection of EC number;

or matching of SUPER- FOCUS function name within ModelSEED lookup tables for reactions

(reaction name or alias), subsystems (role), or reaction-pathways (external reaction name). Reactions

were then linked to corresponding compounds using ModelSEED database tables ('reactions.tsv',

'compounds.tsv'). Advancing from the previous method used in Liddicoat et al. (2024), here we

derived CPP measures at the resolution of individual compounds (all software parameters and

supporting R code for CPP calculations are available at: https://github.com/liddic/cpp3d):

    a. Function level relative abundances (%) from SUPER-FOCUS were allocated to compounds by

        dividing values equally across all sub-functions and reactions, and dividing again across all

        corresponding compounds, with weightings to account for stoichiometric coefficients for each

        compound within each reaction, with equal consideration to reactant and product compounds.

    b. Relative abundances (%) for respective unique compounds (which may arise across multiple

        reactions and functions/pathways) were then collated and summed to provide a summary CPP

        relative abundance (%) value at the individual compound level.

177   c.   To assist further mapping visualization of CPP patterns for carbon-containing compounds,

178   elemental ratios of O:C, H:C, and N:C were calculated. Such chemical mapping frameworks

179   have been used previously to display and interpret groupings of energetically and chemically

180   similar compounds (Liddicoat et al. 2024; Rivas-Ubach et al. 2018).

Figure 1. Overview of the CPP analysis workflow used to translate microbial metagenome functional

potential relative abundances to quantify potential metabolism at the level of individual compounds.

Statistical Analysis

Three strategies were used to analyze microbiome CPP profiles across the soil ecosystem and T2D gut

samples (further detail is in Supplemental Material and at https://github.com/liddic/cpp3d):

189   a.   ***Selected compounds*** were chosen due to their relevance to soil and/or gut health (e.g., Daisley

190   et al. 2021; Jardon et al. 2022; Six et al. 2006; compounds and reference information are listed

191   in Table S1). CPP trends with soil disturbance were evaluated using ordinal (Kendall tau) rank

192   correlation tests. CPP trends (i.e., differences) with T2D versus normal health were evaluated

193   using Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests.

194  b. ***Compound-wide association tests*** were also performed spanning all compounds represented in

195    the respective CPP datasets, using the same trend evaluation methods as in a. In soils,

196    compounds that did not have relative abundance data for at least a quarter of the total sample

197    number were excluded due to low data (while permitting detection of effects at either extreme

198    of the most disturbed or natural/unmined states). In soils, strong trends were discovered and

199    only significant results based on adjusted P-values were considered further (after applying

200    Benjamini and Hochberg false discovery rate correction). In the separate compound-wide

201    analysis of T2D gut samples, compounds were only included if at least one or other of the T2D

202    or normal groups contained at least 50% non-zero CPP values. The T2D Wilcoxon-Mann-

203    Whitney test results yielded many P-values < 0.05, however none were strong enough to

204    withstand Benjamini and Hochberg P-adjustment for multiple testing, therefore P-adjustment

205    was not performed in the compound-wide T2D gut data to retain the most interesting results.

206    Next, compounds with trends in soils and T2D gut microbiomes, and overlaps between the two,

207    were 'mapped' using their chemical formula elemental ratios of O:C, H:C, and N:C. From this

208    mapping space, prominent clusters of consistently trending compounds were identified and

209    further analysed to interpret their possible metabolic importance.

210  c. ***Beta diversity ordinations*** were performed to examine community-scale compositional patterns

211    and differences between sample groups and analysis approaches – comparing conventional

212    functional potential (%) data (termed 'functions') versus CPP (%) data. This analysis used

213    principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) ordinations based on Bray-Curtis distances, and testing for

214    differences between groups via permutational analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) and beta

215    dispersion testing for homogeneity of groupings using the vegan R package (Oksanen et al.

216    2020).

Results

Selected compounds with shared trends for potential metabolism in disturbed soils and T2D

Analysis of CPP trends for selected compounds (Table 1; Figures S2-S34) found that potential

metabolism for the sugars: fructose, sucrose, and arabinose increased with both soil disturbance (all $P <$

0.001) and in T2D (Figure 2). CPP values for ammonia also increased in T2D and showed marginal

increase ($P < 0.1$) in disturbed soils (Figure S5). Conversely, CPP values indicating potential

metabolism of lignin and trimethylamine N-oxide (TMAO) decreased with both soil disturbance and in

T2D (Figure 3). Trimethylamine (TMA) potential metabolism also decreased in disturbed soils and

showed marginal decrease ($P < 0.1$) in T2D (Figure S26).

Selected compounds with increasing CPP trends in soils only

Glucose, galactose, xylose, mannose (sugars), glucosamine (amino sugar), chitin (polysaccharide),

arabinoxylan (hemicellulose) and hydrogen sulfide – all displayed increased potential metabolism with

soil disturbance (Figures S6-S13). The potential metabolism trends for glucose, xylose, and chitin in

disturbed soils were all strong ($P < 0.001$).

