1

Microbial traits and the realized niche in a simple metaorganism

Peter Deines[1]*, Katrin Hammerschmidt[2] and Thomas CG Bosch[1]

[1]Zoological Institute, Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel, 24118 Kiel, Germany

[2]Institute of General Microbiology, Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel, 24118 Kiel,

Germany

*Correspondence:

Peter Deines

pdeines@zoologie.uni-kiel.de

Keywords

microbiome, microbial interactions, trait-based theory, niche concept, metaorganism

Running title: Microbial traits, niches, and the metaorganism

Abstract

Organisms and their resident microbial communities - the microbiome - form a complex and mostly stable ecosystem. It is known that the specific composition and abundance of certain bacterial species have a major impact on host health and *Darwinian fitness*, but the processes that lead to these microbial patterns have not yet been identified. We here apply the niche concept and trait-based approaches as a first step in understanding the patterns underlying microbial community assembly and structure in the simple metaorganism *Hydra*. We find that the carrying capacities in single associations do not reflect microbiota densities as part of the community, indicating a discrepancy between the fundamental and realized niche. Whereas in most cases, the realized niche is smaller than the fundamental one, as predicted by theory, the opposite is observed for *Hydra's* two main bacterial colonizers. Both, *Curvibacter sp.* and *Duganella sp.* benefit from association with the other members of the microbiome and reach higher fractions as in single colonisations. This cannot be linked to any particular trait that is relevant for interacting with the host or by the utilization of specific nutrients but is most likely determined by metabolic interactions between the individual microbiome members.

Introduction

Microbiomes contribute to ecosystems as key engines that power system-level processes (Falkowski et al., 2008). This also applies to host ecosystems, where they are critical in maintaining host health, survival, and function ((Kau et al., 2011; McFall-Ngai et al., 2013)). Despite their importance, the mechanisms governing microbiome assembly and composition are largely unknown. This is different for macroscopic communities, thanks to the application of niche (Holt, 2009; Leibold, 1995; Whittaker et al., 1973) and trait-based theories, which might also provide a useful framework for studying the ecology and evolution of microbiomes in metaorganisms (Kopac and Klassen, 2016).

The niche concept is one of the core concepts in ecology and has been rediscovered by modern ecology for explaining biodiversity and species coexistence patterns (Pocheville, 2015). The niche-based theory states that an ecological community is made up of a limited number of niches, each occupied by a single species. Hutchinson (Hutchinson, 1957) defined the *fundamental niche* as the needs of a species for it to maintain a positive population growth rate, disregarding biotic interactions (Hutchinson, 1957; Pearman et al., 2008). The fundamental niche therefore represents an idealized situation exclusive of interspecific interactions. The effect of biological interactions is taken into account in the definition of the *realized niche* (Hutchinson, 1957). This is the portion of the fundamental niche in which a species has a positive population growth rate, despite the constraining effects of biological interactions, such as inter-specific competition (Hutchinson, 1957; Pearman et al., 2008).

In the last two decades, the shift from taxonomy to function by using trait-based approaches has provided a detailed understanding of biodiversity-ecosystem functioning (Louca et al., 2018). Recently, this framework is also being used by microbial ecologists to study microbial biogeography (Green et al., 2008), or to unravel microbial biodiversity-ecosystem functioning relationships (Krause et al., 2014). Further, this approach allows studying microbiomes in the light of coexisting traits/ functions rather than of coexisting microbes (Martiny et al., 2015). A recent study successfully used this approach and analysed trait-based patterns to understand the mechanisms of community assembly and succession of the infant gut microbiome (Guittar et al., 2019). Microbial traits cover a range of phenotypic characteristics ranging from simple to complex, for example organic phosphate utilization, bacteriophage host range, cellulose degradation, biofilm formation, nitrogen fixation, methanogenesis, and salinity preference (Martiny et al., 2015). Potential microbial traits can be measured directly by

laboratory assays (as in this study) or can be indirectly inferred based on genomic
information.

The aim of this study is to apply the niche concept and trait-based theory to the
metaorganism *Hydra* to gain insight into the mechanisms underlying the microbial
community composition. We thus specifically extend the niche-assembly perspective,
classically used for assessing species assembly and coexistence in abiotic environments,
to a host-associated microbiome, thus a biotic environment.

The freshwater polyp and its microbiome have become a valuable model system
for metaorganism research as it provides a bridge between the simplicity of synthetic
communities and the complex mouse model (Deines and Bosch, 2016). The ectoderm is
covered by a multi-layered glycocalyx, which is the habitat for a species-specific
microbiome of low complexity (Bosch, 2013; Deines et al., 2017; Franzenburg et al.,
2013). The most abundant bacterial colonizers of *Hydra vulgaris* (strain AEP) are
Curvibacter sp. (75,6%), *Duganella sp.* (11,1%), *Undibacterium sp.* (2.1%), *Acidovorax sp.*
(0.7%), *Pseudomonas sp*. (0.4%), and *Pelomonas sp.* (0.2%) (Fraune et al., 2015). All
strains can be cultured and manipulated *in vitro* (Bosch, 2013; Fraune et al., 2015; Wein
et al., 2018), allowing the measurement of phenotypic microbial traits and fitness.
Fitness, as defined by niche theory, is the positive population growth of the focal species,
which in our study is that of the six microbiome members. Measurements of the
performance of the bacterial populations when grown singly, i.e. in the absence of the
other microbial competitors *in vitro* and *in vivo* (on germ-free *Hydra* polys), specify the
fundamental niche. For each species, we compare the fundamental niche to the realized
niche, which we predict based on data showing the microbiome composition of wild
type polys (Franzenburg et al., 2013; Fraune et al., 2015). We also measure phenotypic
traits for the different microbial strains that might play a role in populating the host and
interacting with the host and their associate microbial community members. Ultimately,
we take the traits and the ecological niches as determinants of species interactions,
which may infer the assembly and structure of the host-associated microbiome.
106

