1   Variation in genome content and predatory phenotypes between *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 isolated

2   from soil and *B. bacteriovorus* type strain HD100

3   Laura E. Williams[a]#, Nicole Cullen[a], Joseph A. DeGiorgis[a,b], Karla J. Martinez[a], Justina

4   Mellone[a], Molly Oser[a]

5   [a]Department of Biology, Providence College, Providence, RI, USA

6   [b]Cellular Dynamics Program, Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA, USA

7   Running title: Genome and phenotype of *Bdellovibrio* from soil

8   #Corresponding author: Laura E. Williams, lwillia7@providence.edu

Abstract

The range of naturally occurring variation in the ability of *Bdellovibrio* strains to attack

and kill Gram-negative bacteria is not well understood. Defining phenotypic and associated

genotypic variation among *Bdellovibrio* will clarify how divergent lineages within this genus

impact microbial communities and will inform development of predatory bacteria as biocontrol

agents to combat bacterial infections. We isolated *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 from soil and compared

its genome and predatory phenotypes to *B. bacteriovorus* type strain HD100. Based on analysis

of 16S rRNA gene sequences and average amino acid identity, NC01 belongs to a different

species than HD100. Genome-wide comparisons and individual gene analyses indicated that

eight NC01 genome regions were likely acquired by horizontal gene transfer (HGT), further

supporting an important role for HGT in *Bdellovibrio* genome evolution. Within these regions,

multiple protein-coding sequences were assigned predicted functions related to transcriptional

regulation and transport; however, most were annotated as hypothetical proteins. Compared to

HD100, NC01 has a limited prey range and kills *E. coli* ML35 less efficiently. Whereas HD100

drastically reduces the ML35 population and then maintains low prey population density, NC01

causes a smaller reduction in ML35, after which the prey population recovers, accompanied by a

decrease in NC01. In addition, NC01 forms turbid plaques on lawns of ML35, in contrast to clear

plaques formed by HD100. Characterizing variation in interactions between *Bdellovibrio* and

Gram-negative bacteria, such as observed with NC01 and HD100, is important for understanding

the ecological significance of predatory bacteria and evaluating their effectiveness in clinical

applications.

<u>Importance</u>

Bdellovibrio attack and kill Gram-negative bacteria; however, not all *Bdellovibrio* strains

are equally efficient at killing the same Gram-negative bacteria. Defining how *Bdellovibrio* vary

in predatory phenotypes and how this phenotypic variation relates to differences in genotype is

important for understanding the ecological significance of predatory bacteria and evaluating their

effectiveness in biocontrol of bacterial infections. We determined variation in genome content

and predatory phenotypes, including prey range and predation efficiency, between *Bdellovibrio*

sp. NC01 isolated from soil and *B. bacteriovorus* type strain HD100. NC01 is phylogenetically

divergent from HD100, with eight regions of unique gene content likely acquired by horizontal

gene transfer. Compared to HD100, the prey range of NC01 is limited, and it was less efficient at

killing a strain of *E. coli*. These differences may have important implications for how each strain

impacts microbial communities in different environments and for the effectiveness of each in

clinical applications.

<u>Introduction</u>

Since their discovery in the early 1960s, predatory bacteria have been isolated from a

wide range of terrestrial and aquatic environments, including some with extreme conditions such

as high temperature or salinity (1). The impact of predatory bacteria in these environments is not

fully known, but initial studies indicate they may play an important role in shaping microbial

communities (2–4). In addition, their ability to attack and kill Gram-negative bacterial pathogens

has generated interest in developing predatory bacteria as biocontrol agents to combat drug-

resistant infections (5–7). Given their potential ecological significance and possible clinical

applications, it is important to define phenotypic and genotypic variation among predatory

bacteria. In particular, variation in the outcomes of interactions between different strains of

predatory bacteria and prey will determine the impact of bacterial predation in microbial

communities, and variation in genome content among predatory bacteria strains may directly

affect those outcomes. To broaden our understanding of variation in predatory bacteria, we

isolated, assayed and sequenced a *Bdellovibrio* strain from soil and compared its predatory

phenotypes and genome content to other sequenced *Bdellovibrio*.

Among the different genera of predatory bacteria, *Bdellovibrio* is the most well-studied.

Currently, this genus includes two species that differ in their predation strategy. *B. bacteriovorus*

invades the periplasm of Gram-negative prey cells (8), whereas *B. exovorus* attaches to the

outside of prey cells but does not enter the cell itself (9). Here, we focus on intraperiplasmic

Bdellovibrio. This lifecycle includes two main phases: the attack phase and the growth phase

(10). During the attack phase, small, highly motile *Bdellovibrio* cells seek out and attach to

Gram-negative prey bacteria. *Bdellovibrio* then gains access to the prey periplasm by using lytic

enzymes to open a small hole in the prey outer membrane and cell wall (11). After *Bdellovibrio*

moves into the prey periplasm, it uses peptidoglycan-modifying enzymes to reseal and reshape

the prey cell wall, resulting in formation of a rounded structure called a bdelloplast (12). Within

the bdelloplast, *Bdellovibrio* initiates the growth phase, during which it secretes lytic enzymes

into the prey cytoplasm. Using digested prey cell contents as nutrients, *Bdellovibrio* grows into a

single long filament within the prey periplasm, eventually dividing into multiple progeny, which

lyse the bdelloplast and emerge as new attack phase cells.

By invading and lysing Gram-negative bacteria, some strains of *Bdellovibrio* can reduce

prey populations by up to 8 log units over 48 hours *in vitro* (6, 13). However, not all *Bdellovibrio*

strains are equally effective at killing the same Gram-negative species. Researchers have

observed variation among *Bdellovibrio* strains in which Gram-negative bacteria are susceptible

to predation (14) and in how quickly and to what extent a population of Gram-negative prey is

reduced (13, 15). These predatory phenotypes, referred to as prey range and predation efficiency,

are clearly important in determining the outcomes of interactions between *Bdellovibrio* strains

and Gram-negative bacteria; however, the extent of naturally occurring variation in these

phenotypes and the underlying mechanisms governing them are not well understood. Defining

how predatory phenotypes differ among *Bdellovibrio* will contribute to our understanding of the

impact of predatory bacteria on microbial communities in different environments and inform

their application in biocontrol of bacterial pathogens.

Here, we describe isolation of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 from soil and compare its genome

and predatory phenotypes to other *Bdellovibrio*, focusing primarily on the *B. bacteriovorus* type

strain HD100. The intraperiplasmic predator HD100 was the first *Bdellovibrio* strain sequenced

(16), and multiple studies have dissected some of the molecular mechanisms governing predation

in this strain (17). To investigate variation in genome content, we compared the genome of NC01

to that of HD100 and *B. bacteriovorus* W, which is phylogenetically divergent from HD100 (18,

19). To define variation in predatory phenotypes between NC01 and HD100, we determined prey

range by testing each strain against a panel of Gram-negative bacteria, and we measured

predation efficiency by quantifying viable *E. coli* ML35 during co-culture with each strain.

