RESEARCH ARTICLE

REVISED Characterization of cellulose-degrading microbiota from the eastern subterranean termite and soil [version 2; peer review: 1 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]

Xianfa Xie ¹, Alonzo B. Anderson¹, Latoya J. Wran¹, Myrna G. Serrano², Gregory A. Buck²

¹Department of Biology, Virginia State University, Petersburg, VA, 23806, USA

²Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, 23284, USA

v2 First published: 04 Dec 2017, 6:2082
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.13148.1>

Latest published: 03 Aug 2021, 6:2082
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.13148.2>

Abstract

Background: While there have been a lot of studies on the termite gut microbiota, there has been very little research directly on the cellulose-degrading microbiota in termites or their soil environment. This study addresses this problem by profiling cellulose-degrading bacteria and archaea in the selective cellulose cultures of two samples of the eastern subterranean termite (*Reticulitermes flavipes*) and one soil sample collected at the same location as one of the termite samples.

Methods: All the cultures were examined for cell concentration and remaining cellulose after the culture was completed. The 16S rRNA pyrotag sequencing method was used to identify the prokaryotic microbiota for the three cultures and one termite colony without culture. The MOTHUR, SSU-ALIGN, RDPTools, phyloseq, and other R packages were used for sequence and statistical analyses.

Results: Biochemical analyses of the cultures suggested high efficiency of cellulose degradation. Comparative analyses between the cultured and uncultured termite gut microbiota revealed a significant difference. Proteobacteria and Firmicutes were found to be the two most abundant phyla of cellulose-degrading bacteria from the three cultures, but different classes within each phylum dominated the different samples. Shared and sample-specific cellulose-degrading taxa, including a core set of taxa across all the cultures, were identified.

Conclusions: Our study demonstrates the importance of using selective cellulose culture to study the cellulose-degrading microbial community. It also revealed that the cellulose-degrading microbiota in the eastern subterranean termite is significantly influenced by the microbiota in the surrounding soil environment. Biochemical analyses showed that the microbial communities enriched from all the selective cultures were efficient in degrading cellulose, and a core set of

Open Peer Review

Approval Status ? X

	1	2
version 2		
(revision)		X
03 Aug 2021		view
		↑
version 1	?	X
04 Dec 2017	view	view

1. Swapna Priya Rajarapu , Ohio State University, Wooster, USA
2. Xing-Feng Huang , Colorado State University, Fort Collins, USA

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

bacteria have been identified as targets for further functional analyses.

Keywords

cellulose degradation, termite, soil, microbiome, 16S, metagenomic

Corresponding author: Xianfa Xie (xxie@vsu.edu)

Author roles: **Xie X:** Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Resources, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Anderson AB:** Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; **Wran LJ:** Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; **Serrano MG:** Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; **Buck GA:** Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: The research reported in this publication was partially supported by a U.S. Department of Defense grant (Award No. W911NF-14-1-0170, to Xianfa Xie), a U.S. Department of Education grant (Award No. P382G090018, to the Virginia State University), and a U.S. National Science Foundation grant (Award No. HRD-1036286, to the Virginia State University).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Copyright: © 2021 Xie X *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Xie X, Anderson AB, Wran LJ *et al.* **Characterization of cellulose-degrading microbiota from the eastern subterranean termite and soil [version 2; peer review: 1 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]** F1000Research 2021, 6:2082 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.13148.2>

First published: 04 Dec 2017, 6:2082 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.13148.1>

REVISED Amendments from Version 1

We would like to thank the two reviewers of the first version of our manuscript for their comments and questions, which helped us to revise the manuscript to make it more clear.

In the Introduction, two references were added as suggested by one of the previous reviewers and comments were made on how the two references related to our study.

Most importantly, we clarified the design of our project in this revision, which we realized had not been very clear in the previous version based on the reviewers' comments. The design of the project was briefly explained in the Introduction and described in more details in the first section of Methods. Accordingly, we included a new figure (now [Figure 1](#)) to help explain the project design in a more direct way.

