Phylogenetic and functional diversity have contrasting

effects on the ecological functioning of bacterial

communities

Constantinos Xenophontos[1,2], Martin Taubert[1], W. Stanley Harpole[2,3,4], Kirsten Küsel[1,2]

1. Institute of Biodiversity, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena 07743, Germany

2. German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, 04103

Leipzig, Germany

3. Department of Physiological Diversity, Helmholtz-Center for Environmental Research

(UFZ), 04318 Leipzig, Germany

4. Institute of Biology, Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg, 06120 Halle,

Germany

Correspondence:

Kirsten Küsel kirsten.kuesel@uni-jena.de

Abstract

Biodiversity can have a positive impact on ecosystem functions because greater numbers of species, and their associated genetic and functional differences, can contribute at different times and contexts to overall ecosystem functioning. Quantifying the relative contributions of microbial species to ecosystem functioning is challenging, because many species are believed to be functionally redundant, or their function is not known but inferred by their phylogeny. Here, we used synthetic bacterial communities to test the independent effects of two aspects of biodiversity, phylogenetic and functional diversity, on ecosystem functioning, expecting that greater diversity of each would be associated with greater ecosystem function. Moreover, we tested whether the phylogenetic and functional diversities interact in our system and if that interaction results in the amplification of diversity positive effects on ecosystem functions. To study these effects, we used bacterial isolates to construct communities with different diversity traits and employed exoenzyme activities (EEAs) as proxies of bacterial functioning. Overall, EEAs increased with increasing phylogenetic diversity but decreased with functional diversity. Communities with phylogenetically dissimilar species exhibited more moderate, but mostly positive, changes in their EEAs. Furthermore, we observed that the effects of phylogenetic and functional diversity differed between EEAs investigated: EEAs on carbohydrates were positively correlated with phylogenetic diversity and negatively correlated with functional diversity, while EEAs on fatty acids typically showed no correlation at all. Furthermore, EEAs of phylogenetically similar groups were strongly affected by the taxonomy of the isolates and their growth strategies. We concluded that phylogenetic and functional diversity have contrasting effects, which furthermore depended on the ecosystem function under examination – diversity effects were depended on the substrates' biochemical nature and the molecular mechanisms related to each substrate's degradation. This highlights the importance of investigating individual aspects of biodiversity but also their interactions as the variations

40   within the biological mechanisms and processes that underscore them and their influence on

41   community ecosystem functioning can inform ecological models and improve our

42   understanding of what we consider diverse or redundant.

Keywords

44   ecosystem functions; phylogenetic diversity; functional diversity; biodiversity; bacteria;

45   synthetic communities; exoenzymes

Keywords

Introduction

More diverse ecosystems are typically more productive (Lehman and Tilman 2000, Byrnes et al. 2014, Maron et al. 2018), perform more functions (Hector and Bagchi 2007, Maron et al. 2018), are more resistant to disturbances (Ives and Carpenter 2007, Gross et al. 2014) and have populations that are more stable (Lehman and Tilman 2000). Bacteria activities are inextricable from ecosystem functions (Finlay et al. 1997) and recent research has highlighted that microbial diversity contributes to the functioning of ecosystems, challenging earlier ideas that microbes might have a high degree of functional redundancy (Yin et al. 2000, Louca et al. 2018, Taubert et al. 2019). While doubts have been raised, whether metrics such as species richness are informative enough for contemporary biodiversity research (Mokany et al. 2008, Thompson et al. 2015, Hillebrand et al. 2018), phylogeny and genetic relatedness allow for an increased representation of species traits in biodiversity indices and algorithms (Webb et al. 2002, Faith 2002, Anderson et al. 2004, Chase 2005, Srivastava and Vellend 2005). Phylogenetic information is also used to infer functional traits (Martiny et al. 2013). Increasing phylogenetic diversity, in general, improves ecosystem functioning due to complementarity and niche partitioning effects (Balvanera et al. 2006, Duffy 2009, Cardinale 2011, Jousset et al. 2011, Cardinale et al. 2012, Hooper et al. 2012, Naeem et al. 2012, Turnbull et al. 2013). Phylogenetic diversity is easy to quantify by standard sequencing methods, and can capture microorganism relatedness, growth rates (Morrissey et al. 2016), and species interactions via ecological networks (Srivastava et al. 2012). However, not all functional traits have a strong phylogenetic signal, as many ecologically relevant traits are spread across many phylogenetic clades (Srivastava et al. 2012, Martiny et al. 2013, Goberna and Verdú 2016). A direct assessment of functional diversity hence allows a better prediction of community ecosystem functions (Mokany et al. 2008, Salles et al. 2009, Krause et al. 2014). Functional diversity, however, is more difficult to define and quantify (Mouchet et al. 2010, Cadotte et al. 2011, Steudel et al.

2016). Functional diversity requires the measurement of functional trait differences of

organisms to estimate functional diversity (Petchey and Gaston 2002, 2006, Naeem et al. 2009).

Ways that microbial functional traits can be determined include functional gene-targeting

microarrays and metabolic activity assays (Litchman and Klausmeier 2008, Naeem et al. 2009,

Paula et al. 2014, Wang et al. 2017). The latter can also be used as a measure for community

functioning itself along with other ecologically important community functions, such as

nutrient cycling, organic matter decomposition and CO_2 production, which were shown to be

positively correlated with functional diversity (Rivett et al. 2016, Evans et al. 2017).

Furthermore, phylogenetic and functional diversity are related (Srivastava et al. 2012, Letten et

al. 2014, Thompson et al. 2015) and dependent on each other (Loreau 2010a, 2010b). A critical

feature that underscores the connections between the two biodiversity aspects is that while they

have distinct underlying mechanisms, they are connected by evolutionary processes.

Phylogenetic diversity emerges due to the genetic divergence of species, yet a lot of their

functions are conserved. However, functional redundancy can encompass situations such as

alternative adaptations from convergent evolution or differences in metabolic rates and

variability in enzyme temperature optima and substrate specificity due to selection or drift.

Differences in these underlying mechanisms can potentially influence how each biodiversity

aspect influences community ecosystem functions and how the two interact. Identifying the

effects of phylogenetic and functional diversity interaction is, therefore, crucial for the further

development of microbial ecological theory (Krause et al. 2014, Shade et al. 2018).

Such biodiversity aspects and their effects on microbial ecosystem functions can be studied

with different approaches, each with its own challenges. Natural microbial communities are

highly taxonomically and functionally diverse (López-García and Moreira 2008) and exist in

complex interaction networks (Ben-Jacob 2009, Faust and Raes 2012, Zuñiga et al. 2017).

Therefore, while useful when relating experimental results back to the real world, it makes it

difficult to identify and disentangle specific biodiversity effects influencing ecosystem

functioning. In contrast, monoculture approaches offer a simple, controlled study environment

but do not allow the investigation of interspecies interactions, which can radically affect their

ecosystem functioning (Gause 1934, Hardin 1960, Lawrence et al. 2012, Dolinšek et al. 2016,

Levine et al. 2017). Synthetic communities allow us to include interactions from natural

communities while keeping the experimental simplicity advantage of monocultures (De Roy et

al. 2014, Fredrickson 2015, Chodkowski and Shade 2017). The ability to manipulate the degree

of diversity in the synthetic communities makes them suitable models to study biodiversity

influences on community ecosystem functions (Rainey et al. 2000, Bell et al. 2005, Großkopf

and Soyer 2014).

