1   **Methane-fed microbial communities enriched from field-grown rice support diverse**

2   **heterotrophic bacteria**

Elena K. Perry[1], Aqib Hasnain[1], Benjamin J. Cole[2], Hans K. Carlson[1], Adam M. Deutschbauer[1],

Dawn Chiniquy[1]*

[1]Environmental Genomics and Systems Biology Division, Lawrence Berkeley National

Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA

[2]DOE Joint Genome Institute, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA

*Correspondence: dmchiniquy@lbl.gov

Abstract

Rice paddies naturally host significant populations of methanotrophs, due to the production of methane in flooded soils. However, relatively little is known about how the activity of these bacteria impacts the structure of the broader microbial community in this important agricultural environment. To address this question, we passaged 51 microbial aerobic enrichment cultures from rice rhizosphere, root, and stem samples in a chemically-defined medium with methane as sole electron donor. We profiled the cultures over time by 16S rDNA amplicon sequencing and sequenced the genomes of 34 isolates from the enrichments to gain functional insights. Notably, taxa whose relative abundance increased during community growth on methane represented more than a dozen families, many of which are not known to utilize methane or other one-carbon substrates. Despite the selective pressure imposed by the culture condition, the final community structures were taxonomically varied rather than converging to a common composition, and genomic analysis of the sequenced isolates revealed considerable variation in likely carbon source utilization repertoires. Taken together, these findings support the view that methanotrophy represents a key link in the microbial food web of rice fields, with the potential for downstream effects on the abundance and activity of a wide range of community members.

Introduction

Microbes that oxidize one-carbon compounds, such as methane and methanol, play a key role in global nutrient cycles. In particular, aerobic methanotrophs in the phylum Pseudomonadota are the most widespread functional guild contributing to microbial methane oxidation. Aerobic methanotrophs are classically divided into two major groups, Type I (Gammaproteobacteria) and Type II (Alphaproteobacteria); Type I methanotrophs use the ribulose monophosphate (RuMP) pathway for carbon assimilation into biomass, while Type II use the serine pathway. Because these bacteria can use methane as a sole carbon and energy source, they are found in a variety of environments where methane is abundant, such as wetlands, freshwater lake sediments, and landfill cover soils (1). Besides contributing to carbon cycling via methane oxidation, methanotrophs may also play an important role in the global nitrogen cycle, as many proteobacterial methanotrophs are capable of nitrogen fixation (2). Conversely, methanotrophs have also been shown to stimulate the activity of denitrifying bacteria (3, 4).

Consistent with the latter observation, it is thought that methanotrophs often interact metabolically with other members of their native microbial communities (5). Methanotrophs are notoriously difficult to isolate (6), and culturing methanotrophs in the presence of other heterotrophic bacteria frequently increases methane oxidation rates and overall biomass yields (7, 8). Such partnerships may benefit the methanotrophs by preventing the accumulation of inhibitory metabolic byproducts or providing essential vitamins (7, 9). Methanotrophs can in turn provide benefits to their neighbors. Studies using stable-isotope probing (SIP) have demonstrated that carbon derived from methane by methanotrophs in a variety of environments can end up in the biomass of diverse other organisms (10–15). Thus, methanotrophs contribute to local microbial food webs by transforming methane into other, more bioavailable carbon sources.

While the existence of metabolic exchanges between methanotrophs and other bacteria is

well-established, relatively little is known about how methanotrophs influence the microbial

communities of methane-rich wetland environments, including rice paddies (16). Recently,

methanotrophs have been shown to stimulate both nitrogen fixation and denitrification in rice

paddies, depending on the environmental conditions (12, 17), but the full range of their impact on

the rice microbiome remains unclear. Given the roles of methanotrophs in both carbon and nitrogen

cycling, an improved understanding of their ecological influence in rice paddies could have

significant implications for improving the productivity and sustainability of rice cultivation. This

issue is of global importance since rice is one of the world's most widely-consumed staple crops

(18). The most concrete evidence that specific taxa might preferentially benefit from methane-

derived carbon in rice fields has come from DNA-SIP studies on microcosms of paddy soils or

rice roots (10, 12). In these studies, the bacteria that incorporated the ^{13}C label mainly belonged to

the Alphaproteobacteria and Betaproteobacteria, although the results varied at lower taxonomic

levels. However, the sensitivity of DNA-SIP is limited and the results can be significantly affected

by experimental parameters such as incubation time (19), thus motivating the use of

complementary approaches to determine the range of microbial taxa that may profit from

methanotrophic activity in rice fields.

Here, we performed 16S rDNA gene-based profiling on methane-fed enrichment cultures,

complemented by whole-genome sequencing of strains isolated from the enrichments, to gain new

insights into how methanotrophs from rice paddies influence their native communities.

Specifically, we addressed the following questions: 1) What is the taxonomic diversity of rice-

associated bacteria that can be supported by methane-derived carbon? 2) To what extent is the

community composition of methane-fed enrichment cultures affected by external variables such

as the part of the rice plant used for the inoculum? 3) Is the impact of methanotrophs on the rice

microbiome predictable, as indicated by recurring community assembly patterns (if any) during

growth on methane as the sole exogenous carbon source? 4) What carbon sources are the most

likely drivers of non-methanotrophic growth in methane-fed, methanotroph-anchored

communities?

Results

Methane-fed enrichment cultures maintained high alpha diversity

We established 51 enrichment cultures in chemically-defined media with methane as the

sole electron donor and oxygen as the major electron acceptor, inoculated with rice rhizosphere,

root, and stem samples collected from two field locations in California, as described in Materials

and Methods. The cultures were sampled weekly over 12 weeks for 16S amplicon-based profiling

of community composition, resulting in a total of 534 sequenced samples (excluding those that

failed to meet our threshold for minimum reads; see Materials and Methods); the complete ASV

abundance table and sample metadata are available in Tables S1 and S2, respectively. At the final

time point, 16 families belonging to three phyla (Pseudomonadota, Bacteroidota, and

Verrucomicrobiota) achieved a relative abundance of >10% in at least two enrichments (Fig. 1A).

Two additional higher-level taxonomic groups, consisting of ASVs that could not be classified

beyond the order Rhizobiales or the domain Bacteria, met the same criteria for abundance and

prevalence. By far the most prominent families across the final enrichment communities, when

considering both prevalence and relative abundance, were Comamonadaceae (>10% in 33/51

enrichments, mean relative abundance 16.3%) and Methylocystaceae (>10% in 29/51 enrichments,

mean relative abundance 22.4%). Comamonadaceae does not contain any known methanotrophs,

but Methylocystaceae represents the Type II methanotrophs. Type I methanotrophs, represented

by the family Methylococcaceae, were less prevalent in the final enrichments (>10% in 4/51

enrichments).

Interestingly, while all of the final enrichment communities contained a detectable level of

at least one putative methanotroph ASV classified as Methylocystaceae or Methylococcaeae,

methanotrophs were not always the most abundant community members. Methanotrophs

represented the majority of reads in just eight out of the 51 final communities. In 16 out of the 51

enrichments (nearly 1/3) the final total methanotroph relative abundance was <10%, and the lowest

final total methanotroph relative abundance was just 0.2%. Inspecting the relative abundances of

putative methanotroph ASVs over time revealed that in many of the enrichments, methanotroph

abundances fluctuated or dropped after reaching a peak prior to the final time point, rather than

steadily increasing over time—especially for many of the Type I methanotrophs (Fig. 1B).