Results

Bioswale soil harbors predatory bacteria belonging to *Bdellovibrio*

Using Gram-negative soil bacteria isolated from a residential area as prey, we obtained a

pure isolate of predatory bacteria from a sample of soil collected at a bioswale on the Providence

College campus. The bioswale is a manmade landscape feature designed to collect and filter

stormwater runoff from nearby buildings. We designated the bioswale soil isolate as NC01.

Using 1000x phase-contrast microscopy of lysates combining NC01 and Gram-negative prey, we

observed small, fast-moving attack phase NC01 cells that attached to prey cells (Figure 1a). We

also observed rounded structures characteristic of bdelloplasts, suggesting that NC01 uses a cell

invasion strategy similar to *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus*. Negative stain electron microscopy

showed that NC01 attack phase cells have a comma-shaped morphology with a single polar

flagellum (Figure 1b).

To classify NC01, we constructed a phylogeny of 16S rRNA gene sequences from this

isolate and all *Bacteriovorax*, *Bdellovibrio* and *Halobacteriovorax* strains with complete

genomes available in GenBank (Figure 2). In this phylogeny, NC01 clearly clusters with other

Bdellovibrio. Pairwise alignment of 16S rRNA gene sequences from NC01 and *Bdellovibrio*

bacteriovorus HD100, which is the type strain of the species, showed 97% similarity across

1,516 nucleotides. This value is above the 95% similarity cutoff typically used to define bacterial

genera (20), which supports classifying NC01 as *Bdellovibrio*. However, it is below the 98.7%

similarity cutoff typically used to define species (21), which suggests that NC01 should not be

classified as *bacteriovorus*.

To explore this further, we compared the average amino acid identity (AAI) of

Bdellovibrio strains NC01, W, HD100 and 109J (Table 1). HD100 and 109J, which are both

classified as *B. bacteriovorus*, cluster in a well-supported clade in the 16S rRNA phylogeny, and

their protein sequences are highly similar (average AAI 99.2%). However, NC01 protein

sequences are <70% similar on average to HD100 and 109J protein sequences, supporting the

conclusion that NC01 belongs to a different species than these two strains. NC01 protein

sequences are even less similar on average to those of strain W, suggesting that NC01 does not

belong to the same species as this strain. Based on these analyses, we chose not to designate a

species for NC01, and we refer to this isolate as *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01.

Comparative genomics identifies eight regions of unique gene content possibly acquired by

***Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 via horizontal gene transfer**

129   Based on the 16S rRNA gene phylogeny and average AAI comparisons, we chose *B.*

bacteriovorus HD100 and *B. bacteriovorus* W to represent phylogenetic diversity and genome

variation among sequenced *Bdellovibrio* for comparative genomics. The genome of *Bdellovibrio*

sp. NC01 is larger than that of both HD100 and W (Table 2). The GC content of the NC01

genome is lower than that of HD100, but slightly higher than that of W. Using the BLAST Ring

Image Generator (BRIG), we conducted pairwise comparisons of NC01 to HD100 and W based

on nucleotide sequence alignments with BLASTN. This analysis identified eight NC01 genome

regions of at least 15,000 nucleotides in which no alignments of >200 nucleotides and e-value

<0.1 to HD100 or W were reported. These eight regions, which may represent unique NC01 gene

content, are marked on Figure 3. The plot of GC content shows that four of the eight regions

(regions 1, 4, 5, and 7) encompass substantial decreases in GC content compared to the typical

variation along the genome. Such deviation in GC content may be an indicator of horizontal gene

transfer (HGT) (22).

142   To assess whether the genes encoded in these eight NC01 genome regions are present but

divergent in HD100 and W, we used TBLASTN to compare NC01 amino acid sequences

annotated in each region by RAST to the HD100 and W genomes translated into all six reading

frames. RAST annotated 11 to 50 protein-coding sequences within each of the eight NC01

genome regions. By searching for these sequences along the entire HD100 and W genomes, this

analysis detects similar protein-coding sequences even if the genes have undergone

rearrangement. For the majority of the protein-coding sequences in each of the eight NC01

regions, TBLASTN did not produce any alignments to HD100 or W with >70% query coverage.

For those protein-coding sequences that did align to HD100 and/or W with >70% query coverage,

identity was low (<40%) for most of the sequences. Less than five protein-coding sequences in

each region aligned to HD100 or W at >70% coverage and >40% identity. This suggests that the

protein-coding sequences in the eight NC01 genome regions are missing from HD100 and W,

instead of divergent.

In addition to comparisons against HD100 and W, we also used BLASTP to align amino

acid sequences annotated in each region by RAST against the non-redundant GenBank database.

For each sequence, we examined the top 250 alignments for any sequences classified as

Bdellovibrio. This analysis expands the search space beyond complete *Bdellovibrio* genomes to

any deposited sequences that were denoted by the submitters as *Bdellovibrio*. In two of the

regions (regions 1 and 4), only one-third of amino acid sequences aligned to *Bdellovibrio*

sequences. In every other region except region 8, 52-64% of the amino acid sequences aligned to

Bdellovibrio sequences. In region 8, three-fourths of the amino acid sequences aligned to

Bdellovibrio sequences. These results suggest that most of the protein-coding sequences in

regions 1 and 4 may be unique to *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01, because they do not align to other

Bdellovibrio sequences in the database. In the other regions, the larger proportion of shared gene

content between NC01 and *Bdellovibrio* in the database may be the result of HGT events that

occurred before the divergence of NC01 and these strains.

The hypothesis that the eight NC01 genome regions were acquired by horizontal gene

transfer is also supported by predicted functions of the protein-coding sequences encoded within

the regions. RAST annotation identified functions related to mobile elements in five of the eight

regions. These include phage tail fibers (regions 1, 5 and 6), site-specific recombinases or

integrases (regions 1, 4, and 7), a phage-related DNA primase (region 4), and a plasmid

conjugative transfer protein (region 7). In addition, Prophinder analysis of the complete NC01

genome identified a portion of region 5 (1,632,099 – 1,632,833) as a possible prophage. Three

regions (regions 2, 3 and 8) did not encode any obvious mobile element functions.

Apart from mobile element-related genes, most of the protein-coding sequences in the

eight NC01 genome regions are annotated as hypothetical proteins, therefore it is unclear what

functional capacities may have been gained by *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 via HGT and whether

those functions impact predation. Some of the genes were annotated with predicted functions,

which enabled us to assess gene content in the eight regions in terms of broad functional

categories. Four of the eight regions (regions 1, 3, 6 and 8) encode predicted functions related to

transcriptional regulation, and five regions (regions 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7) encode predicted functions

related to transport. Regarding enzymatic activity, region 6 encodes a predicted cell wall

endopeptidase, which is interesting given *Bdellovibrio'*s interactions with the Gram-negative

prey cell wall during its life cycle.

***Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 has a limited prey range compared to HD100 and is less efficient at**

killing *E. coli* ML35

To assess variation in predatory phenotypes between *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 and *B.*

bacteriovorus HD100, we assayed prey range and predation efficiency. To determine prey range,

we tested NC01 and HD100 against a panel of eight Gram-negative bacteria isolated from

different environments, including a freshwater stream and soil from a residential area (Table 3).

Plaque formation on a bacterial lawn indicates that the predatory isolate is able to attack and lyse

that particular Gram-negative prey strain. NC01 formed plaques on lawns of five of the eight

prey strains tested, whereas HD100 formed plaques on lawns of all eight prey strains. NC01 was

not able to attack and lyse two prey strains belonging to *Acinetobacter* and *Raoultella* that were

isolated from a freshwater stream. In addition, although NC01 formed plaques on *E. coli* ML35,

it did not attack and lyse *E. coli* 0057.

To measure predation efficiency, we quantified viable *E. coli* ML35 at different time

points over 72 hours of co-culture with NC01 or HD100 (Figure 4). In the absence of predatory

bacteria, we did not observe any reduction in viable *E. coli* ML35, demonstrating that co-culture

conditions do not adversely affect the ML35 population. After 6 hours of co-culture, NC01 did

not appreciably reduce viable *E. coli* ML35 compared to the control, whereas HD100 reduced

viable ML35 by approximately 1 log unit. After 24 hours of co-culture, there was a substantial

difference in the impact of NC01 and HD100 on the *E. coli* population. NC01 reduced viable

ML35 by approximately 3 log units compared to the control, whereas HD100 reduced viable

ML35 by 6 log units. Over the next 48 hours, HD100 continued to restrict the viable ML35

population, but the population recovered in co-cultures with NC01, increasing by 2 log units.

For two of the assay replicates, we quantified NC01 and HD100 after 72 hours of co-

culture to determine if recovery of the ML35 population is associated with changes in predatory

bacteria population density. Based on direct cell counts used to establish co-cultures, both NC01

and HD100 populations were $\sim10^8$ cells/ml at the beginning of the assay (NC01: 3.8 x 10^8

cells/ml and 7.8 x 10^8 cells/ml, HD100: 4.1 x 10^8 cells/ml and 9.8 x 10^8 cells/ml). After 72 hours

of co-culture with *E. coli* ML35, plaque counts showed a small decrease in the HD100

population (1.5 x 10^8 pfu/ml and 4.5 x 10^8 pfu/ml), whereas the NC01 population decreased

substantially (2.3 x 10^5 pfu/ml and 7.5 x 10^6 pfu/ml). When compared in validation tests, direct

cell counts and plaque counts yielded comparable results, therefore the observed decrease in

NC01 population is not due to a difference in methods for determining predator population

density. These data demonstrate that for both NC01 and HD100, active predatory bacteria are

present after 72 hours of co-culture with *E. coli* ML35, but, in contrast to HD100, the NC01

population density decreases by at least two orders of magnitude over the course of the predation

efficiency assay.

Plaques formed by *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 on *E. coli* ML35 prey lawns are not as clear as

those formed by HD100

In addition to quantitative differences in the ability of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 and *B.*

bacteriovorus HD100 to kill *E. coli* ML35, we also observed qualitative differences in the

appearance of plaques formed by each strain on lawns of ML35 (Figure 5). In contrast to HD100,

which forms completely clear, regular plaques, NC01 forms plaques of a similar size, but with

incomplete clearance of the prey lawn within the plaques. Some NC01 plaques remain

completely turbid over eight days of incubation, whereas others retain a turbid center but begin

to clear on the edges of the plaque.

Discussion

We isolated *Bdellovibrio* from soil collected at a manmade landscape feature designed for

stormwater management on a college campus. By comparing 16S rRNA gene sequences and

analyzing average amino acid identity (AAI) among multiple sequenced *Bdellovibrio*, we

determined that the *Bdellovibrio* isolate was sufficiently divergent from *B. bacteriovorus* type

strain HD100 and other *B. bacteriovorus* strains that it should be classified as a different species.

The only other species currently described within *Bdellovibrio* is *exovorus*; however, this species

uses an epibiotic predation strategy that differs from the cell invasion strategy observed by

microscopy for the soil *Bdellovibrio* isolate described here. Pending further characterization, we

designated the isolate as *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01. Our analysis of 16S rRNA sequences and

average AAI also suggests that *Bdellovibrio* strain W is divergent enough from both HD100 and

NC01 to warrant its own species designation. This is consistent with the reported ability of W to

form a resting stage called a "bdellocyst", which has not been observed for any other

Bdellovibrio so far (18, 23).

Because *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 is phylogenetically divergent from HD100 and other

Bdellovibrio with sequenced genomes, this isolate provides a valuable opportunity to assess

variation in genome content and predatory phenotypes among *Bdellovibrio*. Genome-wide

comparisons of NC01 to HD100 and W using BLASTN identified eight regions of unique gene

content along the NC01 genome, and TBLASTN confirmed that the protein-coding sequences

within these regions are missing from the genomes of HD100 and W. Multiple lines of evidence

support the hypothesis that these eight regions were acquired by *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 via

horizontal gene transfer. Four of the regions have substantially lower GC content than the

genome average, which may indicate horizontal acquisition from a bacterial genome with a

lower average GC content than that of NC01 (22). Five of the regions encode genes with

predicted functions related to mobile elements such as phage and plasmids, and one of these

regions was identified as a possible prophage by phage finding sequence analysis software.

Alignment by BLASTP of amino acid sequences encoded within two of the eight regions

against the GenBank database suggested that these two regions may have been acquired recently

by *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01, because most of the sequences did not align to *Bdellovibrio* sequences

(complete or partial) in the database. This indicates that, given the current representation of

Bdellovibrio in the database, gene content in these two regions is mostly unique to NC01. For the

other six regions, the majority of amino acid sequences encoded in these regions aligned to

Bdellovibrio sequences in the database. This suggests that these *Bdellovibrio* strains may be

closely related to NC01, and the HGT events corresponding to acquisition of these six regions

occurred in the ancestral lineage before NC01 diverged from these strains. Addition of more

complete *Bdellovibrio* genomes to the database will improve our ability to reconstruct

evolutionary events such as horizontal gene transfer.

The analysis of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 gene content reported here further illustrates the

role of horizontal gene transfer as an important force in predatory bacteria genome evolution.