Therefore, to study the effects of phylogenetic and functional diversity, we used bacterial

groundwater isolates to form simplified four-member communities with different phylogenetic

and functional dissimilarity, allowing us to test whether and how these two aspects of

biodiversity interact as they shape community ecosystem functions. Bacterial functioning,

related to nutrient cycling and organic matter decomposition, depends on the accessibility and

uptake rate of energy sources. Exoenzymes are one of the main mechanisms that bacteria can

use to access exogenous, complex carbon and energy sources and can be produced constantly

or on-demand. As such, exoenzymes can be considered "public goods" that can be shared

among different species (Drescher et al. 2014, Smith and Schuster 2019). Bacterial species

exhibit differences in what sources they can access, and species using the same complex source

can also differ in their efficiency. We used catabolic exoenzyme activities (EEAs) assays to

identify and measure differences in degradation rates of different complex sources between

bacterial isolates and, as an extend, determine functional diversity for the community

construction. Additionally, EEAs were used as a measure of functioning in the communities.

Measuring EEAs allowed us to examine how differences in the phylogenetic and functional

diversity between the species can affect community functions. We hypothesised that 1)

phylogenetic diversity and 2) functional diversity increase community EEAs. Additionally, we

expected that 3) the phylogenetic and functional diversity traits will interact positively,

amplifying the effect on community EEAs when both have higher diversity.

Material and Methods

Selection of bacterial isolates and culture setups

The twenty-seven bacterial strains used in this study (Table S1) were isolated from pristine groundwater (Geesink et al. 2018), obtained from the Hainich Critical Zone Exploratory located in Thuringia, Germany (Küsel et al. 2016). The isolates were selected from a pool of more than 340 groundwater isolates as representatives of the most abundant taxonomic families within the total groundwater bacterial population, based on 16S rRNA gene MiSeq amplicon sequencing data (Schwab et al. 2017, Kumar et al. 2017), throughout the taxonomic classes of *Actinobacteria*, *Bacilli*, *Flavobacteriia*, *Sphingobacteria*, *Alpha-* and *Gammaproteobacteria*. The isolates were maintained on S2P medium agar (Geesink et al. 2018). Before each of the experimental assays, isolates were cultured aerobically in 20 ml of liquid S2P medium, in cap-perforated 50 ml Falcon tubes, horizontally shaken (125 rpm) at room temperature, for 48 h to early stationary phase. Growth in the liquid cultures was being determined via optical density measurements at a wavelength of 600 nm (Synergy™ H4 Hybrid Multi-Mode Microplate Reader, BioTek, Germany).

Molecular analysis and taxonomic classification of bacterial isolates

DNA from bacterial isolates was extracted with GenElute™ Bacterial Genomic DNA Kit (NA2110-1KT, Sigma-Aldrich, Germany). Sterile inoculation loops were used to gather 1 µl-worth of biomass from the agar medium cultures, for DNA extraction. For the 16S rRNA gene amplification, the primers 8F (5′-AGA GTT TGA TCC TGG CTC AG-3′) (Turner et al. 1999) and 1492R (5'-GGT TAC CTT GTT ACG ACT T-3') (Turner et al. 1999) were used. PCR was performed with a PEQSTAR thermocycler (PEQLAB, Germany) using the following cycling conditions: initial denaturation at 95 ºC for 10 min, 30 cycles of 95 ºC (denaturation), 55 ºC

(primer annealing) and 72 °C (elongation) for 30 sec, 45 sec and 60 sec, respectively, followed

by 10 min at 72 °C (final elongation). DNA purification and sequencing of the 1484bp-length

PCR products was carried out by Macrogen (Amsterdam, Netherlands) with the 27F (5'-AGA

GTT TGA TCM TGG CTC AG-3') primer.

The sequences were assigned to their closest reference relative using BLASTn (Zhang et al.

2000) (v2.8.0+) and cross-referenced with SILVA Incremental Aligner (SINA) (Pruesse et al.

2012) (v1.2.11). A rooted maximum-likelihood phylogenetic tree for the 16S rRNA gene

taxonomic classification of the organisms was constructed with MEGA X (Kumar et al. 2018)

(v10.1.5).

Exoenzyme activity assays (EEAs)

EEAs for each bacterial isolate were performed using eleven substrates (Table S2) (Sigma-

Aldrich, Germany), each carrying a fluorescent moiety allowing spectrophotometric

measurements of activity using a microplate reader (Synergy™ H4 Hybrid Multi-Mode

Microplate Reader). The sensor was set to detect fluorescence at wavelengths 360/9 nm for

excitation and 450/9 nm for emission.

Prior to the EEA assays, the optical density of the bacterial cultures was determined

spectrophotometrically (600 nm). For the EEA assays, a modified version of the protocols from

Frossard *et al.* (Frossard et al. 2012) and Rivett *et al.* (Rivett et al. 2016) was used here, as

follows: a black 96-well plate setup, with 100 µl HEPES buffer at 100mM stock concentration

in each well, was inoculated with 100 µl of bacterial culture and to each test well 50 µl of

substrate solution at 40 µM final concentration was added. Negative controls consisted of wells

containing 100 µl of sterile S2P liquid medium and wells with just 100 µl sterile MilliQ water

(Merck Millipore, Germany). Background fluorescence, measured in negative controls with

either substrate solution or MilliQ water, was subtracted from the respective assay plates.

Measurement of the assay plates begun immediately after the substrate addition and continued

for 90 min, at 2.5 min measurement intervals.

Determining phylogenetic and functional diversity of isolates

To examine effects of diversity on the function of synthetic bacterial communities, the 16S

rRNA gene taxonomy and EEAs of the twenty-seven bacterial isolates were used as the basis

of the community traits; phylogenetic and functional diversity. We formed four trait-groups,

each consisting of five isolates, being either phylogenetically and functionally similar (Psim-

Fsim), phylogenetically similar but functionally dissimilar (Psim-Fdis), phylogenetically

dissimilar and functionally similar (Pdis-Fsim) as well as phylogenetically and functionally

similar (Pdis-Fdis). In total, the isolates cover ten taxonomic families of five classes (Figure

S1). In the Psim groups, isolates were affiliated with the same genus; Psim-Fsim held

Flavobacteria isolates and Psim-Fdis group held *Pseudomonas* isolates. Pdis groups were

formed so that all members of a group were related to different families. Hierarchical clustering

based on Euclidean distance was used to quantise functioning of the total EEAs for each isolate

(Figure 1) and categorise them as functionally similar or dissimilar. The clustering analysis was

performed in R (v. 3.6.1) (R Core Team 2019) using the core dist() and hclust() functions. Fsim

groups were formed from isolates of the same cluster, Fdis groups were formed so that each

member of the group belonged to a different functional cluster (Figure 1). Principal component

analysis (PCA) based on the functional traits of the isolates confirmed the higher functional

dissimilarities between isolates of Psim-Fdis and Pdis-Fdis compared to group Psim-Fsim and

Pdis-Fsim (Figure S2).

Bacterial community setups and experimental design

Synthetic communities were designed to contain bacterial species according to their functional

and phylogenetic diversity, based on the four trait groups; Psim-Fsim, Psim-Fdis, Pdis-Fsim,

Pdis-Fdis. From the initial twenty-seven isolates tested, a total of seventeen isolates were used

for designing communities. Within each trait group, five distinct communities were formed by

omitting one isolate out of the five, per community, allowing us to control whether within-

group community EEA variations were due to the activity of a specific community member.