Additionally, in most of the enrichments only one or two methanotroph ASVs were abundant at

any given time (Fig. 1B-C). By contrast, individual enrichments supported up to 80 non-

methanotroph ASVs (with a median of 39) at the final time point (Fig. 1C).

We also assessed how overall alpha diversity was affected by time, sample type, and initial

inoculum dilution. For rhizosphere and root enrichments, the number of ASVs observed per

enrichment initially dropped noticeably compared to the inoculum, but subsequently fluctuated

around the value reached by the end of week one, rather than continuing to decline, despite the

1:10 dilution transfers that were performed after week four and week eight (Fig. 1D). For stem

enrichments, the number of observed ASVs dropped only slightly in the first week, and fluctuated

around the original value thereafter (Fig. 1D). Community evenness followed generally similar

patterns over time for the different sample types (Fig. 1E). At the final time point, the number of

observed ASVs was significantly lower for stem enrichments compared to rhizosphere and root

enrichments, but did not differ between the latter two groups (Fig. 1F). Initial inoculum dilution

had no statistically significant effect on the final number of observed ASVs (Fig. 1G).

Beta diversity arose primarily from individual variation between enrichments rather than external

variables

The taxa bar plots for the final time point indicated considerable variability in community

composition across the enrichments (Fig. 1A). We therefore performed additional analyses to

assess the impact of three external variables on beta diversity: time since inoculation, field site of

origin, and original sample type. PERMANOVA analysis indicated that time had a significant

effect on beta diversity regardless of whether ASV abundances and phylogenetic relationships

were accounted for (p = 0.001 for both Jaccard and weighted UniFrac distances) (Table 1).

However, the effect was relatively small (R^2 = 0.04 and 0.08 for Jaccard and weighted UniFrac

distances, respectively), and the respective PCoA plots suggested that the effect was not

particularly consistent over time or across different enrichments (Fig. 2A). Indeed, the time to

reach a stable community composition varied across the enrichments, with some appearing to

largely stabilize following the first 1:10 dilution transfer after week four; some experiencing

another dramatic shift following the second 1:10 dilution transfer after week eight; and a few

appearing to undergo a more or less continuous shift starting after the first transfer and continuing

to the end of the experiment (Fig. S1). Additionally, PERMDISP analysis indicated that the sample

dispersions differed significantly across different time points (p = 0.001 for both Jaccard and

weighted UniFrac distances) (Table 1), which can cause a significant PERMANOVA result even

if there is no difference in the group centroids.

The field site of origin (Biggs versus Staten Island) also had a statistically significant effect

on community composition (PERMANOVA p = 0.001 for both Jaccard and weighted UniFrac

distances, permuting only within each time point given the significant effect of time) (Table 1).

However, while the PCoA plot based on Jaccard distances revealed an almost perfect separation

between enrichments from the two fields, this was not evident with weighted UniFrac distances

(Fig. 2B), and the overall effect of field site was again quite small in both cases (R^2 = 0.05 and

0.03 for Jaccard and weighted UniFrac distances, respectively). Original sample type (rhizosphere,

root, or stem) also had a significant effect on community composition (PERMANOVA p = 0.001

for both Jaccard and weighted UniFrac distances, permuting only within each time point), with

slightly larger effect sizes (R^2 = 0.07 and 0.13 for Jaccard and weighted UniFrac distances,

respectively). Indeed, while the PCoA plots suggested a high degree of overlap among rhizosphere

and root enrichments, the stem enrichments clustered somewhat separately based on both Jaccard

and weighted UniFrac distances (Fig. 2C). However, PERMDISP indicated that as with the effect

of time, sample dispersions also differed for the two field sites and across the different sample

types (p = 0.001 for both Jaccard and weighted UniFrac distances) (Table 1).

In contrast to the relatively small effects of the above variables, by far the greatest

proportion of the beta diversity was explained by individual enrichment identity, i.e. the unique

combination of field site, sample type, replicate, and dilution (PERMANOVA p = 0.001, R^2 = 0.44

for weighted UniFrac) (Table 1). The marginal effects of replicate and dilution were very small

(R^2 = 0.01 and 0.02 respectively), although still statistically significant (p = 0.001) (Table 1). We

therefore also asked whether enrichments derived from the same original sample but with different

inoculum dilutions ("within sample") ended up more similar to each other at the final time point

than enrichments derived from different original samples ("between sample"). In the case of

Jaccard distances (which take into account only the presence/absence of each ASV), there was a

statistically significant difference for the "within sample" versus "between sample" comparison

(Fig. 2D). This intuitively makes sense as enrichments derived from the same original sample

would be expected to share a higher proportion of ASVs, given the lack of opportunities for

dispersal between the enrichments over time. Notably, however, based on the weighted UniFrac

metric, which provides an arguably better representation of overall differences in community

structure, there was no statistically significant difference for "within sample" versus "between

sample" distances.

Stochastic processes dominated the enrichment community assembly

Given the high degree of variability in final community composition, even across

individual enrichments derived from the same original sample, we hypothesized that stochastic

processes had contributed significantly to community assembly in the enrichments. We therefore

sought to quantitatively infer the contribution of stochastic versus deterministic ecological

processes (i.e. drift versus selection), using two related statistical methods known as QPEN

("Quantifying assembly Processes based on Entire-community Null model analysis") and iCAMP

("infer Community Assembly Mechanisms by Phylogenetic-bin-based null model analysis") (20–

22). Both approaches are founded on the observation that more closely related species tend to

occupy more similar niches; thus, if the abundance-weighted phylogenetic relationships between

two communities' members are on average significantly closer than expected by chance given the

full set of taxa observed across all communities, this suggests that deterministic selection is at

work in similar environments. Consistent with our hypothesis, QPEN suggested that ecological

drift was the dominant process for 75% of all pairwise comparisons among the final enrichment

communities, while homogenous selection was the dominant ecological process for just 5%.

Similarly, iCAMP indicated that drift was the dominant process for the majority of phylogenetic

bins in 70% of the pairwise comparisons, while dispersal limitation and homogenous selection

were dominant in 8% and 5% of the comparisons respectively.

As an orthogonal approach to assess the potential contribution of deterministic forces to

the assembly of the enrichment communities, we performed consensus clustering analysis on the

final communities after collapsing the taxonomy abundance table to the family level. Consensus

clustering is a method of estimating how many subclasses (in this case, types of community

structures) are present in a dataset (23), and has previously been used to infer whether deterministic

forces contributed to variation across different enrichment communities (24). Specifically, if the

number of inferred community types is much less than the number of samples, this would suggest

some degree of determinism (non-randomness) in the community assembly process. Inspection of

the delta area plot (in which lower values represent lesser gains in cluster stability with increasing

k), as well as the cumulative distribution functions and heatmaps of the consensus matrices for

different k's (numbers of clusters), suggested that the optimal number of clusters was 9 (Fig. 3A-

C, Fig. S2). However, clusters 5, 6, 7, and 9 were represented by only a single enrichment each.

