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, little is known about the carbon and energy flow within and between organisms in these communities. 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 metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs) were recovered from the microbiome and metabolic reconstruction of the 10 most abundant MAGs, representing 91% of the total metagenomic reads, 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. Additionally, a previously unknown role of $H_2$ production and consumption on MCFA production is predicted from our transcriptomic and thermodynamic analyses of this microbiome. From these findings, we propose new strategies for the rational development of microbiomes that produce MCFA from lignocellulosic-based feedstocks and possibly other mixed organic nutrient streams.

**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 have advantages 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 approach and findings can be used 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. Members of these microbial communities hydrolyze complex organics to products that can be fermented and subsequently converted to 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). While there is growing interest in harnessing microbiomes for renewable chemical manufacturing, little is known about the specific biochemical transformations carried out by members of these microbiomes. We are interested in obtaining the knowledge needed for the rational development and implementation of strategies to improve yields of MCFA or other products from renewable carbon sources using engineered microbiomes.

To obtain this knowledge, we dissected the flow of substrates, intermediates, and products in a carboxylate platform microbiome. Previous applications of the carboxylate platform have focused on converting organics from undistilled corn beer (5, 6), food (7, 8) or winery residue (9), and lignocellulose-derived materials (10-12) to MCFA. In addition, production of MCFA from conversion residues using anaerobic microbiomes can improve the economic sustainability of lignocellulosic biofuel production (4). In each of these studies, it is proposed that MCFA precursors, resulting from hydrolysis and fermentation of available organic substrates, are elongated via one or more chain-elongating

microorganisms (1). In addition, MCFA producing bioreactors contain diverse communities

with members affiliated with the Firmicutes, particularly Clostridia and *Lactobacilli*, having

high abundance (4, 5, 11). However, the specific roles of the abundant microbiome

members are not well understood.

Here, we utilize a combination of metagenomic, metatranscriptomic , pathway

modeling, and thermodynamic analyses to reconstruct the combined metabolic activity of a

microbiome converting lignocellulosic conversion residues to C6 and C8. In total, 37 high

quality draft metagenome-assembled genomes (MAGs) were assembled, and the gene

expression patterns of those representing the ten most abundant community members

during steady-state reactor operation were analyzed. Our results identify several MAGs in

the community 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 capable of producing C6 and C8 from these fermentation

products were expressed by two abundant MAGs affiliated with the class Clostridia. Based

on a thermodynamic analysis of the proposed MCFA-producing pathways, we predict that

individual Clostridial MAGs use different substrates for MCFA production (lactate, versus a

combination of xylose, $H_2$, and acetate). We also describe how new insights into MCFA

production could improve the biomanufacturing productivity of 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 contained high amounts of xylose, carbohydrate

oligomers, and uncharacterized organic matter (Fig. 1). Following an initial acclimation

period (Day 0 – Day 48), the quantity of produced organic acids stabilized (Fig. 1). 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.

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

and binned, resulting in 37 high quality MAGs (Supplement 1). For the Day 96 sample, 91%

of the DNA reads mapped to the ten most abundant MAGs (Supplement 2). Based on

analysis with CheckM, these abundant MAGs had high completion with low contamination

(Table S1)(13). Relative abundance of the top 10 MAGs was calculated from the total DNA

reads mapped to the MAGs and normalized to their predicted genome length (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 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. 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 (14), 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 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). The three Actinobacteria MAGs,

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

(COR2) clustered with *Olsenella umbonata* (15), 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.

**Genomic predictions of chemical transformations in the microbiome**

A prediction of metabolic networks in the microbiome was performed 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

(16) and manual curation, particularly of proposed sugar utilization, fermentation and

chain elongation pathways (Supplement 4) (1). This analysis identified a set of genes that

also had high expression levels in the metatranscriptome that could be used to model 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 (Fig. 1). Based on the

characterization of the bioreactor performance throughout the operational period,

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 (17). 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) (18).