Materials and Methods

Animals used, culture conditions, and generation of germ-free animals

Hydra vulgaris (strain AEP) was used in the experiments and cultured according to standard procedures at 18°C in standardized *Hydra* culture medium (Lenhoff and Brown, 1970). Animals were fed three times a week with 1st instar larvae of *Artemia salina*. Germ-free polyps were obtained as previously described (Franzenburg et al., 2013; Murillo-Rincon et al., 2017). After two weeks of treatment, polyps were transferred into antibiotic-free sterile *Hydra* culture medium for recovery (four days). Sterility was confirmed by established methods (Franzenburg et al., 2013). During antibiotic treatment and re-colonization experiments, polyps were not fed.

Bacterial strains and media

The bacterial strains used in this study are *Curvibacter sp*. AEP1.3, *Duganella sp*. C1.2, *Undibacterium sp*. C1.1, *Acidovorax sp*. AEP1.4, *Pseudomonas sp*. C2.2, *Pelomonas sp*. AEP2.2., which are strains isolated from the *Hydra vulgaris* (strain AEP) microbiome (Fraune et al., 2015). These bacteria were cultured from existing isolate stocks in R2A medium at 18°C, shaken at 250 r.p.m for 72 hrs before use in the different experiments.

Carrying capacity of mono-associations in *Hydra*

Germ-free polys were inoculated with single bacterial strains using 5×10^3 cells in 1.5 ml Eppendorf tubes containing 1 ml of sterile *Hydra* culture medium. After 24 hrs of incubation, all polyps were washed with, and transferred to sterile *Hydra* culture medium, incubated at 18°C. After three days of incubation individual polyps were homogenized in an Eppendorf tube using a sterile pestle, after which serial dilutions of the homogenate were plated on R2A agar plates to determine colony-forming units (CFUs) per polyp.

Measurement of bacterial growth rates *in vitro*

Cultures of the all six strains were produced in R2A microcosms (grown for 72 hrs at 18°C, at 250 r.p.m). Aliquots of each culture were first washed in S medium and then re-suspended in fresh R2A medium to an optical density of 0.025 at 600 nm (OD_{600}). Growth kinetics of all strains were determined in 96-well microtiter plates. A 100 µl aliquot of each re-suspension was pipetted into 100 µl of fresh R2A medium. The microtiter plate was then placed in a microplate reader (TECAN Spark 10M), and the OD_{600} of each well was measured at 30 min intervals for 96 cycles (with 10 sec shaking at 150 r.p.m. prior to each read). The growth of each strain was determined in five well

143 locations on an individual 96-well plate, which was replicated six times. The maximum
144 growth rate (V_{max}) was calculated from the maximum slope of the absorbance over time.
145

Cell surface hydrophobicity (CSH)

The BATH assay was performed as described previously (Borecká-Melkusová and
Bujdáková, 2008; Rosenberg, 1984). It uses a biphasic separation method to measure
cell surface hydrophobicity. In short, for each strain tested, 4 ml of bacterial suspension
(OD_{600} = 0.1; $OD_{initial}$) was placed into a class tube, overlaid with 1 ml of n-hexodecane
(Sigma Aldrich), and vortexed for 3 min. The phases were then allowed to separate for
15 min, after which the ODs of the aqueous (lower) phase containing hydrophilic cells
was measured at OD_{600} ($OD_{residual}$). The hydrophobic cells are found in the n-hexodecane
overlay (upper phase). OD values were compared to the bacterial suspension before
mixing with n-hexodecane. The relative hydrophobicity (RH) was calculated as follows:
RH = (($OD_{initial}$ − $OD_{residual}$)/$OD_{initial}$) x 100%. The experiment was performed in triplicate
with independent bacterial overnight cultures.
158

Biofilm quantification by use of crystal violet (CV)

Biofilm formation was assayed and quantified as previously described (Ren et al., 2015).
Briefly, exponential growth phase cultures of the six strains were adjusted to an optical
density at 600nm (OD_{600}) of 0.1 in R2A medium. Biofilm formation was assayed in a 96
well plate using eight replicates for each treatment. For single isolates an inoculation
volume of 180 µl was used and for the six-species biofilm 30 µl per species. After 48 hrs
of incubation at 18°C with shaking (200 r.p.m) biofilm formation was quantified by a
modified crystal violet (CV) assay (Peeters et al., 2008).
167