Organizing the taxonomy abundance bar plots by cluster identity suggested that cluster 1 (the

largest cluster) was driven by a relatively high abundance of Methylocystaceae, whereas cluster 2

(the second-largest cluster) was driven by a high abundance of Comamonadaceae paired with a

lower abundance of Methylocystaceae (Fig. 3D). Cluster 3 was appeared to be driven by a high

abundance of ASVs that could not be classified beyond the domain Bacteria, cluster 4 was driven

by a high abundance of Methylococcaceae, and cluster 8 was driven by a high abundance of

Chromobacteriaceae. The samples in the singleton clusters did not fall into any of these categories.

Taken together, these results suggest that despite the uniform culture conditions and

theoretically strong selective force imposed by the use of minimal media with methane as the only

added electron donor, stochastic processes (such as chance colonization—i.e. which strains were

present at time zero—and random extinction) were important drivers of community assembly in

our enrichments. Accordingly, even though certain types of community structures were more

prevalent than others among the final enrichments (as revealed by the consensus clustering

analysis), unpredictable and unique community structures also emerged.

Putative parasitic bacteria belonging to the Candidate Phylum Radiation transiently bloomed in

multiple independent enrichments

We were intrigued by the observation that ASVs that could not be classified beyond the

domain Bacteria were abundant in several of the enrichments. This was particularly striking in the

case of the final timepoint of the Staten Island root 2 10^{-2} enrichment, where the relative abundance

of a single unclassified bacterial sequence, ASV607, was 40.9%. Besides ASV607, five other

unclassified bacterial ASVs appeared at a relative abundance of >5% at least three times in our

enrichment time course dataset: ASV611, ASV616, ASV684, ASV697, and ASV891 (Fig. 4A). To

gain insight into the possible nature of these taxa, we used BLAST to search the respective ASV

sequences against the NCBI core nucleotide database (Table S3). For ASV697, the best named hit

was uncultured member of Chlamydiota detected in Chinese rice paddy soil, while for ASV684,

the best named hit was an uncultured member of Lentisphaerota detected in lake sediment (also

located in China), another environmental source of methane. For ASV616, there was no named hit

with coverage >50%, but the top overall hits were from environments such as subsurface water, a

sewage stabilization pond, and floodplain soil. For all three of the remaining sequences, the top

named hits belonged to the members of the Candidate Phylum Radiation (CPR)—specifically, the

candidate phyla Altimarinota (a.k.a. Gracilibacteria; ASV607 and ASV611) and

Peregrinibacteriota (ASV891). Notably, the top overall hit for ASV891 was a 100% match to an

unclassified 16S sequence from water that had been used to rinse rice grains; the second-best

overall hit for ASV607 was a 97.83% match to an unclassified 16S sequence from the "heavy"

isotopic fraction of activated sludge that had been incubated with ^{13}C-labeled methane; and the top

overall hits for ASV611 included sequences from lake sediment and a wetland. Taken together,

these results suggest that bacteria closely related to the unclassified sequences in our enrichments

might commonly occur in environments where methane is abundant.

Given that ASV607 was the most prevalent and abundant unclassified ASV in our

enrichments (Fig. 4A), we focused on this taxon for further analysis. Members of the CPR, to

which ASV607 putatively belongs, are mostly uncultivated but are thought to primarily be ultra-

small (~200-500 nm diameter) episymbiotic parasites of other bacteria (25, 26). To determine

whether such bacteria were present in a sample containing ASV607, we performed scanning

electron microscopy (SEM) on the Staten Island root 2 10^{-2} enrichment after regrowing it from a

frozen glycerol stock under the same conditions as the original enrichment. Strikingly, we found

multiple examples of such a bacterium in this culture: small (~340 nm diameter) cocci or

diplococci that in all cases ($n = 4$) appeared to be directly attached to a larger host (Fig. 4B).

Although we cannot be sure that these bacteria represent ASV607, these observations lend

credence to the possibility that ASV607 is an episymbiont, similar to other studied members of the

CPR.

Finally, we attempted to identify of the potential host(s) of ASV607 by looking for other

ASVs whose abundances were correlated with this taxon. Since ASV607 might by chance not

occur in every enrichment where its host was present, we first subsetted our enrichment time course

dataset to only the enrichments where ASV607 was detected at least once. We then used two

complementary methods of correlation analysis: SparCC, which was designed to handle some of

the challenging characteristics of microbiome data (e.g. compositionality and sparsity) (27), and

Pearson correlation, the method with the highest sensitivity for detecting parasitic interactions in

a prior study based on simulated data (28). Importantly, the latter study also demonstrated that

parasitic interactions between two taxa usually present as positive correlations (i.e. co-occurrence)

rather than negative correlations in microbial abundance data (28). Only two ASVs were

significantly positively correlated with ASV607 according to both methods: ASV7 (classified as

Methylophilaceae) and ASV441 (classified as Spartobacteria). When we highlighted the

abundances of these ASVs in the enrichments where ASV607 occurred, it became clear that

ASV607 occurred at relatively high abundances in multiple enrichments where ASV441 was

consistently below detection (Fig. 4C). By contrast, ASV7 was detected at least once in all of the

enrichments where ASV607 was abundant, and at many timepoints these two taxa co-occurred

with similar relative abundances (Fig. 4C). Thus, although we currently cannot rule out the

possibility that ASV441 (or other taxa) could be a host for ASV607, ASV7 (Methylophilaceae)

appears to be the most likely candidate for the primary host.

Strains isolated from the enrichments possess variable catabolic repertoires

Given that the enrichment cultures were fed only with methane, the abundance and

diversity of non-methanotrophic strains raised the question of what carbon sources could be

supporting their growth. Methanotrophic activity has been shown to contribute to the pool of

organic acids in rice paddy soils (12). Additionally, it has been previously reported that some

methanotrophs can cross-feed methanol (the first product of methane oxidation) to non-

methanotrophic methylotrophs (29). We therefore investigated whether organic acids and/or

methanol could plausibly support the growth of members of the enrichment communities.

To do so, we isolated a total of 65 strains from the enrichments (Table S4). Of these isolates, three are methanotrophs (*Methylosinus* DMC42, *Methylosinus* DMC45, and *Methylocystis* DMC101), while the rest are non-methane-utilizing heterotrophs. The isolates represent 12 of the 16 families that had reached a final relative abundance of >10% in at least two enrichments (missing representatives only for Verrucomicrobiaceae, Methylococcaceae, Bradyrhizobiaceae, and Prolixibacteraceae). Three isolates belonging to the genus *Methyloraptor*, in the family Ancalomicrobiaceae, matched a similarly prevalent and abundant ASV that had been classified only to order level as Rhizobiales. We also obtained isolates for several other families that were less prevalent and/or abundant in the final enrichments, including Moraxellaceae, Sphingomonadaceae, Xanthobacteraceae, Caulobacteraceae, Devosiaceae, Microbacteriaceae, Sphaerotilaceae, and additional members of Rhizobiaceae (one of which had dominated a Biggs stem enrichment).

288   To obtain strain-level insights into the potential catabolic capabilities of the enrichment community members, we generated draft genome assemblies for a diverse selection of isolates representing most of the families in our collection. We then assessed the non-methanotrophic isolates' genomic potential for the consumption of 62 common carbon sources, using the program GapMind (30). We considered a strain likely to be able to use a carbon source if GapMind identified a complete pathway with only high-confidence hits, and a "maybe" if GapMind identified a complete pathway but at least one step was at best a medium-confidence hit. Strains were considered unlikely to be able to use a carbon source if any of the best hits in the respective pathway were low-confidence, i.e. "gaps." This analysis revealed that nearly all of the sequenced isolates are likely to be able to use fumarate as a carbon source, and most of the isolates (with the exception of members of Methylophilaceae and *Cloacibacterium*) are also likely to be able to use

multiple other organic acids, such as succinate, malate, and acetate (Fig. 5). By comparison, the

capacity to utilize sugar-related compounds and amino acids as carbon sources appeared to be less

widespread.