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

hydrolases (GHs) were abundant in several MAGs in the microbiome (Fig. 4). 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-$\beta$-xylosidases that could remove terminal

xylose molecules from xylans present in the conversion residue (GH43 and GH120; Fig. 4;

Supplement 5). LAC2 also had high levels of transcripts for an exo-$\alpha$-L-1,5-arabinanase

(GH93), predicted to release other pentose sugars from arabinan, which accounts for 3% of

the sugar polymers in switchgrass (19, 20). 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 (21). In sum, this analysis predicts that glucans are

degraded by *Lactobacillus* and Coriobacteriaceae MAGs, where LAC MAGs may also degrade

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.

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 high transcript levels for

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

glucose dimer that may result from extracellular breakdown of glucans (Fig. 4). Transcripts

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

(GH2) are found across the MAGs (Fig. 4). In addition, transcripts that encode β-xylosidases

(GH1, GH3) and α-L-arabinofuranosidases (GH2), are found in all the LAC MAGs except

LAC3 (Fig. 4). 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. 4).

***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 (Fig. 1). As discussed above, the relative transcript levels of

genes encoding extracellular GHs (Fig. 4) 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. 5a) 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. These

putative transporter proteins 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. S1).   LCO1, LAC1, LAC2, and LAC3 are predicted to contain

xylose transporters (XylT) (Fig. 5a), while glucose (GluT), fructose (FruT), and other hexose

transporters were expressed across the LAC, COR, and LCO MAGs (Fig. 5a; Fig. S1). EUB1

only encoded transcripts encoding carbohydrate transporters for uptake of fructose and

sucrose (Fig. S1). Overall, this analysis predicts that all MAGs have the potential to utilize

hexose sugars, while gene expression patterns observed for the LCO1 and the *Lactobacillus*

MAGs (excluding LAC3) predicted that they play 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. 5a), except LAC5, which does not encode known

homologues of these proteins. Fructose utilization starts with phosphorylation during

transport (Fig. 5a). 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) (22), they

all contain transcripts for homologues of PK (Fig. 5a). 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) (23), 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. 5a). 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 (Fig. 5a; 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. 5a). 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. 5a), 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. 5a), 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. 5a). All MAGs (except EUB1) contain transcripts

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

acetate while producing ATP (Fig. 5a). 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 predict 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. 5b). Thus,

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

producers of MCFA in this microbiome.

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. 5b).

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. 5b). 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. 5a). Both MAGs also contained transcripts predicted

to encode CoAT enzymes (Fig. 5b). 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 (11). While transcripts encoding genes for lactate production are abundant in the

microbiome (Fig. 5a), lactate does not accumulate to detectable levels during steady

operation, but transiently accumulates when the bioreactor receives a higher load of

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

(LacT) were abundant in EUB1 but not in LCO1, 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. 5b). 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. 5b), 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. 5b) (24). 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. 5b). 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 (25). 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. 5b). 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. 5b), 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. 5b,) or by electron confurcation, utilizing electrons from both NADH and

reduced ferredoxin (HydABC, Fig. 5b) (25). 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). 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 (26). 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 (27).

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. 5b), so we considered both possibilities in the thermodynamic

analysis.

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. 5a). 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). 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 (27) 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. Nevertheless, these models predict that chain elongation

by EUB1 using lactate as the electron donor would result in $H_2$ production and that there is

an energetic gain if TE is used as the terminal enzyme in reverse β-oxidation.

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. 5b). 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**

The goal of this work was to generate knowledge needed to understand how the combined

metabolic activity of predominant members of a microbiome could allow it to produce

valuable products from a renewable resource. 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. 6). 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.

Our data suggest that the contribution of *Lactobacillus* in this microbiome is in extracellular carbohydrate degradation and subsequent metabolism of pentose-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. In addition, microbiome gene expression patterns indicate that two MAGs, EUB1 and LCO1, produce MCFA via reverse $\beta$-oxidation. LCO1 is predicted to consume xylose based on gene expression analysis, whereas RNA abundance measurements indicate that EUB1 consumes lactate. Our thermodynamic analysis predicts that the most energetically advantageous metabolism for LCO1 is the consumption of xylose, $H_2$ and carboxylates to produce C4, C6, and C8. While xylose is a major component of conversion residue (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 C2.