Following the new policy of F1000Research, we have deposited all the supplemental figures and tables in an online database Figshare. And following the suggestion of the Production Editor, we have included such information about the supplemental figures and tables in Figshare as Extended data.

We hope these revisions will resolve the questions raised by the two reviewers of the first version of our manuscript and make the publication to be consistent with the current policies of the journal, particularly regarding supplemental data.

Any further responses from the reviewers can be found at the end of the article

Introduction

How plant materials are decomposed or digested is a fundamental question for the study of nutrient cycling in the ecosystem as well as animal physiology. Plants as the primary producers on earth have been the major or even exclusive source of energy for many animals, including herbivorous insects like termites. Most of the plant materials in the ecosystem that have not been consumed by animals are ultimately decomposed in soil to provide nutrients and energy for a variety of other organisms. It has been well established that microbes play essential roles in such processes.

Cellulose is the most abundant plant material on earth, produced by plants from natural habitats like forests, prairies, and grasslands, as well as agricultural and other man-made habitats like lawns in residential, commercial, or public areas. Understanding how cellulose is degraded is not only critical for understanding the nutrient cycling in both natural and human-altered ecosystems but also essential for the study of animal metabolism and physiology. Furthermore, detailed understanding of the cellulose degradation process and the major players involved in the process would help develop the cost-effective next-generation biofuel technology based on cellulose rather than starch or sugar as commonly used in the current technology.

Termites are a group of insects that have evolved efficient strategy to utilize cellulose-rich plant materials. There has been a growing interest in studying the microbiota in the digestive system of termites, including fungus-farming termites, particularly over the last decade or so¹⁻¹⁰. However, most of the existing studies have focused on the profiling of whole microbiota in termite guts, rather than those taxonomic groups specifically

involved in the degradation of cellulose. Through laboratory experiments, some studies showed the effects of antimicrobial treatments on the digestion of lignocellulosic materials and the change of microbiota in a lower termite species^{11,12}. However, such studies could not determine whether the reduction in lignocellulosic degradation activity was directly or indirectly dependent on the reduction of abundance of certain group of bacteria.

Soil, particularly the topsoil, is where most such cellulose degradation process takes place in the natural and human-modified ecosystems. Some termite species, like the subterranean termites, spend significant amount of their time living underground in soil. While there have been some studies on the source of microbiota in termite digestive system^{7,13-15}, the debate about whether the microbiota is vertically inherited or largely shaped by the environment is still unresolved. So far, there seems to be a dearth of study on whether there is any connection between the cellulose-degrading microbiota in the termite digestive system and those in the soil.

In this study, we tried to elucidate the above questions by focusing on cellulose-degrading prokaryotes, particularly bacteria, from both termite and soil samples. The design of the study allows for comparisons in multiple directions. The study of two colonies of the eastern subterranean termite species, *Reticulitermes flavipes*, allowed comparison between termite colonies. The comparison to one soil sample collected at the same site as one of the termite colonies makes it possible to study the relationship between termites and the environment in their microbiome compositions. Through selective cultures, the abilities of the microbial communities from the different samples to degrade cellulose were biochemically tested, and the enriched cultures were characterized using the 16S rRNA genetic marker to identify the cellulose-degrading bacteria and archaea from the two termite and one soil samples. The diversity of cellulose-enriched prokaryotic microbiota was compared with the whole gut microbiota for one termite sample, which highlighted the value of using selective culture to study cellulose-degrading microbial communities.

Methods

Study design, sample collection and preparation

As shown in [Figure 1](#), the study is designed to make the microbiome comparison in multiple directions. First, for the termite colony at the center of the study, the microbiome composition was compared before and after the selective culture to reveal the difference and identify microbiota involved in cellulose degradation in this termite colony. Second, the cellulose-enriched microbiome of this termite colony was compared to that of another termite colony to study the difference between termite colonies. Third, this termite colony's microbiome after culture was compared to that of a soil sample collected at the same site to study the relationship between termite and its environment with respect to cellulose-degrading microbiota.