Characterizing nutrient utilisation

To characterise the nutrient profiles (niches) of *Hydras* microbiota, we measured the
carbon metabolism profile for each strain using BIOLOG GN2 plates. BIOLOG GN2 plates
are 96-well microwell plates containing 95 different carbon sources plus a carbon-
absent water control well. Strains were grown from isolate stocks in R2A medium (18°C,
shaken at 250 r.p.m.), centrifuged at 3000 r.c.f. for 5 min, re-suspended in S medium and
adjusted to an OD_{600} of 0.1. Each well of the BIOLOG plate was inoculated with 150 µl of
bacterial suspension and incubated for three days at 18°C in a humid chamber. Growth
on each of the 95 nutrients was determined as OD_{600} of each well using a TECAN plate
reader. For each plate, the OD of the water control was subtracted from the reading of
all other wells prior to analysis, and differenced OD values below 0.005 were considered

as no growth (Vaz Jauri et al., 2013). Nutrient use was evaluated on three replicate
plates. Nutrient (niche) overlap (NO) was calculated using the formula: NO = (number of
nutrients used by both A and B)/((number of nutrients used by A + number of nutrients
used by B)/ 2) (Vaz Jauri et al., 2013). A value of 1 indicates the use of the same
nutrients (100% overlap) and 0 indicates no nutrient overlap among the 95 substrates
tested. We also calculated the relative use of the eleven functional groups
(carbohydrates, carboxylic acids, amino acids, polymers, aromatic chemicals, amines,
amides, phosphorylated chemicals, esters, alcohols and bromide chemicals) according to
Daou et al. (2017). In brief, the relative use of C substrates was calculated as absorption
values in each well divided by the total absorption in the plate.
189

Statistical analysis
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and subsequent post hoc Tukey-Kramer tests were used
to test for differences in the carrying capacity of the six *Hydra* colonizers. To meet the
requirements for the model, the variable was Box-Cox transformed. A Welch ANOVA
(and subsequent Wilcoxon posthoc tests) was used to test for differences in *in vitro*
growth rates between the strains.
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and subsequent post hoc Tukey-Kramer tests were used
to test for differences in the cell surface hydrophobicity of the six *Hydra* colonizers.
A Welch ANOVA (and subsequent Wilcoxon posthoc tests) was used to test for
differences in biofilm formation capacity.
Sample size was chosen to maximise statistical power and ensure sufficient
replication. Assumptions of the tests, that is, normality and equal distribution of
variances, were visually evaluated. Non-significant interactions were removed from the
models. All tests were two-tailed. Effects were considered significant at the level of $P <$
0.05. All statistical analyses were performed with JMP 9. Graphs were produced with
GraphPad Prism 5.0, and RStudio (RStudio Team, 2015).
206

Results

Growth performance of the bacterial strains

The six bacterial strains differ significantly in their carrying capacity on *Hydra* (Figure

1A; ANOVA: $F_{5,12}$=12.696, P=0.0002). The most extreme cases are *Acidovorax sp.* that

reaches the highest numbers with 2.6*10^5 CFUs/polyp, and *Duganella sp.* the lowest

with 1.7*10^4 CFUs/polyp. When comparing the *in vitro* growth rates we find strains

perform differently (Figure 1B; Welch ANOVA: $F_{5,174}$=223.856, P<0.0001). The fastest

strain, *Undibacterium sp.*, grows twice as fast as compared to the slowest one, *Pelomonas*

sp..

When comparing the fundamental and the realized niches of the six strains (Figure 2)

we find that the realized niche of *Curvibacter sp.* and *Duganella sp.* is larger than their

fundamental niche. For the other strains the fundamental niche exceeds the realized

niche.

Bacterial traits

The colonization process

The BATH assay was conducted with six strains of the *Hydra* microbiome to measure

cell surface hydrophobicity (CSH). The CSH of the bacterial strains spanned a medium

wide range; the values ranged from 0% to 42% and differs significantly between strains

(ANOVA: $F_{5,12}$=26.869; P<0.0001). *Curvibacter sp.* and *Pelomonas sp.* were the only two

strains that didn't show any affinity to the hexadecone; thus their cell population can be

considered homogeneous consisting of only hydrophilic cells, which significantly differs

from the others, except for *Pseudomonas sp.* (Figure 3A). *Pseudomonas sp.* and

Undibacterium sp. show a mixed cell population, where 10 to 20% of the cells are

hydrophobic. The strains with the highest percentage of hydrophobic cells are

Acidovorax sp. and *Duganella sp.*, between 30 and 35%.

The strains differed in their biofilm formation (Welch ANOVA: $F_{5,18}$=350.723, P<0.0001).

All strains formed biofilms (Figure 3B), with *Pelomonas sp.* producing the largest

biomass amount, which significantly differed from all other strains. The biofilm amount

of *Acidovorax sp.* was also significantly different from all other strains but only roughly a

third of the mass that *Pelomonas sp.* produced. All other strains didn't differ and are

comparatively weak biofilm producers.

