1 Metatranscriptomic and thermodynamic insights into medium-chain fatty acid
2 production using an anaerobic microbiome
3

4 *Matthew J. Scarborough[1,2], Christopher E. Lawson[2], Joshua J. Hamilton[3,4], Timothy J. Donohue[1,3], and*

5 *Daniel R. Noguera[1,2]**

7 Running Title: MCFA Producing Anaerobic Microbiome
8

[1]The Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center

University of Wisconsin – Madison

Madison, WI

[2]Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

University of Wisconsin – Madison

Madison, WI

[3]Department of Bacteriology

University of Wisconsin – Madison

Madison, WI

[4]Department of Biochemistry

University of Wisconsin – Madison

*Corresponding author e-mail: dnoguera@wisc.edu

Abstract

Biomanufacturing from renewable feedstocks represents a sustainable strategy to offset

fossil fuel-based chemical production. One potential biomanufacturing strategy is

production of medium chain fatty acids (MCFA) from organic feedstocks using either pure

cultures or microbiomes. While the set of microbes in a microbiome can often metabolize

more diverse organic materials than a single species, and the role of specific species may be

known, knowledge of the carbon and energy flow within and between organisms in MCFA

producing microbiomes is only starting to emerge. Here, we integrate metagenomic,

metatranscriptomic, and thermodynamic analyses to predict and characterize the

metabolic network of an anaerobic microbiome producing MCFA from organic matter

derived from lignocellulosic ethanol fermentation conversion residue. A total of 37 high

quality (>80% complete, < 10% contamination) metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs)

were recovered from the microbiome and metabolic reconstruction of the 10 most

abundant MAGs was performed. Metabolic reconstruction combined with

metatranscriptomic analysis predicted that organisms affiliated with *Lactobacillus* and

Coriobacteriaceae degraded carbohydrates and fermented sugars to lactate and acetate.

Lachnospiraceae and Eubacteriaceae affiliated organisms were predicted to transform

these fermentation products to MCFA. Thermodynamic analyses identified conditions in

which H_2 is expected to be either produced or consumed, suggesting a potential role of H_2

partial pressure on MCFA production. From an integrated systems analysis perspective, we

propose that MCFA production could be improved if microbiomes are engineered to use

homofermentative instead of heterofermentative *Lactobacillus*, and if MCFA-producing

organisms are engineered to preferentially use a thioesterase instead of a CoA transferase

as the terminal enzyme in reverse β-oxidation.

Importance

Mixed communities of microbes play important roles in health, the environment,

agriculture, and biotechnology. While tapping the combined activity of organisms within

microbiomes may allow the utilization of a wider range of substrate over the use of pure

cultures for biomanufacturing, harnessing the metabolism of these mixed cultures remains

a major challenge. Here, we predict metabolic functions of bacteria in a microbiome that

produces medium-chain fatty acids from a renewable feedstock. Our findings lay the

foundation to begin addressing how to engineer and control microbiomes for improved

biomanufacturing; to build synthetic mixtures of microbes that produce valuable chemicals

from renewable resources; and to better understand microbial communities that

contribute to health, agriculture, and the environment.

Introduction

Biological production of chemicals from renewable resources is an important step to

reduce societal dependence on fossil fuels. One approach that shows potential for the

biological production of chemicals from renewable resources, the carboxylate platform (1,

2), uses anaerobic microbial communities to biotransform complex substrates into

carboxylic acids, including medium-chain fatty acids (MCFA). MCFA such as hexanoate (a

six carbon monocarboxylate, C6) and octanoate (an eight carbon monocarboxylate, C8) are

used in large quantities for the production of pharmaceuticals, antimicrobials, and

industrial materials, and can be processed to chemicals currently derived from fossil fuels

(3, 4).

Previous applications of the carboxylate platform have focused on converting

organics from undistilled corn beer (5, 6), food (7, 8), winery residue (9), thin stillage from

corn ethanol production (10), and lignocellulose-derived materials (11-13) to MCFA, and as

we have shown for lignocellulosic biofuel production (4), one can anticipate economic

benefits of converting organic residues from these industries into MCFA.

MCFA producing bioreactors contain diverse microbial communities (4, 5, 12).

While the roles of some community members in these microbiomes can be inferred from

studies with pure cultures and from phylogenetic relationships (10, 12, 14, 15), detailed

knowledge of specific metabolic activities in many members of these microbiomes is only

starting to emerge (16). In general, some community members participate in hydrolysis

and fermentation of available organic substrates, while others are involved in the

conversion of intermediates to MCFA via reverse β-oxidation, a process also known as

chain elongation (1). In reverse β-oxidation, an acyl-CoA unit is combined with acetyl-CoA,

with each cycle elongating the resulting carboxylic acid by two carbons(1). Energy

conservation in organisms using reverse β-oxidation as the main metabolic process for

growth relies on ATP generation with reduced ferredoxin, which is generated through both

pyruvate ferredoxin oxidoreductase and an electron bifurcating acyl-CoA dehydrogenase

(17). A proton translocating ferredoxin, NAD_ reductase, is used to reduce NAD with

ferredoxin and create an ion motive force which is used to generate ATP (17). The even-

chain butyric (C4), hexanoic (C6), and octanoic (C8) acids are all potential products of

reverse β-oxidation when the process is initiated with acetyl-CoA. The odd-chain valeric

(C5) and heptanoic (C7) acids are products of reverse β-oxidation when the chain

elongation process starts with propionyl-CoA. While there are demonstrations of this wide

range of possible products from chain elongation (5, 18), and MCFA-bioreactors typically

produce more than one product (4, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20), a strategy to control the final

product length has not yet emerged. We are interested in obtaining the knowledge needed

for the rational development and implementation of strategies to improve MCFA yields and

control product formation in MCFA-producing microbiomes.

Earlier we reported on a bioreactor that produced a mixture of C2, C4, C6 and C8

from lignocellulosic stillage (4). Based on 16S rRNA tag sequencing, we found that five

major genera, three Firmicutes (*Lactobacillus*, *Roseburia*, *Pseudoramibacter*) and two

Actinobacteria (*Atopobium*, *Olsenella)*, represented more than 95% of the community (4).

Based on the phylogenetic association of these organisms, the *Lactobacillus* and the

Actinobacteria were hypothesized to produce lactic acid, while *Roseburia* and

Pseudoramibacter were hypothesized to produce the even-chain C4, C6, and C8 acids (4).

Furthermore, lactic acid was proposed as the key fermentation product that initiated chain

elongation in the microbiome (4). However, since phylogenetic association is not enough to

understand in detail the metabolism of these organisms, the earlier study did not generate

sufficient knowledge to help understand how to control a MCFA-producing microbiome.

Here we report on further studies of the MCFA-producing microbiome reported

earlier (4), where we utilized a combination of metagenomic, metatranscriptomic, and

thermodynamic analyses to reconstruct the combined metabolic activity of the microbial

community. We analyzed the gene expression patterns of the ten most abundant

community members during steady-state reactor operation. Our results identify several

community members that expressed genes predicted to be involved in complex

carbohydrate degradation and in the subsequent fermentation of degradation products to

lactate and acetate. Genes encoding enzymes for reverse β-oxidation were expressed by

two abundant organisms affiliated with the class Clostridia. Based on a thermodynamic

analysis of the proposed MCFA-producing pathways, we predict that individual Clostridial

organisms use different substrates for MCFA production (lactate, versus a combination of

xylose, H_2, and acetate). We also show that, under certain conditions, production of MCFA

provides energetic benefits compared to production of butyrate, thus generating

hypotheses for how to control the final products of chain elongation. This knowledge lays a

foundation to begin addressing how to engineer and control MCFA producing microbiomes.

Results

Microbiome characterization

We previously described the establishment of a microbiome that produces MCFA in

a bioreactor that is continuously fed with the residues from lignocellulosic ethanol

production (4). The reactor feed, identified as conversion residue (CR) in Fig. 1, contained

high amounts of xylose, carbohydrate oligomers, and uncharacterized organic matter. To

gain insight into the microbial activities that were associated with this MCFA-producing

microbiome, samples were collected for metagenomic analysis at five different times (Days

12, 48, 84, 96, and 120), and RNA was prepared for metatranscriptomic analysis at Day 96.

At the time of metatranscriptomic sampling, the bioreactor converted 16.5% of the organic

matter (measured as chemical oxygen demand (COD)) in conversion residue to C6 and C8.

During the period of reactor operation described in Fig. 1, the bioreactor converted 16.1 ±

3.1 % of COD to C6 and C8, and, therefore, Day 96 is representative of the overall reactor

performance.

From the metagenomic samples, a total of 219 million DNA reads were assembled

and binned, resulting in 37 high quality (>80% complete, <10% contamination) MAGs

(Supplement 1). In this study, MAGs are the collection of genes that were assembled into

contigs and represent the population of organisms associated with this collection. For the

Day 96 sample, 90% of the DNA reads mapped to the ten most abundant MAGs, and each

individual MAG mapped to either more than 0.9% of the DNA reads or more than 0.9% of

the cDNA reads (Supplement 2).. Abundance of the top 10 MAGs was calculated from the

percent of the total DNA reads mapped to the MAGs (Fig. 1c). For the Day 96 sample,

relative abundance and expression were compared (Fig. 2; Supplement 2). The most

abundant MAGs include a Lachnospiraceae (LCO1, 50%), a *Lactobacillus* (LAC1, 30%), a

Coriobacteriacea (COR1, 6.3%), and a Eubacteriaceae (EUB1, 6.0%). Four additional

Lactobacilli and two additional Coriobacteriacea are also predicted to be within the 10

most abundant MAGs (Fig. 2). The other MAGs (Supplement 1) corresponded to Firmicutes

(17 MAGs), Actinobacteria (4 MAGs), Tenericutes (3 MAGs), Bacteroidetes (2 MAGs), and

Spirochaetes (1 MAG).

The metatranscriptome data, obtained from the Day 96 sample, contained 87

million cDNA reads. After quality checking and removal of rRNA sequences, 82.6 million

predicted transcript reads were used for mapping to MAGs. Of these, 85.3% of the

predicted transcripts (hereafter referred to as transcripts or mRNA) mapped back to the 10

most abundant MAGs (Supplement 2). Relative expression was calculated from the total

filtered mRNA mapped to the MAGs and normalized to the predicted genome length of

these bacteria (Fig. 2). MAGs with the highest levels of transcripts included LAC1 (60%),

EUB1 (12%), LCO1 (11%), and COR1 (6.3%), which also displayed high abundance in the

metagenome (Fig. 2). Whereas LCO1 was most abundant based on DNA reads, LAC1

appeared to have the highest activity based on transcript levels.