This resulted in twenty communities, five for each trait group, identified as M1 to M5; we

confirmed the phylogenetic dissimilarity between the isolates via estimates of average

evolutionary divergence over sequence pairs within groups and their functional dissimilarity

based on the Euclidean distance matrix of the EEAs (Table S3). The phylogenetic and

functional dissimilarity values for each community showed a distinct differentiation of the

communities from each of the four groups, confirming that we successfully separated the

bacterial isolates and communities into the four intended groups (Figure 2).

Cultures of each isolate were grown in liquid medium as described above. Optical density (600

nm) was used to calculate the required final volume for each isolate, so that all members of

each community were to be introduced at similar biomass levels. The communities were

established in cultures by mixing a predetermined amount of liquid isolate culture for a total

volume of 2.5 ml. The community cultures were incubated in deep 96-well plates (2.5 ml

volume), at room temperature and sealed with rayon film seals (391-1262, VWR, Germany) to

allow gas exchange. The EEAs of the microcosms were assessed after 0 h, 6 h and 24 h of

incubation. Additionally, at the 0 h and 24 h marks, a 200 µl culture sample was pelleted by

centrifugation (17.000 × g, 5 min) and stored at -80 °C, for subsequent molecular analysis.

Data from EEA assays were transformed into a proportional change of EEA with the following

steps (visualised in Figure S3): The measured EEA of the isolates within each community group

was used to calculate expected EEA for each of the group's communities. This expected EEA

was compared to the measured EEA of the experimental communities and the result was

represented as percent proportional changes of EEA. The proportional changes were used for

subsequent analyses and visualisation of the data.

Molecular and diversity analysis of synthetic communities

Community DNA was extracted as described above. DNA concentration was measured spectrophotometrically (NanoDrop 1000, PEQLAB, Germany) and samples were stored at -20 °C.

For Illumina MiSeq amplicon sequencing of 16S rRNA genes, PCR was performed using the primer set Bakt_341F (5'-CCT ACG GGN GGC WGC AG-3') (Herlemann et al. 2011) and Bakt_805R (5'-GAC TAC HVG GGT ATC TAA TCC-3') (Herlemann et al. 2011) targeting the V3-V4 hypervariable region of the rRNA gene. DNA amplification was carried out with a PEQSTAR 2X thermocycler (PEQLAB, Germany) in the following conditions: initial denaturation at 95 °C for 15 min, 30 cycles of 94 °C (denaturation), 55 °C (primer annealing) and 72 °C (elongation) at 45 sec for each step, followed by 10 min at 72 °C (final elongation). The PCR DNA products were purified using NucleoSpin Gel and PCR Clean-up (Ref. 740609, Macherey-Nagel, Germany) following the manufacturer's protocol. The final step, DNA recovery from the columns, was performed twice for a total volume of 60 μl purified PCR product samples.

MiSeq-generated sequence data was analysed using mothur (Schloss et al. 2009) (v.1.39.1; mothur.org) along with the mother MiSeq SOP developed by Kozich *et al*. (Kozich et al. 2013) (accessed November 19th 2018). Paired-end reads were combined and sequences below 400 bp or above 429 bp as well as sequences with ambiguous bases or homopolymer runs above 8 bp were removed. Sequences were aligned to the SILVA reference database release SSU 132 (Quast et al. 2012) and clustered when differed in four or fewer bases. Chimeric sequences were removed with uchime (Edgar 2016) using the GOLD database (Mukherjee et al. 2019) as a reference. OTUs were binned from sequences with a 3% identity cut-off and were classified using the aforementioned SILVA database. Raw data has been deposited in the European

246   Nucleotide Archive under the study with accession number PRJEB34832 (samples

247   ERR3588683 - ERR3588722).

Statistical analyses of EEAs and diversity treatment effects

We evaluated significance for the phylogenetic and functional diversity treatment effects on

EEA using ANOVA of linear regression models, including the interaction of the of these two

treatments. For the linear models, EEA data were log2-transformed. Phylogenetic and

functional dissimilarity metrics were scaled using z-score standardisation. The significance of

EEA changes over 24 h was tested using Student's t-test (2-tailed) and false discovery rate

controlled with the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure (McDonald 2014).

Results

EEAs of synthetic communities and comparison to constituent isolates

EEAs changes of the synthetic four-species communities showed sharp decreases, down to 100%, and increases, up to 385%, at 0 h and exhibited strong differences between substrates (Figure 3; Figure S4). The EEA changes for each one substrate within a group, however, were typically consistent (< 50% EEA proportional change from the average) for 33 of the 44 (75%) community-substrate combinations, especially for substrates with ester bonds like 4-MUB acetate (ACE), 4-MUB-butyrate (BUT) and 4-MUB oleate (OLE), while the highest relative increases in EEA were typically observed for substrates with glycosidic bonds like 4-MUB-N-acetyl-β-D-glucosaminide (NAG), 4-MUB-β-D-cellobioside (CB) and 4-MUB-β-D-xylopyranoside (XYL) (see Table S2 for complete list of substrate abbreviations). This indicates that, in most cases, community behaviour was not strongly influenced by the excluded fifth isolate of each group.

When comparing EEA changes between the groups (Figure S4), we observed that Pdis communities had relatively small to no changes in EEA: 76% of community-substrate combinations of group Pdis-Fsim and Pdis-Fdis remained between +50% and -50% EEA proportional change. Contrarily, communities of Psim groups differed greatly in activities compared to their constituent isolates. Group Psim-Fsim exhibited the majority the largest EEA increases (up to 330%) with 27% of the group's 55 community-substrate combinations measuring > +50% EEA proportional change. Group Psim-Fdis communities recorded the greatest amount of negative EEA proportional changes (53% of the group's 55 community-substrate combinations having < -50% EEA proportional change) with the maximum EEA proportional change increase at only 5.4%. These results show that phylogenetically similar

communities exhibited more variable and genus-specific responses than phylogenetically

dissimilar communities, indicating towards a stabilizing effect of phylogenetic diversity.

While this seemed to run counter to our first hypothesis, linear regression analyses of both

phylogenetic and functional diversity effects on community EEAs offered a clearer picture

(Table S4). Averaging across all communities and substrates, we observed significant positive

correlation for phylogenetic diversity (0.64 ± 0.12, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,211} = 18.19$, $p <$

0.001) and significant negative correlation for functional diversity (-0.88 ± 0.12, estimate $\pm$ std.

error; $F_{3,211} = 43.34$, $p < 0.001$). The interaction of phylogenetic and functional diversity also

had a significant positive correlation with EEAs (0.63 ± 0.12, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,211} =$

27.36, $p < 0.001$). A significant effect from the interaction points towards synergistic effects

between the two diversity parameters affecting the EEAs. The model results contrast with our

hypothesis which stated that all diversity would increase EEAs. Phylogenetic diversity fits the

hypothesis predictions, but functional diversity effects do not. In contrast, the interaction

between phylogenetic and functional dissimilarities fit the hypothesis. This signifies that

biodiversity effects are more complex than expected.