Microbial nutrient niches

Niche overlap (NO) among all pairwise strain combinations ranged from 60 to 80%

(Figure 4). *Curvibacter sp.* shares the highest overlap (80%) with *Pseudomonas sp.* and

Duganella sp.. For the other strains the overlap ranges between 60 and 70%. *Duganella*
sp. displays the highest overlap with *Pseudomonas sp.* and *Undibacterium sp.* around
80%, whereas the overlap between *Pelomonas sp.* and *Acidovorax sp.* reaches almost
70%. *Unidibacterium sp.* exhibits an overlap of 60 to 70% with *Acidovorax sp.*,
Pseudomonas sp. and *Pelomonas sp.*. *Acidovorax sp.* a 80% overlap with *Pseudomonas sp.*
and 70% overlap with *Pelomonas sp.*. *Pseudomonas sp.* and *Pelomonas sp.* show a 75%
overlap of the nutrients used. Comparing the number of nutrients being used by the
individual strains we find that *Curvibacter sp.* and *Pseudomonas sp.* are able to use 70%
of the provided substrates. *Duganella sp.* uses 57%, *Acidovorax sp.* 54% and *Pelomonas*
sp. 51%. The lowest substrate utilization was measured for *Undibacterium sp.* with 41%
of the available substrates.
254
Resource competition between bacterial colonizers
Nutrient utilisation of all strains was determined using a BIOLOG assay. The 94 carbon
substrates are organized into eleven functional groups (Suppl. Figure S1). Results
showed that all six strains actively oxidize carbon compounds such as carbohydrates
(30-50% relative use), carboxylic acids (15-35% relative use) and amino acids (15-35%
relative use) (Figure 5A; Suppl. Figure S1). Carbohydrates are being used to an equal
extent between all strains, except for *Undibacterium sp.*, which uses the highest amount
of around 50% (relative use). Turanose is the compound most highly utilised, followed
by a-D-lactose, L-rhamnose, and D-cellobiose. The use of carboxylic acids increases in
the strains, which are characterized by low frequencies in the *Hydra* microbiome, with
the exception of *Duganella sp.* (with a relative use of 25-30%). Here D-galactonic acid
lactone is the substrate with the highest usage, followed by different forms of hydroxyl
butyric acids. Amino acids are most excessively used by *Acidovorax sp.*, *Curvibacter sp.*
and *Pseudomonas sp.,* whereas the other strains use amino acids to a lesser extent.
Polymers are being used very differently between the strains with *Pseudomonas sp.*
showing the highest and *Undibacterium sp.* the lowest values. Amines are being used
more frequent by the dominant strains in the microbiome and are utilized to a lesser
extent by the low abundant species.
The Venn diagram in Figure 5B displays overlaps in carbon substrate usage between all
six microbiome members. There are only two substrates, which are not utilized by any
species, whereas 20 substrates are used by all. There are only two strains that can
metabolize substrates that none of the other species is using. While *Pseudomonas sp.*
uses two substrates: i-erythritol and lactulose, *Curvibacter sp.* is able to utilise eight
substrates: D-arabitol, D-mannose, D-trehalose, mono-methyl succinate, formic acid,

glucuronamide, L-pyroglutamic acid, and D-serine. The number of substrates shared

exclusively between two strains only is between one and two.

Overall, we do find that microbial performance, i.e. bacterial density on the host, cannot

be linked to a specific bacterial trait or substrate utilization pattern (Figure 6).

Discussion

Microbial communities residing in abiotic environments typically comprise numerous interacting species. Such communities have been studied with traditional approaches, for example the niche-assembly concept, which is an extension of the classical niche theory (Hutchinson, 1957). The niche-assembly perspective proposes that any ecosystem is made up of a limited number of niches, each occupied by a single species (Wennekes et al., 2012). Thus, the partitioning of these niches leads to the stable coexistence of competing species within an ecosystem. To assess the rules of assembly and coexistence of microbiota in host-associated microbiomes, we here apply the niche-assembly perspective to a metaorganism, and thus specifically extend the concept to biotic environments.

We find that the fundamental niche (here defined by the absence of interspecific microbial interactions) differs considerably from the realized niche of *Hydras* associated microbes. This reflects the difference in performance between the strains when they individually occupy *Hydra* (mono-association) as to when they occur as part of their microbial community on the host. As predicted by niche theory, we find for the majority of the strains that the realized niche is smaller than the fundamental one, most likely caused by interspecific microbial competition, as has also been observed in other systems, e.g. *Vibrios* in their marine environment (Materna et al., 2012). In our study, the best colonizer in the mono-colonisations, *Acidovorax sp.* (as also observed by Fraune et al. (2015)), is only the fourth most abundant species as part of the microbial community. This is different for the two main colonizers in the community, *Curvibacter sp.* and *Duganella sp.*, where the realized niche is four times the size of the fundamental niche. This finding is very interesting and indicates that the two strains benefit from positive interactions when part of the microbiome. This can happen directly through positive interactions with the other members of the microbiome or indirectly by benefitting from the interactions between the other microbiome members and the host. We draw attention to the fact that the latter aspect differs from the classical Hutchinson niche concept, in that in our case the environment, i.e. the host, has the potential to change its interactions depending on the specific bacterial colonizers. Our finding also highlights the importance of the low frequency community members in shaping the overall community composition.