Comparative genomics has yielded evidence of both ancient and recent HGT in *Bdellovibrio* and

in the saltwater-adapted predatory genus *Halobacteriovorax* (24–27). However, lack of

functional annotation of many *Bdellovibrio* protein-coding sequences prevents a thorough

assessment of how HGT events impact predatory phenotypes. Within the eight NC01 genome

regions likely acquired via HGT, many of the protein-coding sequences are annotated as

hypothetical proteins, which provides no insight into their function and their potential roles in the

predatory life cycle. To fully understand how *Bdellovibrio* genome variation relates to variation

in predatory phenotypes, it is essential to assign functions to protein-coding genes.

In addition to genome comparisons, we also compared predatory phenotypes between

Bdellovibrio sp. NC01 and *B. bacteriovorus* type strain HD100. Based on plaque formation on

lawns of eight different Gram-negative bacteria, NC01 has a more restricted prey range than

HD100. In particular, HD100 was able to attack and kill both tested strains of *E. coli*, whereas

NC01 was only able to attack and kill *E. coli* ML35. Other researchers have also observed that a

particular *Bdellovibrio* strain may vary in its ability to kill different members of the same species

(14, 28); however, the mechanisms governing these outcomes are not known. By demonstrating

that strain-level variation within a Gram-negative species determines susceptibility to predation,

these data have potentially important implications for developing predatory bacteria as

biocontrol agents in the treatment of bacterial infections. If a *Bdellovibrio* isolate attacks and

kills one representative of a Gram-negative species, it does not guarantee that the isolate will

attack and kill other strains within the species. Further work to define the molecular mechanisms

underlying variation in prey range may enable prediction of whether a Gram-negative strain will

be susceptible to predation by a particular *Bdellovibrio* strain.

Although both NC01 and HD100 can attack and kill *E. coli* ML35, predation by HD100

causes a greater reduction in the ML35 population after 24 hours *in vitro* compared to predation

by NC01. HD100 then maintains a low ML35 population density, although it does not

completely eliminate viable ML35. By contrast, in co-cultures of NC01 and ML35, the ML35

population recovers after 24 hours, whereas the NC01 population decreases. This is likely not the

result of general predator-prey dynamics, such as an increase in search time due to reduced

ML35 numbers, because we did not observe ML35 population recovery in co-cultures with

HD100. Other researchers have observed similar prey population recovery (29, 30), and

Shemesh and Jurkevitch demonstrated that recovery of *Erwinia carotovora* in co-cultures with

Bdellovibrio isolated from soil was due to development of phenotypic resistance to predation. It

is possible that *E. coli* ML35 uses a similar mechanism to develop resistance to predation by

Bdellovibrio sp. NC01, but this mechanism is either not expressed or not successful in co-

cultures with *B. bacteriovorus* HD100. Further work will test this hypothesis and define the

molecular mechanisms governing ML35 population recovery.

Differences in predation efficiency between NC01 and HD100 on *E. coli* ML35 may also

be related to variation in plaque phenotype. Plaques formed by NC01 on lawns of ML35 are

turbid, whereas plaques formed by HD100 are completely clear. Turbid plaques have been

reported as a characteristic of prey-independent mutants of *Bdellovibrio*; however, these plaques

are typically smaller than those formed by the wild-type strain and sometimes have a small

colony of host-independent *Bdellovibrio* at their center (31, 32). Neither of these features were

observed when comparing NC01 and HD100 plaques, suggesting that the NC01 plaque

phenotype is not the result of prey-independent growth. Turbid plaques formed by NC01 may

arise from incomplete lysis of *E. coli* ML35 cells. If prey cells are successfully invaded but not

lysed, *Bdellovibrio* progeny will be trapped, which would explain the incomplete clearance of

the prey lawn and the decrease in the NC01 population observed during predation efficiency

assays. Further work will test this hypothesis.

318   Overall, comparisons between *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 and *B. bacteriovorus* HD100

revealed variation in predation phenotypes that may have important implications for the

ecological impact of each of these strains and their effectiveness in clinical applications. The

molecular mechanisms governing phenotypes such as prey range and predation efficiency are not

known. Comparative genomics can generate hypotheses linking gene content differences to

observed phenotype differences, but the lack of functional annotation for many protein-coding

genes complicates this effort. It is also likely that the outcomes of interactions between predatory

bacteria and prey, such as whether or not two different *Bdellovibrio* can kill the same Gram-

negative strain, are dependent upon mechanisms specific to the *Bdellovibrio* strain and

mechanisms specific to the prey strain. Defining these mechanisms is key for understanding

variation in predatory phenotypes among divergent *Bdellovibrio*.

Materials and Methods

Isolation and classification of environmental bacteria for use as prey

We isolated bacteria from an urban freshwater stream in Providence, RI (41.835, -

71.44299) and from soil in a residential area of Massachusetts (42.0877, -71.2309) for use as

prey. We also obtained *E. coli* ML35 from Mark Martin (University of Puget Sound, Puget

Sound, WA) and *Escherichia* 0057 from Brett Pellock (Providence College, Providence, RI).

To classify these isolates, we sequenced the 16S rRNA gene following a previously

described procedure (24). Briefly, we used primers 63F (33) and 1378R (34) to amplify the 16S

rRNA gene. Sanger sequencing of purified PCR products was performed by GeneWiz (South

Plainfield, NJ) using the same primers. We trimmed and assembled reads using

Phred/Phrap/Consed (35–37), then classified the assembled 16S rRNA gene sequences using

BLAST (38), the SILVA Incremental Aligner (39) and the Ribosomal Database Project classifier

(40). Supplementary Table 1 shows the full classification results. The RDP classifier and the

SILVA Incremental Aligner classify sequences to the genus level, but not the species level;

therefore, species names are not provided for these isolates.

Isolation and classification of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 from bioswale soil

In September 2015, we collected 50 g of soil from a bioswale on the Providence College

campus (41.84277, -71.43944). We combined the soil sample with 500 ml of sterile HM buffer

(25 mM HEPES adjusted to pH 7.4 and supplemented with 3 mM calcium chloride dihydrate and

2 mM magnesium chloride hexahydrate). We then filtered this mixture through sterile

cheesecloth into a sterile container to remove large particulate matter. We vortexed the filtrate to

release bacterial cells from the small particles of soil that passed through the cheesecloth. To

pellet the soil particles, we centrifuged the filtrate at 1753 rpm for 10 minutes, after which we

retained the supernatant containing suspended bacterial cells.

To enrich for predatory bacteria in the soil sample supernatant, we used *Pseudomonas* sp.

NC02 as prey, because it was also isolated from a soil environment (41). We cultured

Pseudomonas sp. NC02 overnight in 120 ml tryptic soy broth (TSB) at 28°C and 200 rpm, then

centrifuged the culture at 6000 rpm for 10 minutes, washed the resulting pellet with 100 ml

sterile HM buffer, centrifuged again and resuspended the resulting pellet in 2.5 ml HM buffer.