Modelling the average EEA for all substrates resulted in high unexplained variance (70.36%

explained by residuals, adj. $R^2 = 0.29$), potentially due to the high variability in EEAs between

the different substrates. When we investigated the datasets for all substrates individually using

linear models, we indeed observed broad differences in the relationships of EEAs to the

functional and phylogenetic diversity between them (Table S4). For example, CB showed

positive significant correlations with phylogenetic diversity (1.02 ± 0.44, estimate $\pm$ std. error;

$F_{3,16} = 3.83$, $p = 0.03$) and the interaction between phylogenetic and functional diversity ($1.30 \pm$

0.42, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,16} = 9.44$, $p = 0.01$). Substrates XYL and NAG behaved similarly

to CB (Table S4). When combining datasets from these three substrates for the analysis, the

resulting model improved substantially from the all-substrate model, with unexplained variance

decreasing to 39.53 % and coefficient of correlation increasing to adj. $R^2 = 0.58$. There was a

significant effect of phylogenetic diversity (1.20 ± 0.25, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,56} = 15.26$, p <

0.001) and functional diversity (-1.78 ± 0.25, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,56} = 44.98$, p < 0.001) and

their interaction (1.21 ± 0.24, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,56} = 25.43$, p < 0.001) with an adj.

$R^2 = 0.58$. Interestingly, all substrates in these groups are biochemically similar in that the

targets for exoenzymes are glycosidic bonds. This might hint towards predictable EEA patterns

in biochemically similar substrates. As another substrate containing glycosidic bonds, 4-MUB-

β-D-glucopyranoside (bG) showed different correlations with no significant effect from

phylogenetic diversity (0.36 ± 0.25, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,16} = 0.93$, p = 0.16), significant

effect from functional diversity (-0.75 ± 0.25, estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,16} = 8.09$, p = 0.01) and

a non-significant effect from phylogenetic and functional diversity interaction (0.43 ± 0.24,

estimate $\pm$ std. error; $F_{3,16} = 3.13$, p = 0.1) with adj. $R^2 = 0.33$. Interestingly, as a peptide

analogue substrate, Z-L-Arginine-7-AMC HCL (ARG) exhibited a similar linear regression

trend and statistical significances, with a slightly higher adj. R^2 of 0.61, compared to the 3-

substrate model (Table S4).

Based on these observations, we also looked at substrates containing ester bonds, ACE, BUT

and OLE, as another biochemically similar group. None of these substrates showed significant

effects in their models (Table S4). A model with all three substrates did not have an improved

fit, despite of their biochemical similarities.

Therefore, while there are biochemical similarities behind the substrates that are visible in the

data (Figure 1 and Figure 3), the similarities do not appear to have a universal ecological role,

something that is reflected in the statistical models.

Effects of diversity in EEA changes over 24 h

We further investigated how the community EEA changed with increasing time after

community mixing, by comparing EEA results from time points of 0 h, 6 h and 24 h (Figure 4).

Both Fsim groups exhibited only negative trends over the 24 h. The Psim-Fdis group showed

both significantly negative and positive trends between EEAs measured over 24 h after mixing.

Changes in the Pdis communities' composition within 24 h did not explain the observed activity

changes, because all the introduced species appear to persist in the community cultures during

24 h post-mixing, with only close to ~1-fold change of relative abundance for most species and

a 2-fold change for two species. Thus, the observed changes in EEA over time should not be

the result of a shifting community composition supporting our hypothesis, that EEA changes

are due to diversity traits effects of the original makeup of the communities (Figure S5).

Substrate acclimation in EEA assays

Acclimation describes any phenotypic plasticity an organism can undergo to adjust to changes

in its environment. Effects of substrate acclimation can be observed directly by measuring the

increase of EEA due to potential upregulation of exoenzyme production. We tested the effect

of substrate acclimation, by incubating communities for 270 min in the presence of the substrate

before monitoring fluorescence for 90 min. We compared measurements for both isolates and

communities with and without this additional 270 min of substrate exposure. For various

substrates, we observed an increase of EEAs that were exposed to substrates for a longer period.

For isolate activities in the 4-MUB-α-D-glucopyranoside (aG) assay, the largest increase

(~3.3 times increase) was observed from 757 ± 19 to 1762 ± 54 RFU min^{-1}. For community

activities, increases were even larger (~11 times increase) from 139 ± 5 to 1378 ± 84 RFU

min^{-1}. On average, the acclimation effect was much more pronounced in communities, resulting

in a ~5-fold increase, compared to a ~1-fold increase in isolates (Figure 5). This increase in

activity did not match the EEA changes observed for communities after 6 h of mixing without

the addition of substrates, and thus the effect was indeed substrate acclimatisation of the

bacteria during the longer assays and not an effect of mixing the community cultures. These

observations link back to our original hypothesis, where we predict that the diversity traits of

the group will enhance the functioning of communities.

Discussion

We examined the current census in biodiversity and ecological research, that higher biodiversity

leads to enhanced ecosystem functioning. To do so, we investigated how different aspects of

biodiversity, phylogenetic and functional diversity, affect the ecosystem functions of synthetic

bacterial communities. We stated that higher diversity would lead to higher EEA of bacterial

communities compared to their constituent isolates. Although the group having highest increase

in EEAs was Psim-Fsim, the group with the highest decrease in EEAs was Psim-Fdis. On the

other hand, both Pdis groups did show a moderate increase in EEAs in total (Figure S4). Thus,

our model, teasing apart the treatment effects, shows that overall phylogenetic diversity effects

were in line with the hypothesis and correlated with increases in EEAs (Figure 6B). Functional

diversity effects, however, were not (Figure 6C), signifying that the effects of diversity in the

study were more complex than we previously thought.

The contrasting diversity effects revealed that while substrate biochemical similarity can

explain similarities in response to biodiversity effects, it's not necessarily a universal predictor.

In addition, the direction of the correlation effects, positive for phylogenetic diversity and

negative for functional diversity remained the same for all but one substrate. Rather, the

strength of the diversity effect was changing (Figure 6). Such differences can be related to

inherent variations in exoenzyme production, maintenance and regulation. Biochemically

unrelated substrate groups such as monosaccharide (aG, bG), polysaccharide (CB, XYL, NAG)

and ester (ACE, BUT, OLE) had very different responses to the diversity treatments and others

like amino acids (ARG) and polysaccharides had almost identical responses. Variations

between and within the same substrate biochemical groups could be due to fundamental

differences for the class of exoenzymes targeting them. For example, polysaccharides are

targeted by hydrolytic exoenzymes that are produced on-demand (Warren 1996, Lynd et al.

2002). In contrast, enzymes involved in the degradation of fatty acids belonging to the ester

group of substrates are part of bacterial core metabolism, and thus can be continuously

produced. Our results show that greater diversity effects are more important to ecosystem

functions that rely on environmental factors, such as the temporal or spatial presence of plant-

derived polysaccharides. Hence, not only the diversity of ecosystem functions tested (Huston

1997, 2000, Tilman 1997, Loreau 2000) but also their underlying biochemical mechanisms

have a great effect on the outcomes of biodiversity research.

To understand the very strong contrasting changes in EEAs of the Psim groups, their genus-

specific capacity for co-existence with its related species is crucial. Psim-Fsim communities

contained *Flavobacteria* species which are usually non-motile organisms, prefer aquatic

environments and have strong differences between species. The genus includes generalist

species that can use a wide range of carbohydrates, to more specialist asaccharolytic species

that prefer nitrogenous substrates (i.e. amino acids) (Bernardet and Bowman 2006). These

physiological characteristics might allow the *Flavobacteria* communities to increase their EEA

as different species could be utilising different carbon sources in their growth medium.