A phylogenetic tree of the ten most abundant MAGs was constructed based on

concatenated amino acid sequences of 37 single-copy marker genes (Fig. 3). All Bacilli

MAGs (LAC1, LAC2, LAC3, LAC4, and LAC5) clustered with *Lactobacillus.* Average

nucleotide identity (ANI) calculations with other *Lactobacillus* genomes were above the 95-

96% ANI suggested for species demarcation (21), indicating that these MAGs represent

strains of established *Lactobacillus* species (Supplement 3). Clostridia EUB1 clustered with

Pseudoramibacter alactolyticus. The ANI calculations for this MAG with *P. alactolyticus* and

related members of the Eubacteriaceae indicated that EUB1 could represent a new genus

within the Eubacterium (Supplement 3). The EUB1 MAG is likely the same organism as

represented by the *Pseudoramibacter* operational taxonomic unit (OTU) in the 16S rRNA-

based identification reported earlier (4). The Clostridia LCO1 did not cluster with a specific

genus; ANIs of the LCO1 MAG and related organisms suggest this MAG could represent a

novel genus within the Lachnospiraceae (Supplement 3), while the 16S rRNA-based

analysis misclassified it as belonging to the *Roseburia* genus (4). The three Actinobacteria

MAGs, COR1, COR2, and COR3, clustered within the Coriobacteriaceae family. One of these

MAGs (COR2) clustered with *Olsenella umbonata* (22), but the ANI calculation did not

support this MAG being a representative of the *Olsenella* genus (Supplement 3). The other

two MAGs (COR1 and COR3) formed their own cluster within the Coriobacteriacea, but

were sufficiently different in ANI calculations to suggest that each represents new genera

within the Coriobacteriaceae. Phylogenetic classification of the other MAGs obtained in this

study are provided in Supplement 1.

Genomic predictions of chemical transformations in the microbiome

186   A prediction of metabolic networks in the microbiome was performed by analysis of

gene annotations or each of the abundant MAGs, whereas expression of the metabolic

network was analyzed by mapping mRNA reads to the open reading frames (ORFs) within

each of the ten most abundant bacteria. Metabolic reconstruction was performed with

automated prediction algorithms (23) and manual curation, particularly of proposed sugar

utilization, fermentation and chain elongation pathways (Supplement 4) (1). This analysis

identified a set of genes that could be used to model the metabolic potential of the

microbiome and also a set of genes with high expression levels in the metatranscriptome.

These gene sets were used to analyze the metabolic potential of the microbiome to [1]

degrade complex carbohydrates remaining in ethanol conversion residue; [2] transform

simple sugars into the fermentation products acetate, lactate, and ethanol; and [3] produce

butyrate (C4), C6, and C8 from sugars and fermentation products. The predictions for each

of these processes are summarized below.

Degradation of complex carbohydrates. Carbohydrates were a large portion of the

organic substrates present in the ethanol conversion residue fed to the bioreactor, and

uncharacterized carbohydrates. Quantitative analyses indicated that xylose was the most

abundant monosaccharide in the residue, accounting for 22% of the organic matter.

Glucose was undetected in most samples or a minor component, and other carbohydrates

corresponded to 20% of the organic matter in the residue (see CR bar in Fig. 1).

Approximately 40% of the uncharacterized carbohydrates were being degraded at the time

the metatranscriptomic samples were obtained (Day 96; Fig. 1).

To investigate the expression of genes related to degradation of complex

carbohydrates, we analyzed the predicted MAG ORFs using the carbohydrate-active

enzyme (CAZyme) database (24). Of particular interest was production of predicted

extracellular enzymes that hydrolyze glycosidic bonds in complex carbohydrates, as these

may release sugars that can be subsequently metabolized by community members that do

not express complex carbohydrate degrading enzymes. The subcellular localization

software, CELLO, was used to predict whether individual CAZyme proteins were located

within the cytoplasm or targeted to the extracellular space (Supplement 5) (25).

This analysis showed that transcripts encoding genes for several types of glycoside

hydrolases (GHs) were abundant in several MAGs in the microbiome (Fig. S1). All LAC

MAGs expressed genes encoding extracellular CAZymes that cleave glycosidic bonds

between hexose and pentose moieties in xylans. In particular, LAC1 LAC2, and LAC4

expressed genes that encode several extracellular exo-β-xylosidases that could remove

terminal xylose molecules from xylans present in the conversion residue (GH43 and

GH120; Fig. S1; Supplement 5). LAC2 also had high levels of transcripts for an exo-α-L-1,5-

arabinanase (GH93), predicted to release other pentose sugars from arabinan, which

accounts for 3% of the sugar polymers in switchgrass (26, 27). In addition, the COR1, COR3

and LAC4 members of the community had high transcript levels for three extracellular

CAZymes (GH13) that are predicted to degrade a variety of glucans that may be remaining

in switchgrass conversion residue (28). In sum, this analysis predicts that at the time of

sampling glucans were degraded by populations represented by *Lactobacillus* and

Coriobacteriaceae MAGs, where the populations represented by the LAC MAGs may also

have degraded xylans and arabinans. It further suggests that this microbiome is capable of

releasing oligosaccharides and sugar monomers from glucans, xylans, and arabinans, the

primary components of switchgrass and other plant biomass. The analysis also predicts

that LCO1 and EUB1 are not participating in complex carbohydrate degradation.

Bacterial oligosaccharide hydrolysis can also occur in the cytoplasm. All MAGs in

this microbiome contained predicted cytoplasmic GH13 enzymes, which are known to

degrade hexose oligosaccharides. The microbiome also contained abundant transcripts for

genes encoding predicted cytoplasmic CAZYmes that degrade maltose (GH4, GH65), a

glucose dimer that may result from extracellular breakdown of glucans (Fig. S1).

Transcripts encoding known or predicted cytoplasmic β-glucosidases (GH1, GH3) and β-

galactosidases (GH2) are found across the MAGs (Fig. S1). In addition, transcripts that

encode β-xylosidases (GH1, GH3) and α-L-arabinofuranosidases (GH2), are found in all the

LAC MAGs except LAC3 (Fig. S1). Based on the metatranscriptomic analysis, other

cytoplasmic CAZymes predicted to hydrolyze pentose-containing oligosaccharides are

predicted to be expressed by the LAC1, LAC2, LAC4, and LAC5 members of this microbiome

(Fig. S1).

Transport and production of simple fermentation products from sugars. Simple sugars

are abundant in ethanol conversion residue and produced during complex carbohydrate

hydrolysis. Sugars are therefore expected to be a major substrate for the microbiome.

Despite the use of a yeast strain that was engineered for improved xylose utilization in the

ethanol fermentation, xylose was the major abundant monosaccharide present in the

remaining conversion residue (CR; Fig. 1). As discussed above, the relative transcript levels

of genes encoding extracellular GHs (Fig. S1) by several MAGs in the microbiome predict

that additional pentoses and hexoses may be released through degradation of complex

carbohydrates.

We therefore analyzed the genomic potential of the community to transport sugars, and

metabolize them to fermentation products, particularly the known MCFA precursors

lactate, acetate, and ethanol. To investigate the ability of the community to transport

sugars, MAG ORFs were annotated with the Transporter Classification Database

(Supplement 6). Expression of genes associated with the pentose phosphate pathway,

phosphoketolase pathways, and glycolysis (Fig. 4a) was analyzed to predict the potential

for sugar metabolism within individual MAGs.

This analysis found that transcripts from genes encoding predicted carbohydrate

transporters were among the most highly abundant mRNAs across the microbiome,

accounting for 5.8% of the total transcripts . These putative transporters belonged to a

variety of families, including many associated with the ATP-binding cassette (ABC)

superfamily, and the phosphotransferase system (PTS) family (TD 4.A.-) (Fig. S2).   LCO1,

LAC1, LAC2, and LAC3 are predicted to contain xylose transporters (XylT) (Fig. 4a), while

glucose (GluT), fructose (FruT), and other hexose transporters were expressed across the

LAC, COR, and LCO MAGs (Fig. 4a; Fig. S2). EUB1 only encoded transcripts encoding

carbohydrate transporters for uptake of fructose and sucrose (Fig. S2). Overall, this

analysis predicts that all MAGs have the potential to transport hexose sugars into the cell,

while gene expression patterns observed for the LCO1 and the *Lactobacillus* MAGs

(excluding LAC3) predicted that at the time of sampling they played a major role in

pentose utilization in this microbiome.

We also analyzed the metatranscriptomic data to investigate potential routes for sugar

metabolism. Once transported to the cytoplasm, glucose can be phosphorylated with

hexokinase (HK) and converted to fructose-6-phosphate (F-6-P) by glucose-6-phosphate

isomerase (GI). Transcripts encoding predicted HK and GI enzymes are abundant for all

MAGs within the microbiome (Fig. 4a), except LAC5 for which the assembly does not show

homologues of these proteins. Fructose utilization starts with phosphorylation during

transport (Fig. 4a). Fructose-6-phosphate (F-6-P) is either phosphorylated to fructose-1,6-

bisphosphate (F-1,6-BP) by phosphofructokinase (PFK) in glycolysis or is cleaved to acetyl-

P (Ac-P) and erythrose-4-P (E-4-P) by phosphoketolase (PK). While LAC1, LAC2, LAC4,

LAC5 and COR3 all lack homologues of genes encoding PFK (a highly-conserved glycolysis

enzyme known to be a major target for regulatory control in hexose utilization) (29), they

all contain transcripts for homologues of PK (Fig. 4a). In sum, these analyses predict that all

of the abundant MAGs in this microbiome can utilize hexoses that may be produced during

hydrolysis of complex oligosaccharides.