Selected compounds with decreasing CPP trends in soils only

Glycogen (polysaccharide), acetate, propionate, butyrate (short chain fatty acids), methane and carbon

dioxide – all displayed decreased potential metabolism with soil disturbance (Figures S18-S23). The

strongest trends were shown in carbon dioxide (Kendall tau = 0.84, $P < 0.001$) and acetate (Kendall tau

= 0.72, $P < 0.001$).

Figure 2. Potential metabolism of sucrose, D-fructose and L-arabinose compounds displayed increases

with soil disturbance (younger revegetation age) and in T2D gut samples.

Figure 3. Potential metabolism of lignin and trimethylamine N-oxide (TMAO) decreased in more

disturbed soils (younger revegetation age) and in T2D.

Selected compounds with increasing CPP trends in T2D gut only

Xyloglucan (hemicellulose), starch, and starch components amylopectin and amylose displayed

increased potential metabolism in T2D gut samples (Figures S14-S17)

Selected compounds with decreasing CPP trends in T2D gut only

Potential metabolism for pectin (polysaccharide) and muramic acid (amino sugar acid) were reduced in

T2D gut samples (Figures S27-S28).

Compound-wide CPP patterns and overlaps with soil disturbance and T2D gut microbiomes

Ordinal correlation trends were assessed across 8370 compounds in the soil ecosystem restoration dataset. After false discovery rate correction for multiple testing, 2122 compounds displayed significant trends (n = 757 increasing and n = 1365 decreasing with restoration age). From these, the carbon-containing compounds (total n = 1975, n = 720 increasing and n = 1255 decreasing with restoration age) were isolated and mapped using their O:C, H:C and N:C elemental ratios to enhance visualization and interpretation of energetically and chemically similar compounds that shift together (Figure 4). Example CPP % data for a single sample plotted in this manner are shown in Figure S35.

Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney testing of differences in CPP values in T2D versus normal subjects revealed 1243 compounds with $P < 0.05$ (n = 328 increasing and n = 915 decreasing with T2D). From these, the carbon-containing compounds were isolated and visualized based on their O:C, H:C and N:C elemental ratios (Figure 5; total n = 1158, n = 294 increasing and n = 864 decreasing with T2D).

Examination of overlapping compounds with trends in both T2D and in soils under gradients of ecosystem condition, from the analyses above, revealed a total of n = 276 compounds (n = 70 were 'decreasing in T2D (reduced exposure in disturbed ecosystems)', n = 58 were 'increasing in T2D (increased exposure in disturbed ecosystems)', n = 98 were 'decreasing in T2D (reduced exposure in quality ecosystems)' , n= 50 were 'increasing in T2D (increased exposure in quality ecosystems)'). From these, the carbon-containing compounds were isolated and visualized based on their O:C, H:C and N:C elemental ratios (Figure 6; total n = 260, n = 66 were 'decreasing in T2D (reduced exposure in disturbed ecosystems)', n = 52 were 'increasing in T2D (increased exposure in disturbed ecosystems)', n = 93 were 'decreasing in T2D (reduced exposure in quality ecosystems)' , n= 49 were 'increasing in T2D (increased exposure in quality ecosystems)').

Figure 4. Compound-wide trend analysis results derived from soil metagenomes (described in Table 1)

showing carbon-containing compounds with increasing (aqua, n = 720) or decreasing (red, n = 1255)

compound processing potential (CPP, i.e., functional capacity % or potential metabolism at individual

compound scale) with revegetation age. Each point represents a carbon-containing compound, mapped

via its chemical formula O:C, H:C and N:C elemental ratios. Only compounds that have trending

potential metabolism (i.e., shifting CPP % values) from disturbed to mature/natural ecosystem quality

are displayed. Clusters of points indicate energetically and chemically similar compounds. The O:C by

H:C panels are zoomed in from their full extent to improve visualization of more data-rich regions. N:C

ratios are calculated as continuous numeric values but displayed as three depth-slices of varying

thickness to represent the third dimension. Rectangular zones denoting compound classes are provided

as a visual guide only (adapted from Rivas-Ubach et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2018).

Figure 5. Compound-wide trend analysis results derived from T2D and normal gut metagenomes (described in Table 1) showing carbon-containing compounds with increasing (aqua, n = 328) or decreasing (red, n = 864) compound processing potential (CPP) in T2D. Further description of the plot format is provided in Figure 4.

Figure 6. Overlap analysis showing carbon-containing compounds with trending potential metabolism

(i.e., shifting CPP or functional capacity % at individual compound scale) in both T2D and along a

gradient of soil-ecosystem condition, derived from overlapping compounds in Figures 4-5. Clusters of

each color represent energetically and chemically similar compounds occurring in each of the four

trend groups listed (numbers of compounds are provided in the text). Further description of the plot

format is provided in Figure 4.