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 higher production of this MFCA would inhibit growth of one or

more members of the community (11). 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 (28). Our analysis predicts a previously

undescribed 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 (29, 30), 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 conserves energy, a TE makes production of MCFA more

energetically advantageous (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 or butyrate 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, 11). 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) (31). Hydrolysate was fermented with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Y128, a strain

with improved xylose utilization (32). 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 (33). Soluble carbohydrates were measured with the

anthrone method (34). 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 sequencing, 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). For RNA sequencing, 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 bead beating with Lysing Matrix A (MP

Biomedicals, CA, USA). After this step, successive phase separations with

phenol:chloroform were used to separate nucleic acids from additional cell material.

Nucleic acids were precipitated with a sodium acetate solution and washed with ethanol.

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 nucleic

acids, 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 (35). Reads from all five samples were then co-assembled using metaspades and kmer

values of 21, 33, 55, 77, 99, and 127 (36). Binning of assembled contigs was performed with

MaxBin v2.2.1 (37). The quality, completeness, and contamination of each bin was analyzed

with CheckM v1.0.3 (13). 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 (38). 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 (39). ANI calculations were performed

using JSpecies (40).

**Genome annotations.** Draft genomes were annotated with MetaPathways v2.5.(16) Open

reading frames (ORFs) were predicted using Prodigal v2.0 (41), 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 (42). Functional annotations for each MAG

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

database (17). CELLO was used to determine the subcellular location of the CAZYs (18).

Transporters were identified using the Transporter Classification Database.

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

al. (43). cDNA reads were quality filtered as described above for DNA. SortMeRNA was used

to remove rRNA sequences using multiple databases for RNA sequences (44). The

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

v35.92 ([https://sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap](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 (45). 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**

591
1.    **Angenent LT, Richter H, Buckel W, Spirito CM, Steinbusch KJJ, Plugge CM, Strik**
**D, Grootscholten TIM, Buisman CJN, Hamelers HVM.** 2016. Chain Elongation with
Reactor Microbiomes: Open-Culture Biotechnology To Produce Biochemicals.
Environ Sci Technol **50:**2796-2810.
2.    **Holtzapple MT, Granda CB.** 2009. Carboxylate platform: the MixAlco process part
1: comparison of three biomass conversion platforms. Appl Biochem Biotechnol
**156:**95-106.
3.    **Sarria S, Kruyer NS, Peralta-Yahya P.** 2017. Microbial synthesis of medium-chain
chemicals from renewables. Nat Biotechnol **35:**1158-1166.
4.    **Scarborough MJ, Lynch G, Dickson M, McGee M, Donohue TJ, Noguera DR.** 2018.
Increasing the economic value of lignocellulosic stillage through medium-chain fatty
acid production. Biotechnology for Biofuels **11:**200.
5.    **Agler MT, Spirito CM, Usack JG, Werner JJ, Angenent LT.** 2012. Chain elongation
with reactor microbiomes: upgrading dilute ethanol to medium-chain carboxylates.
Energy Environ Sci **5:**8189.
6.    **Ge S, Usack JG, Spirito CM, Angenent LT.** 2015. Long-Term n-Caproic Acid
Production from Yeast-Fermentation Beer in an Anaerobic Bioreactor with
Continuous Product Extraction. Environ Sci Technol **49:**8012-8021.
7.    **Grootscholten TIM, Strik DPBTB, Steinbusch KJJ, Buisman CJN, Hamelers HVM.**
2014. Two-stage medium chain fatty acid (MCFA) production from municipal solid
waste and ethanol. Applied Energy **116:**223-229.
8.    **Grootscholten TIM, dal Borgo FK, Hamelers HVM, Buisman CJN.** 2013.
Promoting chain elongation in mixed culture acidification reactors by addition of
ethanol. Biomass & Bioenergy **48:**10-16.