We also assessed whether the non-methanotrophic isolates could potentially utilize

methanol, which is not included in GapMind. To do so, we searched the genomes for homologs of

the four known types of methanol dehydrogenases (MxaF, XoxF, Mdh2, and NAD-dependent Mdh)

(Fig. 6A). For strains that possessed a putative homolog of at least one of these genes, we also

looked for homologs of the genes needed for the ribulose monophosphate (RuMP) cycle, the serine

cycle, and the Calvin-Benson cycle, which are the three known pathways for assimilation of C1

units by methylotrophic bacteria (31) (Fig. 6B). The results were mostly consistent with what has

been reported for the respective taxonomic groups: members of *Methylovorus*, *Methylophilus*,

Methylobacterium, *Methyloraptor, Oharaeibacter*, and *Xanthobacter* are all known methylotrophs,

and all sequenced isolates from these genera possessed both MxaF and XoxF, as well as a complete

C1 assimilation pathway. However, one isolate from a genus not known to be methylotrophic also

showed possible genomic capacity for methylotrophy: *Pinisolibacter* sp. DMC19 possesses a

homolog of XoxF as well as a complete Calvin-Benson cycle. Another *Pinisolibacter* isolate also

possesses XoxF, but appears to be missing a key enzyme in the Calvin-Benson cycle

(glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase), while *Oryzibacter oryziterrae* DMC98 possesses

XoxF along with a near-complete serine cycle, but appears to be missing phosphoenolpyruvate

carboxylase. A few other isolates from genera not typically known to consume methanol contained

putative homologs of XoxF, Mdh2, and/or NAD-dependent Mdh, but lacked multiple steps in each

of the C1 assimilation pathways, suggesting that they are unlikely to use methanol as a carbon

source.

Discussion

In this study, we utilized methane-fed enrichment cultures to determine which bacterial

members of the rice microbiota can be supported by methane-derived carbon, revealing

considerable taxonomic diversity among the potential beneficiaries of methanotrophic activity. We

found that the composition of rice-derived, methane-supported microbial communities is

significantly affected by the type of plant part used as the inoculum (with stem enrichments

exhibiting lower alpha diversity than root and rhizosphere enrichments), but is less affected by

field site. While many of our enrichments had a high abundance of type II methanotrophs and/or

members of Comamonadaceae, a variety of overall community structures emerged, suggested a

limited contribution of deterministic forces to community assembly during growth on methane.

Finally, genomic analysis indicated that organic acids and methanol are likely carbon sources that

may support the growth of many non-methanotrophs in methane-fed communities. Taken together,

these results shed new light on the contribution of methanotrophs to the rice microbiome.

The diversity of non-methanotrophic taxa that were enriched alongside methanotrophs in

our cultures, representing at least 14 families, greatly expands the knowledge of which taxa may

benefit from methanotrophic activity in rice paddies. In prior DNA-SIP studies where rice roots or

paddy soils were incubated with isotopically-labeled methane, relatively few taxa were identified

(10–12), possibly due to the limited sensitivity of this technique and the presence of alternative

carbon sources in those experimental setups. In our enrichments, as in the DNA-SIP studies, some

carbon from the soil or plant material would have been present at the start of the experiment, but

any such nutrients would have then been diluted by the two sequential transfers, if not already fully

consumed in the first few weeks of incubation. We cannot rule out that nutrients may also have

been released by cell lysis over the course of our experiment, potentially supporting some of the

taxa that only persisted at a very low relative abundance in the enrichments. Nevertheless, with the possible exception of a few enrichments where the final abundance of putative methanotrophs appeared to be extremely low (which may have occurred due to stochastic extinction), taxa that were abundant at the final timepoint of our enrichments were likely primarily supported by methane-derived carbon. Among the non-methanotrophic taxonomic groups that were particularly prevalent and/or abundant in our enrichments, Comamonadaceae, Methylophilaceae, Rhizobiales, and Sphingomonadales have also been labeled with methane-derived carbon in DNA-SIP studies (10, 12), providing further evidence that these taxa genuinely benefit from methanotrophic activity in rice fields.

The heterogeneity of our enrichments indicated a significant contribution of stochastic ecological forces to community assembly during growth under methane. While this may in part have been driven by the particulars of our experimental setup (e.g., the use of a dilution series, and the relatively long four-week incubation time between transfers), the variety of observed community structures, together with the diversity of the enriched taxa, suggests that the impact of altering methanotrophic activity in rice microbiomes might not be easily predicted. That being said, our enrichments also bore some taxonomic resemblance to previous studies on methane-supported microbial communities from other environments. For example, *Methylophilus*, *Pseudomonas*, and *Flavobacterium*, three prominent genera in our enrichments, were also prevalent in methane-fed enrichments from lake sediment (32, 33). Moreover, a study on naturally-occurring methane-supported biofilms in a mineral spring cave reported the presence of Flavobacteriales, Verrucomicrobia, Rhizobiales, Sphingomonadales, Pseudomonadales, and Xanthomonodales, among other non-methanotrophic taxa (34), all of which were abundant in at least two of our enrichments. Thus, it appears that the assembly of methane-supported communities is not entirely

random, and many of the taxonomic groups in our enrichments may be associated with

methanotrophs not only in rice paddies, but also more broadly.

Another notable finding was the unexpected prevalence of CPR bacteria in our enrichments.

To our knowledge, this phenomenon has not previously been reported in a methane-supported

microbial ecosystem. However, many of the closest sequenced relatives for the putative CPR

bacteria in our enrichments were also derived from environments where methane is abundant,

indicating that our detection of CPR members in methanotrophic communities is not an anomaly.

Given that the DNA of one such organism was labeled with methane-derived carbon in a DNA-

SIP study (see Table 2), some of these bacteria may in fact benefit from the activity of

methanotrophs. This interpretation is further supported by the positive correlation between

ASV607 (a putative CPR member) and ASV7 (a member of the methylotrophic family

Methylophilaceae) in our enrichments. Notably, standard 16S primer pairs are a poor match for

many CPR members (35). Thus, these organisms may be even more prevalent and abundant in rice

microbiomes and other methane-supported microbial communities than is reflected in currently

available data. Detailed studies on CPR bacteria are unfortunately challenging due to the difficulty

of isolating these organisms. Nevertheless, future attempts to confirm the identity of the host(s)

for rice-associated CPR bacteria, and to ascertain the nature of the host-epibiont relationship (i.e.,

parasitic, predatory, or commensal), may help improve the understanding of rice microbiome

dynamics.

Finally, regarding the question of how non-methanotrophic growth is supported in

methane-fed communities, the prevalence of pathways for organic acid catabolism in isolates from

our enrichments suggests that organic acids may be a key class of cross-fed metabolites, consistent

with prior evidence that methanotrophs contribute to organic acid production in paddy soils (12).