Exploring compounds with consistent trends in T2D and disturbed soils

To explore overlaps in compounds that share trending CPP values in T2D and soil disturbance, we

examined three example groupings of compounds from Figure 6. In this analysis we emphasized trends

associated with more disturbed soil ecosystems (i.e., towards younger revegetation age) for the purpose

of exploring the influence of ecosystem degradation on microbiome functional capacity that may also

be relevant to T2D. With regards to our emphasis on disturbance, it should be noted that the sign of the

correlation statistics reported here will be opposite, as soil CPP trend statistics were calculated based on

increasing revegetation age. The first group ('group A', Table S2, Figure S36-37; these are the red

points arranged in two diagonal lines in the middle panel of Figure 6) comprise 35 unique acyl-carrier

proteins involved in fatty acid synthesis, which all have reduced CPP in T2D and reduced CPP in

disturbed ecosystems. When analyzed collectively by summing CPP % values for all group A proteins

we found that they collectively exhibit a strong decrease (Kendall tau = 0.741, P = <0.001) with soil

disturbance and also show substantial reduction in T2D (Wilcox-Mann-Whitney W = 513, P = 0.02).

Group A decreasing proteins all occur on two straight lines in the O:C, H:C, N:C mapping space (line

1: H:C = -0.625 × O:C + 2 and line 2: H:C = -0.375 × O:C + 2, where N:C is in the range >0 to 0.2).

Example group B comprise 6 carbohydrate compounds that all display increasing CPP in both

T2D and with soil disturbance (Table S2, Figures S38-39, compounds are L-arabinose, melibiose,

manninotriose, D-lyxulose, sucrose, D-fructose). In the O:C, H:C, N:C mapping space, these

carbohydrates all occur on the line H:C = 2*O:C, with N:C = 0 (Figure S38). Analysis of summed CPP

% values for group B sugars showed that they collectively exhibit a strong increase (Kendall tau = -

0.844, P = <0.001) with soil disturbance and substantial increase in T2D (Wilcox-Mann-Whitney W =

984, P = 0.002).

Example group C comprise 10 aromatic compounds which all have decreased CPP in T2D and

decreased CPP in disturbed ecosystems (Table S2, Figures S40-41, compound names are phenyl

acetate (PACT), 3-chlorocatechol, 3-chlorobenzyl alcohol, phenolic-donors, phenoxyl-rad-of-phenolic-

donors, sinapyl alcohol, p-coumaryl alcohol, baicalein, 6,7-dehydrobaicalein, phenylcarbinol).

Collectively, these aromatics exhibit a strong decrease (Kendall tau = 0.802, P = <0.001) with soil

disturbance and in T2D (Wilcox-Mann-Whitney W = 474, P = 0.007).

Preliminary index of T2D status informed by soil and gut microbiome CPP trends

Based on our findings, we proposed a preliminary index of T2D status informed by consistent CPP

trends in both disturbed soils and T2D gut samples, and calculated using gut microbiome CPP values

only. The index used CPP values rescaled to the range 1-100 from selected groups of compounds

representing potential metabolism associated with energy harvest (/availability) and energy

management (equation 1). The compounds used in this index calculation are detailed in the

Supplemental Material and their rationale for consideration are discussed below.

T2D Index = log10(Energy harvest / Energy management)　　　　(equation 1)

Where: Energy harvest = ($^{\#}\Sigma$ CPP$_{sugars}$ × $^{\#}\Sigma$ CPP$_{starches}$ × $^{\#}$CPP$_{ammonia}$)

Energy management = ($^{\#}\Sigma$ CPP$_{acyl\ carrier\ proteins}$ × $^{\#}\Sigma$ CPP$_{aromatics}$ × $^{\#}\Sigma$ CPP$_{fiber}$ × $^{\#}$CPP$_{TMAO}$)

$^{\#}$CPP (%) values were rescaled to 1-100 before the terms were multiplied.

All CPP values used in the T2D index calculation are from gut microbiome samples.

Both energy harvest and energy management sub-indices held significant explanatory value in their

own right (log10(Energy harvest): Wilcox-Mann-Whitney $W = 990$, $P = 0.001$; log10(1/Energy

manangement): Wilcox-Mann-Whitney $W = 970$, $P = 0.003$), however the ability to discriminate

between T2D and normal subjects improved further when these were combined (log10(Energy

harvest/Energy manangement): Wilcox-Mann-Whitney $W = 1001$, $P = <0.001$; Figure 7).

Figure 7. Preliminary T2D index values in subjects with untreated T2D and normal health, based on

potential metabolism (CPP values) associated with (a) energy harvest and energy management, (b)

energy harvest alone, and (c) energy management alone.

Community-scale profiling of metagenomic capacity using functions vs. CPP

Beta diversity ordinations (Figure 8) show that soil samples from different revegetation ages readily

separated into groups based on the community scale function and CPP compositions. PCoA ordination

axes provided greater explanation of overall compositional variation following conversion from

functions to CPP measures (PCo1 + PCo2 in functions: 49.6 + 18.8 = 68.4% vs. CPP: 61.5 + 17.9 =

79.4%) and improved the explanatory value of revegetation age as a key variable affecting

compositional shifts (PERMANOVA$_{soil\ functions}$: Df = 4, R^2 = 0.67, F = 5.08, P = 0.002; Beta

dispersion$_{soil\ functions}$: F = 0.34, P = 0.838; PERMANOVA$_{soil\ CPP}$: Df = 4, R^2 = 0.75, F = 7.87, P = 0.001;

Beta dispersion$_{soil\ CPP}$: F = 0.36, P = 0.842; Figure 1a-b). These results show that revegetation age

explained 75% of the compositional variation when using CPP measures spanning 8,370 compounds,

compared to 67% using 30,125 functions.