9.   **Kucek LA, Xu JJ, Nguyen M, Angenent LT.** 2016. Waste Conversion into n-
Caprylate and n-Caproate: Resource Recovery from Wine Lees Using Anaerobic
Reactor Microbiomes and In-line Extraction. Front Microbiol **7**.
10.  **Xiong BY, Richard TL, Kumar M.** 2015. Integrated acidogenic digestion and
carboxylic acid separation by nanofiltration membranes for the lignocellulosic
carboxylate platform. J Membr Sci **489:**275-283.
11.  **Andersen SJ, De Groof V, Khor WC, Roume H, Props R, Coma M, Rabaey K.** 2017.
A Clostridium Group IV Species Dominates and Suppresses a Mixed Culture
Fermentation by Tolerance to Medium Chain Fatty Acids Products. Front Bioeng
Biotechnol **5:**8.
12.  **Kenealy WR, Cao Y, Weimer PJ.** 1995. Production of caproic acid by cocultures of
ruminal cellulolytic bacteria and Clostridium kluyveri grown on cellulose and
ethanol. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol **44:**507-513.
13.  **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.
14.  **Kim M, Oh HS, Park SC, Chun J.** 2014. Towards a taxonomic coherence between
average nucleotide identity and 16S rRNA gene sequence similarity for species
demarcation of prokaryotes (vol 64, pg 346, 2014). Int J Syst Evol Microbiol
**64:**1825-1825.
15.  **Kraatz M, Wallace RJ, Svensson L.** 2011. Olsenella umbonata sp. nov., a
microaerotolerant anaerobic lactic acid bacterium from the sheep rumen and pig
jejunum, and emended descriptions of Olsenella, Olsenella uli and Olsenella profusa.
Int J Syst Evol Microbiol **61:**795-803.
16.  **Konwar KM, Hanson NW, Bhatia MP, Kim D, Wu SJ, Hahn AS, Morgan-Lang C,**
**Cheung HK, Hallam SJ.** 2015. MetaPathways v2.5: quantitative functional,
taxonomic and usability improvements. Bioinformatics **31:**3345-3347.
17.  **Lombard V, Golaconda Ramulu H, Drula E, Coutinho PM, Henrissat B.** 2014. The
carbohydrate-active enzymes database (CAZy) in 2013. Nucleic Acids Res **42:**D490-
495.
18.  **Yu CS, Chen YC, Lu CH, Hwang JK.** 2006. Prediction of protein subcellular
localization. Proteins **64:**643-651.
19.  **Zurawski JV, Khatibi PA, Akinosho HO, Straub CT, Compton SH, Conway JM, Lee**
**LL, Ragauskas AJ, Davison BH, Adams MWW, Kelly RM.** 2017. Bioavailability of
Carbohydrate Content in Natural and Transgenic Switchgrasses for the Extreme
Thermophile Caldicellulosiruptor bescii. Appl Environ Microbiol **83**.
20.  **Sakamoto T, Thibault JF.** 2001. Exo-arabinanase of Penicillium chrysogenum able
to release arabinobiose from alpha-1,5-L-arabinan. Appl Environ Microbiol
**67:**3319-3321.
21.  **Abdullah M, French D.** 1970. Substrate Specificity of Pullulanase. Arch Biochem
Biophys **137:**483-&.
22.  **Ronimus RS, Morgan HW.** 2001. The biochemical properties and phylogenies of
phosphofructokinases from extremophiles. Extremophiles **5:**357-373.
23.  **Lawlis VB, Dennis MS, Chen EY, Smith DH, Henner DJ.** 1984. Cloning and
sequencing of the xylose isomerase and xylulose kinase genes of Escherichia coli.
Appl Environ Microbiol **47:**15-21.