Transcripts predicted to encode enzymes to convert xylose to xylulose-5-phosphate,

xylose isomerase (XI) and xylulose kinase (XK) (30), were abundant in most of the

Lactobacillus MAGs and LCO1, and either absent or showed very low abundance in LAC3,

EUB1 and the COR MAGs (Fig. 4a). Once produced, xylulose-5-P can be degraded through

either the phosphoketolase pathway or the pentose phosphate pathway. Transcripts from a

gene predicted to encode the diagnostic enzyme of the phosphoketolase pathway,

phosphoketolase (PK), which splits xylulose-5-P (X-5-P) into acetyl-P (Ac-P) and

glyceraldehyde-3-P (G-3-P), were among the most abundant mRNAs in the *Lactobacillus*

MAGs and is also present at high levels in LCO1, accounting for 1.5% of the total transcripts

(Fig. 4a; Supplement 4). LCO1 and LAC1 also contained transcripts from homologues of all

of the genes needed for the pentose phosphate pathway (R5PE, R5PI, TA, TK in Fig. 4a).

Overall, this analysis predicted that multiple routes of pentose utilization could be utilized

by the MAGs in this microbiome.

The predicted routes for both hexose and xylose metabolism in this microbiome lead to

pyruvate production (Fig. 4a), so we also analyzed how this and other fermentation

products might lead to MCFA production in this community. All MAGs contained transcripts

encoding lactate dehydrogenase homologues (LDH) (Fig. 4a), an enzyme which reduces

pyruvate to lactate. Transcript analysis also predicts that all of the MAGs (except LAC3) can

oxidize pyruvate to acetyl-CoA, utilizing either pyruvate dehydrogenase (PDH) or pyruvate

flavodoxin oxidoreductase (PFOR) (Fig. 4a). All MAGs (except EUB1) contain transcripts

encoding homologues of acetate kinase (ACK), which converts acetyl-phosphate (Ac-P) to

acetate while producing ATP (Fig. 4a). Based on predictions of the gene expression data,

the COR and LAC MAGs are also able to convert acetyl-CoA (Ac-CoA) to ethanol with

aldehyde dehydrogenase (ADA) and alcohol dehydrogenase (ADH). In summary, analysis of

the gene expression patterns in the conversion residue microbiome predicts that the MAGs

in the LCO, LAC and COR ferment sugars to acetate and lactate, while the LAC and COR

members produce ethanol as an additional fermentation product.

Elongation of fermentation products to MCFAs. Based on the above findings, we analyzed

the microbiome gene expression data to predict which members of the microbiome had the

potential for conversion of predicted fermentation products to MCFA. The Clostridia (LCO1

and EUB1) are the only MAGs that contained genes encoding homologues of genes known

to catalyze chain elongation reactions in the reverse β-oxidation pathway (Fig. 4b). Thus,

the subsequent analysis is based on the prediction that only LCO1 and EUB1 are the major

producers of MCFA in this microbiome. Furthermore, based on the analysis of sugar

utilization above, we predict that LCO1 is the only microorganism in the community that

can directly utilize sugars for MCFA production.

Acetate, lactate and ethanol, are all fermentation products that would require

transformation to acetyl-CoA before being used as a substrate for elongation by the reverse

β-oxidation pathway. Acetate could be converted to acetyl-CoA utilizing ATP via acetyl-CoA

synthase (ACS) or the ACK and phosphate acetyltransferase (PTA) route (Fig. 4b).

Alternatively, acetate can be converted to acetyl-CoA with a CoA transferase (CoAT) which

transfers a CoA from one carboxylic acid to another (e.g., from butyryl-CoA to acetate,

producing butyrate and acetyl-CoA) (Fig. 4b). Genes encoding homologues of ACS and ACK

were not found in EUB1, but LCO1 contained abundant transcripts that encoded

homologues of both ACK and PTA (Fig. 4a). Both MAGs also contained transcripts predicted

to encode CoAT enzymes (Fig. 4b). Taken together, this analysis predicts that acetate may

be used as a substrate for MCFA production by LCO1 and EUB1.

Lactate has been proposed as a key intermediate in other microbiomes producing

MCFA (12). While transcripts encoding genes for lactate production were abundant in the

microbiome (Fig. 4a), lactate did not accumulate to detectable levels during steady

operation, but transiently accumulated when the bioreactor received a higher load of

conversion residue (4). Transcripts for a gene encoding a predicted lactate transporter

(LacT) were abundant in EUB1. In addition, the assembly of LCO1 did not reveal the

presence of lactate transporter genes in this MAG, suggesting that only EUB1 may utilize

the lactate produced by other MAGs. Neither EUB1 nor LCO1 accumulated transcripts

encoding a predicted ADA homologue, which would be required for conversion of

acetaldehyde to acetyl-CoA during utilization of ethanol (Fig. 4b). This indicates that if

ethanol is produced in this microbiome, it is not used as a significant substrate for MCFA

production. Moreover, since ethanol did not accumulate in the reactor during either steady

state operation (Fig. 1) or after a high load of conversion residue (4), we predict that

ethanol is not a substrate for MCFA production in this microbiome. Rather, based on the

predicted activity of LAC and COR MAGs producing lactate and that of EUB1 consuming

lactate, we predict that lactate is a key fermentation intermediate for MCFA production.

Within the reverse β-oxidation pathway (Fig. 4b), a key enzyme is an electron-

bifurcating acyl-CoA dehydrogenase (ACD) containing two electron transfer flavoproteins

(EtfA, EtfB) that pass electrons from NADH to ferredoxin (Fig. 4b) (31). This electron

bifurcating complex has been recognized as a key energy conserving mechanism in strictly

anaerobic bacteria and archaea (17, 31) and studied in detail in butyrate producing

anaerobes (32, 33). Transcripts for genes encoding a homologue of the acyl-CoA

dehydrogenase complex (ACD, EtfA, EtfB) were abundant in both LCO1 and EUB1, as are

those from other genes predicted to be involved in this pathway (Fig. 4b). Chain elongation

by the reverse β-oxidation pathway conserves energy by increasing the ratio of reduced

ferredoxin (a highly electropositive electron carrier) to the less electropositive NADH (1).

In organisms that use this pathway, oxidation of ferredoxin by the Rnf complex generates

an ion motive force, and ATP synthase utilizes the ion motive force to produce ATP (17).

We found that transcripts for genes encoding homologues of all six subunits of the Rnf

complex were abundant in both EUB1 and LCO1 (RnfABCDEG, Fig. 4b). To maintain

cytoplasmic redox balance, reduced ferredoxin could transfer electrons to H^+ via

hydrogenase, generating H_2. LCO1 and EUB1, along with the COR MAGs, contained

abundant transcripts for genes predicted to produce ferredoxin hydrogenase (H2ase, Fig.

4b), supporting the hypothesis that H_2 production plays a role within this MCFA-producing

microbiome. We also looked for two additional hydrogenases known to conserve energy

either through the translocation of protons (EchABCDEF Fig. 4b,) or by electron

confurcation, utilizing electrons from both NADH and reduced ferredoxin (HydABC, Fig. 4b)

(17). It does not appear that these systems play a major role in H_2 production in this

microbiome since none of the MAGs contained genes encoding homologues of the known

components for either of these enzyme complexes (Fig 5b).

Thermodynamic analysis of MCFA production in the microbiome

The above analysis predicted several potential routes for MCFA production by LCO1

and EUB1 in this microbiome. To evaluate the implications of these potential chain

elongation routes, we used thermodynamic analysis to investigate the energetics of the

predicted transformations. For this, we reconstructed metabolic pathways for xylose and

lactate conversion, as well as ATP yields based on the data obtained from gene expression

analyses (Tables S2-S3, Supplement 7). Metabolic reconstructions considered xylose (Table

S2) and lactate (Table S3) as major substrates for synthesis of C4, C6, and C8 products. In

addition, both LCO1 and EUB1 have the potential to use a CoAT or a thioesterase (TE) as

the terminal enzyme of the reverse β-oxidation pathway (Fig. 4b), so we considered both

possibilities in the thermodynamic analysis. We used these reconstructions to calculate the

free energy changes of the overall biochemical reactions assuming an intracellular pH of

7.0, a temperature of 35°C, and H_2 partial pressures of 1.0 x 10^{-6}, 1.0, and 6.8 atm for low,

standard, and high H_2 partial pressure, respectively. The low value is the approximate

concentration of H_2 in water that is in equilibrium with the atmosphere and the high value

is an expected maximum in a pressurized mixed culture fermentation system (34). We also

compared the efficiency of ATP production to an expected maximum yield of 1 ATP per -60

kJ energy generated by the overall chemical transformation (35).

The use of xylose as the substrate (Table S2, Eqs. 3-8) is possible for LCO1 but not

EUB1, since the later MAG lacks genes to transport and activate xylose to xylulose-5-P

(XylT, XI, XK, Fig. 4a). Our analysis predicts that, with a pathway containing a terminal

CoAT enzyme, the ATP yield (mol ATP mol^{-1} xylose) does not increase if longer chain

MCFAs are produced. However, if TE is used for the terminal step of reverse β-oxidation

(Eqs. 6-8), the overall ATP yield is lower, but it increases with increasing product length,

and C8 production provides a 17% increase in ATP yield versus production of C4. This

suggests that LCO1 has no energetic benefit for producing C6 or C8 solely from xylose

unless TE is used as the terminal enzyme of reverse β-oxidation. Additionally, the higher

ATP yield of xylose conversion to C4 (Eqs. 3 and 6), in comparison to xylose conversion to

lactate and acetate by other members of the microbiome (Eq. 2), may explain why LCO1

reached higher abundance in the microbiome compared to the other less abundant MAGs

(LAC) that are predicted to ferment xylose to lactate and acetate (Fig. 2). In production of

C4 and C8, no H_2 is predicted to be formed if a CoAT is utilized (Eqs. 3 and 5), whereas H_2

production is predicted when C6 is produced (Eq. 4). On the other hand, if a TE terminal

enzyme is utilized for the reverse β-oxidation, H_2 is predicted to be produced for all

carboxylic acid products.

Additional metabolic reconstructions analyzed the co-utilization of xylose with a

monocarboxylic acid (Table S2, Eq 9-18). This analysis predicted that co-metabolism of

these substrates could provide an energetic advantage (i.e., higher mol ATP per mol of

xylose) if H_2 is utilized as an electron donor. This suggests that H_2, produced by either

EUB1 or COR MAGs (H2ase, Fig5a), may be utilized by LCO1 to support MCFA production. If

TE is used as the terminal enzyme of reverse β-oxidation (Eqs. 14-18), there is no increase

in ATP yield versus utilization of xylose as the sole carbon source (Eqs. 6-8).