Figure 8. Visualisation of functional and CPP compositional differences in soils under ecosystem

restoration (a-b) and gut microbiomes in T2D versus normal (c-d), as measured using function

(/biochemical pathway) potential (a, c) and compound processing potential (b, d). Statistical

information is provided in the text and Table 1. T2D met- denotes subjects have not received

metformin treatment.

When the T2D samples were evaluated at the entire community scale, neither functions nor

CPP data were able to discriminate between T2D and normal healthy subjects (PERMANOVA$_{T2D}$

$_{functions}$: Df $= 1$, $R^2 = 0.02$, F $= 1.55$, $P = 0.136$; Beta dispersion: F $= 0.16$, $P = 0.712$; PERMANOVA$_{T2D}$

$_{\text{CPP}}$: Df = 1, R^2 = 0.02, F = 1.49, *P* = 0.174; Beta dispersion: F = 9 x 10^{-4}, *P* = 0.979). PCoA ordination

axes using CPP data increased the scope to visualize compositional variation compared to functions in

the T2D samples (PCo1 + PCo2 in functions: 28.3 + 21.4 = 49.7 % using 17,962 functions vs. CPP:

40.6 + 22.9 = 63.5 % using 7031 compounds; Figure 1c-d). While these entire community PCoA

analyses cannot discriminate between T2D and normal subjects, the increased explanatory value

demonstrated in soils provides support for the translation from functions to using CPP values,

consistent with the notion that compound-level data represent a more fundamental basis for analyses.

Discussion

In this study we found several meaningful overlapping trends in the potential metabolism of soil

microbiomes within disturbed ecosystems and gut microbiomes in T2D. These patterns may have

profound implications for potential linkages between the interlinked, widespread and increasing

processes of global change, biodiversity loss, ecosystem degradation and soil microbiome disturbance –

because soil microbiomes provide a key reservoir and source for priming and resupplying the human

gut microbiome. We found that these microbiomes in the soil and human gut, and their associated

functional / metabolic capacities shifted strongly with ecosystem quality and T2D versus health, when

measured in terms of the potential metabolism of key compounds linked to energy harvesting/

availability and energy management (discussed below).

Using a novel method we translated metagenome functional capacities (i.e., function potential

relative abundances %) to compound processing potential (%), reflecting potential metabolism at the

scale of individual compounds. This compound-oriented approach allowed us to access a wealth of

published literature that associates chemical compounds with health, biological processes and

biochemical pathways in soils and gut microbiome-mediated human health. T2D is in essence a

metabolic disease that appears to be driven by a breakdown in complex bioenergetic processes (Daisley

et al. 2021). Biochemical processes relevant in soil microbiomes and gut microbiome-host interactions,

are also expected to be shaped by bioenergetic gradients and (bio)chemical relationships, and our

mapping of compounds into the bioenergetically informed O:C, H:C and N:C coordinate space helped

to reveal apparently meaningful patterns of simultaneously trending compounds with soil ecosystem

quality and T2D versus health.

Compounds linked to energy harvesting and availability in soils and T2D

We found a number of compounds linked to energy harvesting and availability that increased in T2D,

where some also increased in disturbed soils, supporting the hypothesis that environmental microbial

exposures from disturbed ecosystems may excessively supplement and reinforce gut microbiome

functional capacities and biochemical pathways that exacerbate metabolic imbalances underlying T2D.

Potential metabolism of several sugars (see group B in Table 2) and ammonia increased in both

disturbed soils and T2D. Sugars and ammonia represent sources of energy. Venous ammonia levels

have been associated with diabetes through potential mechanisms including autonomic dysfunction,

extended gastrointestinal transit times, bacterial overgrowth and increased protein catabolism (Balcar et

al. 2023). CPP values for the group B sugars and ammonia identified through earlier trend analyses

were included into the 'energy harvest' sub-index calculation described earlier. The remaining

component used in the energy harvest sub-index comprised the sum of CPP % values for starch,

amylopectin and amylose. These compounds did not trend with soil ecosystem condition, however it is

reasonable to consider that functional capacity to process these compounds is likely to be amplified

through regular dietary choices over a sufficient period of time, perhaps even including dietary choices

within prior generations that create a degree of heritability in gut microbiomes (Sonnenburg et al.

2016).

Compounds linked to energy management in soils and T2D

We found potential metabolism for several different types of compounds with links to energy

management (e.g., energy storage via fatty acids and lipids, gut hormone secretion, appetite regulation)

that decreased in both disturbed soils and in T2D. This finding supports a second hypothesis that

exposures to disturbed soil ecosystems that are deficient in potential metabolism (CPP) of compounds

involved in energy management may supplement and shape gut microbiomes that are also deficient in

this way, thereby contributing to further metabolic imbalances found in T2D. Specifically, the

compounds of interest for energy management include acyl carrier proteins involved in fatty acid

biosynthesis (group A in Table S2), aromatics (group C in Table S2), fiber and Trimethylamine N-

oxide (TMAO), as discussed below.