We combined 1 ml of *Pseudomonas* sp. NC02 resuspension with 20 ml of soil sample

supernatant and incubated this enrichment at 28°C and 200 rpm.

Once we observed small, fast-moving cells under 1000x phase-contrast microscopy, we

filtered the enrichment using a 0.45 μm filter and performed 10-fold serial dilutions of the filtrate

in sterile HM buffer. Dilutions were then plated using a double agar overlay method. For each

dilution of the filtrate to be plated, we combined 100 μl of the dilution, 250 μl of *Pseudomonas*

sp. NC02 at 10^8 cfu/ml and 4.5 ml of molten HM top agar (0.6% agar). After vortexing, we

poured this mixture onto HM agar plates (1.5% agar). We allowed the top agar to solidify at

room temperature, then incubated plates at 28°C until we observed plaques in the lawn of

Pseudomonas sp. NC02. To begin the process of obtaining a pure isolate, we used a sterile

Pasteur pipette to extract single, well-defined plaques from the top agar. We combined each

plaque with 500 μl of sterile HM buffer, incubated the plaque suspension at room temperature

for at least 5 minutes, then vortexed it vigorously.

To culture predatory bacteria from the plaque suspensions, we made lysates combining

300 μl of each plaque suspension, 1.5 ml of an overnight culture of *Serratia* 0043 and 20 ml

sterile HM buffer. *Serratia* 0043 was also isolated from a soil environment, and switching to this

prey species during the isolation procedure selected for predatory isolates that were capable of

attacking multiple different soil bacteria. We incubated lysates at 28°C and 200 rpm. After 48 h,

one lysate showed small, fast-moving cells, and we used this lysate to begin two additional

rounds of serial dilution, plating and plaque picking to ensure a pure isolate. We used *Serratia*

0043 as prey during both of these rounds. After the final round, we filtered the plaque suspension

using a 0.45 μm filter, then combined 500 μl of filtrate with 500 μl of sterile 50% glycerol and

stored the stock at -80°C.

To classify NC01, we extracted the 16S rRNA gene sequence from the NC01 genome

based on the annotation generated by PGAP (see below for genome sequencing and annotation

methods). Using SINA 1.2.11 (39), we aligned this sequence against 16S rRNA gene sequences

from all nine delta-proteobacterial obligate predatory bacteria with complete genomes available

in GenBank at the time (*Bacteriovorax stolpii* DSM12778 CP025704, *Bdellovibrio*

bacteriovorus 109J CP007656, *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* HD100 NC_005363, *Bdellovibrio*

bacteriovorus SSB218315 CP020946, *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* Tiberius NC_019567,

Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus W NZ_CP002190, *Bdellovibrio exovorus* JSS NC_020813,

Halobacteriovorax marinus BE01 CP017414, *Halobacteriovorax marinus* SJ NC_016620). We

then inferred a phylogeny from the alignment with the online server RAxML Blackbox (42),

using 100 bootstrap replicates to estimate the confidence of the topology.

To further investigate the relationships among NC01 and other *Bdellovibrio*, we used an

average amino acid identity (AAI) calculator (http://enve-omics.ce.gatech.edu/) (43) to analyze

the similarity among protein-coding sequences from NC01, 109J, HD100 and W, as annotated by

RAST (see below for genome sequencing and annotation methods).

Negative stain electron microscopy of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01

To obtain samples of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 for negative stain electron microscopy, we

added a small amount of the -80°C freezer stock to HM buffer mixed with 1.5 ml of an overnight

culture of *E. coli* ML35. After 48 h of incubation at 28°C and 200 rpm, we stained samples with

uranyl acetate following a previously described procedure (24) and imaged the resulting

specimens using a JEOL CX 2000 transmission electron microscope.

Genome sequencing, annotation and analysis of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01

To obtain genomic DNA, we combined a small amount of the -80°C stock, 1.5 ml of an

overnight culture of *E. coli* ML35 and 25 ml of sterile HM buffer. We chose ML35 as prey

because the genome sequence is available for screening reads if needed (44). After 72 hours of

incubation at 28°C and 200 rpm, we centrifuged the lysate at 9100 rpm for 10 minutes to pellet

bacterial cells. Because PacBio sequencing technology requires at least 10 μg of genomic DNA,

we did not filter the lysate to prevent loss of predatory bacteria cells. We then used the Wizard

Genomic DNA purification kit to extract genomic DNA, following the manufacturer's

instructions beginning with resuspension of the pellet in 600 μl of the kit's nuclei lysis solution.

For the final rehydration step, we rehydrated the DNA pellet overnight at 4°C. Quantification by

Qubit estimated a final concentration of 340 ng/μl genomic DNA.

For long-read sequencing, library construction and sequencing were performed at the

Institute for Genome Sciences at the University of Maryland Baltimore on a Pacific Biosciences

RSII instrument using P6-C4 chemistry. Quality control analysis of the reads showed that <10%

of reads aligned by BLAST to *E. coli* or *Shigella*, indicating that representation of the prey

genome in the read dataset is low. To analyze and assemble the reads, we launched an instance

of SMRT Portal 2.3.0 using Amazon EC2. A single SMRT cell yielded 79,088 postfilter

polymerase reads (N_{50} 17,028) and 94,031 subreads (N_{50} 13,572). Within SMRT Portal, we

assembled the reads with HGAP3 (45), using 4.5 Mbp for the genome size. This generated 186

contigs. The largest contig was 4,001,137 bp and aligned to *Bdellovibrio* in the database using

BLASTN. The other 185 contigs were each <48,000 bp in length, and all of them aligned to *E.*

coli by BLASTN, which is expected due to the inclusion of prey genomic DNA in the

sequencing library.

To close the genome, we used BLASTN to identify overlap in the ends of the contig and

trimmed the sequence to generate a closed contig of 3,975,771. We also adjusted the start site so

that the first nucleotide of the closed genome sequence corresponds to the first nucleotide in the

start codon of *dnaA*. To polish this sequence, we used 250 bp paired-end Illumina MiSeq data

generated at the Rhode Island Genomics and Sequencing Center. We filtered and trimmed the

raw read dataset to retain only those read pairs for which the quality score of every base was ≥13

and the read length was ≥65. This yielded 1,256,135 read pairs. Using bwa-mem (46), samtools

(47) and Pilon (48), we aligned these reads to the closed genome sequence and corrected 1 SNP,

84 small insertions totaling 85 bases and 4 small single-base deletions. We manually examined

changes flagged by Pilon using the alignment viewer Tablet (49), generating a final, polished

Bdellovibrio sp. NC01 genome sequence of 3,975,853 bp. This sequence has been deposited in

GenBank as CP030034.

In addition to annotation with NCBI's Prokaryotic Genome Annotation Pipeline (PGAP)

version 4.5, we also annotated the sequence using ClassicRAST (50, 51), Infernal (52), and

tRNAScan-SE (53, 54). For genome-wide pairwise comparisons, we used the BLAST Ring

Image Generator (BRIG) (55).