Communities of these specialist *Flavobacteria* could be facilitating community interactions that

translate into increases in their community EEAs. In contrast, the *Pseudomonas* species in

Psim-Fdis communities are generally motile-planktonic bacteria, ubiquitous in almost all oxic

environments, including soil and water, due to their expansive metabolic repertoire, simple

nutritional requirements and rapid growth rates (Moore et al. 2006). However, the reduced

capacity of many *Pseudomonas* species to withstand starvation (Moore et al. 2006) might lead

them to adapt more selfish nutrient acquisition strategies (Reintjes et al. 2017, 2019, Arnosti et

al. 2018). As generalists, *Pseudomonas* species might be more competing, resulting in

Pseudomonas communities with lower EEAs than their respective isolates. Thus, bacteria with

a broad substrate range might not benefit when living in communities of the same genus but of

dissimilar functioning. Contrastingly, in the Pdis communities these genus-specific effects in

nutrient acquisition strategies can be balanced due to the increased species diversity.

Nevertheless, even competing generalists like *Pseudomonas* species will profit from species

interactions when incubated for longer time in the presence of certain substrates. When we used

the Psim-Fdis communities to run EEA assays for longer time (Figure 5), we identified that the

amplifying effect of substrate acclimation on the EEAs is much stronger for the communities

than for the constituent isolates on substrate aG. But oversimplifying the experimental design

and just looking at one substrate or one group, would have let to an underestimation of the

complexity of diversity ecosystem functioning relationships, and explain why we see studies

showing opposite effects of biodiversity (Balvanera et al. 2006).

Altogether, our results concur with previous studies that focus on separating the different

aspects of biodiversity and examining the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem

functioning (Griffiths et al. 2001, Zhang and Zhang 2006, Balvanera et al. 2006, Naeem et al.

2009, Jousset et al. 2011, Purschke et al. 2013, Thompson et al. 2015, Gamfeldt and Roger

2017). A meta-analysis demonstrated that biodiversity effects depend on the organisation level

with positive effects at the community level, positive but weaker effects at the ecosystem level

and negative effects at the population level (Balvanera et al. 2006). A modelling approach

showed that when considering increasing number of functions, the effect of biodiversity is lost

(Gamfeldt and Roger 2017). Experiments done by Griffiths *et al.* (Griffiths et al. 2001)

recognised no consistent effect from biodiversity on soil functions. Thus, the need for more

research including the effects of the environmental context, like nutrient availability, on the

relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning was recognized (Zhang and Zhang

2006). Our study fills this gap by focussing not only on phylogenetic and functional diversity

of organisms, but also measuring a broad diversity of activities controlled by different

underlying mechanisms of enzyme regulations. Such a complex approach is required to tackle

the complex dimensions of biodiversity research. We show that biodiversity had a significant

impact on most EEAs, but the strength of the effect depended on the context. As such,

biodiversity's effects on community ecosystem functioning cannot always be predicted as a

positive correlation between species diversity and enhanced ecosystem function (Aarssen 1997,

Tilman 1997, Huston 2000, Carroll et al. 2011). Natural, larger scale experiments struggle with

introducing different levels of complexity in their experimental design (Cairns et al. 2018). That

is why synthetic communities, as simplified systems, are ideal to study such complex

biodiversity effects. Looking forward, we should aim to understand how diversity effects can

mechanistically influence ecosystems, synthetic and natural (Fox and Harpole 2008, Naeem et

al. 2009, Turnbull et al. 2013), and not take the effects as granted (Shade 2017).

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) (DFG FZT 118). This project has been conducted in the framework of the iDiv-Flexpool – the internal funding mechanism of iDiv. We would like to express our immense gratitude to Patricia Geesink for the bacterial isolation work under the framework of the CRC AquaDiva of the Friedrich Schiller University Jena, funded by the DFG (DFG SFB 1076). Additionally, we would like to thank Will A. Overholt and Lijuan Yan for their invaluable statistical analysis input.

Author Contributions

KK and SWH secured funding for the project. CX, MT, and KK designed the experiments. CX performed the experiments and carried out all assays and molecular analyses; the data analysis was performed by CX closely supported by MT. Statistical analysis was performed by CX supported by MT and SWH. All co-authors assisted in interpreting the results; CX initiated the manuscript writing, which was finalized with substantial contributions from MT, KK and SWH.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

Aarssen, L. W. 1997. High Productivity in Grassland Ecosystems: Effected by Species

Diversity or Productive Species? Oikos 80:183.

Anderson, M. T., M.-A. Lachance, and W. T. Starmer. 2004. The Relationship of Phylogeny

to Community Structure: The Cactus Yeast Community. The American Naturalist

164:709.

Arnosti, C., G. Reintjes, and R. Amann. 2018. A mechanistic microbial underpinning for the

size-reactivity continuum of dissolved organic carbon degradation. Marine Chemistry

206:93–99.

Balvanera, P., A. B. Pfisterer, N. Buchmann, J.-S. He, T. Nakashizuka, D. Raffaelli, and B.

Schmid. 2006. Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem

functioning and services. Ecology Letters 9:1146–1156.

Bell, T., J. A. Newman, B. W. Silverman, S. L. Turner, and A. K. Lilley. 2005. The

contribution of species richness and composition to bacterial services. Nature 436:1157–

1160.

Ben-Jacob, E. 2009. Bacterial Complexity: More Is Different on All Levels. Pages 25–35

Systems Biology. Springer Japan, Tokyo.

Bernardet, J.-F., and J. P. Bowman. 2006. The Genus Flavobacterium. Pages 481–531 The

Prokaryotes. Springer New York, New York, NY.

Byrnes, J. E. K., L. Gamfeldt, F. Isbell, J. S. Lefcheck, J. N. Griffin, A. Hector, B. J.

Cardinale, D. U. Hooper, L. E. Dee, and J. Emmett Duffy. 2014. Investigating the

relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality: Challenges and

solutions. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 5:111–124.

Cadotte, M. W., K. Carscadden, and N. Mirotchnick. 2011. Beyond species: functional

diversity and the maintenance of ecological processes and services. Journal of Applied

Ecology 48:1079–1087.

Cairns, J., R. Jokela, J. Hultman, M. Tamminen, M. Virta, and T. Hiltunen. 2018.

Construction and Characterization of Synthetic Bacterial Community for Experimental

Ecology and Evolution. Frontiers in Genetics 9.

Cardinale, B. J. 2011. Biodiversity improves water quality through niche partitioning. Nature

472:86–89.

Cardinale, B. J., J. E. Duffy, A. Gonzalez, D. U. Hooper, C. Perrings, P. Venail, A. Narwani,

G. M. MacE, D. Tilman, D. A. Wardle, A. P. Kinzig, G. C. Daily, M. Loreau, J. B.

Grace, A. Larigauderie, D. S. Srivastava, and S. Naeem. 2012. Biodiversity loss and its

impact on humanity. Nature 486:59–67.

Carroll, I. T., B. J. Cardinale, and R. M. Nisbet. 2011. Niche and fitness differences relate the

maintenance of diversity to ecosystem function. Ecology 92:1157–1165.

Chase, J. M. 2005. Towards a really unified theory for metacommunities. Functional Ecology

19:182–186.

Chodkowski, J. L., and A. Shade. 2017. A synthetic community system for probing microbial

interactions driven by exometabolites. mSystems 2:e00129-17.