24.   **Demmer JK, Pal Chowdhury N, Selmer T, Ermler U, Buckel W.** 2017. The
semiquinone swing in the bifurcating electron transferring flavoprotein/butyryl-
CoA dehydrogenase complex from Clostridium difficile. Nat Commun **8:**1577.
25.   **Buckel W, Thauer RK.** 2013. Energy conservation via electron bifurcating
ferredoxin reduction and proton/Na(+) translocating ferredoxin oxidation. Biochim
Biophys Acta **1827:**94-113.
26.   **de Kok S, Meijer J, van Loosdrecht MC, Kleerebezem R.** 2013. Impact of dissolved
hydrogen partial pressure on mixed culture fermentations. Appl Microbiol
Biotechnol **97:**2617-2625.
27.   **Buckel W, Thauer RK.** 2013. Energy conservation via electron bifurcating
ferredoxin reduction and proton/Na+ translocating ferredoxin oxidation.
Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Bioenergetics **1827:**94-113.
28.   **Stams AJ, Plugge CM.** 2009. Electron transfer in syntrophic communities of
anaerobic bacteria and archaea. Nat Rev Microbiol **7:**568-577.
29.   **Zhang F, Zhang Y, Chen M, van Loosdrecht MCM, Zeng RJ.** 2013. A modified
metabolic model for mixed culture fermentation with energy conserving electron
bifurcation reaction and metabolite transport energy. Biotechnol Bioeng **110:**1884-
1894.
30.   **Rodriguez J, Kleerebezem R, Lema JM, van Loosdrecht MCM.** 2006. Modeling
product formation in anaerobic mixed culture fermentations. Biotechnol Bioeng
**93:**592-606.
31.   **Balan V, Bals B, Chundawat SPS, Marshall D, Dale BE.** 2009. Lignocellulosic
Biomass Pretreatment Using AFEX. Biofuels: Methods and Protocols **581:**61-77.
32.   **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.
33.   **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.
34.   **Yemm EW, Willis AJ.** 1954. The estimation of carbohydrates in plant extracts by
anthrone. Biochem J **57:**508-514.
35.   **Joshi NA, Fass JN.** 2011. Sickle: A sliding-window, adaptive, quality-based trimming
tool for FastQ files  (Version 1.33)
36.   **Nurk S, Meleshko D, Korobeynikov A, Pevzner PA.** 2017. metaSPAdes: a new
versatile metagenomic assembler. Genome Res **27:**824-834.
37.   **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.
38.   **Darling AE, Jospin G, Lowe E, Matsen FAt, Bik HM, Eisen JA.** 2014. PhyloSift:
phylogenetic analysis of genomes and metagenomes. PeerJ **2:**e243.

707 39. **Stamatakis A.** 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-
708   analysis of large phylogenies. Bioinformatics **30:**1312-1313.

709 40. **Richter M, Rossello-Mora R, Oliver Glockner F, Peplies J.** 2016. JSpeciesWS: a
710   web server for prokaryotic species circumscription based on pairwise genome
711   comparison. Bioinformatics **32:**929-931.

712 41. **Hyatt D, Chen GL, Locascio PF, Land ML, Larimer FW, Hauser LJ.** 2010. Prodigal:
713   prokaryotic gene recognition and translation initiation site identification. BMC
714   Bioinformatics **11:**119.

715 42. **Kielbasa SM, Wan R, Sato K, Horton P, Frith MC.** 2011. Adaptive seeds tame
716   genomic sequence comparison. Genome Res **21:**487-493.

717 43. **Lawson CE, Wu S, Bhattacharjee AS, Hamilton JJ, McMahon KD, Goel R, Noguera**
718   **DR.** 2017. Metabolic network analysis reveals microbial community interactions in
719   anammox granules. Nat Commun **8:**15416.

720 44. **Kopylova E, Noe L, Touzet H.** 2012. SortMeRNA: fast and accurate filtering of
721   ribosomal RNAs in metatranscriptomic data. Bioinformatics **28:**3211-3217.