The 35 acyl carrier proteins (see Supplemental Material), for which potential metabolism was

deficient in disturbed soils and T2D, were linked to three enzymes involved in fatty acid biosynthesis

(EC 5.3.3.14, EC 1.3.1.9, EC 1.3.1.10). One enzyme in particular (EC 5.3.3.14) is involved in energy

storage via forming unsaturated fatty acids such as palmitoleic acid and vaccenic acid

(https://www.genome.jp/entry/5.3.3.14). Alternatively, energy storage as the saturated fatty acid,

palmitic acid, has been linked to increasing risk of T2D through decreasing β-cell function (Taylor

2024). Higher ratios of palmitic acid to palmitoleic acid are also associated with a higher risk of

diabetes (Qureshi et al. 2019), and this ratio would likely increase if capacity to produce unsaturated

palmitoleic acid is decreased.

The aromatic compounds for which potential metabolism was deficient in disturbed soils and

T2D were involved in many functional pathways including catabolism of aromatic amine compounds,

ubiquinone biosynthesis, omega-amidase enzymatic activity, oxidative stress responses, fermentation,

and synthesis of acetone, butanol and ethanol. Ubiquinone is a redox active lipid produced across all

domains of life that functions in electron transport and oxidative phosphorylation and whose deficiency

causes human diseases (Stefely and Pagliarini 2017). Omega-amidase is an enzyme involved in L-glutamine and L-asparagine metabolism which comprise important components in the wider metabolism of mammals (Cooper et al. 2016). In particular, glutamine is believed to play an important role in stimulating regulatory gut hormones such as glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP1), to increase insulin levels and reduce blood sugar (Jafari-Vayghan et al. 2020). One of the compounds was baicalein, a dietary flavonoid which has recently been found to enhance the insulin-sensitizing effect of metformin to prevent type 2 diabetes via the regulation of lipid metabolism and gut microenvironment (Xing et al. 2024).

Dietary fiber is known to decrease plasma ghrelin (hunger hormone) and increase other key gut regulatory hormones: cholecystokinin (CCK), glucagon-like-peptide-1 (GLP-1), and peptide YY (PYY) compared to energy matched low fiber control diets (Bulsiewicz 2023). Short chain fatty acids (SCFAs) are produced when certain members of the gut microbiome ferment non-digestible fibers, and these SCFAs bind to receptors in the colon leading to the production of a range of key hormones that regulate food intake, body weight, and energy metabolism (Bulsiewicz 2023). To represent fiber we included both lignin and pectin which had been detected in the datasets and are among the recognized key types of dietary fibers (Blanco-Pérez et al. 2021). Potential metabolism (CPP values) for lignin decreased with soil disturbance and in T2D gut microbiomes. Potential metabolism for pectin also decreased in T2D, but not in disturbed soils. We also searched for oligosaccharides (e.g., fructan, inulin, galactan; Blanco-Pérez et al. 2021) but could not detect these compounds in our datasets.

Trimethylamine N-oxide (TMAO) was another compound with deficient potential metabolism in the T2D gut and disturbed soils. TMAO has reported beneficial effects including potential protection from hyperammonemia and glutamate neurotoxicity, alleviation of endoplasmic reticulum stress, and improved glucose homeostasis by stimulating insulin secretion by pancreatic cells (Hoyles et al. 2018). However, with increasing levels TMAO is also positively associated with metabolic diseases such as

T2D (Daisley et al. 2021). Such contradictory reports may align with generalizable u-shaped dose-

health response relationships (i.e., deficiency-sufficiency-toxicity) seen in many biological systems

(Calabrese et al. 2007; Figure S1). Certain key members of the gut microbiome may help to detoxify

and thereby manage levels of TMAO, via reducing it in the gut to trimethylamine (TMA) followed by

host uptake of TMA from the gut into the bloodstream, then conversion back to TMAO by host

enzymes in the liver, through a process termed metabolic retroconversion (Hoyles et al. 2018).

Limitations and future work

Our study examined separate model case study metagenome datasets and did not consider variables

associated with microbiome-host interactions. We did not test environmental exposures or microbiome

transfer from soils to the human gut (e.g., Roslund et al. 2021). Some compounds of interest were not

included in the case study datasets, or sometimes recorded using synonyms or closely chemically

related species. Alternative naming for some chemical species may have introduced minor uncertainties

in our analyses. We analyzed only a portion of the compounds present, featuring those that we pre-

selected (Table S1), and example groupings from the compound-wide trend analysis that featured

conspicuously in our mapping into the O:C, H:C, N:C bioenergetic coordinate space. However, a much

broader spectrum of ~7,000 to >8,000 compounds are potentially metabolized by the gut and soil

microbiomes considered here. Notwithstanding, our analysis provides strong support for the notion that

differences in potential metabolism of key compounds by microbiomes do contribute to T2D

(complementing previous work by Forslund et al. 2015), and we show several overlapping patterns of

this differential potential metabolism (CPP trends) in disturbed soils. Our study provides evidence

supporting the hypothetical linkage from ecosystem degradation and disturbed soil microbiomes, via

environmental exposures, to influence metabolic anomalies encoded in T2D gut metagenomes. The

widespread scale of global land degradation (causing rising loss of biodiversity, soil and ecosystem

functions, recently estimated to impact 75% of the Earth's land surface; IPBES 2018) seems to align

with the rising pandemic scale of T2D (Ong et al. 2023; Sun et al. 2022). However, further evidence of

these hypothetical links are required through controlled experimentation.