Whether this contribution is primarily direct or indirect remains unclear, but certain type I and type

II methanotrophs have been shown to excrete organic acids in pure cultures during growth on

methane under low oxygen conditions (36–38). Additionally, the abundance of several

methylotrophic taxa in our enrichments suggests that methanol may also have been cross-fed from

methanotrophs, as has been previously demonstrated in pairwise co-cultures of a methanotroph

and a methylotroph (29). However, organic acids and methanol may not be the only cross-fed

carbon sources in methanotroph-supported communities. Several taxa enriched in our cultures

belong to the phylum Bacteroidota, members of which are best known for their ability to degrade

complex carbohydrates (39). Consequently, it has previously been suggested that Bacteroidota

members that frequently co-occur with methanotrophs (e.g., *Flavobacterium* species) may be

supported by extracellular polysaccharides produced by other community members, though direct

evidence of such interactions is still lacking (5). These taxa proved difficult to isolate from our

enrichments, and thus we only have one representative genome sequence so far, from a strain of

Cloacibacterium. Potentially consistent with the extracellular polysaccharide hypothesis, this

strain does not possess high-confidence pathways for the usage of either organic acids or methanol,

suggesting that it may indeed have been supported by other compounds in the enrichment cultures.

While beyond the scope of the current study, future work will be directed at more precisely

identifying the carbon sources exchanged among members of methanotroph-supported microbial

communities.

In summary, our findings suggest that methanotrophs may help support a wide range of

heterotrophic bacteria in the microbial ecosystem of rice paddies. Furthermore, our collection of

65 taxonomically-diverse isolates, more than half of which have draft genomes, represents a

valuable resource for future mechanistic studies on how rice-associated methanotrophs interact

with their native neighbors. Given the recent evidence that methanotrophs affect not only carbon

cycling but also nitrogen cycling in rice paddies (12, 17), it will be worthwhile to continue gaining

a deeper understanding of how methanotrophic bacteria influence the structure and function of the

rice microbiome under different conditions, so as to ensure the long-term sustainability and

productivity of this globally-important staple crop.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the Laboratory Directed Research & Development program

(award 23-071) at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. We thank the Sundaresan and

Schuppenhauer labs for providing the field-grown rice samples, Deepika Awasthi for assistance

with establishing a methane gassing station, Morgan Price for assistance with data processing, and

Misun Kang and the staff at the University of California Berkeley Electron Microscope Laboratory

for advice and assistance with electron microscopy sample preparation and imaging.

Materials and Methods

Time course of methane-fed enrichment cultures

Six rice plants were collected from two fields (three plants per field), located in Biggs,

California (39.4643, -121.7340) and Staten Island, California (38.1235, -121.5490), in the summer

of 2022. The Biggs samples were collected in late July, and the Staten Island samples were

collected in late August. Each plant was collected from a different area of the respective field and

had the entire root structure dug up with the attached soil. The collected plants were placed in

individual clean zipper-top plastic bags in 5-gallon buckets and transported back to the laboratory.

The protocol for establishing methane-fed cultures from the rhizosphere was based on previous

work (40), with modifications made to include the root and stem. For each plant, after removing

soil not tightly bound to roots, a portion of the roots was dissected and placed in a 15 mL conical

tube containing 10 mL of dilute nitrate mineral salts (dNMS) media, made according to the recipe

of (40) except that the vitamin solution was procured from the American Type Culture Collection

(catalog no. MD-VS). The roots were vigorously vortexed to generate the rhizosphere samples.

Then, a portion of the roots was ground in 1 mL dNMS for 45 s using a sterilized stainless-steel

grinding jar (Qiagen, catalog no. 69985) in a Qiagen TissueLyser II. Stem samples were processed

in a similar manner. 0.5 mL of the homogenized samples, representing the week 0 time point, was

spun down at 4000 rpm for 20 min in a tabletop centrifuge, and the pellets were stored at -20°C

until DNA extraction. The remainder of each sample was diluted 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, and 10^{-4} in dNMS

(Staten Island stem samples were only diluted up to 10^{-3}), and 0.5 mL of the resulting suspensions

was injected into sealed, autoclaved Balch tubes containing 5 mL of dNMS. Approximately 5 mL

of the headspace was removed by syringe and replaced with 5 mL of methane to create a 20%

methane headspace. The cultures were incubated upright with shaking at 24°C. Every seven days,

0.5 mL was collected from each culture and pelleted for later DNA extraction as above.

Additionally, 70 µL of each culture was used to make a frozen stock in 15% glycerol, stored at -

80°C. At the same time, 5 mL of headspace was withdrawn and replaced with another 5 mL of

methane. Every four weeks, 0.5 mL of each culture was transferred to a new Balch tube containing

5 mL of fresh dNMS. The experiment was terminated after a total of 12 weeks.

16S rDNA amplicon sequencing

Genomic DNA was extracted from pelleted samples using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood &

Tissue kit (catalog no. 69506), following the manufacturer's protocol for Gram-positive bacteria.

The extracted DNA was PCR amplified using dual-index 16S V4-V5 primers (515F/926R) (41).

A peptide nucleic acid (PNA) PCR clamp was used to block the amplification of plastid and

mitochondrial DNA (42). The resulting libraries were quantified using the Qubit dsDNA BR Assay

kit (Invitrogen, catalog no. Q32853), pooled, cleaned using a PCR purification kit, and sequenced

on an Illumina MiSeq (PE 2x300). The paired-end reads were assembled using PEAR (43), and

reads with more than one expected error were detected using USEARCH (44) and discarded, along

with rare sequences (less than 4 reads in a sample). Chimera removal and error correction were

performed with the UNOISE3 algorithm (45). Taxonomy was assigned using SINTAX (46) with

the RDP training set v18.

16S sequencing data analysis

The following initial analysis steps were performed in Qiime2 (version amplicon-2024.5):

Samples were rarefied to 900 reads (based on the histogram of reads per sample), a phylogenetic

tree was constructed using MAFFT alignment and FastTree, core alpha and beta diversity metrics

were calculated, and principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) matrices were generated. SparCC and

Pearson correlation analyses were also performed in Qiime2, using the SCNIC plugin (47). All

other analyses were performed in R. PERMANOVA analyses were performed with the adonis2

function from the package vegan (version 2.6-10) (48). PERMDISP tests were performed with the

permutest function in conjunction with the betadisper function, also from vegan. When testing the

effect of time point, permutations were constrained within each enrichment and the data were

treated as a series. When testing the effect of field site or sample type, permutations were

constrained within time point. Assessment of the contribution of stochastic versus deterministic

processes during community assembly was performed using the functions qpen and icamp.big in

the iCAMP package (20). Consensus clustering was performed using the package

ConsensusClusterPlus, with maxK = 17, reps = 100, pItem = 0.8, pFeature = 1, and clusterAlg =

"hc" (49). Except for the consensus clustering plots, which were produced by the

ConsensusClusterPlus package, all plots were made with the R package ggplot2 (50).