We also modeled MCFA production from lactate by EUB1, since the gene expression

data suggested that EUB1 could transform lactate to MCFA. In models utilizing CoAT (Table

S3, Eq. 19-21) as a final step in MCFA production, the ATP yield increases as longer chain

MCFA are produced, but the free energy released is near the expected limit for ATP

production (35) under conditions of low H_2 partial pressure and below this limit at high H_2

partial pressures (Table S3). If TE is utilized as a final step in MCFA production by EUB1

(Eq. 22-24), lower ATP yields are predicted, and in that case the production of longer chain

MCFAs has a more pronounced effect on the ATP generated per mol of lactate consumed.

For instance, production of C6 results in a 100% increase in the ATP yield compared to

producing C4. However, each elongation step reduces the amount of energy released per

mol ATP produced, such that production of C8 from lactate results in the release of -58 kJ

per ATP produced under high H_2 conditions, which is near the expected limits for a cell to

conserve chemical energy as ATP. Overall, the thermodynamic analysis does not

unequivocally predict which terminal enzyme may be energetically more advantageous for

MCFA production from lactate. While using TE would result in more favorable free energy

release than when using CoAT, the predicted ATP yields are lower with TE than with CoAT.

We also note that although CoAT transcript abundance was higher than TE transcript

abundance (Fig. 4b), expression alone cannot be used as a predictor of which terminal

enzyme was primarily used since a kinetic characterization of these enzymes is not

available. Regardless, the thermodynamic modeling predicts that, in all conditions, H_2 will

be produced during lactate elongation (Table S3), and that TE could be a better terminal

enzyme to force production of longer chain acids in order to maximize ATP yield (Table

S3).

When modeling scenarios utilizing lactate plus carboxylic acids as growth substrates

(Table S3, Eqs. 25-36), their elongation by EUB1 would increase the amount of ATP it could

produce compared to using lactate only if using a terminal CoAT (Eqs. 19-21). H_2

production or consumption is not predicted in these scenarios, and the calculated free

energy released per mol of ATP produced (-50 to -53 kJ mol^{-1} ATP) is low, near the

physiological limit of -60 kJ mol^{-1} ATP for energy conservation by the cell. Models with TE

as the terminal enzyme in reverse β-oxidation were also analyzed (Eqs. 31-36) even though

EUB1 is not predicted to have this ability as it lacks ACS and ACK needed to utilize acetate

(Fig. 4b). In such models, producing C6 and C8 from lactate plus acetate (Eqs. 32-33) is

energetically favorable, whereas C4 production is not (Eq. 31).

Discussion

In this study, we illustrate how combining genomic, computational and thermodynamic

predictions can illustrate how a microbial community can convert organic substrates in

lignocellulosic conversion residues into MCFA (Fig. 5). Specifically, this approach predicts

that the coordinated and step-wise metabolic activity of different members of this

microbiome allow cleavage of complex five- and six-carbon containing polysaccharides;

conversion of sugars into simple fermentation products; and utilization of sugars and

intermediate fermentation products for MFCA production. This approach further predicts

the role of intracellular and extracellular reductants in these processes. Below, we illustrate

the new insight that has been gained on the activity of a MCFA producing microbiome and

how this might relate to other systems.

The microbial community studied here is similar in phylogenetic composition to

other microbial communities producing MCFA. For instance, in a community fed with dilute

ethanol and stillage, *Lactobacillus* and a member of the Clostridium Group IV were

abundant (12). In a system producing MCFA using thin stillage produced from corn ethanol,

Lactobacillus were enriched alongside *Megasphaera*, a known MCFA-producing Firmicute

(10). In a reactor converting wastes from wine production to MCFA, *Lactobacillus* and

Clostridia related to *Ruminococcus* were enriched (9). In each case, a community containing

carbohydrate fermenting organisms and potential MCFA producing organisms emerged.

Our data suggest that the contribution of *Lactobacillus* in this microbiome is in

extracellular carbohydrate degradation and subsequent metabolism of pentose- and

hexose-containing carbohydrates, while Coriobacteriaceae are predicted to metabolize

hexose-containing carbohydrates. The combined metabolic activities of these two MAGs

would produce oligosaccharides and monomeric sugars that would become available to

these and other members of the microbiome. Metabolic reconstruction combined with

microbiome transcript levels also suggest that the *Lactobacillus* and Coriobacteriaceae

MAGs produce fermentation end products, primarily lactate and acetate, from these

carbohydrates. Coriobacteriaceae, however, are also predicted to produce H_2. In addition,

microbiome gene expression patterns indicate that two MAGs, EUB1 and LCO1, produce

MCFA via reverse β-oxidation. LCO1 is predicted to consume xylose based on gene

expression analysis, whereas RNA abundance measurements indicate that EUB1 consumes

lactate.

We used thermodynamics to analyze hypothetical scenarios of MCFA production by

EUB1 and LCO1. Although the comparison of these hypothetical scenarios did not provide

an unequivocal answer to how chain elongation occurs in LCO1 and EUB1, it is helpful to

generate hypotheses that could eventually be tested in future research. Our

thermodynamic analysis predicts that the most energetically advantageous metabolism for

LCO1 (based on ATP production per mol xylose consumed) is the consumption of xylose, H_2

and carboxylates to produce C4, C6, and C8 while utilizing CoAT as a terminal enzyme.

While xylose is a major component of conversion residue (CR, Fig. 1), H_2 is expected to be

produced by Coriobacteriaceae MAGs and EUB1. For EUB1, which is expected to utilize

lactate, our analysis predicts that production of MCFA produces higher amounts of ATP,

with C6 resulting in a 2-fold increase in ATP production versus producing C4 when

consuming lactate as a sole substrate.

Predictions from our thermodynamic modeling indicate that C8 production from

lactate is energetically advantageous. However, this is at odds with C6 being produced from

conversion residue at higher concentrations than C8 (Fig. 1). It is known that C8 is a

biocide, so it may be that C8 accumulation is limited by the level of tolerance community

members have for this product (12). It is also possible that higher C6 production indicates

a more important role of C6 production by LCO1 without lactate being an intermediate

metabolite. It has also been shown that removal of C8 allows for higher productivities of

carboxylate platform systems (1).

H$_2$ production and interspecies H$_2$ transfer are known to have significant impacts on

the metabolism of microbial communities (36). Our analysis predicts a role of H$_2$ in

supporting chain elongation in a carboxylate platform microbiome. While high H$_2$ partial

pressures are proposed to inhibit production of acetate and other carboxylic acids (37, 38),

organisms that use the phosphoketolase pathway (the *Lactobacillus* and LCO1 MAGs

identified in this study) can produce C2, C4 and C8 without producing H$_2$ (Table S2, Eqs. 2,

3 and 5). While conversion of lactate to MCFA (Table S3, Eqs. 19-24) is predicted to

produce H$_2$, other processes such as co-utilization of xylose and a monocarboxylic acid for

MCFA production (Table S2, Eq. 9-18) would consume H$_2$. Therefore, H$_2$ accumulation is

not expected to limit production of MCFA, although H$_2$ partial pressures may influence the

metabolic routes utilized by the microbiome.

In considering how to further improve the production of MCFA with a microbiome,

additional work is needed to characterize and engineer reverse β-oxidation proteins from

the Firmicutes in order to improve production of organic acids longer than C4. Further, our

data predict that the terminal enzyme of reverse β-oxidation can influence production of

MCFA. While a CoAT enzyme results in higher ATP production, a TE makes production of

MCFA more energetically advantageous by increasing the ATP yield for production of C6

and C8 compared to C4 (Tables S2-S3). Therefore, engineering chain-elongating organisms

to only have a TE rather than CoAT may improve production of MCFA.

Our metabolic reconstructions predict that lactate was a key fermentation product

that supports MCFA production. Therefore, strategies to enhance lactate production and

minimize other fermentation products (fermentation of carbohydrates to lactate, rather

than acetate in this example), could improve production of desired end products.

Moreover, designing strategies to enrich a community that produces a critical intermediate

like lactate by one pathway (e.g., homofermentative lactate-producing *Lactobacilli*, rather

than hetero-fermenters producing both lactate and C2) could improve performance of the

microbiome. However, the principles controlling the presence or dominance of

heterofermentative versus homofermentative organisms in microbial communities remain

largely unexplored. Alternatively, higher production of a desired product, C8, could be

achieved by adjusting the abundance or establishing a defined co-culture containing a lactic

acid bacterium capable of complex carbohydrate degradation, such as LAC1, and a lactate-

elongating organism, such as EUB1. The ability to establish defined synthetic communities,

to adjust the abundance of microbiome members or to regulate the metabolic routes within

the microbiome may allow more control over the function of a microbiome for production

of MCFA or to optimize other traits.

In summary, this work demonstrates that one can dissect and model the

composition of microbiomes as a way to understand the contribution of different

community members to its function. In the case of an anaerobic carboxylate platform

microbiome fed lignocellulosic ethanol conversion residue, two Clostridia-related

organisms (EUB1 and LCO1) are predicted to be responsible for production of MCFA via

reverse β-oxidation. This provides a genome-centric rationale for the previously

established correlation between Clostridia-related abundance and MCFA production noted

in carboxylate platform systems (4, 12). This study further predicts that the terminal

enzyme in product synthesis and the fermentation end products produced by other

community members can play a role in determining predominant products of this

microbiome.   These approaches, concepts and insights should be useful in predicting and

controlling MCFA production by reactor microbiomes and in analyzing the metabolic,

genomic and thermodynamic factors influencing the function of other microbiomes of

health, environmental, agronomic or biotechnological importance.

Methods

Production of conversion residue. Switchgrass used to generate conversion residue was

treated by ammonia fiber expansion and enzymatically treated with Cellic CTec3® and

Cellic HTec3® (Novozymes) to digest cellulose and hemicellulose (to glucose and xylose,

primarily) (39). Hydrolysate was fermented with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Y128, a strain

with improved xylose utilization (40). Fermentation media was distilled to remove ethanol

(4).

Bioreactor operation. The bioreactor was seeded with acid digester sludge from the Nine

Springs Wastewater treatment plant in Madison, WI. The retention time of the semi-

continuous reactor was maintained at six days by pumping conversion residue into the

reactor, pumping reactor effluent from the reactor once per hour, and maintaining a liquid

volume of 150mL in the reactor. The reactor was mixed with a magnetic stir bar. The

temperature of the reactor was controlled at 35 °C using a water bath, and the pH of the

reactor was maintained at 5.5 by feeding 5M KOH through a pump connected to a pH

controller. This reactor sustained MCFA production for 252 days (4).