De Roy, K., M. Marzorati, P. Van den Abbeele, T. Van de Wiele, and N. Boon. 2014.

Synthetic microbial ecosystems: an exciting tool to understand and apply microbial

communities. Environmental microbiology 16:1472–1481.

Dolinšek, J., F. Goldschmidt, and D. R. Johnson. 2016. Synthetic microbial ecology and the

dynamic interplay between microbial genotypes. FEMS Microbiology Reviews 40:961–

979.

Drescher, K., C. D. Nadell, H. A. Stone, N. S. Wingreen, and B. L. Bassler. 2014. Solutions

to the public goods dilemma in bacterial biofilms. Current biology: CB 24:50–55.

Duffy, J. E. 2009. Why biodiversity is important to the functioning of real-world ecosystems.

Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 7:437–444.

Edgar, R. 2016. UCHIME2: improved chimera prediction for amplicon sequencing.

bioRxiv:074252.

Evans, R., A. M. Alessi, S. Bird, S. J. McQueen-Mason, N. C. Bruce, and M. A. Brockhurst.

2017. Defining the functional traits that drive bacterial decomposer community

productivity. The ISME Journal 11:1680–1687.

Faith, D. P. 2002. Quantifying Biodiversity: a Phylogenetic Perspective. Conservation

Biology 16:248–252.

Faust, K., and J. Raes. 2012. Microbial interactions: from networks to models. Nature

Reviews Microbiology 10:538–550.

Finlay, B. J., S. C. Maberly, and J. I. Cooper. 1997. Microbial Diversity and Ecosystem

Function. Oikos 80:209.

Fox, J. W., and W. S. Harpole. 2008. Revealing How Species Loss Affects Ecosystem

Function: The Trait-Based Price Equation Partition. Ecology 89:269–279.

Fredrickson, J. K. 2015. Ecological communities by design. Science 348:1425–1427.

Frossard, A., L. Gerull, M. Mutz, and M. O. Gessner. 2012. Disconnect of microbial structure

and function: enzyme activities and bacterial communities in nascent stream corridors.

The ISME journal 6:680–691.

Gamfeldt, L., and F. Roger. 2017. Revisiting the biodiversity–ecosystem multifunctionality

relationship. Nature Ecology & Evolution 1:0168.

Gause, G. F. 1934. The Struggle for Existence. Williams & Wilkins.

Geesink, P., O. Tyc, K. Küsel, M. Taubert, C. van de Velde, S. Kumar, and P. Garbeva. 2018.

Growth promotion and inhibition induced by interactions of groundwater bacteria.

FEMS Microbiology Ecology 94:1–8.

Goberna, M., and M. Verdú. 2016. Predicting microbial traits with phylogenies. The ISME

Journal 10:959–967.

Griffiths, B. S., K. Ritz, R. Wheatley, H. L. Kuan, B. Boag, S. Christensen, F. Ekelund, S. J.

Sørensen, S. Muller, and J. Bloem. 2001. An examination of the biodiversity–ecosystem

function relationship in arable soil microbial communities. Soil Biology and

Biochemistry 33:1713–1722.

Gross, K., B. J. Cardinale, J. W. Fox, A. Gonzalez, M. Loreau, H. Wayne Polley, P. B. Reich,

and J. van Ruijven. 2014. Species Richness and the Temporal Stability of Biomass

Production: A New Analysis of Recent Biodiversity Experiments. The American

Naturalist 183:1–12.

Großkopf, T., and O. S. Soyer. 2014. Synthetic microbial communities. Current Opinion in

Microbiology 18:72–77.

Hardin, G. 1960. The competitive exclusion principle.

Hector, A., and R. Bagchi. 2007. Biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality. Nature

448:188–190.

Herlemann, D. P. R., M. Labrenz, K. Jürgens, S. Bertilsson, J. J. Waniek, and A. F.

Andersson. 2011. Transitions in bacterial communities along the 2000 km salinity

gradient of the Baltic Sea. ISME Journal 5:1571–1579.

Hillebrand, H., B. Blasius, E. T. Borer, J. M. Chase, J. A. Downing, B. K. Eriksson, C. T.

Filstrup, W. S. Harpole, D. Hodapp, S. Larsen, A. M. Lewandowska, E. W. Seabloom,

D. B. Van de Waal, and A. B. Ryabov. 2018. Biodiversity change is uncoupled from

species richness trends: Consequences for conservation and monitoring. The Journal of

applied ecology 55:169–184.

Hooper, D. U., E. C. Adair, B. J. Cardinale, J. E. K. Byrnes, B. A. Hungate, K. L. Matulich,

A. Gonzalez, J. E. Duffy, L. Gamfeldt, and M. I. O'Connor. 2012. A global synthesis

reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change. Nature 486:105–108.

Huston, M. A. 1997. Hidden treatments in ecological experiments: re-evaluating the

ecosystem function of biodiversity. Oecologia 110:449–460.

Huston, M. A. 2000. No Consistent Effect of Plant Diversity on Productivity. Science

289:1255a–11255.

Ives, A. R., and S. R. Carpenter. 2007. Stability and Diversity of Ecosystems. Science

317:58–62.

Jousset, A., B. Schmid, S. Scheu, and N. Eisenhauer. 2011. Genotypic richness and

dissimilarity opposingly affect ecosystem functioning. Ecology Letters 14:537–545.

Kozich, J. J., S. L. Westcott, N. T. Baxter, S. K. Highlander, and P. D. Schloss. 2013.

Development of a Dual-Index Sequencing Strategy and Curation Pipeline for Analyzing

Amplicon Sequence Data on the MiSeq Illumina Sequencing Platform. Applied and

Environmental Microbiology 79:5112–5120.

Krause, S., X. Le Roux, P. A. Niklaus, P. M. Van Bodegom, J. T. Lennon, S. Bertilsson, H.-P.

Grossart, L. Philippot, and P. L. E. Bodelier. 2014. Trait-based approaches for

understanding microbial biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. Frontiers in

Microbiology 5:1–10.

Kumar, S., M. Herrmann, B. Thamdrup, V. F. Schwab, P. Geesink, S. E. Trumbore, K.-U.

Totsche, and K. Küsel. 2017. Nitrogen Loss from Pristine Carbonate-Rock Aquifers of

the Hainich Critical Zone Exploratory (Germany) Is Primarily Driven by

Chemolithoautotrophic Anammox Processes. Frontiers in Microbiology 8:1–13.

Kumar, S., G. Stecher, M. Li, C. Knyaz, and K. Tamura. 2018. MEGA X: Molecular

Evolutionary Genetics Analysis across Computing Platforms. Molecular Biology and

Evolution 35:1547–1549.

Küsel, K., K. U. Totsche, S. E. Trumbore, R. Lehmann, and M. Herrmann. 2016. How deep

can surface signals be traced in the critical zone? Merging biodiversity with

biogeochemistry research in a central German Muschelkalk landscape. Frontiers in Earth

Science 4:1–18.

Lawrence, D., F. Fiegna, V. Behrends, J. G. Bundy, A. B. Phillimore, T. Bell, and T. G.

Barraclough. 2012. Species Interactions Alter Evolutionary Responses to a Novel

Environment. PLoS Biology 10:e1001330.

Lehman, C. L., and D. Tilman. 2000. Biodiversity, Stability, and Productivity in Competitive

Communities. The American Naturalist 156:534–552.