Scanning electron microscopy

To prepare the scanning electron microscopy (SEM) sample (Electron Microscopy Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley), the Staten Island root 2 10^{-2} enrichment was regrown, from a frozen glycerol stock, in dNMS with 20% methane (shaking at 125 rpm at 25°C). The regrown culture was sub-cultured twice at a 1:100 dilution ratio on day 15 and day 23. On day 29, 10 mL of the culture was pelleted (5000 g for 10 min), and the cells were gently resuspended in a fixative solution (2% glutaraldehyde in 0.1M sodium cacodylate buffer, pH 7.2). The sample was placed at 4°C on a rotator overnight and subsequently stored at 4°C in the dark (standing) until further processing. Prior to imaging, the sample was washed 3x in 0.1M sodium cacodylate buffer, pH 7.2, postfixed 3x in 1% osmium tetroxide in 0.1M sodium cacodylate buffer, pH 7.2 for 1 h, and then washed 3x in 0.1M sodium cacodylate buffer, pH 7.2. Samples were dehydrated in a graded ethanol series up to 100%. Samples were then transferred onto 0.1% (w/v) poly-L-lysine–coated coverslips and subjected to critical point drying (Tousimis, Mayland, USA). The dried coverslips were mounted onto aluminum stubs using conductive carbon tape and sputter-coated with a gold/palladium alloy (Safematic GmbH, Switzerland). SEM imaging was performed using a Zeiss Crossbeam 550 (Carl Zeiss Microsystems GmbH, Oberkochen, Germany).

Isolation of strains from the enrichment cultures

Strains were isolated from the original enrichment cultures, as well as enrichments regrown from frozen glycerol stocks, by plating a 10-fold dilution series onto dNMS with 1.5% agarose and 0.2% methanol; dNMS agarose under a mixed methane/air atmosphere; or 0.1x R2A with 1.5% agar. To obtain the *Methylocystis* isolate, a 10-fold dilution series (10^{-1} to 10^{-8}) of an enrichment regrown from the frozen stock was set up in a 48-well plate and incubated statically under 20% methane at room temperature for 4 weeks; then, a loopful of the culture in the 10^{-8} dilution well

was streaked onto dNMS agarose and incubated under a mixed methane/air atmosphere. The mixed

methane/air atmosphere was achieved by flooding a mostly-closed BD EZ Incubator Container

with methane for 30-60s and then quickly latching the lid. All plates were incubated at room

temperature, and morphologically distinct colonies were picked and restreaked 3-4 times until the

colony morphologies appeared uniform. The 16S rRNA gene was then amplified by colony PCR,

using Platinum Hot Start Master Mix (Invitrogen) with the primers 27F

(AGAGTTTGATCMTGGCTCAG) and 1492R (TACGGYTACCTTGTTACGACTT). The PCR

products were Sanger sequenced at Elim Biopharm, Inc. with the same 27F and 1492R primers.

The resulting forward and reverse sequences were aligned in Geneious Prime and subjected to

BLAST against the NCBI core nucleotide database.

Genomic analysis of isolated strains

Genomic DNA was isolated from selected strains using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood & Tissue

kit (catalog no. 69506), following the manufacturer's protocol for Gram-positive bacteria. Library

preparation and whole-genome sequencing was performed by Novogene on an Illumina NovaSeq

X Plus. The raw reads were cleaned with Trimmomatic on KBase (51), using the default settings.

Draft genomes were assembled with SPAdes (v3.15.3), with the minimum contig size set to 1000

bp, and annotated with Prokka (v1.145), also on KBase. Genomes were checked for completeness

and contamination with CheckM. Taxonomy was assigned using the Microbial Genomes Atlas

pipeline against the Genome Taxonomy Database (GTDB, version r214) (52, 53). Annotation of

common carbon source utilization pathways was performed using the online GapMind tool (30).

Detection of homologs of known methanol dehydrogenases was performed using DIAMOND with

the "sensitive" setting [REF]; a hit was considered a homolog if it had >40% identity to the

reference sequence, with at least 80% coverage. The list of reference methanol dehydrogenase

sequences was obtained from a prior publication (54). For C1 assimilation pathways, DIAMOND

with the same settings failed to detect complete pathways in some of the known methylotrophs.

We therefore instead used HMMER (version 3.4) (55) with the HMM profiles from the same prior

publication (54), requiring hits to have at least 80% coverage of the respective model to be

considered a homolog.

Data availability

All data is available from the authors upon reasonable request.

References

1.   Hanson RS, Hanson TE. 1996. Methanotrophic bacteria. Microbiol Rev 60:439–471.

2.   Auman AJ, Speake CC, Lidstrom ME. 2001. nifH Sequences and Nitrogen Fixation in Type
I and Type II Methanotrophs. Appl Environ Microbiol 67:4009–4016.

3.   Eisentraeger A, Klag P, Vansbotter B, Heymann E, Dott W. 2001. Denitrification of
groundwater with methane as sole hydrogen donor. Water Research 35:2261–2267.

4.   Knowles R. 2005. Denitrifiers associated with methanotrophs and their potential impact on
the nitrogen cycle. Ecological Engineering 24:441–446.

5.   Chistoserdova L, Kalyuzhnaya MG. 2018. Current Trends in Methylotrophy. Trends in
Microbiology 26:703–714.

6.   Whittenbury R, Phillips KC, Wilkinson JF. 1970. Enrichment, Isolation and Some Properties
of Methane-utilizing Bacteria. Journal of General Microbiology 61:205–218.

7.   Ho A, De Roy K, Thas O, De Neve J, Hoefman S, Vandamme P, Heylen K, Boon N. 2014.
The more, the merrier: heterotroph richness stimulates methanotrophic activity. The ISME
Journal 8:1945–1948.

8.   Stock M, Hoefman S, Kerckhof F-M, Boon N, De Vos P, De Baets B, Heylen K, Waegeman
W. 2013. Exploration and prediction of interactions between methanotrophs and heterotrophs.
Research in Microbiology 164:1045–1054.

9.   Iguchi H, Yurimoto H, Sakai Y. 2011. Stimulation of Methanotrophic Growth in Cocultures
by Cobalamin Excreted by Rhizobia. Appl Environ Microbiol 77:8509–8515.

10.   Qiu Q, Conrad R, Lu Y. 2009. Cross-feeding of methane carbon among bacteria on rice roots
revealed by DNA-stable isotope probing. Environ Microbiol Rep 1:355–361.

11. Murase J, Frenzel P. 2007. A methane-driven microbial food web in a wetland rice soil.

Environmental Microbiology 9:3025–3034.

12. Chen K-H, Feng J, Bodelier PLE, Yang Z, Huang Q, Delgado-Baquerizo M, Cai P, Tan W,

Liu Y-R. 2024. Metabolic coupling between soil aerobic methanotrophs and denitrifiers in

rice paddy fields. Nat Commun 15:3471.

13. Osaka T, Ebie Y, Tsuneda S, Inamori Y. 2008. Identification of the bacterial community

involved in methane-dependent denitrification in activated sludge using DNA stable-isotope

probing: Characterization of a MDD ecosystem by SIP. FEMS Microbiology Ecology

64:494–506.

14. Dumont MG, Pommerenke B, Casper P, Conrad R. 2011. DNA-, rRNA- and mRNA-based

stable isotope probing of aerobic methanotrophs in lake sediment. Environmental

Microbiology 13:1153–1167.

15. Hutchens E, Radajewski S, Dumont MG, McDonald IR, Murrell JC. 2004. Analysis of

methanotrophic bacteria in Movile Cave by stable isotope probing. Environmental

Microbiology 6:111–120.

16. Bridgham SD, Cadillo-Quiroz H, Keller JK, Zhuang Q. 2013. Methane emissions from

wetlands: biogeochemical, microbial, and modeling perspectives from local to global scales.