Conclusions

We found meaningful overlapping trends in the potential metabolism of key compounds involved in

energy harvesting and energy management (storage, regulation) within model case study metagenomes

from soils under disturbed ecosystems and in T2D gut microbiomes. Our results support existing

studies implicating, at least partially, a role for microbiomes in T2D. Additionally, our findings also

support the conceptual involvement of soil microbiomes from disturbed environments at least partially

contributing to the metabolic (energy harvesting and management) imbalance found in T2D. Our novel

method used to examine microbiome potential metabolism at the resolution of individual compounds

has derived new insights to potential links between soil and T2D gut health that warrant further

investigation.

Data availability

521 Code used to support this study is available from: https://github.com/liddic/cpp3d

Acknowledgments

524 We acknowledge the authors of previously published metagenomics datasets used here which enabled

525 comparison of samples spanning human and environmental health. We acknowledge First Nations

526 Peoples and traditional custodians of the lands from which the case study datasets originate. This work

527 was supported by the People, Cities and Nature research program (Aotearoa New Zealand Ministry of

528 Business, Innovation and Employment, grant UOWX2101).

References

Aliluev A, Tritschler S, Sterr M, Oppenländer L, Hinterdobler J, Greisle T, et al. 2021. Diet-induced alteration of intestinal stem cell function underlies obesity and prediabetes in mice. Nature Metabolism 3:1202-1216.

Anthony MA, Bender SF, van der Heijden MGA. 2023. Enumerating soil biodiversity. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 120:e2304663120.

Attard SM, Herring AH, Mayer-Davis EJ, Popkin BM, Meigs JB, Gordon-Larsen P. 2012. Multilevel examination of diabetes in modernising china: What elements of urbanisation are most associated with diabetes? Diabetologia 55:3182-3192.

Balcar L, Krawanja J, Scheiner B, Paternostro R, Simbrunner B, Semmler G, et al. 2023. Impact of ammonia levels on outcome in clinically stable outpatients with advanced chronic liver disease. JHEP Reports 5:100682.

Beulens JWJ, Pinho MGM, Abreu TC, den Braver NR, Lam TM, Huss A, et al. 2022. Environmental risk factors of type 2 diabetes—an exposome approach. Diabetologia 65:263-274.

Blanco-Pérez F, Steigerwald H, Schülke S, Vieths S, Toda M, Scheurer S. 2021. The dietary fiber pectin: Health benefits and potential for the treatment of allergies by modulation of gut microbiota. Current Allergy and Asthma Reports 21:43.

Blot F, Marchix J, Ejarque M, Jimenez S, Meunier A, Keime C, et al. 2023. Gut microbiota remodeling and intestinal adaptation to lipid malabsorption after enteroendocrine cell loss in adult mice. Cellular and Molecular Gastroenterology and Hepatology 15:1443-1461.

Browne HP, Forster SC, Anonye BO, Kumar N, Neville BA, Stares MD, et al. 2016. Culturing of 'unculturable' human microbiota reveals novel taxa and extensive sporulation. Nature 533:543-546.

Bulsiewicz WJ. 2023. The importance of dietary fiber for metabolic health. American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine 17:639-648.

Calabrese EJ, Bachmann KA, Bailer AJ, Bolger PM, Borak J, Cai L, et al. 2007. Biological stress response terminology: Integrating the concepts of adaptive response and preconditioning stress within a hormetic dose–response framework. Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology 222:122-128.

Cheema A, Adeloye D, Sidhu S, Sridhar D, Chan KY. 2014. Urbanization and prevalence of type 2 diabetes in southern asia: A systematic analysis. J Glob Health 4:010404.

Cooper AJL, Shurubor YI, Dorai T, Pinto JT, Isakova EP, Deryabina YI, et al. 2016. Ω-amidase: An underappreciated, but important enzyme in l-glutamine and l-asparagine metabolism; relevance to sulfur and nitrogen metabolism, tumor biology and hyperammonemic diseases. Amino Acids 48:1-20.

Cunningham AL, Stephens JW, Harris DA. 2021. Gut microbiota influence in type 2 diabetes mellitus (t2dm). Gut Pathogens 13:50.

Daisley BA, Koenig D, Engelbrecht K, Doney L, Hards K, Al KF, et al. 2021. Emerging connections between gut microbiome bioenergetics and chronic metabolic diseases. Cell Reports 37:110087.