Metabolite analysis. Samples from the bioreactor and conversion residue were collected

for metabolite analysis. All samples were filtered using 0.22 μm syringe filters

(ThermoFisher Scientific SLGP033RS, Waltham, MA, USA). Chemical oxygen demand (COD)

analysis was performed using High Range COD Digestion Vials (Hach 2125915, Loveland,

CO, USA) per standard methods (41). Soluble carbohydrates were measured with the

anthrone method (42). Glucose, xylose, acetic acid, formic acid, lactic acid, succinic acid,

pyruvic acid, glycerol and xylitol were analyzed with high performance liquid

chromatography and quantified with an Agilent 1260 Infinity refractive index detector

(Agilent Technologies, Inc. Palo Alto, CA) using a 300 x 7.8 mm Bio-Rad Aminex HPX-87H

column with Cation-H guard (BioRad, Inc., Hercules, CA). Acetamide, ethanol, n-propionic

acid, n-butyric acid, iso-butyric acid, n-pentanoic acid, iso-pentanoic acid, n-hexanoic acid,

iso-hexanoic acid, n-heptanoic acid, and n-octanoic acid were analyzed with tandem gas

chromatography-mass spectrometry. An Agilent 7890A GC system (Agilent Technologies,

Inc. Palo Alto, CA) with a 0.25 mm Restek Stabilwax DA 30 column (Restek 11008,

Belefonte, PA) was used. The GC-MS system was equipped with a Gerstel MPS2 (Gerstel,

Inc. Baltimore, MD) auto sampler and a solid-phase micro-extraction gray hub fiber

assembly (Supelco, Bellefonte, PA). The MS detector was a Pegasus 4D TOF-MS (Leco Corp.,

Saint Joseph, MI). Stable isotope labeled internal standards were used for each of the

analytes measured with GC-MS.

DNA and RNA sequencing. Biomass samples, consisting of centrifuged and decanted 2 mL

aliquots, were collected at Day 12, Day 48, Day 84, Day 96, and Day 120 of reactor

operations from initial start-up. Samples were also taken at 96 days and flash-frozen in

liquid nitrogen for RNA extraction. For DNA extraction, cells were lysed by incubating in a

lysis solution (1.5M sodium chloride, 100mM trisaminomethane, 100mM ethylenediamine

(EDTA), 75mM sodium phosphate, 1% cetyltrimethylammonium bromide, and 2% sodium

dodecyl sulfate(SDS)), lysozyme (Thermo Fisher Scientific, MA, USA), and proteinase K

(New England Biolabs,MA, USA). We then added 500 uL of a 24:24:1 solution of phenol:

chloroform: isoamyl alcohol and bead-beat samples for 2 minutes. After bead-beating,

biomass was centrifuged at 5,000 rcf for 3 minutes and the entire supernatant was

transferred to a 1.5 mL centrifuge tube. Samples were centrifuged again at 12,000 rcf for 10

minutes and the aqueous layer was then removed to a new centrifuge tube. A second phase

separation was then performed using chloroform. After centrifuging again and separating

the aqueous phase, 500 uL of isopropanol was added to each samples and samples were

then incubated at -20 deg C for 24 hours. Following this incubation, samples were

centrifuged at 12,000 rcf for 30 minutes at 4 deg C, decanted, and washed with 70%

ethanol. After air-drying the samples, pellets were resuspended in 100 uL of TE buffer and

2 uL of 10 mg/mL RNAse was added to each sample. Samples were incubated for 15

minutes at 37 deg C. We then added 100uL of a 24:24:1 solution of phenol: chloroform:

isoamyl alcohol to each sample and centrifuged at 12,000 rcf for 10 minutes.   We

separated the aqueous phase to a new centrifuge tube and added 100 Ul of chloroform.

Again, samples were centrifuged at 12,000 rcf for 10 minutes and the aqueous phase was

separated to a new centrifuge tube. We then added 10 uL of 3M sodium acetate and 250 uL

of 95% ethanol to each sample and incubated for 24 hours at -20 deg C. Samples were

centrifuged at 12,000 rcf for 30 minutes at 4 deg C and the pellets were washed with 70%

ethanol. After air-drying, pellets were resuspended in 50uL of TE buffer. After re-

suspending the DNA, quantity, purity, and quality were assessed with a Qubit 4

Fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, MA, USA), a Nanodrop 2000 spectrophotometer

(Thermo Fisher Scientific, MA, USA), and gel electrophoresis.

For RNA extraction, cells were lysed by incubating in a lysis solution (20 mM sodium

acetate, 1 mM EDTA, and 0.5% SDS prepared in diethylpyrocarbonate-treated water

(Invitrogen, CA, USA)) and TRIzol (Invitrogen, CA, USA). The treated cells were subjected to

2 minutes of bead beating using Lysing Matrix A (MP Biomedicals, CA, USA). After this step,

successive phase separations with phenol: chloroform: isoamyl alcohol and chloroform

were used to separate nucleic acids from additional cell material, as described above. RNA

was further purified with an RNEasy Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) and on-column

DNAse 1 (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) treatment. After re-suspending the RNA, quantity,

purity, and quality were assessed with a Qubit 4 Fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific,

MA, USA), a Nanodrop 2000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, MA, USA), and

gel electrophoresis. RNA samples were submitted to the University of Wisconsin Gene

Expression Center for quality control with a Bioanalyzer (Agilent, CA, USA), ribosomal RNA

reduction with a RiboZero-Bacteria rRNA Removal Kit (Illumina, CA, USA) with a 1μg RNA

input. Strand-specific cDNA libraries were prepared with a TruSeq RNA Library Prep Kit

(Illumina, CA, USA).

DNA and RNA were sequenced with the Illumina HiSeq 2500 platform (Illumina, CA,

USA). For DNA, an average insert size of 550 bp was used and 2 x 250 bp reads were

generated. For RNA, 1 x 100 bp reads were generated. Raw DNA and cDNA reads can be

found on the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) website under

BioProject PRJNA418244.

Metagenomic assembly, binning, and quality control. DNA sequencing reads were

filtered with Sickle using a minimum quality score of 20 and a minimum sequence length of

100 (43). Reads from all five samples were then co-assembled using metaspades and kmer

values of 21, 33, 55, 77, 99, and 127 (44). Binning of assembled contigs was performed with

MaxBin v2.2.1 (45). The quality, completeness, and contamination of each bin was analyzed

with CheckM v1.0.3 (46). Read mapping was performed with BBMAP v35.92

(https://sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap) to estimate the relative abundance of each bin.

Relative abundance was calculated by normalizing the number of mapped reads to the

genome size.

Phylogenetic analysis. Phylogeny of the draft genomes was assessed using 37 universal

single-copy marker genes with Phylosift v1.0.1 (47). In addition to the draft genomes, 62

publically-available genomes of related organisms were used to construct a phylogenetic

tree. Concatenated amino acid sequences of the marker genes were aligned with Phylosift,

and a maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree was constructed with RAxML v8.2.4 with the

PROTGAMMAAUTO model and 100 bootstraps (48). ANI calculations were performed

using JSpecies (49).

Genome annotations. Draft genomes were annotated with MetaPathways v2.5.(23) Open

reading frames (ORFs) were predicted using Prodigal v2.0 (50), and the ORFs were

annotated with the following databases: SEED (accessed March 2013), Clusters of

Orthologous Groups (COG, accessed December 2013), RefSeq (accessed January 2017),

Metacyc (accessed October 2011), and KEGG (accessed January 2017). The LAST algorithim

was used for assigning functional annotations (51). Functional annotations for each MAG

are provided in Supplement 4. Draft genomes were further annotated with the CAZY

database (24). CELLO was used to determine the subcellular location of the CAZYs (25).

Transporters were identified using the Transporter Classification Database.

Transcript analysis. Analysis of transcript data was performed as described in Lawson, et

al. (52). cDNA reads were quality filtered as described above for DNA. SortMeRNA was used

to remove rRNA sequences using multiple databases for RNA sequences (53). The

remaining non-rRNA sequences were then mapped back to the draft genomes using BBMap

v35.92 (https://sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap) with the minimum sequence identity set

to 0.95. Ambiguous reads with multiple top-hit mapping locations were assigned to a

random ORF. The number of RNA reads mapping to each ORF was calculated with htseq-

count v0.6.1 with the "intersection-strict" parameter (54). Relative gene expression

(RPKM) was calculated for each ORF by normalizing the number of mapped RNA reads for

each ORF to the ORF length and the total number of RNA reads mapping back to the

genome. The relative RPKM (relPKM) was then calculated as the ratio of the RPKM for the

ORF to the median RPKM across the draft genome. Finally, the $\log_2$(relRPKM) was

calculated to determine the log-fold difference. As such, a positive number corresponds to

greater than median expression levels and a negative number to expression below median

levels.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the DOE Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center (DOE BER

Office of Science DE-FC02-07ER64494 and DE-SC0018409). M.J.S. is supported by the

National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant No. DGE-

1256259. C.E.L is supported by a Postgraduate Scholarship–Doctoral (PGS-D) award from

the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and a

Wisconsin Distinguished Graduate Fellowship. JJH was supported by the National Institute

of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under award number 2016-

67012-24709. The authors thank Francisco Moya for assistance with RNA extraction and

the University of Wisconsin Biotechnology Center DNA Sequencing Facility and Gene

Expression Center for library preparation and Illumina sequencing services.