Global Change Biology 19:1325–1346.

17. Cao W, Cai Y, Bao Z, Wang S, Yan X, Jia Z. 2022. Methanotrophy Alleviates Nitrogen

Constraint of Carbon Turnover by Rice Root-Associated Microbiomes. Front Microbiol

13:885087.

18. Muthayya S, Sugimoto JD, Montgomery S, Maberly GF. 2014. An overview of global rice

production, supply, trade, and consumption. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences

1324:7–14.

19. Neufeld JD, Dumont MG, Vohra J, Murrell JC. 2007. Methodological Considerations for the

Use of Stable Isotope Probing in Microbial Ecology. Microbial Ecology 53:435–442.

20. Ning D, Yuan M, Wu L, Zhang Y, Guo X, Zhou X, Yang Y, Arkin AP, Firestone MK, Zhou J.

2020. A quantitative framework reveals ecological drivers of grassland microbial community

assembly in response to warming. Nat Commun 11:4717.

21. Stegen JC, Lin X, Fredrickson JK, Chen X, Kennedy DW, Murray CJ, Rockhold ML,

Konopka A. 2013. Quantifying community assembly processes and identifying features that

impose them. The ISME Journal 7:2069–2079.

22. Stegen JC, Lin X, Fredrickson JK, Konopka AE. 2015. Estimating and mapping ecological

processes influencing microbial community assembly. Front Microbiol 6:370.

23. Monti S, Tamayo P, Mesirov J, Golub T. 2003. Consensus Clustering: A Resampling-Based

Method for Class Discovery and Visualization of Gene Expression Microarray Data. Machine

Learning 52:91–118.

24. Celiker H, Gore J. 2014. Clustering in community structure across replicate ecosystems

following a long-term bacterial evolution experiment. Nat Commun 5:4643.

25. Méheust R, Burstein D, Castelle CJ, Banfield JF. 2019. The distinction of CPR bacteria from

other bacteria based on protein family content. Nat Commun 10:4173.

26. Ji Y, Zhang P, Zhou S, Gao P, Wang B, Jiang J. 2022. Widespread but Poorly Understood

Bacteria: Candidate Phyla Radiation. Microorganisms 10:2232.

27.   Friedman J, Alm EJ. 2012. Inferring Correlation Networks from Genomic Survey Data.
PLOS Computational Biology 8:e1002687.

28.   Weiss S, Van Treuren W, Lozupone C, Faust K, Friedman J, Deng Y, Xia LC, Xu ZZ, Ursell
L, Alm EJ, Birmingham A, Cram JA, Fuhrman JA, Raes J, Sun F, Zhou J, Knight R. 2016.
Correlation detection strategies in microbial data sets vary widely in sensitivity and precision.
ISME J 10:1669–1681.

29.   Krause SMB, Johnson T, Samadhi Karunaratne Y, Fu Y, Beck DAC, Chistoserdova L,
Lidstrom ME. 2017. Lanthanide-dependent cross-feeding of methane-derived carbon is
linked by microbial community interactions. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 114:358–363.

30.   Price MN, Deutschbauer AM, Arkin AP. 2022. Filling gaps in bacterial catabolic pathways
with computation and high-throughput genetics. PLoS Genet 18:e1010156.

31.   Chistoserdova L. 2011. Modularity of methylotrophy, revisited. Environmental Microbiology
13:2603–2622.

32.   Oshkin IY, Beck DAC, Lamb AE, Tchesnokova V, Benuska G, McTaggart TL, Kalyuzhnaya
MG, Dedysh SN, Lidstrom ME, Chistoserdova L. 2015. Methane-fed microbial microcosms
show differential community dynamics and pinpoint taxa involved in communal response.
The ISME Journal 9:1119–1129.

33.   Van Grinsven S, Sinninghe Damsté JS, Harrison J, Polerecky L, Villanueva L. 2021. Nitrate
promotes the transfer of methane-derived carbon from the methanotroph *Methylobacter* sp.
to the methylotroph *Methylotenera* sp. in eutrophic lake water. Limnology & Oceanography
66:878–891.

34.   Karwautz C, Kus G, Stöckl M, Neu TR, Lueders T. 2018. Microbial megacities fueled by
methane oxidation in a mineral spring cave. The ISME Journal 12:87–100.

35. Brown CT, Hug LA, Thomas BC, Sharon I, Castelle CJ, Singh A, Wilkins MJ, Wrighton KC,

Williams KH, Banfield JF. 2015. Unusual biology across a group comprising more than 15%

of domain Bacteria. Nature 523:208–211.

36. Vecherskaya M, Dijkema C, Saad HR, Stams AJM. 2009. Microaerobic and anaerobic

metabolism of a Methylocystis parvus strain isolated from a denitrifying bioreactor.

Environmental Microbiology Reports 1:442–449.

37. Tays C, Guarnieri MT, Sauvageau D, Stein LY. 2018. Combined effects of carbon and

nitrogen source to optimize growth of proteobacterial methanotrophs. Front Microbiol 9:2239.

38. Kalyuzhnaya MG, Yang S, Rozova ON, Smalley NE, Clubb J, Lamb A, Gowda GAN, Raftery

D, Fu Y, Bringel F, Vuilleumier S, Beck DAC, Trotsenko YA, Khmelenina VN, Lidstrom ME.

2013. Highly efficient methane biocatalysis revealed in a methanotrophic bacterium. Nat

Commun 4:2785.

39. Gavriilidou A, Gutleben J, Versluis D, Forgiarini F, van Passel MWJ, Ingham CJ, Smidt H,

Sipkema D. 2020. Comparative genomic analysis of Flavobacteriaceae: insights into

carbohydrate metabolism, gliding motility and secondary metabolite biosynthesis. BMC

Genomics 21:569.

40. Rahalkar MC, Khatri K, Pandit P, Bahulikar RA, Mohite JA. 2021. Cultivation of Important

Methanotrophs From Indian Rice Fields. Front Microbiol 12:669244.

41. Thompson LR, Sanders JG, McDonald D, Amir A, Ladau J, Locey KJ, Prill RJ, Tripathi A,

Gibbons SM, Ackermann G, Navas-Molina JA, Janssen S, Kopylova E, Vázquez-Baeza Y,

González A, Morton JT, Mirarab S, Zech Xu Z, Jiang L, Haroon MF, Kanbar J, Zhu Q, Jin

Song S, Kosciolek T, Bokulich NA, Lefler J, Brislawn CJ, Humphrey G, Owens SM,

Hampton-Marcell J, Berg-Lyons D, McKenzie V, Fierer N, Fuhrman JA, Clauset A, Stevens

RL, Shade A, Pollard KS, Goodwin KD, Jansson JK, Gilbert JA, Knight R. 2017. A communal catalogue reveals Earth's multiscale microbial diversity. Nature 551:457–463.

42. Lundberg DS, Yourstone S, Mieczkowski P, Jones CD, Dangl JL. 2013. Practical innovations for high-throughput amplicon sequencing. Nat Methods 10:999–1002.

43. Zhang J, Kobert K, Flouri T, Stamatakis A. 2014. PEAR: a fast and accurate Illumina Paired-End reAd mergeR. Bioinformatics 30:614–620.