To examine the difference between termite colonies, two colonies of the eastern subterranean termite species, *R. flavipes*,

Figure 1. Project design. The design of the study allows for various comparisons, including between cultured and uncultured samples, between cultures of termite colonies from different sites, and between the termite colony and soil sample from the same site after the selective culture.

were collected about 1 km apart in central Virginia. Colony 1 (Termite_EW) was collected from inside a partially decomposed log on the ground in the forest (East Wood, EW; N: 37.238854, W: -77.414578) on the campus of the Virginia State University, while Colony 2 (Termite_AX) was from a log by the Appomattox River (AX; N: 37.231483, W: -77.418612) at Petersburg, Virginia. For each colony, both adult workers and soldiers were collected. The biological classification of the termites was verified with morphological characters, particularly those of the soldiers. However, only workers were used for subsequent microbiota analyses in order to eliminate any variation between castes⁸ as a confounding factor. In order to test the relationship between termite and soil microbiomes, a soil sample was also collected right underneath the log where the termite Colony 1 was collected.

For each termite sample, the hindguts of 30 adult workers were dissected and ground to release gut microbes in 1.5 ml of sterile saline water. 100 µl of the evenly mixed microbial cell suspension solution was then used to inoculate 10 ml of selective medium, while the rest was kept for later use. The selective medium was prepared by dissolving 1.25 grams of NaNO₃, 1 gram of KH₂PO₄, 0.1 gram each of MgSO₄ and NaCl, and 0.05 gram of CaCl₂•6H₂O in 500 ml of Type I water, which was then autoclaved and added 2 grams of cellulose. For the soil sample, 200 mg of soil was measured and then suspended in 10 ml of sterile saline water in a 15 ml tube. After the settlement of soil particles at the bottom of the tube, 100 µl of the microbial cell suspension in the top layer was used to inoculate 10 ml of the same selective medium as described above. The inoculated cellulose selective media were then cultured in an incubator at 30°C for 10 days.

Biochemical analysis of cellulose degradation

Immediately after the culture was completed, the cell density in each culture was measured by the absorbance at 600 nm using the SmartSpec Plus spectrometer, which was then used to calculate the cell concentration. The cellulose remaining in the medium was measured following an established method¹⁶.

DNA extraction and PCR amplification

1.5 ml of each culture was used for DNA extraction using a standard phenol method. To study the microbial diversity in termite gut without the selective culture, the gut microbial resuspension from the Termite_EW colony was also directly used for DNA extraction using the same method. The size distribution, purity, and concentration of the genomic DNAs extracted from each sample were examined using 1% agarose gel electrophoresis, NanoDrop 2000 spectrophotometer, and Qubit 2.0 fluorometer following the standard protocols.

A fragment of 16S rRNA marker covering the V1–V3 region was amplified from the genomic DNA extracted from each of the four samples as described above. Each reaction tube contains 1 unit of *Taq* polymerase, 2.5 µl of 10x *Taq* Buffer, 1 µl of 10mM Mg²⁺, 0.5 µl of dNTPs (all the above reagents from Fisher Scientific), 1 µl of the forward primer (10 mM), 1 µl of the reverse primer (10mM), 1 µl of template DNA, and 18 µl of ddH₂O. The PCR amplification was carried out in an Eppendorf Mastercycler™ Nexus Thermal Cycler with the following stages: Initial denaturation at 95°C for 5 minutes, followed by 35 cycles each of 95°C for 30 seconds, 55°C for 30 seconds, and 72°C for 1 minute, and finished with 72°C for 5 minutes for extension.

After verifying the success of the PCR reactions with gel electrophoresis, the PCR products were purified using the NucleoSpin Extraction Kits (Clontech Laboratories) following the recommended procedure. The purity and yield of the purified products were then analyzed using gel electrophoresis, NanoDrop 2000, and Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA).

Sequencing and analysis

GS FLX Titanium Rapid Library Preparation Kit was used to ligate the RL Adaptors on either side of the existing PCR amplicons. The libraries for the four different samples were normalized, and the sequencing was completed using 454 GS FLX Titanium sequencing technology at the Virginia Commonwealth University. The raw reads were quality-filtered and removed of barcode and primer sequences, which were then summarized using the MOTHUR program v.1.39.5¹⁷. The majority of the remaining sequences were shown to be at least 400bp in length (Table 2). Subsequently, only sequences of 400bp or longer were used for the analyses in order to improve the quality of sequence alignments and the accuracy of the analyses.