For linking the community composition in *Hydra*'s microbiome to specific characteristics, we used a trait-based approach focussing on traits potentially involved in microbiome assembly and stability. A first step in microbiome assembly is the attachment to host surfaces, which can happen in a multitude of ways. In the human

intestine, for example, microbes have been found to bind to mucin, a major component
of the human mucosa (de Vos, 2015). Adhesion is thus thought to be a powerful
mechanism for exerting both, positive and negative selection for or against specific
microbes (McLoughlin et al., 2016; Schluter et al., 2015). Amongst others (van
Loosdrecht et al., 1987), bacterial cell surface hydrophobicity has been shown to play a
crucial role in surface attachment (Krasowska and Sigler, 2014). In general, hydrophobic
cells adhere more strongly to hydrophobic surfaces and vice versa (Giaouris et al., 2009;
Kochkodan et al., 2008). Nevertheless, the heterogeneity of a bacterial population needs
to be taken into account. For example, the presence of both, hydrophilic and
hydrophobic cells, have been observed in planktonic bacteria cell populations, implying
that only part of the population participates in an adhesion process to substrates
(Krasowska and Sigler, 2014). We also observe mixed cell populations for most of *Hydra*
microbial associates, except for two strains, *Curvibacter sp.* and *Pelomonas sp.*, which
only consist of hydrophobic cells. They seem to be perfectly adapted to *Hydras* epithelial
cells, which are coated with a carbohydrate-rich layer, the glycocalyx (Ouwerkerk et al.,
2013; Schröder and Bosch, 2016). The microbiome inhabits the outer mucus-like layer
of the glycocalyx (Fraune et al., 2015), which is hydrophilic. Thus, hydrophilic bacterial
cells should adhere more strongly to *Hydra* than hydrophobic cells. Both, *Curvibacter sp.*
and *Pelomonas sp.,* have been shown to be of particular importance to the host.
Curvibacter sp. shows signs of coevolution with its host and contributes to fungal
resistance against the filamentous fungus *Fusarium* (Fraune et al., 2015). *Pelomonas sp.*
has been shown to be of central importance in modulating the spontaneous body
contractions in *Hydra* (Murillo-Rincon et al., 2017). So both strains contribute to host
fitness, providing the opportunity for the speculation that the host actively selects for
specific microbes. This could happen, for example, by controlling the production and
release of adhesive molecules from the host epithelium as suggested by McLoughlin et
al. (2016) or through an active support by the host so that they perform better in the
host context (Deines et al., 2019).

After successful attachment, bacteria need to colonise the habitat. In most cases,
this happens through the formation of biofilms, as has been reported for the gut (de Vos,
2015; Kania et al., 2007). The biofilm succeeds the planktonic phase in the bacterial life
cycle (McDougald et al., 2012) and represents a key ecological process for the
colonization of different habitats. Thus, the difference in the ability to form biofilms
could provide an explanation for why one strain outcompetes the other strain or has got
a higher chance of persistence in the *Hydra* ecosystem. Further, biofilms have been
shown to protect bacterial cells from various environmental stressors (Flemming and

Wingender, 2010). Interestingly, from the six strains tested here, the one with the
highest ability to form biofilms is *Pelomonas sp.*, whereas the two main colonizers,
Curvibacter sp. and *Duganella sp.* show a reduced capacity to form biofilms. Our finding
indicates that the capability of biofilm formation is not a good predictor of the bacterial
performance in the *Hydra* habitat. Nevertheless, it might be of importance for the
establishment and persistence of some of the low abundance species, such as *Pelomonas*
sp. and *Acidovorax sp.*.

Importantly, microbiomes on external surfaces of metaorganisms, such as the
skin, have been reported to be highly stable despite their constant exposure to extrinsic
factors (Oh et al., 2016). Whereas bacterial diversity is widely recognized in leading to
temporal stability of ecosystem processes (Bell et al., 2009; Griffin et al., 2009; Prosser
et al., 2007), the influence of resource niche breadth has received little scientific
attention (Hunting et al., 2015). Recent work studying the decomposition of organic
matter in experimental microcosms found that the higher the overlap in resource
niches, the higher the stability of the microbial community. It is reasonable to assume
that the same underlying principles govern stability in host-associated microbial
communities. We therefore measured the niche overlap and resource use of the six
strains isolated from the *Hydra* microbiome. Interestingly, we find the niche overlap
between all pairwise combinations to be between 60 and 80%, with about 20% of the
carbon sources being metabolized by all strains. This suggests that metabolic overlap
could be involved in promoting the temporal stability of the microbiome, which was
reported for *Hydra* by Fraune and Bosch (2007). We also found the two main colonisers,
Curvibacter sp. and *Duganella sp.,* to possess the widest resource niche breadth of all
strains, and that five out of six strains were able to metabolize more than 50% of the 95
offered carbon substrates. Overall, the relative niche breadth observed in the tested
strains can serve as a proxy of the metabolic diversity of the *Hydra* microbiome.