Phenotype assays to test prey range and predation efficiency

We obtained *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* HD100 from Mark Martin (University of Puget

Sound, Puget Sound, WA) for predatory phenotype comparisons. To culture *Bdellovibrio* NC01

and HD100, we added a small amount of -80°C stocks to 20 ml HM buffer combined with 1.5 ml

of an overnight culture of *E. coli* ML35. After 72 hours of incubation at 28°C and 200 rpm, we

filtered the lysate using a 0.45 μm filter to separate predatory cells from prey cells and cell debris.

For each phenotype assay described below, we followed this protocol to obtain attack phase

Bdellovibrio cells.

To test prey range and plaque appearance, we plated 10-fold serial dilutions of filtered

lysate using a double agar overlay method as described above for the isolation procedure. Each

tested prey strain was grown in 120 ml TSB overnight at 28°C and 200 rpm, with the exception

of *Escherichia* strains, which were grown at 37°C. After centrifugation and washing, we

resuspended prey cell pellets in 5 ml of sterile HM buffer. Based on cfu/ml counts, this yielded

concentrations of at least 10^8 cfu/ml, which ensured a dense prey lawn for visualizing plaques.

For some prey strains, we added 500 μl of prey resuspension to top agar to improve our ability to

detect and observe plaques in the prey lawn. We incubated plates at 28°C for 8 days before

scoring plaque formation and performed three replicates for each prey strain. In observations of

plaque appearance, we photographed plates at multiple time points over the course of 8 days.

To test predation efficiency, we adapted a protocol described in (15). We centrifuged the

filtered lysate at 8500 rpm for 10 minutes. The resulting pellet of predatory bacteria was

resuspended in sterile HM buffer to yield ~10^8 cells/ml based on direct cell counts using a

Petroff-Hausser counting chamber. To ensure that direct cell counts provided accurate estimates

of active predatory bacteria concentrations, we validated the method by comparing cells/ml

estimated using the Petroff-Hausser counting chamber with plaque-forming units/ml estimated

using serial dilution and double agar overlay to count plaques in a prey lawn. Results from two

replicates showed that direct cell counts were slightly lower than pfu/ml counts, but within the

same order of magnitude (direct cell counts: 3.94 x 10^8 cells/ml and 2.58 x 10^8 cells/ml, plaque

counts: 9.2 x 10^8 pfu/ml and 4.7 x 10^8 cells/ml).

To initiate the predation efficiency assay, we combined 500 μl of *Bdellovibrio* cell

resuspension (at ~10^8 cells/ml) with 12.5 ml of an overnight culture of *E. coli* ML35 diluted to

OD_{600} 0.15 (range: 0.135 – 0.165). This yielded ~10^8 cfu/ml, therefore the predation efficiency

assay results reported here are based on a predator:prey ratio of approximately 1:1. As a control,

we used 500 μl of sterile HM buffer in place of *Bdellovibrio* cell resuspension. Using cfu/ml

counts, we quantified viable *E. coli* ML35 at the beginning of the assay (time zero) and then after

6, 24, 48 and 72 hours of incubation at 28°C and 200 rpm.

<u>Acknowledgements</u>

This research was supported by an Institutional Development Award (IDeA) from the

National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under grant no.

P20GM103430 and by funding from Providence College. This material is based upon work

conducted at a Rhode Island NSF EPSCoR research facility, the Genomics and Sequencing

Center, supported in part by the National Science Foundation EPSCoR Cooperative Agreement

#EPS-1004057. This material is based upon work supported in part by the National Science

Foundation under EPSCoR Cooperative Agreement #OIA-1655221. The funders had no role in

study design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for

publication.

We thank Lisa Sadzewicz and Luke Tallon at the Institute for Genome Sciences at the

University of Maryland Baltimore for PacBio sequencing services. We thank Janet Atoyan at the

Rhode Island Genomics and Sequencing Center for Illumina MiSeq sequencing services. We

thank Sean O'Donnell for isolating freshwater prey bacteria and Mark Martin and Brett Pellock

for donating bacterial strains.

<u>References</u>

1.   Jurkevitch E, Davidov Y. 2007. Phylogenetic diversity and evolution of predatory

prokaryotes, p. 11–56. *In* Jurkevitch, E (ed.), Predatory Prokaryotes: Biology, Ecology and

Evolution. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.

2.   Chen H, Laws EA, Martin JL, Berhane T-K, Gulig PA, Williams HN. 2018. Relative

contributions of *Halobacteriovorax* and bacteriophage to bacterial cell death under various

environmental conditions. MBio 9.

3.   Welsh RM, Zaneveld JR, Rosales SM, Payet JP, Burkepile DE, Thurber RV. 2016.

Bacterial predation in a marine host-associated microbiome. ISME J 10:1540–1544.

4.   Feng S, Tan CH, Constancias F, Kohli GS, Cohen Y, Rice SA. 2017. Predation by

Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus significantly reduces viability and alters the microbial

community composition of activated sludge flocs and granules. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 93.

5.   Dwidar M, Monnappa AK, Mitchell RJ. 2012. The dual probiotic and antibiotic nature of

Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus. BMB Rep 45:71–78.

6.   Kadouri DE, To K, Shanks RMQ, Doi Y. 2013. Predatory bacteria: a potential ally against

multidrug-resistant Gram-negative pathogens. PLoS ONE 8:e63397.

7.   Tyson J, Sockett RE. 2017. Nature knows best: employing whole microbial strategies to

tackle antibiotic resistant pathogens. Environmental Microbiology Reports 9:47–49.

8.   Martin MO. 2002. Predatory prokaryotes: an emerging research opportunity. J Mol

Microbiol Biotechnol 4:467–477.

9.   Koval SF, Hynes SH, Flannagan RS, Pasternak Z, Davidov Y, Jurkevitch E. 2013.

Bdellovibrio exovorus sp. nov., a novel predator of *Caulobacter crescentus*. Int J Syst Evol

Microbiol 63:146–151.

10.   Sockett RE. 2009. Predatory lifestyle of *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus*. Annu Rev Microbiol

63:523–539.

11. Kuru E, Lambert C, Rittichier J, Till R, Ducret A, Derouaux A, Gray J, Biboy J, Vollmer W,

VanNieuwenhze M, Brun YV, Sockett RE. 2017. Fluorescent D-amino-acids reveal bi-

cellular cell wall modifications important for *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* predation. Nat

Microbiol 2:1648–1657.

12. Lerner TR, Lovering AL, Bui NK, Uchida K, Aizawa S-I, Vollmer W, Sockett RE. 2012.

Specialized peptidoglycan hydrolases sculpt the intra-bacterial niche of predatory

Bdellovibrio and increase population fitness. PLOS Pathogens 8:e1002524.