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

725
**Fig. 1. Transformation of materials in lignocellulosic ethanol conversion residue by an anaerobic**
**microbiome.** During 120 days of reactor operation, compounds in conversion residue (CR) were converted to
medium-chain fatty acids. 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.  This figure is generated with data from Scarborough,
et al. 2018 **(4).**

733
734 **Fig. 2. Relative abundance and expression of the 10 most abundant MAGs in the bioreactor at Day 96.**
735 Relative abundance was determined by mapping DNA sequencing reads to the MAG and normalizing to the
736 length of the MAG genome. Relative transcript abundance (expression) was determined by mapping c-DNA
737 sequencing reads to the MAG and normalizing to the length of the MAG genome.
738
739

740
**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 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 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).

758
759
**Fig. 5. Relative expression of genes involved in the conversion of xylose and glycerol 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 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), ACDH = 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)
785

786
787
**Fig. 6. 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 hexnaoic 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 and C4 and 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).
798

| 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 |

799
800

801
802
**Fig. S1. Expression of known or predicted transporters by 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, with brown color intensity indicating expression below median levels and purple intensity
indicating expression above median levels. 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).

**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}) | | | $Y_{ATP}$ (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 | | | |
| **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$^{-1}$) | | | | 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] | | |
| **Lactate Elongation** | | | | | | | | |
| Eq. 19 | 2 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $H^+$ → 1 $C_4H_7O_2^-$ + 2 $CO_2$ + 2 $H_2$ | EUB1 | -62 | -26 | -21 | 0.75 | <span style="color:red">-29</span> to -82 | CoAT |
| Eq. 20 | 3 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 2 $H^+$ → 1 $C_6H_{11}O_2^-$ + 3 $CO_2$ + 2 $H_2$ + 1 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -58 | -34 | -31 | 0.83 | <span style="color:red">-37</span> to -70 | CoAT |
| Eq. 21 | 4 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 3 $H^+$ → 1 $C_8H_{15}O_2^-$ + 4 $CO_2$ + 2 $H_2$ + 2 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -57 | -39 | -36 | 0.88 | <span style="color:red">-41</span> to -64 | CoAT |
| Eq. 22 | 2 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 1 $C_4H_7O_2^-$ + 1 $CO_2$ + 1 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -50 | -50 | -50 | 1.00 | <span style="color:red">-50 to -50</span> | CoAT |
| Eq. 26 | 2 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $C_2H_3O_2^-$ + 2 $H^+$ → 1 $C_6H_{11}O_2^-$ + 2 $CO_2$ + 2 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -50 | -50 | -50 | 1.00 | <span style="color:red">-50 to -50</span> | CoAT |
| Eq. 27 | 3 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $C_2H_3O_2^-$ + 3 $H^+$ → 1 $C_8H_{15}O_2^-$ + 3 $CO_2$ + 3 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -51 | -51 | -51 | 1.00 | <span style="color:red">-51 to -51</span> | CoAT |
| Eq. 28 | 1 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $C_4H_7O_2^-$ + 1 $H^+$ → 1 $C_6H_{11}O_2^-$ + 1 $CO_2$ + 1 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -50 | -50 | -50 | 1.00 | <span style="color:red">-50 to -50</span> | CoAT |
| Eq. 29 | 2 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $C_4H_7O_2^-$ + 2 $H^+$ → 1 $C_8H_{15}O_2^-$ + 2 $CO_2$ + 2 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -51 | -51 | -51 | 1.00 | <span style="color:red">-51 to -51</span> | CoAT |
| Eq. 30 | 1 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $C_6H_{11}O_2^-$ + 1 $H^+$ → 1 $C_8H_{15}O_2^-$ + 1 $CO_2$ + 1 $H_2O$ | EUB1 | -53 | -53 | -53 | 1.00 | <span style="color:red">-53 to -53</span> | CoAT |
| Eq. 31 | 1 $C_3H_5O_3^-$ + 1 $C_2H_3O_2^-$ + 1 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 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 $H^+$ → 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.