The metabolic overlap, i.e. redundancy, within *Hydra's* microbial community
indicates that the individual species are not occupying a specific metabolic niche.
Nevertheless, the only one for which we observed a specific carbon usage pattern is the
main colonizer *Curvibacter sp.*, which utilizes eight carbon sources that are not
metabolized by any other tested microbiome members. Whether this hints at the
occupation of a specific niche within *Hydra's* microbial community and can be linked to
the observation that its realized is bigger than its fundamental niche when part of the
community as compared to single occupation on *Hydra*, is currently open to speculation.
An alternative option might be that *Curvibacter sp.* is auxotrophic in producing certain
amino acids, as are 98% of all sequenced microbes (Zengler and Zaramela, 2018), and

thus relies on the uptake of external substrates that might not be secreted by the host
but by its fellow community members. Analysing the metabolic interactions within this
microbial network will be essential for understanding community assembly,
composition, and maintenance.
In summary we find that the here measured bacterial traits vary across
microbiome members. Further, the dominant species in the microbiome do not
necessarily perform best in all of the measured traits. We rather observe that all species,
independent of their density, perform well in a subset of traits, likely facilitating the
coexistence of several niches within the host ecosystem. Whether a change in the
realized niche of microbes can be linked to potential for dysbiosis is an interesting
aspect, which warrants further investigation.
404

References

Bell, T., Gessner, M. O., Griffiths, R. I., McLaren, J. R., Morin, P. J., and van der Heijden, M. (2009). "Microbial diversity and ecosystem functioning under controlled conditions and in the wild," in *Biodiversity, Ecosystem Functioning, and Human Wellbeing*, eds.S. Naeem, D. E. Bunker, A. Hector, M. Loreau, and C. P. Perring (Oxford, UK), 121–133.

Borecká-Melkusová, S., and Bujdáková, H. (2008). Variation of cell surface hydrophobicity and biofilm formation among genotypes of Candida albicans and Candida dubliniensis under antifungal treatment. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* 54, 718–724. doi:10.1139/w08-060.

Bosch, T. C. G. (2013). Cnidarian-Microbe Interactions and the Origin of Innate Immunity in Metazoans. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 67, 499–518. doi:10.1146/annurev-micro-092412-155626.

Daou, L., Luglia, M., Périssol, C., Calvert, V., and Criquet, S. (2017). Sporulation and physiological profiles of bacterial communities of three Mediterranean soils affected by drying-rewetting or freezing-thawing cycles. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 113, 116–121. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2017.06.008.

de Vos, W. M. (2015). Microbial biofilms and the human intestinal microbiome. *NPJ Biofilms Microbiomes* 1, 15005. doi:10.1038/npjbiofilms.2015.5.

Deines, P., and Bosch, T. C. G. (2016). Transitioning from Microbiome Composition to Microbial Community Interactions: The Potential of the Metaorganism Hydra as an Experimental Model. *Front. Microbiol.* 7, 1610. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.01610.

Deines, P., Hammerschmidt, K., and Bosch, T. C. (2019). The effect of symbiosis on symbiont fitness – interactions within a simple metaorganism. *bioRxiv*, 609271. doi:10.1101/609271.

Deines, P., Lachnit, T., and Bosch, T. C. G. (2017). Competing forces maintain the Hydra metaorganism. *Immunol. Rev.* 279, 123–136. doi:10.1111/imr.12564.

Falkowski, P. G., Fenchel, T., and Delong, E. F. (2008). The microbial engines that drive Earth's biogeochemical cycles. *Science* 320, 1034–1039. doi:10.1126/science.1153213.

Flemming, H. C., and Wingender, J. (2010). The biofilm matrix. *Nature Publishing Group* 8, 623–633. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2415.

Franzenburg, S., Walter, J., Künzel, S., Wang, J., Baines, J. F., Bosch, T. C. G., et al. (2013). Distinct antimicrobial peptide expression determines host species-specific bacterial associations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110, E3730–8. doi:10.1073/pnas.1304960110.

Fraune, S., and Bosch, T. C. G. (2007). Long-term maintenance of species-specific bacterial microbiota in the basal metazoan Hydra. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. doi:10.1063/1.1599624.

Fraune, S., Anton-Erxleben, F., Augustin, R., Franzenburg, S., Knop, M., Schröder, K., et al. (2015). Bacteria-bacteria interactions within the microbiota of the ancestral metazoan Hydra contribute to fungal resistance. *ISME J* 9, 1543–1556. doi:10.1038/ismej.2014.239.

Giaouris, E., Chapot-Chartier, M.-P., and Briandet, R. (2009). Surface physicochemical
analysis of natural Lactococcus lactis strains reveals the existence of hydrophobic
and low charged strains with altered adhesive properties. *International Journal of*
Food Microbiology 131, 2–9. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2008.09.006.

Green, J. L., Bohannan, B. J. M., and Whitaker, R. J. (2008). Microbial biogeography: from
taxonomy to traits. *Science* 320, 1039–1043. doi:10.1126/science.1153475.

Griffin, J. N., O'Gorman, E. J., Emmerson, M. C., Jenkins, S. R., Klein, A. M., and Loreau, M.
(2009). "Biodiversity and the stability of ecosystem functioning," in *Biodiversity,*
Ecosystem Functioning, and Human Wellbeing, eds.S. Naeem, D. E. Bunker, A. Hector,
M. Loreau, and C. P. Perring (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press), 78–93.

Guittar, J., Shade, A., and Litchman, E. (2019). Trait-based community assembly and
succession of the infant gut microbiome. *Nat Commun* 10, 512. doi:10.1038/s41467-
019-08377-w.

Holt, R. D. (2009). Bringing the Hutchinsonian niche into the 21st century: Ecological
and evolutionary perspectives. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 106, 19659–19665.
doi:10.1073/pnas.0905137106.