The sequences from the four samples were first aligned to the 16S rRNA reference sequences¹⁸ using structure-based alignment method Infernal v.1.1.2¹⁹ as implemented in the SSU-ALIGN program v.0.1.1. To facilitate the comparison among samples, the alignments from all four datasets were masked with the default, pre-calculated mask, reformatted using a custom Perl script, and then analyzed using the unsupervised method through the locally installed RDPTools program v.2.0.2²⁰. For the unsupervised method, replicate sequences were first removed, then a pairwise distance matrix was calculated, based on which the sequences were clustered and an OTU table was generated. The representative sequence for each OTU was obtained and a BIOM file created, which was then added the classification and sample data. A tree was built from the representative sequences using the FastTree program v.2.1.10²¹. The sequences from the four datasets were also classified using the supervised method implemented in the RDPTools program, which compared each sequence against the reference database to identify the taxonomic group each sequence represents.

The results from the above analyses were then further analyzed and visualized in R v3.3.3 using the *phyloseq* v.1.19.1²², *vegan* v.2.4-3²³, *phangorn* v.2.2.0²⁴, and *GUniFrac* v.1.0²⁵ packages. To facilitate the comparison among the samples across different taxonomic levels, the results from the RDPTools analysis with the supervised method were further processed using the KronaTools program v.2.7²⁶, which created pie charts that can be interactively viewed in a web browser.

The taxonomic classification using the RDPTools supervised method was compared among the four datasets in order to identify the shared and sample-specific cellulose-degrading microbes from the three selective cultures and the taxa only found in the uncultured termite gut sample. The results were visualized in R v.3.3.3. with the *limma* package v.3.30.13²⁷.

Results

Biochemical analysis of selective cellulose cultures

The enrichment of the cellulose-degrading microbes from two termite gut colonies and one soil sample was achieved through the selective liquid medium culture with only cellulose and basic salts. As shown in Table 1, all the three cultures reached very similar concentrations between 2.38×10^8 to 2.75×10^8 cells/ml after being cultured under the same condition. The percentage of cellulose that has been degraded in each of the three cultures is 64.37%, 62.55%, and 55.28% for Termite_AX, Termite_EW, and Soil_EW cultures respectively.

Sequence summary statistics

After quality filtering and the removal of barcode and primer sequences, 54,554, 32,990, 34,939, and 51,595 sequence reads were obtained from the uncultured Termite_EW sample, the cultured Termite_EW sample, the cultured Termite_AX sample, and the cultured Soil_EW sample, respectively. The data summary using the MOTHUR program shows that at least three quarters of the reads in each sample is over 400bp. Consequently, only sequences of at least 400bp from each sample were used in subsequent analysis in order to improve the alignment quality and analysis accuracy, which yields 48,563, 25,745, 27,095, and 42,578 reads for each of the above four samples, respectively. After the removal of identical sequences, the number of unique sequences in each sample is 48,277, 20,280, 22,320, and 34,134, respectively (Table 2).

Bacterial composition and diversity of individual samples

Across all the four different samples, including the three cellulose cultures and the one uncultured termite gut microbial sample, at least 99.98% of all the prokaryotes identified were bacteria, which have become the focus of subsequent analyses.

As shown in Figure 2, at the phylum level, the bacterial flora in the uncultured Termite_EW population is much higher than each of the three selective cellulose cultures. Even for the phyla found in both uncultured and cultured samples, the relative proportion of each phylum is different, showing the enrichment of certain phyla compared to others. For example, while Firmicutes is the most abundant group in the uncultured termite gut community, it represents only the second most abundant group in cellulose-degrading microbes while the Proteobacteria are the most abundant in all the three cellulose cultures.