References

686
687   1.   **Angenent LT, Richter H, Buckel W, Spirito CM, Steinbusch KJJ, Plugge CM, Strik**
688   **D, Grootscholten TIM, Buisman CJN, Hamelers HVM.** 2016. Chain Elongation with
689   Reactor Microbiomes: Open-Culture Biotechnology To Produce Biochemicals.
690   Environ Sci Technol **50:**2796-2810.
691   2.   **Holtzapple MT, Granda CB.** 2009. Carboxylate platform: the MixAlco process part
692   1: comparison of three biomass conversion platforms. Appl Biochem Biotechnol
693   **156:**95-106.
694   3.   **Sarria S, Kruyer NS, Peralta-Yahya P.** 2017. Microbial synthesis of medium-chain
695   chemicals from renewables. Nat Biotechnol **35:**1158-1166.
696   4.   **Scarborough MJ, Lynch G, Dickson M, McGee M, Donohue TJ, Noguera DR.** 2018.
697   Increasing the economic value of lignocellulosic stillage through medium-chain fatty
698   acid production. Biotechnology for Biofuels **11:**200.
699   5.   **Agler MT, Spirito CM, Usack JG, Werner JJ, Angenent LT.** 2012. Chain elongation
700   with reactor microbiomes: upgrading dilute ethanol to medium-chain carboxylates.
701   Energy Environ Sci **5:**8189.
702   6.   **Ge S, Usack JG, Spirito CM, Angenent LT.** 2015. Long-Term n-Caproic Acid
703   Production from Yeast-Fermentation Beer in an Anaerobic Bioreactor with
704   Continuous Product Extraction. Environ Sci Technol **49:**8012-8021.
705   7.   **Grootscholten TIM, Strik DPBTB, Steinbusch KJJ, Buisman CJN, Hamelers HVM.**
706   2014. Two-stage medium chain fatty acid (MCFA) production from municipal solid
707   waste and ethanol. Applied Energy **116:**223-229.
708   8.   **Grootscholten TIM, dal Borgo FK, Hamelers HVM, Buisman CJN.** 2013.
709   Promoting chain elongation in mixed culture acidification reactors by addition of
710   ethanol. Biomass & Bioenergy **48:**10-16.

711 9. **Kucek LA, Xu JJ, Nguyen M, Angenent LT.** 2016. Waste Conversion into n-
712   Caprylate and n-Caproate: Resource Recovery from Wine Lees Using Anaerobic
713   Reactor Microbiomes and In-line Extraction. Front Microbiol **7**.
714 10. **Andersen SJ, Candry P, Basadre T, Khor WC, Roume H, Hernandez-Sanabria E,**
715   **Coma M, Rabaey K.** 2015. Electrolytic extraction drives volatile fatty acid chain
716   elongation through lactic acid and replaces chemical pH control in thin stillage
717   fermentation. Biotechnol Biofuels **8**.
718 11. **Xiong BY, Richard TL, Kumar M.** 2015. Integrated acidogenic digestion and
719   carboxylic acid separation by nanofiltration membranes for the lignocellulosic
720   carboxylate platform. J Membr Sci **489:**275-283.
721 12. **Andersen SJ, De Groof V, Khor WC, Roume H, Props R, Coma M, Rabaey K.** 2017.
722   A Clostridium Group IV Species Dominates and Suppresses a Mixed Culture
723   Fermentation by Tolerance to Medium Chain Fatty Acids Products. Front Bioeng
724   Biotechnol **5:**8.
725 13. **Kenealy WR, Cao Y, Weimer PJ.** 1995. Production of caproic acid by cocultures of
726   ruminal cellulolytic bacteria and Clostridium kluyveri grown on cellulose and
727   ethanol. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology **44:**507-513.
728 14. **Kucek LA, Nguyen M, Angenent LT.** 2016. Conversion of L-lactate into n-caproate
729   by a continuously fed reactor microbiome. Water Res **93:**163-171.
730 15. **Zhu X, Tao Y, Liang C, Li X, Wei N, Zhang W, Zhou Y, Yang Y, Bo T.** 2015. The
731   synthesis of n-caproate from lactate: a new efficient process for medium-chain
732   carboxylates production. Sci Rep **5:**14360.
733 16. **Han W, He P, Shao L, Lu F.** 2018. Metabolic Interactions of a Chain Elongation
734   Microbiome. Appl Environ Microbiol doi:10.1128/AEM.01614-18.
735 17. **Buckel W, Thauer RK.** 2013. Energy conservation via electron bifurcating
736   ferredoxin reduction and proton/Na(+) translocating ferredoxin oxidation. Biochim
737   Biophys Acta **1827:**94-113.
738 18. **Spirito CM, Richter H, Rabaey K, Stams AJ, Angenent LT.** 2014. Chain elongation
739   in anaerobic reactor microbiomes to recover resources from waste. Curr Opin
740   Biotechnol **27:**115-122.
741 19. **Zhu X, Zhou Y, Wang Y, Wu T, Li X, Li D, Tao Y.** 2017. Production of high-
742   concentration n-caproic acid from lactate through fermentation using a newly
743   isolated Ruminococcaceae bacterium CPB6. Biotechnol Biofuels **10:**102.
744 20. **Nelson R, Peterson D, Karp E, Beckham G, Salvachúa D.** 2017. Mixed Carboxylic
745   Acid Production by Megasphaera elsdenii from Glucose and Lignocellulosic
746   Hydrolysate. Fermentation **3:**10.
747 21. **Kim M, Oh HS, Park SC, Chun J.** 2014. Towards a taxonomic coherence between
748   average nucleotide identity and 16S rRNA gene sequence similarity for species
749   demarcation of prokaryotes (vol 64, pg 346, 2014). Int J Syst Evol Microbiol
750   **64:**1825-1825.
751 22. **Kraatz M, Wallace RJ, Svensson L.** 2011. Olsenella umbonata sp. nov., a
752   microaerotolerant anaerobic lactic acid bacterium from the sheep rumen and pig
753   jejunum, and emended descriptions of Olsenella, Olsenella uli and Olsenella profusa.
754   Int J Syst Evol Microbiol **61:**795-803.

755   23.   **Konwar KM, Hanson NW, Bhatia MP, Kim D, Wu SJ, Hahn AS, Morgan-Lang C,**
756   **Cheung HK, Hallam SJ.** 2015. MetaPathways v2.5: quantitative functional,
757   taxonomic and usability improvements. Bioinformatics **31:**3345-3347.
758   24.   **Lombard V, Golaconda Ramulu H, Drula E, Coutinho PM, Henrissat B.** 2014. The
759   carbohydrate-active enzymes database (CAZy) in 2013. Nucleic Acids Res **42:**D490-
760   495.
761   25.   **Yu CS, Chen YC, Lu CH, Hwang JK.** 2006. Prediction of protein subcellular
762   localization. Proteins **64:**643-651.
763   26.   **Zurawski JV, Khatibi PA, Akinosho HO, Straub CT, Compton SH, Conway JM, Lee**
764   **LL, Ragauskas AJ, Davison BH, Adams MWW, Kelly RM.** 2017. Bioavailability of
765   Carbohydrate Content in Natural and Transgenic Switchgrasses for the Extreme
766   Thermophile Caldicellulosiruptor bescii. Appl Environ Microbiol **83**.
767   27.   **Sakamoto T, Thibault JF.** 2001. Exo-arabinanase of Penicillium chrysogenum able
768   to release arabinobiose from alpha-1,5-L-arabinan. Appl Environ Microbiol
769   **67:**3319-3321.
770   28.   **Abdullah M, French D.** 1970. Substrate Specificity of Pullulanase. Arch Biochem
771   Biophys **137:**483-&.
772   29.   **Ronimus RS, Morgan HW.** 2001. The biochemical properties and phylogenies of
773   phosphofructokinases from extremophiles. Extremophiles **5:**357-373.
774   30.   **Lawlis VB, Dennis MS, Chen EY, Smith DH, Henner DJ.** 1984. Cloning and
775   sequencing of the xylose isomerase and xylulose kinase genes of Escherichia coli.
776   Appl Environ Microbiol **47:**15-21.
777   31.   **Demmer JK, Pal Chowdhury N, Selmer T, Ermler U, Buckel W.** 2017. The
778   semiquinone swing in the bifurcating electron transferring flavoprotein/butyryl-
779   CoA dehydrogenase complex from Clostridium difficile. Nat Commun **8:**1577.
780   32.   **Li F, Hinderberger J, Seedorf H, Zhang J, Buckel W, Thauer RK.** 2008. Coupled
781   ferredoxin and crotonyl coenzyme a (CoA) reduction with NADH catalyzed by the
782   butyryl-CoA dehydrogenase/Etf complex from Clostridium kluyveri. Journal of
783   Bacteriology **190:**843-850.
784   33.   **Aboulnaga EH, Pinkenburg O, Schiffels J, El-Refai A, Buckel W, Selmer T.** 2013.
785   Effect of an Oxygen-Tolerant Bifurcating Butyryl Coenzyme A
786   Dehydrogenase/Electron-Transferring Flavoprotein Complex from Clostridium
787   difficile on Butyrate Production in Escherichia coli. Journal of Bacteriology
788   **195:**3704-3713.
789   34.   **de Kok S, Meijer J, van Loosdrecht MC, Kleerebezem R.** 2013. Impact of dissolved
790   hydrogen partial pressure on mixed culture fermentations. Appl Microbiol
791   Biotechnol **97:**2617-2625.
792   35.   **Buckel W, Thauer RK.** 2013. Energy conservation via electron bifurcating
793   ferredoxin reduction and proton/Na+ translocating ferredoxin oxidation.
794   Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Bioenergetics **1827:**94-113.
795   36.   **Stams AJ, Plugge CM.** 2009. Electron transfer in syntrophic communities of
796   anaerobic bacteria and archaea. Nat Rev Microbiol **7:**568-577.
797   37.   **Zhang F, Zhang Y, Chen M, van Loosdrecht MCM, Zeng RJ.** 2013. A modified
798   metabolic model for mixed culture fermentation with energy conserving electron
799   bifurcation reaction and metabolite transport energy. Biotechnol Bioeng **110:**1884-
800   1894.