44. Edgar RC. Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST.

45. Edgar RC. 2016. UNOISE2: improved error-correction for Illumina 16S and ITS amplicon sequencing. bioRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/081257.

46. Edgar RC. 2016. SINTAX: a simple non-Bayesian taxonomy classifier for 16S and ITS sequences. bioRxiv https://doi.org/10.1101/074161.

47. Shaffer M, Thurimella K, Sterrett JD, Lozupone CA. 2023. SCNIC: Sparse correlation network investigation for compositional data. Molecular Ecology Resources 23:312–325.

48. Oksanen J, Simpson GL, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Szoecs E, Wagner H, Barbour M, Bedward M, Bolker B, Borcard D, Borman T, Carvalho G, Chirico M, Caceres MD, Durand S, Evangelista HBA, FitzJohn R, Friendly M, Furneaux B, Hannigan G, Hill MO, Lahti L, Martino C, McGlinn D, Ouellette M-H, Cunha ER, Smith T, Stier A, Braak CJFT, Weedon J. 2025. vegan: Community Ecology Package (2.6-10).

49. Wilkerson MD, Hayes DN. 2010. ConsensusClusterPlus: a class discovery tool with confidence assessments and item tracking. Bioinformatics 26:1572–1573.

50. Wickham H. 2016. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New York. https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

S, Pearson E, Poon SS, Price GA, Ramakrishnan S, Ranjan P, Ronald PC, Schatz MC, Seaver

SMD, Shukla M, Sutormin RA, Syed MH, Thomason J, Tintle NL, Wang D, Xia F, Yoo H,

Yoo S, Yu D. 2018. KBase: The United States Department of Energy Systems Biology

Knowledgebase. Nat Biotechnol 36:566–569.

52.   Parks DH, Chuvochina M, Rinke C, Mussig AJ, Chaumeil P-A, Hugenholtz P. GTDB: an

ongoing census of bacterial and archaeal diversity through a phylogenetically consistent, rank

normalized and complete genome-based taxonomy.

53.   Rodriguez-R LM, Gunturu S, Harvey WT, Rosselló-Mora R, Tiedje JM, Cole JR,

Konstantinidis KT. 2018. The Microbial Genomes Atlas (MiGA) webserver: taxonomic and

gene diversity analysis of Archaea and Bacteria at the whole genome level. Nucleic Acids

Res 46:W282–W288.

54.   Salcher MM, Schaefle D, Kaspar M, Neuenschwander SM, Ghai R. 2019. Evolution in action:

habitat transition from sediment to the pelagial leads to genome streamlining in

Methylophilaceae. ISME J 13:2764–2777.

55. Eddy SR. 2011. Accelerated Profile HMM Searches. PLOS Computational Biology

7:e1002195.

Figures and Figure Legends

Figure 1. Taxonomic diversity and dynamics of methane-fed enrichment cultures. A) Taxa

bar plot showing the overall diversity and major families in the enrichment cultures at the final

sequenced timepoint. Individual ASVs within each family are separated by white lines. **B)** Relative

abundance of putative methanotroph ASVs over time in each enrichment. Under each header (e.g.

"Biggs rhizo 1"), the enrichments are arranged from left to right in order of increasing inoculum

dilution (i.e., 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}). **C)** The number of detected ASVs that were classified as

methanotrophs or non-methanotrophs in each enrichment at the final timepoint. **D-E)** The number

of ASVs detected (D) or Pielou evenness (E) of the enrichments over time, separated by sample

type. **F)** The number of ASVs detected in the enrichments at the final timepoint, separated by

sample type or by inoculum dilution. * $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$, ANOVA followed by Tukey HSD.

Figure 2. Impact of external variables on enrichment community beta diversity. A) PCoA
plots of all sequenced enrichment samples, colored by time point. **B)** The same plots as in (A), but
colored by field site. **C)** The same plots as in (A), but colored by sample type. **D)** Jaccard and
weighted UniFrac distances for enrichments inoculated from different replicate plant parts
("between") versus enrichments inoculated from the same replicate plant part (albeit at different
dilutions; "within").

Figure 3. Consensus clustering analysis of enrichment communities. A) Delta area plot

showing the relative change in area under the cumulative distribution function (CDF) curve for *k*

versus *k* − 1. The optimal number of clusters is usually considered to be the value of *k* at which

there is no longer an appreciable increase in area under the CDF. **B)** The CDFs of the consensus

matrix for each *k* (indicated by colors), estimated by a histogram of 100 bins. **C)** The consensus

matrix for *k* = 9. Darker blues in the matrix indicate higher consensus. **D)** Taxa bar plots for the

samples in each consensus cluster for *k* = 9.

Figure 4. Presence of CPR bacteria in methane-fed enrichments. A) Taxa bar plot highlighting

the six unclassified bacterial ASVs that appeared at a relative abundance of >5% at least three

times (whether in different enrichments or multiple timepoints of a single enrichment). **B)** SEM

images showing the putative CPR epibiont, marked with a white arrow. Scale bar = 300 nm. **C)**

Taxa bar plots highlighting ASV607 along with the two candidates for its host based on correlation

analysis.

Figure 5. Putative carbon source utilization pathways in non-methanotrophic isolates from methane-fed enrichments. The completeness of pathways for utilizing 62 common carbon sources was assessed using GapMind. "Complete" indicates that a complete pathway was found with only high-confidence steps; "Maybe" indicates that the pathway was found but at least one step was at best medium-confidence; "Gap" indicates that one or more steps was missing or low-confidence.

Figure 6. Genomic capacity for methanol catabolism in non-methanotrophic isolates from methane-fed enrichments. A) Presence of homologs of known methanol dehydrogenases in all of the sequenced non-methanotrophic isolates. Green = present, white = absent. **B)** Presence of the genes needed for the three known bacterial C1 assimilation pathways in strains possessing at least one putative methanol dehydrogenase.

Table 1. PERMANOVA and PERMDISP statistical test results.

Distance metric	Test	Independent variable	R^2	Pseudo-F	Pr(>F)
Jaccard	PERMANOVA	Timepoint	0.04	2.0427	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMANOVA	Timepoint	0.08	3.8124	0.001
Jaccard	PERMDISP	Timepoint	NA	5.8664	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMDISP	Timepoint	NA	8.0389	0.001
Jaccard	PERMANOVA	Field site	0.05	25.623	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMANOVA	Field site	0.03	14.035	0.001
Jaccard	PERMDISP	Field site	NA	50.335	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMDISP	Field site	NA	19.947	0.001
Jaccard	PERMANOVA	Sample type	0.07	20.108	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMANOVA	Sample type	0.13	39.414	0.001
Jaccard	PERMDISP	Sample type	NA	51.113	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMDISP	Sample type	NA	17.582	0.001
Jaccard	PERMANOVA	Enrichment ID	0.52	10.412	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMANOVA	Enrichment ID	0.44	7.4642	0.001
Jaccard	PERMANOVA	Replicate (marginal effect*)	0.01	7.9084	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMANOVA	Replicate (marginal effect*)	0.01	7.9996	0.001
Jaccard	PERMANOVA	Dilution (marginal effect*)	0.02	6.1119	0.001
Weighted UniFrac	PERMANOVA	Dilution (marginal effect*)	0.02	7.8126	0.001

*Marginal effect indicates the effect of the term after taking into account all other terms in the

model (the terms were timepoint, field site, sample type, replicate, and dilution).