Letten, A. D., D. A. Keith, and M. G. Tozer. 2014. Phylogenetic and functional dissimilarity

does not increase during temporal heathland succession. Proceedings of the Royal

Society B: Biological Sciences 281:20142102–20142102.

Levine, J. M., J. Bascompte, P. B. Adler, and S. Allesina. 2017. Beyond pairwise mechanisms

of species coexistence in complex communities. Nature 546:56–64.

Litchman, E., and C. a. Klausmeier. 2008. Trait-Based Community Ecology of

Phytoplankton. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 39:615–639.

López-García, P., and D. Moreira. 2008. Tracking microbial biodiversity through molecular

and genomic ecology. Research in Microbiology 159:67–73.

Loreau, M. 2000. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: recent theoretical advances. Oikos

91:3–17.

Loreau, M. 2010a. Linking biodiversity and ecosystems: towards a unifying ecological

theory. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 365:49–

60.

Loreau, M. 2010b. From Populations to Ecosystems: Theoretical Foundations for a New

Ecological Synthesis. Princeton University Press.

Louca, S., M. F. Polz, F. Mazel, M. B. N. Albright, J. A. Huber, M. I. O'Connor, M.

Ackermann, A. S. Hahn, D. S. Srivastava, S. A. Crowe, M. Doebeli, and L. W. Parfrey.

2018. Function and functional redundancy in microbial systems. Nature Ecology &

Evolution 2:936–943.

Lynd, L. R., P. J. Weimer, W. H. van Zyl, and I. S. Pretorius. 2002. Microbial Cellulose

Utilization: Fundamentals and Biotechnology. Microbiology and Molecular Biology

Reviews 66:506–577.

Maron, P.-A., A. Sarr, A. Kaisermann, J. Lévêque, O. Mathieu, J. Guigue, B. Karimi, L.

Bernard, S. Dequiedt, S. Terrat, A. Chabbi, and L. Ranjard. 2018. High Microbial

Diversity Promotes Soil Ecosystem Functioning. Applied and Environmental

Microbiology 84:e02738-17.

Martiny, A. C., K. Treseder, and G. Pusch. 2013. Phylogenetic conservatism of functional

traits in microorganisms. The ISME journal 7:830–838.

McDonald, J. H. 2014. Handbook of Biological Statistics. 3rd edition. Sparky House

Publishing, Baltimore, Maryland.

Mokany, K., J. Ash, and S. Roxburgh. 2008. Functional identity is more important than

diversity in influencing ecosystem processes in a temperate native grassland. Journal of

Ecology 96:884–893.

Moore, E. R. B., B. J. Tindall, V. A. P. Martins Dos Santos, D. H. Pieper, J.-L. Ramos, and N.
J. Palleroni. 2006. Nonmedical: Pseudomonas. Pages 646–703 The Prokaryotes. Springer
New York, New York, NY.

Morrissey, E. M., R. L. Mau, E. Schwartz, J. G. Caporaso, P. Dijkstra, N. van Gestel, B. J.
Koch, C. M. Liu, M. Hayer, T. A. McHugh, J. C. Marks, L. B. Price, and B. A. Hungate.
2016. Phylogenetic organization of bacterial activity. The ISME Journal 10:2336–2340.

Mouchet, M. A., S. Villéger, N. W. H. Mason, and D. Mouillot. 2010. Functional diversity
measures: an overview of their redundancy and their ability to discriminate community
assembly rules. Functional Ecology 24:867–876.

Mukherjee, S., D. Stamatis, J. Bertsch, G. Ovchinnikova, H. Y. Katta, A. Mojica, I.-M. A.
Chen, N. C. Kyrpides, and T. B. K. Reddy. 2019. Genomes OnLine database (GOLD)
v.7: updates and new features. Nucleic Acids Research 47:D649–D659.

Naeem, S., D. E. Bunker, A. Hector, M. Loreau, and C. Perrings. 2009. Biodiversity,
Ecosystem Functioning, and Human Wellbeing. Oxford University Press.

Naeem, S., J. E. Duffy, and E. Zavaleta. 2012. The Functions of Biological Diversity in an
Age of Extinction. Science 336:1401–1406.

Paula, F. S., J. L. M. Rodrigues, J. Zhou, L. Wu, R. C. Mueller, B. S. Mirza, B. J. M.
Bohannan, K. Nüsslein, Y. Deng, J. M. Tiedje, and V. H. Pellizari. 2014. Land use
change alters functional gene diversity, composition and abundance in Amazon forest
soil microbial communities. Molecular Ecology 23:2988–2999.

Petchey, O. L., and K. J. Gaston. 2002. Functional diversity (FD), species richness and
community composition. Ecology Letters 5:402–411.

Petchey, O. L., and K. J. Gaston. 2006. Functional diversity: back to basics and looking
forward. Ecology Letters 9:741–758.

Pruesse, E., J. Peplies, and F. O. Glöckner. 2012. SINA: Accurate high-throughput multiple
sequence alignment of ribosomal RNA genes. Bioinformatics 28:1823–1829.

Purschke, O., B. C. Schmid, M. T. Sykes, P. Poschlod, S. G. Michalski, W. Durka, I. Kühn,
M. Winter, and H. C. Prentice. 2013. Contrasting changes in taxonomic, phylogenetic

and functional diversity during a long-term succession: insights into assembly processes.

Journal of Ecology 101:857–866.

Quast, C., E. Pruesse, P. Yilmaz, J. Gerken, T. Schweer, P. Yarza, J. Peplies, and F. O.

Glöckner. 2012. The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data

processing and web-based tools. Nucleic Acids Research 41:D590–D596.

R Core Team. 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

Rainey, P. B., A. Buckling, R. Kassen, and M. Travisano. 2000. The emergence and

maintenance of diversity: insights from experimental bacterial populations. Trends in

Ecology & Evolution 15:243–247.

Reintjes, G., C. Arnosti, B. Fuchs, and R. Amann. 2019. Selfish, sharing and scavenging

bacteria in the Atlantic Ocean: a biogeographical study of bacterial substrate utilisation.

The ISME Journal 13:1119–1132.

Reintjes, G., C. Arnosti, B. M. Fuchs, and R. Amann. 2017. An alternative polysaccharide

uptake mechanism of marine bacteria. The ISME Journal 11:1640–1650.

Rivett, D. W., T. Scheuerl, C. T. Culbert, S. B. Mombrikotb, E. Johnstone, T. G. Barraclough,

and T. Bell. 2016. Resource-dependent attenuation of species interactions during

bacterial succession. The ISME journal 10:2259–2268.

Salles, J. F., F. Poly, B. Schmid, and X. Le Roux. 2009. Community niche predicts the

functioning of denitrifying bacterial assemblages. Ecology 90:3324–3332.

Schloss, P. D., S. L. Westcott, T. Ryabin, J. R. Hall, M. Hartmann, E. B. Hollister, R. A.

Lesniewski, B. B. Oakley, D. H. Parks, C. J. Robinson, J. W. Sahl, B. Stres, G. G.

Thallinger, D. J. Van Horn, and C. F. Weber. 2009. Introducing mothur: Open-Source,

Platform-Independent, Community-Supported Software for Describing and Comparing

Microbial Communities. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 75:7537–7541.

Schwab, V. F., M. Herrmann, V. N. Roth, G. Gleixner, R. Lehmann, G. Pohnert, S.