Hunting, E. R., Vijver, M. G., van der Geest, H. G., Mulder, C., Kraak, M. H. S., Breure, A. M.,
et al. (2015). Resource niche overlap promotes stability of bacterial community
metabolism in experimental microcosms. *Front. Microbiol.* 6, 11512.
doi:10.3389/fmicb.2015.00105.

Hutchinson, G. E. (1957). Concluding remarks. *Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on*
Quantitative Biology 22, 415–427.

Kania, R. E., Lamers, G. E. M., Vonk, M. J., Huy, P. T. B., Hiemstra, P. S., Bloemberg, G. V., et
al. (2007). Demonstration of Bacterial Cells and Glycocalyx in Biofilms on Human
Tonsils. *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery* 133, 115–121.
doi:10.1001/archotol.133.2.115.

Kau, A. L., Ahern, P. P., Griffin, N. W., Goodman, A. L., and Gordon, J. I. (2011). Human
nutrition, the gut microbiome and the immune system. *Nature* 474, 327–336.
doi:10.1038/nature10213.

Kochkodan, V., Tsarenko, S., Potapchenko, N., Kosinova, V., and Goncharuk, V. (2008).
Adhesion of microorganisms to polymer membranes: a photobactericidal effect of
surface treatment with TiO2. *Desalination* 220, 380–385.
doi:10.1016/j.desal.2007.01.042.

Kopac, S. M., and Klassen, J. L. (2016). Can They Make It on Their Own? Hosts, Microbes,
and the Holobiont Niche. *Front. Microbiol.* 7, 1647. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.01647.

Krasowska, A., and Sigler, K. (2014). How microorganisms use hydrophobicity and what
does this mean for human needs? *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* 4, 653.
doi:10.3389/fcimb.2014.00112.

Krause, S., Le Roux, X., Niklaus, P. A., Van Bodegom, P. M., Lennon, J. T., Bertilsson, S., et
al. (2014). Trait-based approaches for understanding microbial biodiversity and
ecosystem functioning. *Front. Microbiol.* 5, 2019. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2014.00251.

Leibold, M. A. (1995). The Niche Concept Revisited: Mechanistic Models and Community

Context. *Ecology* 76, 1371–1382. doi:10.2307/1938141.

Lenhoff, H. M., and Brown, R. D. (1970). Mass culture of hydra: an improved method and
its application to other aquatic invertebrates. *Laboratory Animals* 4, 139–154.
doi:10.1258/002367770781036463.

Louca, S., Polz, M. F., Mazel, F., Albright, M. B. N., Huber, J. A., O'Connor, M. I., et al. (2018).
Function and functional redundancy in microbial systems. *Nat Ecol Evol* 2, 936–943.
doi:10.1038/s41559-018-0519-1.

Martiny, J. B. H., Jones, S. E., Lennon, J. T., and Martiny, A. C. (2015). Microbiomes in light
of traits: A phylogenetic perspective. *Science* 350, aac9323–aac9323.
doi:10.1126/science.aac9323.

Materna, A. C., Friedman, J., Bauer, C., David, C., Chen, S., Huang, I. B., et al. (2012). Shape
and evolution of the fundamental niche in marine <i>Vibrio</i>. *ISME J* 6, 2168–
2177. doi:10.1038/ismej.2012.65.

McDougald, D., Rice, S. A., Barraud, N., Steinberg, P. D., and Kjelleberg, S. (2012). Should
we stay or should we go: mechanisms and ecological consequences for biofilm
dispersal. *Nature Publishing Group* 10, 39–50. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2695.

McFall-Ngai, M., Hadfield, M. G., Bosch, T. C. G., Carey, H. V., Domazet-Loso, T., Douglas, A.
E., et al. (2013). Animals in a bacterial world, a new imperative for the life sciences.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 110, 3229–3236. doi:10.1073/pnas.1218525110.

McLoughlin, K., Schluter, J., Rakoff-Nahoum, S., Smith, A. L., and Foster, K. R. (2016). Host
Selection of Microbiota via Differential Adhesion. *Cell Host and Microbe* 19, 550–559.
doi:10.1016/j.chom.2016.02.021.

Murillo-Rincon, A. P., Klimovich, A., Pemöller, E., Taubenheim, J., Mortzfeld, B., Augustin,
R., et al. (2017). Spontaneous body contractions are modulated by the microbiome
of Hydra. *Scientific Reports* 7, 15937. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-16191-x.

Oh, J., Byrd, A. L., Park, M., NISC Comparative Sequencing Program, Kong, H. H., and
Segre, J. A. (2016). Temporal Stability of the Human Skin Microbiome. *Cell* 165, 854–
866. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.04.008.

Ouwerkerk, J. P., de Vos, W. M., and Belzer, C. (2013). Glycobiome: Bacteria and mucus at
the epithelial interface. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Gastroenterology* 27, 25–38.
doi:10.1016/j.bpg.2013.03.001.

Pearman, P. B., Guisan, A., Broennimann, O., and Randin, C. F. (2008). Niche dynamics in
space and time. *Trends Ecol. Evol. (Amst.)* 23, 149–158.
doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.11.005.

Peeters, E., Nelis, H. J., and Coenye, T. (2008). Comparison of multiple methods for
quantification of microbial biofilms grown in microtiter plates. *Journal of
Microbiological Methods* 72, 157–165. doi:10.1016/j.mimet.2007.11.010.