38. **Rodriguez J, Kleerebezem R, Lema JM, van Loosdrecht MCM.** 2006. Modeling
product formation in anaerobic mixed culture fermentations. Biotechnol Bioeng
93:592-606.
39. **Balan V, Bals B, Chundawat SPS, Marshall D, Dale BE.** 2009. Lignocellulosic
Biomass Pretreatment Using AFEX. Biofuels: Methods and Protocols **581:**61-77.
40. **Parreiras LS, Breuer RJ, Avanasi Narasimhan R, Higbee AJ, La Reau A,**
Tremaine M, Qin L, Willis LB, Bice BD, Bonfert BL, Pinhancos RC, Balloon AJ,
Uppugundla N, Liu T, Li C, Tanjore D, Ong IM, Li H, Pohlmann EL, Serate J,
Withers ST, Simmons BA, Hodge DB, Westphall MS, Coon JJ, Dale BE, Balan V,
Keating DH, Zhang Y, Landick R, Gasch AP, Sato TK. 2014. Engineering and two-
stage evolution of a lignocellulosic hydrolysate-tolerant Saccharomyces cerevisiae
strain for anaerobic fermentation of xylose from AFEX pretreated corn stover. PLoS
One **9:**e107499.
41. **American Public Health Association WEF, and American Water Works**
Association 2005. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and
Wastewater: 21st Edition. American Public Health Association.
42. **Yemm EW, Willis AJ.** 1954. The estimation of carbohydrates in plant extracts by
anthrone. Biochem J **57:**508-514.
43. **Joshi NA, Fass JN.** 2011. Sickle: A sliding-window, adaptive, quality-based trimming
tool for FastQ files (Version 1.33)
44. **Nurk S, Meleshko D, Korobeynikov A, Pevzner PA.** 2017. metaSPAdes: a new
versatile metagenomic assembler. Genome Res **27:**824-834.
45. **Wu YW, Simmons BA, Singer SW.** 2016. MaxBin 2.0: an automated binning
algorithm to recover genomes from multiple metagenomic datasets. Bioinformatics
32:605-607.
46. **Parks DH, Imelfort M, Skennerton CT, Hugenholtz P, Tyson GW.** 2015. CheckM:
assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and
metagenomes. Genome Res **25:**1043-1055.
47. **Darling AE, Jospin G, Lowe E, Matsen FAt, Bik HM, Eisen JA.** 2014. PhyloSift:
phylogenetic analysis of genomes and metagenomes. PeerJ **2:**e243.
48. **Stamatakis A.** 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-
analysis of large phylogenies. Bioinformatics **30:**1312-1313.
49. **Richter M, Rossello-Mora R, Oliver Glockner F, Peplies J.** 2016. JSpeciesWS: a
web server for prokaryotic species circumscription based on pairwise genome
comparison. Bioinformatics **32:**929-931.
50. **Hyatt D, Chen GL, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ.** 2010. Prodigal:
prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC
Bioinformatics **11:**119.
51. **Kielbasa SM, Wan R, Sato K, Horton P, Frith MC.** 2011. Adaptive seeds tame
genomic sequence comparison. Genome Res **21:**487-493.
52. **Lawson CE, Wu S, Bhattacharjee AS, Hamilton JJ, McMahon KD, Goel R, Noguera**
DR. 2017. Metabolic network analysis reveals microbial community interactions in
anammox granules. Nat Commun **8:**15416.
53. **Kopylova E, Noe L, Touzet H.** 2012. SortMeRNA: fast and accurate filtering of
ribosomal RNAs in metatranscriptomic data. Bioinformatics **28:**3211-3217.

54.   **Anders S, Pyl PT, Huber W.** 2015. HTSeq--a Python framework to work with high-
847   throughput sequencing data. Bioinformatics **31:**166-169.
848

Fig. 1. Transformation of materials in lignocellulosic ethanol conversion residue by an anaerobic
microbiome and abundance of MAGs. During 120 days of reactor operation, compounds in conversion
residue (CR) were converted to medium-chain fatty acids. **For (A) and (B),** the first set of bars in the figure
describe concentrations in the feed (CR), whereas the rest of the bars describe concentrations in the reactor. A
more detailed description of the operation of this reactor is presented elsewhere (4).Samples were taken for
metagenomic (MG) analysis from five timepoints (Day 12, Day 48, Day 84, Day 96, and Day 120 and for
metatranscriptomic analysis (MT) from one time point (Day 96). Overall, the bioreactor transformed xylose,
uncharacterized carbohydrates and uncharacterized COD to acetic (C2), butyric (C4), hexanoic (C6) and
octanoic (C8) acids. The microbial community was enriched in 10 MAGs.

859
860 **Fig. 2. Relative abundance and expression of the 10 most abundant MAGs in the bioreactor at Day 96.**
861 Relative abundance was determined by mapping DNA sequencing reads to the MAG and normalizing to the
862 length of the MAG genome. Relative transcript abundance (expression) was determined by mapping c-DNA
863 sequencing reads to the MAG and normalizing to the length of the MAG genome.
864
865

866
Fig. 3. Phylogenetic analysis for ten MAGs obtained from reactor biomass. Draft genomes from this study
are shown in bold text. Red text indicates an organism that has been shown to produce MCFA. National Center
for Biotechnology Information assembly accession numbers are shown in parentheses. Node labels represent
bootstrap support values with solid circles representing a bootstrap support value of 100. The phyla and class
of genomes are shown in shaded boxes and families are indicated by brackets For Actinobacteria genomes,
Actinobacteria is both the phylum and class.

Fig. 4. Relative expression of genes involved in the conversion of xylose and lactate to MCFA.
Expression of key enzymes involved in (**A**) the utilization of xylose, and **(B)** acyl chain elongation. Dashed
lines represent the existence of multiple enzyme reactions between the indicated molecules. The relative
RPKM (relRPKM) is normalized to the median RPKM for the MAG. Gene expression data is presented as the
$\log_2$(relRPKM). The color intensities of the heatmaps represent the relative gene expression, with red color
intensity indicating expression below median levels and blue intensity indicating expression above median
levels. Grey indicates that the gene is absent from the genome. For genes that are not predicted to be
expressed by any MAGs, the associated enzyme product is greyed out in the pathway figure. Key pathway
intermediates include xylulose, xylulose-5-phosphate (X-5-P), ribose-5-phosphate (R-5-P), sedoheptulose-7-
phosphate (S-7-P), erythyrose-4-phosphate (E-4-P), glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate (G-3-P), fructose-6-

phosphate (F-6-P), acetate (Ac), acetyl-phosphate (Ac-P), acetyl-CoA (Ac-CoA), lactate and ethanol. Enzyme
abbreviations are as follows: **(A)** XylT = xylose transporter, XI = xylose isomerase (EC 5.3.1.5); XK = xylulose
kinase (EC 2.7.1.17), R5PE = ribulose-5-phosphate epimerase (EC 5.1.3.1), R5PI = ribose-5-phosphate
isomerase (EC 5.3.1.6), TA = transaldolase (EC 2.2.1.2), TK = transketolase (EC 2.2.1.1), PK = D-xylulose 5-
phosphate/ D-fructose 6-phosphate phosphoketolase (EC 4.1.2.9), GluT = glucose transporter, FruT =
fructose PTS transporter, HK = hexokinase (EC 2.7.1.1, EC 2.7.1.2), G6PI =glucose-6-phoshphate isomerase
(EC 5.3.1.9), PFK = phosphofructokinase (EC 2.7.1.11), PDH = pyruvate dehydrogenase complex (EC 1.2.4.1,
EC 2.3.1.12, EC 1.8.1.4), PFOR = pyruvate flavodoxin oxidoreductase (EC 1.2.7.-), ADA = acetaldehyde
dehydrogenase (EC 1.2.1.10), AD = alcohol dehydrogenase (EC 1.1.1.1), PTA = phosphate acetyltransferase
(EC 2.3.1.8), ACK = acetate kinase (EC 2.7.2.1), LDH = lactate dehydrogenase (EC 1.1.1.27), **(B)** LacT = lactate
permease, ACS = acetyl-CoA synthetase (EC 6.2.1.1), ACAT = Acetyl-CoA C-acyltransferase (EC 2.3.1.16, EC
2.3.1.9), HAD = 3-Hydroxyacyl-CoA Dehydrogenase (EC 1.1.1.157, 1.1.1.35), ECH = Enoyl-CoA Hydratase (EC
4.2.1.55, EC 4.2.1.17), ACD = Acyl-CoA Dehydrogenase (EC 1.3.99.2, EC 1.3.99.-), EtfA = electron transfer
flavoprotein A, EtfB = electron transfer flavoprotein B, TE = thioesterase (EC 3.1.2.20), CoAT = 4-
Hydroxybutyrate CoA Transferase (EC 2.8.3.-), Rnf = ferredoxin: NAD$^+$ oxidoreductase - Na+ translocating (EC
1.18.1.8), H2ase = ferredoxin hydrogenase (EC 1.12.7.2), HydABC = bifurcating [Fe-Fe] hydorgenase (EC
1.12.1.4), Ech = energy conserving hydrogenase (EchABCDEF)
903

904
905
Fig. 5. Predicted transformations of major substrates in conversion residue to MCFA by this anaerobic
microbiome. The microbes in the LAC and COR bins are predicted to produce sugars from complex
carbohydrates. Simple carbohydrates, including xylose remaining in conversion residue, are converted to
lactate and acetate by *Lactobacillus* (LAC) and Coriobacteriaceae (COR) MAGs. The Lachnospiraceae (LCO1)
MAG converts pentoses directly to butyric acid (C4). The Eubacteriaceae (EUB1) produces hexanoic acid (C6)
and octanoic acid (C8) from lactate. Further, LCO1 may utilize hydrogen to elongate C2 and C4 to MCFA, as
represented by dashed lines. Additionally, EUB1 may elongate C2, C4 and C6 to C8.