Delgado-Baquerizo M, Eldridge DJ, Liu Y-R, Sokoya B, Wang J-T, Hu H-W, et al. 2021. Global homogenization of the structure and function in the soil microbiome of urban greenspaces. Science Advances 7:eabg5809.

Flandroy L, Poutahidis T, Berg G, Clarke G, Dao M-C, Decaestecker E, et al. 2018. The impact of human activities and lifestyles on the interlinked microbiota and health of humans and of ecosystems. Science of The Total Environment 627:1018-1038.

Flies EJ, Mavoa S, Zosky GR, Mantzioris E, Williams C, Eri R, et al. 2019. Urban-associated diseases: Candidate diseases, environmental risk factors, and a path forward. Environment International 133:105187.

Forslund K, Hildebrand F, Nielsen T, Falony G, Le Chatelier E, Sunagawa S, et al. 2015. Disentangling type 2 diabetes and metformin treatment signatures in the human gut microbiota. Nature 528:262-266.

Frumkin H, Bratman GN, Breslow SJ, Cochran B, Kahn PH, Jr., Lawler JJ, et al. 2017. Nature contact and human health: A research agenda. Environmental health perspectives 125:075001-075001.

Gassasse Z, Smith D, Finer S, Gallo V. 2017. Association between urbanisation and type 2 diabetes: An ecological study. BMJ Global Health 2:e000473.

Gilbert JA, Blaser MJ, Caporaso JG, Jansson JK, Lynch SV, Knight R. 2018. Current understanding of the human microbiome. Nature Medicine 24:392.

Gonzalez LL, Garrie K, Turner MD. 2018. Type 2 diabetes – an autoinflammatory disease driven by metabolic stress. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Molecular Basis of Disease 1864:3805-3823.

Gurung M, Li Z, You H, Rodrigues R, Jump DB, Morgun A, et al. 2020. Role of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetes pathophysiology. eBioMedicine 51.

Hoyles L, Jiménez-Pranteda ML, Chilloux J, Brial F, Myridakis A, Aranias T, et al. 2018. Metabolic retroconversion of trimethylamine n-oxide and the gut microbiota. Microbiome 6:73.

IPBES. 2018. The ipbes assessment report on land degradation and restoration. Bonn, Germany.

Jafari-Vayghan H, Varshosaz P, Hajizadeh-Sharafabad F, Razmi HR, Amirpour M, Tavakoli-Rouzbehani OM, et al. 2020. A comprehensive insight into the effect of glutamine supplementation on metabolic variables in diabetes mellitus: A systematic review. Nutrition & Metabolism 17:80.

Jardon KM, Canfora EE, Goossens GH, Blaak EE. 2022. Dietary macronutrients and the gut microbiome: A precision nutrition approach to improve cardiometabolic health. Gut 71:1214.

Karlsson FH, Tremaroli V, Nookaew I, Bergström G, Behre CJ, Fagerberg B, et al. 2013. Gut
metagenome in european women with normal, impaired and diabetic glucose control. Nature 498:99-
103.

Krajmalnik-Brown R, Ilhan Z-E, Kang D-W, DiBaise JK. 2012. Effects of gut microbes on nutrient
absorption and energy regulation. Nutrition in Clinical Practice 27:201-214.

Liddicoat C, Sydnor H, Cando-Dumancela C, Dresken R, Liu J, Gellie NJC, et al. 2020. Naturally-
diverse airborne environmental microbial exposures modulate the gut microbiome and may provide
anxiolytic benefits in mice. Science of The Total Environment 701:134684.

Liddicoat C, Krauss SL, Bissett A, Borrett RJ, Ducki LC, Peddle SD, et al. 2022. Next generation
restoration metrics: Using soil edna bacterial community data to measure trajectories towards
rehabilitation targets. Journal of Environmental Management 310:114748.

Liddicoat C, Edwards RA, Roach M, Robinson JM, Wallace KJ, Barnes AD, et al. 2024. Bioenergetic
mapping of 'healthy microbiomes' via compound processing potential imprinted in gut and soil
metagenomes. Science of The Total Environment 940:173543.

Liu W, Sun Z, Ma C, Zhang J, Ma C, Zhao Y, et al. 2021. Exposure to soil environments during earlier
life stages is distinguishable in the gut microbiome of adult mice. Gut Microbes 13:1-13.

Lu X, Xie Q, Pan X, Zhang R, Zhang X, Peng G, et al. 2024. Type 2 diabetes mellitus in adults:
Pathogenesis, prevention and therapy. Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy 9:262.

Mhuireach G, Johnson BR, Altrichter AE, Ladau J, Meadow JF, Pollard KS, et al. 2016. Urban
greenness influences airborne bacterial community composition. Science of The Total Environment
571:680-687.

Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, et al. 2020. Vegan:
Community ecology package. R package version 2.5-7.

Ong KL, Stafford LK, McLaughlin SA, Boyko EJ, Vollset SE, Smith AE, et al. 2023. Global, regional,
and national burden of diabetes from 1990 to 2021, with projections of prevalence to 2050: A
systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2021. The Lancet 402:203-234.