Trumbore, K. Küsel, and K. U. Totsche. 2017. Functional diversity of microbial

communities in pristine aquifers inferred by PLFA- and sequencing-based approaches.

Biogeosciences 14:2697–2714.

Shade, A. 2017. Diversity is the question, not the answer. The ISME Journal 11:1–6.

Shade, A., R. R. Dunn, S. A. Blowes, P. Keil, B. J. M. Bohannan, M. Herrmann, K. Küsel, J.

T. Lennon, N. J. Sanders, D. Storch, and J. Chase. 2018. Macroecology to Unite All Life,

Large and Small. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 33:731–744.

Smith, P., and M. Schuster. 2019. Public goods and cheating in microbes. Current biology:

CB 29:R442–R447.

Srivastava, D. S., M. W. Cadotte, A. A. M. Macdonald, R. G. Marushia, and N. Mirotchnick.

2012. Phylogenetic diversity and the functioning of ecosystems. Ecology Letters 15:637–

648.

Srivastava, D. S., and M. Vellend. 2005. Biodiversity-Ecosystem Function Research: Is It

Relevant to Conservation? Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics

36:267–294.

Steudel, B., C. Hallmann, M. Lorenz, S. Abrahamczyk, K. Prinz, C. Herrfurth, I. Feussner, J.

W. R. Martini, and M. Kessler. 2016. Contrasting biodiversity-ecosystem functioning

relationships in phylogenetic and functional diversity. New Phytologist 212:409–420.

Taubert, M., J. Stähly, S. Kolb, and K. Küsel. 2019. Divergent microbial communities in

groundwater and overlying soils exhibit functional redundancy for plant-polysaccharide

degradation. PloS one 14:e0212937.

Thompson, P. L., T. J. Davies, and A. Gonzalez. 2015. Ecosystem Functions across Trophic

Levels Are Linked to Functional and Phylogenetic Diversity. PLOS ONE 10:e0117595.

Tilman, D. 1997. Distinguishing between the Effects of Species Diversity and Species

Composition. Oikos 80:185.

Turnbull, L. A., J. M. Levine, M. Loreau, and A. Hector. 2013. Coexistence, niches and

biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning. Ecology Letters 16:116–127.

Turner, S., K. M. Pryer, V. P. W. Miao, and J. D. Palmer. 1999. Investigating Deep

Phylogenetic Relationships among Cyanobacteria and Plastids by Small Subunit rRNA

Sequence Analysis. The Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology 46:327–338.

Wang, Y., R. Zhang, Z. He, J. D. Van Nostrand, Q. Zheng, J. Zhou, and N. Jiao. 2017.

Functional Gene Diversity and Metabolic Potential of the Microbial Community in an

Estuary-Shelf Environment. Frontiers in Microbiology 8:1–12.

Warren, R. A. J. 1996. MICROBIAL HYDROLYSIS OF POLYSACCHARIDES. Annual

Review of Microbiology 50:183–212.

Webb, C. O., D. D. Ackerly, M. A. McPeek, and M. J. Donoghue. 2002. Phylogenies and

Community Ecology. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 33:475–505.

Yin, B., D. Crowley, G. Sparovek, W. J. De Melo, and J. Borneman. 2000. Bacterial

functional redundancy along a soil reclamation gradient. Applied and environmental

microbiology 66:4361–4365.

Zhang, Q.-G., and D.-Y. Zhang. 2006. Resource availability and biodiversity effects on the

productivity, temporal variability and resistance of experimental algal communities.

Oikos 114:385–396.

Zhang, Z., S. Schwartz, L. Wagner, and W. Miller. 2000. A Greedy Algorithm for Aligning

DNA Sequences. Journal of Computational Biology 7:203–214.

Zuñiga, C., L. Zaramela, and K. Zengler. 2017. Elucidation of complexity and prediction of

interactions in microbial communities. Microbial Biotechnology 10:1500–1522.

Legends for figures and tables

Figure 1: Functional and phylogenetic classification and grouping of groundwater isolates. EEAs are shown for twenty-seven groundwater isolates incubated with eleven fluorescent substrate analogues. Activities are given in relative fluorescence units (RFU) on a logarithmic scale. Empty (white) boxes denote activity outside the detectable range. The left dendrogram shows clusters of isolates with similar function based on Euclidean hierarchical dissimilarity distances. The topmost dendrogram shows hierarchical clustering of substrates that produced similar activity patterns in the assays. The assignment of isolates to the communities of each trait-group is depicted to the right of the heatmap. Double-coloured boxes indicate isolates that were assigned to more than one group. In the legend, the colours indicate the community group and the phylogenetic (P) and functional (F) traits of the communities are indicated as similar (sim) or dissimilar (dis).

Figure 2: Individual communities plotted against the phylogenetic and functional dissimilarities within and between groups. Colours indicate the community groups; red for Psim-Fsim group, green for Psim-Fdis group, blue for Pdis-Fsim group and purple for Pdis-Fdis group. Phylogenetic and functional dissimilarity metrics have been z-score standardized. Variation of dissimilarity scores exists within groups, but the groups are cleanly separated from each other.

Figure 3: Heatmap of community EEA proportional changes. The heatmap scale depicts proportional changes from -100 to 100%. Communities that exhibited changes over 100% have their percent change value shown in the heatmap matrix. Red colours depict a higher activity of the community; blue colours depict a lower activity of the community than estimated based on the activities of the individual isolates. White boxes show measurements outside the

detection limits. On the right, the label for each row indicates the community and the group

from where the activities are taken from; red for Psim-Fsim group, green for Psim-Fdis group,

blue for Pdis-Fsim group and purple for Pdis-Fdis group communities. Columns indicate the

substrates used in the EEA assays. The dendrogram depicts hierarchical clustering of each

substrate's activities, showing groups of substrates with similar activity responses.

Figure 4: Temporal trends of EEA changes between communities and isolates from 0 h to

24 h after community mixing. Rows show community groups and columns show the substrate

where the activity change was noted. The average changes between the timepoints are indicated

by the colour and size of the arrows and their statistical significance (Student's *t*-test, 2-tailed)

showed on top of the arrows. Significance symbols: *** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$;

non-significant (ns) $p > 0.05$.

Figure 5: Substrate acclimation effect on isolates and communities. EEA of Psim-Fdis

group isolates and communities on 4-MUB-α-D-glucopyranoside (aG) are shown as an

example of the substrate acclimation effect. Data is normalized to EEA measured at 0h after

mixing without preincubation with the substrate (green) with a fold-change of 1. EEA is shown

after 270 min of preincubation with the substrate (orange) and at 6 h after community mixing

without additional preincubation with the substrate (grey). Bars depict average fold-changes in

the EEA of isolates and communities and error bars show the standard deviation (n = 5).

Community EEA are shown to increase ~3 times more on average when incubated with the

substrate.

Figure 6: Strength and direction of phylogenetic and functional diversity treatments on

the EEA of bacterial communities. (A) The linear regression model slopes for all 11 substrates

and the average for all substrates (Table S4) are plotted here as points. In (B) the average for

all substrates, community EEA activity, is positively correlated with phylogenetic diversity

($p < 0.001$). In (C) the average for all substrates, community EEA activity, is negatively

correlated with functional diversity ($p < 0.001$). Coloured points in (A) indicate different

substrates and the average. Coloured squares in (B) and (C) indicate community groups: Psim-

Fsim in red, Psim-Fdis in green, Pdis-Fsim in blue and Pdis-Fdis in purple.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6