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

8   Keywords: predatory bacteria, prey range, predation efficiency, plaque phenotype

9   Genome accession number: CP030034

<u>Abstract</u>

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* may further our understanding of how this genus

impacts microbial communities. In addition, comparisons of the predatory phenotypes of

divergent strains may inform the development of *Bdellovibrio* 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 *E. coli* 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 valuable for

understanding the ecological significance of predatory bacteria and evaluating their effectiveness

in clinical applications.

Introduction

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 recent 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 predatory phenotypes such as prey range and predation efficiency will affect how different strains of predatory bacteria impact microbial communities, and this phenotypic variation may be determined by variation in genome content. To further our understanding of phenotypic and genome 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 invades the prey periplasm by using lytic enzymes to open a small hole in the prey outer membrane and cell wall (11). Both attachment

and invasion may be mediated by Type IV pili expressed by *Bdellovibrio* (12, 13). 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

(14). 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, 15). 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 (16, 17) and in how quickly and to what extent a population of Gram-negative prey

is reduced (15, 18). These predatory phenotypes, referred to as prey range and predation

efficiency, are clearly important in determining the outcomes of interactions between

Bdellovibrio 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

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

in this strain (20). To investigate variation in genome content, we compared the genome of NC01

to that of HD100 and *B. bacteriovorus* W (21), which is phylogenetically divergent from HD100

and all other fully sequenced intraperiplasmic *Bdellovibrio* (22). 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.

Methods

Isolation and identification of environmental bacteria for use as prey

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

71.44299) and from soil in a residential area of Massachusetts (lat 42.0877, lon -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 identify these isolates, we sequenced the 16S rRNA gene following a previously

described procedure (23). Briefly, we used primers 63F (24) and 1378R (25), which amplify the

16S rRNA gene from many members of Domain Bacteria. 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 (26–28), then classified the assembled 16S

rRNA gene sequences using BLAST (29), the SILVA Incremental Aligner (30) and the

Ribosomal Database Project classifier (31). 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 identification of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01 from bioswale soil

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

campus (lat 41.84277, lon -71.43944). To isolate predatory bacteria from the soil sample, we

adapted standard methods (32, 33). 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, and its genome has been

sequenced (34). 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 both *Pseudomonas* and *Serratia*, which belong to different orders. 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 identify 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 (30), we aligned this sequence against 16S rRNA gene sequences

extracted from nine genomes of obligate predatory bacteria belonging to *Bacteriovorax*,

Bdellovibrio and *Halobacteriovorax* (*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 (35),

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/) (36) 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 20 ml of HM buffer mixed with 1.5 ml of an

overnight culture of *E. coli* ML35 grown in TSB. After 48 h of incubation at 28°C and 200 rpm,

we stained samples with uranyl acetate following a previously described procedure (23) 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 it is a standard prey strain used in cultivation of *Bdellovibrio*, and the genome sequence

is available for screening reads if needed (37). 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 (38), 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 (39), samtools

(40) and Pilon (41), 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 (42), 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 (43, 44), Infernal (45), and

tRNAScan-SE (46, 47). For genome-wide pairwise comparisons, we used the BLAST Ring

Image Generator (BRIG) (48).

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 conduct phenotype assays,

we adapted standard methods (32, 33, 49). 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 (18). 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 and 1000x phase-contrast microscopy. 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.

Results

Bioswale soil harbors predatory bacteria belonging to *Bdellovibrio*

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

an enrichment followed by three rounds of plaque picking to obtain 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 identify NC01, we constructed a phylogeny of 16S rRNA gene sequences from this

isolate and nine *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 (50), which supports identifying NC01 as *Bdellovibrio*. However, it is below the 98.7%

similarity cutoff typically used to define species (51), which suggests that NC01 belongs to a

different species than *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

identified 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**

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 intraperiplasmic *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) (52).

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 identified 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 by calculating cfu/ml

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. ML35 population recovery in the presence of NC01 was consistently

observed in all assay replicates, and cfu/ml plates showed no evidence of contaminant bacteria.

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 ~10^8 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 identified 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.

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

intraperiplasmic *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 (52). 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* (23, 53–55). 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

(16, 56); 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 (57, 58), 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, thereby causing the NC01 population to decrease as a result of starvation

due to lack of susceptible prey. 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 (59, 60). 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.

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

identified 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*.

Author statements

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

Funding information

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 to LEW 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.

Acknowledgements

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.

References

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.   Mahmoud KK, Koval SF. 2010. Characterization of type IV pili in the life cycle of the

predator bacterium *Bdellovibrio*. Microbiology (Reading, Engl) 156:1040–1051.

13.   Avidan O, Petrenko M, Becker R, Beck S, Linscheid M, Pietrokovski S, Jurkevitch E. 2017.

Identification and characterization of differentially-regulated Type IVb pilin genes

necessary for predation in obligate bacterial predators. Sci Rep 7:1013.

14.   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.

15.   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.

16. 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.

17. Chanyi RM, Ward C, Pechey A, Koval SF. 2013. To invade or not to invade: two

approaches to a prokaryotic predatory life cycle. Can J Microbiol 59:273–279.

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

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

19. 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.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. 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.

23.   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.

24.   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.

25.   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.

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

probabilities. Genome Res 8:186–194.

27.   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.

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

Genome Res 8:195–202.

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

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

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

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

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

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

567   73:5261–5267.

568   32.   Jurkevitch E. 2012. Isolation and classification of *Bdellovibrio* and Like Organisms.

569   Current Protocols in Microbiology 7B.1.1-7B.1.20.

570   33.   Koval SF. 2007. The search for hunters: culture-dependent and -independent methods for

571   analysis of *Bdellovibrio* and Like Organisms, p. 191–211. *In* Jurkevitch, E (ed.), Predatory

572   Prokaryotes: Biology, Ecology and Evolution. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin,

573   Heidelberg.

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

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

576   Announc 6.

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

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

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

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

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

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

38.   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.

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

transform. Bioinformatics 25:1754–1760.

40.   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.

41.   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.

42.   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.

43.   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.

44.   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.

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

Bioinformatics 29:2933–2935.

46. 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.

47. 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.

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

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

49. Lambert C, Sockett RE. 2008. Laboratory maintenance of *Bdellovibrio*. Current Protocols

in Microbiology 9:7B.2.1-7B.2.13.

50. 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.

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

Microbiology Today 33:152–155.

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

PLoS Comput Biol 11.

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

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

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

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

627   Genomics 98:213–222.

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

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

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

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

632   from diverse bacteria. BMC Genomics 13:670.

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

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

635   58:160–164.

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

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

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

639   defined buffer. Sci Rep 7:8329.

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

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

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

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

60.   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.

<u>Figures and Figure Legends</u>

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

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

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.

677

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

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

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

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

 Tables

684 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	

686 Table 2. Genome comparison of *Bdellovibrio* sp. NC01, *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* HD100 and
687 *Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus* W
688

	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

690 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

691 [a]Plaque formation data based on three replicates

692   [b]*Pseudomonas* sp. NC02 is referred to as 0042 in (23)