Overbeek R, Olson R, Pusch GD, Olsen GJ, Davis JJ, Disz T, et al. 2013. The seed and the rapid
annotation of microbial genomes using subsystems technology (rast). Nucleic Acids Research
42:D206-D214.

Pearson ER. 2019. Type 2 diabetes: A multifaceted disease. Diabetologia 62:1107-1112.

Qureshi W, Santaren ID, Hanley AJ, Watkins SM, Lorenzo C, Wagenknecht LE. 2019. Risk of
diabetes associated with fatty acids in the de novo lipogenesis pathway is independent of insulin
sensitivity and response: The insulin resistance atherosclerosis study (iras). BMJ Open Diabetes
Research & Care 7:e000691.

Rivas-Ubach A, Liu Y, Bianchi TS, Tolić N, Jansson C, Paša-Tolić L. 2018. Moving beyond the van
krevelen diagram: A new stoichiometric approach for compound classification in organisms. Analytical
Chemistry 90:6152-6160.

Robinson JM, Cando-Dumancela C, Antwis RE, Cameron R, Liddicoat C, Poudel R, et al. 2021.
Exposure to airborne bacteria depends upon vertical stratification and vegetation complexity. Scientific
Reports 11:9516.

Roslund MI, Puhakka R, Nurminen N, Oikarinen S, Siter N, Grönroos M, et al. 2021. Long-term
biodiversity intervention shapes health-associated commensal microbiota among urban day-care
children. Environment International 157:106811.

Rothschild D, Weissbrod O, Barkan E, Kurilshikov A, Korem T, Zeevi D, et al. 2018. Environment
dominates over host genetics in shaping human gut microbiota. Nature.

Rowland I, Gibson G, Heinken A, Scott K, Swann J, Thiele I, et al. 2018. Gut microbiota functions:
Metabolism of nutrients and other food components. European Journal of Nutrition 57:1-24.

Ruiz-Alejos A, Carrillo-Larco RM, Miranda JJ, Anderson CAM, Gilman RH, Smeeth L, et al. 2018.
Addressing the impact of urban exposure on the incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus: The peru migrant
study. Scientific Reports 8:5512.

Silva GGZ, Green KT, Dutilh BE, Edwards RA. 2015. Super-focus: A tool for agile functional analysis
of shotgun metagenomic data. Bioinformatics 32:354-361.

Six J, Frey SD, Thiet RK, Batten KM. 2006. Bacterial and fungal contributions to carbon sequestration
in agroecosystems. Soil Science Society of America Journal 70:555-569.

Sonnenburg ED, Smits SA, Tikhonov M, Higginbottom SK, Wingreen NS, Sonnenburg JL. 2016. Diet-
induced extinctions in the gut microbiota compound over generations. Nature 529:212-215.

Sonnenburg ED, Sonnenburg JL. 2019. The ancestral and industrialized gut microbiota and
implications for human health. Nature Reviews Microbiology 17:383-390.

Stefely JA, Pagliarini DJ. 2017. Biochemistry of mitochondrial coenzyme q biosynthesis. Trends in
Biochemical Sciences 42:824-843.

Sun H, Saeedi P, Karuranga S, Pinkepank M, Ogurtsova K, Duncan BB, et al. 2022. Idf diabetes atlas:
Global, regional and country-level diabetes prevalence estimates for 2021 and projections for 2045.
Diabetes Res Clin Pract 183:109119.

Sun S, Badgley BD. 2019. Changes in microbial functional genes within the soil metagenome during
forest ecosystem restoration. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 135:163-172.

Sun X, Liddicoat C, Tiunov A, Wang B, Zhang Y, Lu C, et al. 2023. Harnessing soil biodiversity to
promote human health in cities. npj Urban Sustainability 3:5.

Taylor R. 2024. Understanding the cause of type 2 diabetes. The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology
12:664-673.

Van Hul M, Cani PD, Petitfils C, De Vos WM, Tilg H, El-Omar EM. 2024. What defines a healthy gut
microbiome? Gut 73:1893.

Wu X, Wu L, Liu Y, Zhang P, Li Q, Zhou J, et al. 2018. Microbial interactions with dissolved organic
matter drive carbon dynamics and community succession. Frontiers in Microbiology 9.

Xing Y, Liu H, Zhang D, Jiang H, Xiu Z, Dong Y. 2024. Baicalein, a dietary flavonoid, enhances the
insulin-sensitizing effect of metformin to prevent type 2 diabetes via the regulation of lipid metabolism
and gut microenvironment. Food Frontiers 5:668-690.

Ye L, Mueller O, Bagwell J, Bagnat M, Liddle RA, Rawls JF. 2019. High fat diet induces microbiota-
dependent silencing of enteroendocrine cells. eLife 8:e48479.

Zhou G-L, Xie Y, Zhang Y-D, Wang L, Xie Y-T, Qiu H-L, et al. 2024. Exposure to greenspaces
sourced soils improves mice gut microbiota. Environmental Pollution 362:124931.