13. Dashiff A, Junka RA, Libera M, Kadouri DE. 2011. Predation of human pathogens by the

predatory bacteria *Micavibrio aeruginosavorus* and *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus*. Journal of

Applied Microbiology 110:431–444.

14. Jurkevitch E, Minz D, Ramati B, Barel G. 2000. Prey range characterization, ribotyping,

and diversity of soil and rhizosphere *Bdellovibrio* spp. isolated on phytopathogenic bacteria.

Appl Environ Microbiol 66:2365–2371.

15. Rogosky AM, Moak PL, Emmert EAB. 2006. Differential predation by *Bdellovibrio*

bacteriovorus 109J. Curr Microbiol 52:81–85.

16. Rendulic S, Jagtap P, Rosinus A, Eppinger M, Baar C, Lanz C, Keller H, Lambert C, Evans

KJ, Goesmann A, Meyer F, Sockett RE, Schuster SC. 2004. A predator unmasked: life

cycle of *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* from a genomic perspective. Science 303:689–692.

17. Negus D, Moore C, Baker M, Raghunathan D, Tyson J, Sockett RE. 2017. Predator versus

pathogen: How does predatory *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* interface with the challenges of

killing Gram-negative pathogens in a host setting? Annu Rev Microbiol 71:441–457.

18. Hoeniger JFM, Ladwig R, Moor H. 1972. The fine structure of "resting bodies" of

Bdellovibrio sp. strain W developed in *Rhodospirillum rubrum*. Can J Microbiol 18:87–92.

19. Oyedara OO, Segura-Cabrera A, Guo X, Elufisan TO, Cantú González RA, Rodríguez

Pérez MA. 2018. Whole-genome sequencing and comparative genome analysis provided

insight into the predatory features and genetic diversity of two *Bdellovibrio* species isolated

from soil. Int J Genomics 2018.

20. Stackebrandt E, Goebel BM. 1994. Taxonomic note: A place for DNA-DNA reassociation

and 16S rRNA sequence analysis in the present species definition in bacteriology.

International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology 44:846–849.

21. Stackebrandt E, Ebers J. 2006. Taxonomic parameters revisited: tarnished gold standards.

Microbiology Today 33:152–155.

22. Ravenhall M, Škunca N, Lassalle F, Dessimoz C. 2015. Inferring horizontal gene transfer.

PLoS Comput Biol 11.

23. Tudor JJ, Conti SF. 1977. Characterization of bdellocysts of *Bdellovibrio* sp. Journal of

Bacteriology 131:314–322.

24. Enos BG, Anthony MK, DeGiorgis JA, Williams LE. 2018. Prey range and genome

evolution of *Halobacteriovorax marinus* predatory bacteria from an estuary. mSphere

3:e00508-17.

25. Gophna U, Charlebois RL, Doolittle WF. 2006. Ancient lateral gene transfer in the

evolution of *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus*. Trends Microbiol 14:64–69.

26. Pan A, Chanda I, Chakrabarti J. 2011. Analysis of the genome and proteome composition

of *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus*: indication for recent prey-derived horizontal gene transfer.

Genomics 98:213–222.

27. Hobley L, Lerner TR, Williams LE, Lambert C, Till R, Milner DS, Basford SM, Capeness

MJ, Fenton AK, Atterbury RJ, Harris MATS, Sockett RE. 2012. Genome analysis of a

simultaneously predatory and prey-independent, novel *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* from the

River Tiber, supports in silico predictions of both ancient and recent lateral gene transfer

from diverse bacteria. BMC Genomics 13:670.

28. Fratamico PM, Whiting RC. 1995. Ability of *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* 109J to lyse

Gram-negative food-borne pathogenic and spoilage bacteria. Journal of Food Protection

58:160–164.

29.   Baker M, Negus D, Raghunathan D, Radford P, Moore C, Clark G, Diggle M, Tyson J,

Twycross J, Sockett RE. 2017. Measuring and modelling the response of *Klebsiella*

pneumoniae KPC prey to *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* predation, in human serum and

defined buffer. Sci Rep 7:8329.

30.   Shemesh Y, Jurkevitch E. 2004. Plastic phenotypic resistance to predation by *Bdellovibrio*

and like organisms in bacterial prey. Environ Microbiol 6:12–18.

31.   Cotter TW, Thomashow MF. 1992. Identification of a *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* genetic

locus, *hit*, associated with the host-independent phenotype. J Bacteriol 174:6018–6024.

32.   Roschanski N, Klages S, Reinhardt R, Linscheid M, Strauch E. 2011. Identification of

genes essential for prey-independent growth of *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* HD100. Journal

of Bacteriology 193:1745–1756.

33.   Marchesi JR, Sato T, Weightman AJ, Martin TA, Fry JC, Hiom SJ, Dymock D, Wade WG.

1998. Design and evaluation of useful bacterium-specific PCR primers that amplify genes

coding for bacterial 16S rRNA. Appl Environ Microbiol 64:795–799.

34.   Heuer H, Krsek M, Baker P, Smalla K, Wellington EM. 1997. Analysis of actinomycete

communities by specific amplification of genes encoding 16S rRNA and gel-electrophoretic

separation in denaturing gradients. Appl Environ Microbiol 63:3233–3241.

35.   Ewing B, Green P. 1998. Base-calling of automated sequencer traces using Phred. II. Error

probabilities. Genome Res 8:186–194.

36.   Ewing B, Hillier L, Wendl MC, Green P. 1998. Base-calling of automated sequencer traces

using Phred. I. Accuracy assessment. Genome Res 8:175–185.

37.   Gordon D, Abajian C, Green P. 1998. Consed: A graphical tool for sequence finishing.

Genome Res 8:195–202.

38.   Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment search

tool. Journal of Molecular Biology 215:403–410.

39.   Pruesse E, Peplies J, Glöckner FO. 2012. SINA: Accurate high-throughput multiple

sequence alignment of ribosomal RNA genes. Bioinformatics 28:1823–1829.

40.   Wang Q, Garrity GM, Tiedje JM, Cole JR. 2007. Naïve Bayesian classifier for rapid

assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. Appl Environ Microbiol

73:5261–5267.

41.   Cerra J, Donohue H, Kral A, Oser M, Rostkowski L, Zappia L, Williams LE. 2018.

Complete genome sequence of *Pseudomonas* sp. strain NC02, isolated from soil. Genome

Announc 6.

42.   Kozlov A, Darriba D, Flouri T, Morel B, Stamatakis A. 2018. RAxML-NG: A fast, scalable,

and user-friendly tool for maximum likelihood phylogenetic inference. bioRxiv 447110.

43.   Rodriguez-R LM, Konstantinidis KT. 2016. The enveomics collection: a toolbox for

specialized analyses of microbial genomes and metagenomes. PeerJ Preprints 4:e1900v1.