Table S1. Summary of MAGs obtained from DNA sequence analysis of the reactor microbiome.
Taxonomy, completeness, and contamination were estimated with CheckM. Draft genomes were assembled
from five independent reactor samples. These MAGs represent the ten most abundant MAGs at Day 96 (Fig. 1).
916

Bin ID	Taxonomy	Completeness (%)	Contamination (%)	Genome size (bp)	# Scaffolds	N50	GC (%)	Predicted Genes
LCO1	Firmicutes; Clostridia; Clostridiales; Lachnospiraceae; Shuttleworthia	95.4	0.0	2,106,912	44	103,964	45.7	1,900
EUB1	Firmicutes; Clostridia; Clostridiales; Eubacteriaceae; Pseudoramibacter	97.8	0.2	2,002,609	35	142,846	51.2	1,857
COR1	Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Coriobacteriales; Coriobacteriaceae; Olsenella	99.2	0.8	2,512,349	225	22,880	59.0	2,358
COR2	Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Coriobacteriales; Coriobacteriaceae; Olsenella	100	1.6	2,422,853	155	34,678	64.8	2,185
COR3	Actinobacteria; Actinobacteria; Coriobacteriales; Coriobacteriaceae; Olsenella	98.4	7.4	3,647,413	533	13,368	55.5	4,068
LAC1	Firmicutes; Bacilli; Lactobacillales; Lactobacillaceae; Lactobacillus	99.5	1.1	2,633,889	18	640,122	43.6	2,567
LAC2	Firmicutes; Bacilli; Lactobacillales; Lactobacillaceae; Lactobacillus	99.4	1.6	3,179,174	79	122,889	40.5	2,989
LAC3	Firmicutes; Bacilli; Lactobacillales; Lactobacillaceae; Lactobacillus	99.2	1.4	2,704,063	174	29,509	43.0	2,731
LAC4	Firmicutes; Bacilli; Lactobacillales; Lactobacillaceae; Lactobacillus	98.9	1.3	3,335,227	95	86,779	40.2	3,150
LAC5	Firmicutes; Bacilli; Lactobacillales; Lactobacillaceae; Lactobacillus	80.1	0.8	1,487,044	181	12,363	46.1	1,524

917
918
919

920
921
Fig. S1. Relative expression of extracellular and cytoplasmic glycoside hydrolase enzymes. Circle size
indicates the number of ORFs annotated within each bin as the indicated CAZyme family. CAZyme families are
grouped according to the target substrate moieties, being either bonds between hexoses only, bonds between
both hexoses and pentoses, bonds between pentoses only, peptidoglycan-specific moieties, or acid moieties.
The relative RPKM (relRPKM) is normalized to the median RPKM for the MAG. Gene expression data is
presented as the $\log_2$(relRPKM). The color intensity represents the relative gene expression, with red color
intensity indicating expression below median levels and blue intensity indicating expression above median
levels. The represented expression is the highest relative expression for an individual gene within the
indicated family. Descriptions of each family are available through the CAZY database
(http://www.cazy.org/Glycoside-Hydrolases.html).
932

933
934
Fig. S2. Expression of known or predicted transporters by the 10 most abundant microbiome members.
Transporters were annotated with the Transporter Classification Database. **(A)** The number of genes and
relative expression for each analyzed MAG are shown for Transporter Database families. Circle size indicates
the number of ORFs annotated within each bin as the indicated CAZY class or family. The color intensity
represents the relative gene expression according to the shown scale. The represented expression is the highest
relative expression for an individual gene within the indicated transporter family. (B) The expected substrates,
either a pentose (5C-Mono), pentose-containing oligosaccharide (5C-Oligo), hexose (6C-mono), hexose
disaccharide (6C-Di), or hexose-containing oligosaccharide (6C-Oligo) are indicated by orange squares. The
color intensity represents the relative gene expression, with red color intensity indicating expression below
median levels and blue intensity indicating expression above median levels. The transporter family ID and
descriptions are shown. More detailed descriptions of transporters are available from the Transporter
Database (http://www.tcdb.org).

947
948
949
950

Table S2. Thermodynamics of biochemical reactions involved in conversion of xylose to butyrate, hexanoate and octanoate. Free energies of formation for all chemical compounds were obtained from Kbase (www.kbase.us). The ATP yield was determined based on biochemical models presented in Supplement 7 and is indicated as mol ATP produced per mol xylose or lactate consumed. The terminal enzyme of reverse β-oxidation, either a CoA transferase (CoAT) or thioesterase (TE), is also indicated.

Eq No.	Equation	Associated MAG(s)	ΔG per mol substrate[1] (kJ mol^{-1})				ΔG[0] available per ATP produced[2,3] (kJ mol^{-1} ATP)	Terminal Enzyme
			T = 35 °C P_{H2} =10-6 atm	T = 35 °C P_{H2} = 1 atm	T = 35 °C P_{H2} = 6.8 atm	Y_{ATP} (mol ATP mol^{-1} Substrate)[1,2]		
Xylose Simple Fermentation								
Eq. 1.	$3\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 5\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 5\ H^+$	LAC1, LAC2, LAC4, LAC5	-174	-174	-174	1.67	-104 to -104	-
Eq. 2.	$3\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 3\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 3\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 6\ H^+$	LAC1, LAC2, LAC4, LAC5	-214	-214	-214	2.00	-107 to -107	-
Xylose Elongation								
Eq. 3.	$3\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 3\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O + 3\ H^+$	LCO1	-264	-264	-264	3.00	-88 to -88	CoAT
Eq. 4.	$3\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 3\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 4\ H^+ + 2\ H_2$	LCO1	-272	-248	-245	2.83	-87 to -96	CoAT
Eq. 5.	$3\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 2\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O + 3\ H^+$	LCO1	-265	-265	-265	3.00	-88 to -88	CoAT
Eq. 6.	$2\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 2\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 2\ CO_2 + 3\ H^+ + 2\ H_2$	LCO1	-276	-240	-235	2.25	-105 to -123	TE
Eq. 7.	$3\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 3\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O + 4\ H^+ + 2\ H_2$	LCO1	-272	-248	-245	2.50	-98 to -109	TE
Eq. 8	$4\ C_5H_{10}O_5 \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 4\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 4\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2O + 5\ H^+ + 2\ H_2$	LCO1	-270	-253	-250	2.63	-95 to -103	TE
Xylose and C2/ C4/ C6 Elongation								
Eq. 9	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 2\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 2\ H_2 \rightarrow 2\ C_4H_5O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	LCO1	-240	-311	-320	3.50	-69 to -92	CoAT
Eq. 10	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 2\ H_2 \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	LCO1	-240	-311	-320	3.50	-69 to -92	CoAT
Eq. 11	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 2\ H_2 \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	LCO1	-264	-264	-264	3.50	-75 to -75	CoAT
Eq. 12	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O + 1\ H^+$	LCO1	-243	-314	-324	3.00	-81 to -108	CoAT
Eq. 13	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O + 1\ H^+$	LCO1	-267	-267	-267	3.00	-89 to -89	CoAT
Eq. 14	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 2\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 2\ H_2 \rightarrow 2\ C_4H_5O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	LCO1	-240	-311	-320	1.50	-160 to -214	TE
Eq. 15	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 2\ H_2 \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	LCO1	-240	-311	-320	2.50	-96 to -128	TE
Eq. 16	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 2\ H_2 \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	LCO1	-264	-264	-264	2.50	-105 to -105	TE
Eq. 17	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O + 1\ H^+$	LCO1	-243	-314	-324	2.00	-122 to -162	TE
Eq. 18	$1\ C_5H_{10}O_5 + 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O + 1\ H^+$	LCO1	-267	-267	-267	2.00	-133 to -133	TE

1. ΔG values and expected ATP yields are normalized to mol of xylose, mol of lactate, or mol of glycerol
2. Pathway reconstructions shown in Supplement 7 were used to determine expected ATP yields.
3. The minimum expected DG0' released per mol ATP produced is 60 kJ. Values less than this are indicated by red text and indicate the predicted ATP yield exceeds what is phyiologically feasible

Table S3. Thermodynamics of biochemical reactions involved in conversion of lactate to butyrate, hexanoate and octanoate.

Eq No.	Equation	Associated MAG(s)	ΔG per mol substrate[1] (kJ mol^{-1})			Y_{ATP} (mol ATP mol^{-1} Substrate)[1,2]	ΔG[0']available per ATP produced[2,3] (kJ mol^{-1} ATP)	Terminal Enzyme
			T = 35 °C P_{H2} =10-6 atm	T = 35 °C P_{H2} = 1 atm	T = 35 °C P_{H2} = 6.8 atm			
Lactate Elongation								
Eq. 19	$2\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 2\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2$	EUB1	-62	-26	-21	0.75	-29 to -82	CoAT
Eq. 20	$3\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 2\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2 + 1\ H_2O$	EUB1	-58	-34	-31	0.83	-37 to -70	CoAT
Eq. 21	$4\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 3\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 4\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2 + 2\ H_2O$	EUB1	-57	-39	-36	0.88	-41 to -64	CoAT
Eq. 22	$2\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 2\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2$	EUB1	-62	-26	-21	0.25	-86 to -247	TE
Eq. 23	$3\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 2\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2 + 1\ H_2O$	EUB1	-58	-34	-31	0.50	-62 to -116	TE
Eq. 24	$4\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 3\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 4\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2 + 2\ H_2O$	EUB1	-57	-39	-36	0.63	-58 to -90	TE
Lactate and C2/ C4/ C6 Elongation								
Eq. 25	$1\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O$	EUB1	-50	-50	-50	1.00	-50 to -50	CoAT
Eq. 26	$2\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 2\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 2\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2O$	EUB1	-50	-50	-50	1.00	-50 to -50	CoAT
Eq. 27	$3\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 3\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	EUB1	-51	-51	-51	1.00	-51 to -51	CoAT
Eq. 28	$1\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O$	EUB1	-50	-50	-50	1.00	-50 to -50	CoAT
Eq. 29	$2\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 2\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 2\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2O$	EUB1	-51	-51	-51	1.00	-51 to -51	CoAT
Eq. 30	$1\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O$	EUB1	-53	-53	-53	1.00	-53 to -53	CoAT
Eq. 31	$1\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O$	None[4]	-50	-50	-50	0.00	NA[5]	TE
Eq. 32	$2\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 2\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 2\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2O$	None[4]	-50	-50	-50	0.50	-100 to -100	TE
Eq. 33	$3\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_2H_3O_2^- + 3\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 3\ CO_2 + 3\ H_2O$	None[4]	-51	-51	-51	0.67	-76 to -76	TE
Eq. 34	$1\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O$	None[4]	-50	-50	-50	0.00	NA[5]	TE
Eq. 35	$2\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_4H_7O_2^- + 2\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 2\ CO_2 + 2\ H_2O$	None[4]	-51	-51	-51	0.50	-103 to -103	TE
Eq. 36	$1\ C_3H_5O_3^- + 1\ C_6H_{11}O_2^- + 1\ H^+ \rightarrow 1\ C_8H_{15}O_2^- + 1\ CO_2 + 1\ H_2O$	None[4]	-53	-53	-53	0.00	NA[5]	TE

1. ΔG values and expected ATP yields are normalized to mol of xylose, mol of lactate, or mol of glycerol
2. Pathway reconstructions shown in Supplement 7 were used to determine expected ATP yields.
3. The minimum expected ΔG0' released per mol ATP produced is 60 kJ. Values less than this are indicated by red text and indicate the predicted ATP yield exceeds what is phyiologically feasible
4. The proposed model requires ACK for either incorporation of a carboxylate or for ATP generation from acetyl-CoA. EUB1 is not predicted to produce this enzyme.
5. No net ATP production is predicted for this model.