Pocheville, A. (2015). "The Ecological Niche: History and Recent Controversies," in
Handbook of Evolutionary Thinking in the Sciences (Dordrecht: Springer, Dordrecht),
547–586. doi:10.1007/978-94-017-9014-7_26.

Prosser, J. I., Bohannan, B. J. M., Curtis, T. P., Ellis, R. J., Firestone, M. K., Freckleton, R. P.,

et al. (2007). The role of ecological theory in microbial ecology. *Nature Publishing*
Group 5, 384–392. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1643.

Ren, D., Madsen, J. S., Sørensen, S. J., and Burmølle, M. (2015). High prevalence of biofilm
synergy among bacterial soil isolates in cocultures indicates bacterial interspecific
cooperation. *ISME J* 9, 81–89. doi:10.1038/ismej.2014.96.

Rosenberg, M. (1984). Bacterial adherence to hydrocarbons: a useful technique for
studying cell surface hydrophobicity. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 22, 289–295.
doi:10.1111/j.1574-6968.1984.tb00743.x","keywords":["bacterial.

Schluter, J., Nadell, C. D., Bassler, B. L., and Foster, K. R. (2015). Adhesion as a weapon in
microbial competition. *ISME J* 9, 139–149. doi:10.1038/ismej.2014.174.

Schröder, K., and Bosch, T. C. G. (2016). The Origin of Mucosal Immunity: Lessons from
the Holobiont Hydra. *mBio* 7, e01184–16. doi:10.1128/mBio.01184-16.

van Loosdrecht, M. C., Lyklema, J., Norde, W., Schraa, G., and Zehnder, A. J. (1987). The
role of bacterial cell wall hydrophobicity in adhesion. *Applied and Environmental*
Microbiology 53, 1893–1897.

Vaz Jauri, P., Bakker, M. G., Salomon, C. E., and Kinkel, L. L. (2013). Subinhibitory
antibiotic concentrations mediate nutrient use and competition among soil
streptomyces. *PLoS ONE* 8, e81064. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0081064.

Wein, T., Dagan, T., Fraune, S., Bosch, T. C. G., Reusch, T. B. H., and Hülter, N. F. (2018).
Carrying Capacity and Colonization Dynamics of Curvibacter in the Hydra Host
Habitat. *Front. Microbiol.* 9, 185. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2018.00443.

Wennekes, P. L., Rosindell, J., and Etienne, R. S. (2012). The Neutral—Niche Debate: A
Philosophical Perspective. *Acta Biotheor* 60, 257–271. doi:10.1007/s10441-012-
9144-6.

Whittaker, R. H., Levin, S. A., and Root, R. B. (1973). Niche, habitat, and ecotope. *The*
American Naturalist 107, 321–338. doi:10.1086/282837;subPage:string:Access.

Zengler, K., and Zaramela, L. S. (2018). The social network of microorganisms — how
auxotrophies shape complex communities. *Nature Publishing Group* 16, 383–390.
doi:10.1038/s41579-018-0004-5.

Author Contributions

PD designed the experiments. PD performed the experiments. PD and KH analysed the

data. PD, KH, and TCGB wrote the paper.

Funding

PD received funding from the European Union's Framework Programme for Research

and Innovation Horizon 2020 (2014–2020) under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant

Agreement No. 655914 and KH under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement No.

657096. Both also received a Reintegration Grant from the Deutscher Akademischer

Austausch Dienst (DAAD). This work was further supported by the Deutsche

Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) Collaborative Research Center (CRC) 1182 ("Origin and

Function of Metaorganisms").

Acknowledgements

TB gratefully appreciates support from the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research

(CIFAR) and thanks the Wissenschaftskolleg (Institute of Advanced Studies) in Berlin for

a sabbatical leave.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Figures

585 A

586
587 **Figure 1.** Performance of bacterial strains isolated from the *Hydra* microbiome. (A)
588 Carrying capacity of the *Hydra* ecosystem during mono-associations of germ-free polyps
589 with individual bacterial strains. (B) Bacterial growth rates of individual strains
590 measured *in vitro*.

594
Figure 2. *Hydra* functions as an ecosystem, which allows for the niche allocation. Shown
are the fundamental and realized niches of six microbiome members. The realized niche
includes additional constrains arising from inter-specific competition between
microbiome members.

A B

Figure 3. Trait measures of bacterial strains isolated from the *Hydra* microbiome. (A)

Cell surface hydrophobicity and (B) Biofilm formation capacity of six bacterial isolates.

608 **Figure 4.** Niche overlap among all pairwise combinations of six *Hydra* microbiome

609 members.

611 A

612
613 B

614
615 **Figure 5.** Metabolic similarity between *Hydra's* microbiome members. (A) Number of
616 substrates utilized and their relative use (%). (B) Venn diagram showing the
617 distribution of shared substrates among the microbiome members.
618

620   **Figure 6.** Summary of all the traits measured and their performance among the six

621   microbiome members.

Figure S1. Substrate utilization pattern of six bacterial isolates from the *Hydra* microbiome measured with a BIOLOG assay. Colours indicate the relative magnitude of substrate utilization.