44.   Casale A, Clark S, Grasso M, Kryschuk M, Ritzer L, Trudeau M, Williams LE. 2018.

Complete genome sequence of *Escherichia coli* ML35. Genome Announc 6.

45. Chin C-S, Alexander DH, Marks P, Klammer AA, Drake J, Heiner C, Clum A, Copeland A,

Huddleston J, Eichler EE, Turner SW, Korlach J. 2013. Nonhybrid, finished microbial

genome assemblies from long-read SMRT sequencing data. Nature Methods 10:563–569.

46. Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler

transform. Bioinformatics 25:1754–1760.

47. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin

R. 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078–

2079.

48. Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, Cuomo CA, Zeng Q,

Wortman J, Young SK, Earl AM. 2014. Pilon: An integrated tool for comprehensive

microbial variant detection and genome assembly improvement. PLOS ONE 9:e112963.

49. Milne I, Stephen G, Bayer M, Cock PJA, Pritchard L, Cardle L, Shaw PD, Marshall D.

2013. Using Tablet for visual exploration of second-generation sequencing data. Brief

Bioinform 14:193–202.

50. Aziz RK, Bartels D, Best AA, DeJongh M, Disz T, Edwards RA, Formsma K, Gerdes S,

Glass EM, Kubal M, Meyer F, Olsen GJ, Olson R, Osterman AL, Overbeek RA, McNeil

LK, Paarmann D, Paczian T, Parrello B, Pusch GD, Reich C, Stevens R, Vassieva O,

Vonstein V, Wilke A, Zagnitko O. 2008. The RAST Server: rapid annotations using

subsystems technology. BMC Genomics 9:75.

51. Overbeek R, Olson R, Pusch GD, Olsen GJ, Davis JJ, Disz T, Edwards RA, Gerdes S,

Parrello B, Shukla M, Vonstein V, Wattam AR, Xia F, Stevens R. 2014. The SEED and the

Rapid Annotation of microbial genomes using Subsystems Technology (RAST). Nucleic

Acids Res 42:D206-214.

52. Nawrocki EP, Eddy SR. 2013. Infernal 1.1: 100-fold faster RNA homology searches.

Bioinformatics 29:2933–2935.

53. Lowe TM, Chan PP. 2016. tRNAscan-SE On-line: integrating search and context for

analysis of transfer RNA genes. Nucleic Acids Res 44:W54-57.

54. Lowe TM, Eddy SR. 1997. tRNAscan-SE: a program for improved detection of transfer

RNA genes in genomic sequence. Nucleic Acids Res 25:955–964.

55. Alikhan N-F, Petty NK, Ben Zakour NL, Beatson SA. 2011. BLAST Ring Image Generator

(BRIG): simple prokaryote genome comparisons. BMC Genomics 12:402.

Figures and Figure Legends

A   B

Figure 1. Microscopy of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 isolated from bioswale soil. (A) Compilation of

four images taken using 1000x phase-contrast microscopy to show small, comma-shaped NC01

attack phase cells attached to larger *E. coli* ML35 cells after 48 hours of co-culture. (B) Negative

stain electron microscopy of a NC01 attack phase cell. The scale bar is 500 nm.

Figure 2. 16S rRNA gene phylogeny. We aligned 16S rRNA gene sequences using SINA 1.2.11,

then constructed a phylogeny using RAxML BlackBox with 100 bootstrap replicates. The

phylogeny is rooted on the branch joining *Bdellovibrio* with *Bacteriovorax*/*Halobacteriovorax*,

and bootstrap support for each node is shown.

Figure 3. Genome-wide pairwise comparisons of *Bdellovibrio* nucleotide sequences. The

genome of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 is shown as the innermost ring. The next ring is a plot of GC

content and the purple and green ring is a plot of GC skew, both of which were generated by the

BLAST Ring Image Generator (BRIG) using sliding windows to determine deviation from the

average value for the genome. The blue ring and red ring show pairwise nucleotide sequence

alignments of NC01 to HD100 and W, respectively. Each individual alignment is shown as a

block along the ring, and color gradation of the blocks reflects the percent similarity of

657   alignments. The outermost ring denotes eight regions lacking alignments, which may indicate

658   unique NC01 gene content.

Figure 4. Efficiency of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 and *B. bacteriovorus* HD100 predation on *E. coli*

ML35. We quantified viable *E. coli* ML35 over 72 hours on its own (control), combined with

Bdellovibrio sp. NC01 (NC01) and combined with *B. bacteriovorus* HD100 (HD100). The

resulting cfu/ml data were log transformed and plotted using ggplot in RStudio. Each time point

shows the mean and standard deviation for at least five replicates.

A   B

Figure 5. Plaque phenotypes of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 and *B. bacteriovorus* HD100. Using a

double agar overlay method, we assessed plaque formation on lawns of *E. coli* ML35. These

images were taken after 6 days of incubation and illustrate reproducible differences in the

appearance of plaques formed by HD100 (A) and NC01 (B).

Tables

Table 1. Average amino acid identity among *Bdellovibrio* genomes

	NC01	W	HD100	109J
NC01		64.4	68.8	68.8
W	64.4		66.4	66.5
HD100	68.8	66.4		99.2
109J	68.8	66.5	99.2	

676 Table 2. Genome comparison of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01, *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* HD100 and
677 *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* W
678

	Bdellovibrio sp. NC01		*Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* HD100		*Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* W	
	PGAP	RAST and RFAM/ tRNAScan	PGAP	RAST and RFAM/ tRNAScan	PGAP	RAST and RFAM/ tRNAScan
Genome size (bp)	3,975,853		3,782,950		3,006,992	
GC content (%)	44.5		50.6		43.3	
Genes	3,840	3,828	3,597	3,651	2,834	2,901
Protein-coding	3,773	3,776	3,548	3,597	2,760	2,849
Hypothetical proteins	1,712	1,431	1,245	1,309	962	971
tRNA	34	34	36	36	34	34
rRNA	6	6	6	6	6	6
Other RNA	4	12	4	12	4	12

680 Table 3. Prey range of *B. bacteriovorus* HD100 and *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01

Genus	Strain ID	Environment	Plaque formation[a]	
			HD100	NC01
Acinetobacter	0036	Freshwater	Yes	No
Aeromonas	0031	Freshwater	Yes	Yes
Enterobacteriaceae	0032	Freshwater	Yes	Yes
Raoultella	0037	Freshwater	Yes	No
Pseudomonas	NC02 (0042)[b]	Soil	Yes	Yes
Serratia	0043	Soil	Yes	Yes
Escherichia	0057		Yes	No
Escherichia	ML35		Yes	Yes

681 [a]Plaque formation data based on three replicates

682 [b]*Pseudomonas* sp. NC02 is referred to as 0042 in (27)