The two most abundant phyla of cellulose-degrading bacteria were further analyzed in details and compared to those in the uncultured termite sample. Supplementary Figure 1 shows that while Delta-proteobacteria are the most abundant group of Proteobacteria in the uncultured termite sample, the Gamma- and Beta-proteobacteria are the most abundant in the cellulose cultures. However, while Beta-proteobacteria dominated the cellulose-degrading Proteobacteria in the Termite_AX culture, the Gamma-proteobacteria was the most dominant group of the same phylum in both the termite and soil samples collected at a different (EW) site. For Firmicutes, while Clostridia is the most dominant group in the uncultured sample, it was almost

Table 1. Microbial Growth and Cellulose Degradation in Selective Culture.

Sample	Termite_AX	Termite_EW	Soil_EW
Culture Absorbance (O.D. 600nm)	0.476	0.550	0.517
Cell Concentration (cells/ml)	2.38E+08	2.75E+08	2.58E+08
Mass of initial cellulose (mg)	40.00	40.00	40.00
Mass of Remaining Cellulose (mg)	14.2521	14.9789	17.8861
Mass of Degraded Cellulose (mg)	25.7479	25.0211	22.1139
Percentage of cellulose remaining (%)	35.63	37.45	44.72
Percentage of cellulose degraded (%)	64.37	62.55	55.28

Table 2. Summary statistics of the datasets used in the study. The original datasets contains sequence reads that have been quality filtered and removed of barcode and primer sequences.

Sample		Termite_EW Uncultured	Termite_EW Culture	Termite_AX Culture	Soil_EW Culture
Original dataset	Minimum Length	20	33	33	33
	Median Length	834	533	541	529
	Maximum Length	1,055	917	776	881
	No. of Reads	54,554	32,990	34,939	51,595
Reads of at least 400bp in length	Minimum Length	400	400	400	400
	Median Length	851	535	545	537
	Maximum Length	1,055	917	776	881
	No. of Reads	48,563	25,745	27,095	42,578
	No. of Unique Reads	48,277	20,280	22,320	34,134
Percentage of 400+bp reads		89.02	78.04	77.55	82.52

nonexistent in all the three cellulose selective cultures, which contained Bacilli as the almost exclusive group of Firmicutes (Supplementary Figure 2).

The bacterial community composition at the class level for each sample was summarized in Supplementary Figure 3, while Supplementary Figure 4 shows the abundance of each class of at least 1% in abundance in each sample (not including the unclassified classes). Again, at the class level, the uncultured termite sample is much more diverse and dramatically different from all the three cultures in composition, and while the termite and soil cultures from the same location (EW) were very similar in the composition of cellulose-degrading bacteria, both of them are very different from the other termite gut microbial culture (AX).

The charts in Figure 3 show the relative abundance of each taxonomic group at different levels from the phylum to the genus. As immediately apparent from the comparison, the uncultured termite gut sample contained the highest level of diversity with more balanced representation of different taxa, and as expected, the cellulose-degrading bacteria from the selective cultures represent only a proportion of the biodiversity in the whole gut microbiota. Again, the similarity of termite and soil cultures from the same location was clear while the other termite cellulose culture is significantly different in composition and dramatically reduced in diversity.

Comparison among samples

To quantify the alpha diversity within each sample, seven different measures including *Observed*, *Chao1*, *ACE*, *Shannon*,

Figure 2. Comparison of the four samples in taxonomic composition at the phylum level.

Simpson, *InvSimpson*, and *Fisher* diversities were calculated. The results, particularly the Shannon and Simpson indices, show that again the uncultured termite sample contains the highest level of bacterial diversity and the termite and soil samples from the same location (EW) are very similar in alpha diversity (Figure 4). All the measures also consistently show that the Termite_AX cellulose culture contains the lowest diversity of bacteria.

To mitigate the effect of varying numbers of sequence reads across samples on the comparison of diversity, all the four datasets were rarefied to the lowest number of sequence reads in any sample. The subsequent principal component analysis still shows the termite and soil samples from the same EW location were very similar to each other, while each of the other two samples (the Termite_AX culture and the uncultured Termite_EW) were very different (Supplementary Figure 5). The same pattern is observed in clustering analysis (Figure 5), which also shows the three cellulose cultures are overall more similar to each other than they are to the uncultured termite sample.

The principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) based on weighted UniFrac values using the results from the RDP unsupervised method and the *phyloseq* (Figure 6) and *GUniFrac* (Supplementary Figure 6) packages revealed a very similar pattern in terms of the similarity between the cultured termite and soil samples from the same location and their significant differences from each of the other two samples.

Core cellulose-degrading microbiota

To examine the distribution of taxa among the cellulose selective cultures, a tree plot was created for the 20 most abundant OTUs with each taxon's abundance in each sample. As shown on the tree (Supplementary Figure 7), *Burkholderia* and *Dyella* are the two most abundant genera, each with a number of lineages probably representing different species. However, not only these two genera are phylogenetically very distant from each other, their distributions were also almost opposite to each other. While *Dyella* was predominantly found in the termite and soil samples from the same location (EW), *Burkholderia* was mostly found in the other termite sample (AX). In fact, some *Burkholderia* lineages were exclusively found in the latter. Some other

A

B

Figure 3. The bacterial composition across taxonomic levels in the four samples. A. Uncultured Termite_EW sample; **B.** Cultured Termite_EW sample; **C.** Cultured Termite_AX sample; **D.** Cultured Soil_EW sample.

Figure 4. Alpha diversity measures for all samples.

Figure 5. Cluster dendrogram based on the bacterial community composition.

Figure 6. Weighted UniFrac distances among the four samples.

important genera in terms of abundance included *Citrobacter* and *Microbispora*, which were largely found in the soil sample, and *Fontibacillus*, which was found exclusively in the termite sample from the same location.

Next, we tried to identify the shared as well as sample-specific cellulose-degrading taxa among the three cultured samples, while comparing to the taxa found in the uncultured termite sample at the same time. As shown in [Figure 7](#), while each of the three selective cultures contained its own specific taxonomic groups, a significant proportion of the taxa at the genus level were shared between at least two samples, including 18 genera shared between the two termite cultures and 20 shared between the soil and termite from the EW location. In particular, there were 13 genera shared among all the three different cellulose cultures, defining a core set of cellulose-degrading bacteria. The taxonomic classification of these taxa was listed in details

in [Supplementary Table 1](#). However, the relative abundance of each of these taxa is different in different samples, as partially revealed in [Supplementary Figure 7](#).

Cellulose-degrading archaea

The percentage of archaeal sequence reads found in each sample was 0.004%, 0.008%, 0.002, and 0.02% in the uncultured Termite_EW, the Termite_EW culture, the Termite_AX culture, and the Soil_EW culture, respectively. The uncultured Termite_EW sample contained two reads, one classified as Crenarchaeota and the other Pacearchaeota, the Termite_EW cellulose culture also contained two sequence reads both classified as Crenarchaeota, and the Termite_AX culture contained only one read of archaea classified as Euryarchaeota. In contrast, the highest level of abundance and diversity was found in the Soil_EW culture, which contained 7 reads in both Crenarchaeota and Euryarchaeota phyla of archaea ([Supplementary Table 2](#)).

Figure 7. Sample-specific and shared taxa at the genus level among the three cultured samples. The number at the lower right corner indicates the number of genera found in the uncultured Termite_EW sample but not in any of the three cultured samples.

Discussion

Cellulose-degrading microbiota

Identifying the cellulose degrading microbes is not only important for the understanding of the nutrient cycling in the ecosystem, particularly in soil, but also for the understanding of food digestion in animals, including termites. It will also help to develop the next-generation bioethanol technology based on the vastly abundant cellulosic plant materials, although this requires additional technological advances as the authors are fully aware. The present study tried to characterize the cellulose degradation related prokaryotes from termites and soil samples, and the culture condition has allowed the identification of a variety of bacteria, including the aerobes and facultative anaerobes, which may prove to be more useful for next-generation bioethanol production under similar conditions.

Previous studies of whole gut microbiota in the lower termite species *Reticulitermes speratus*² and the wood-feeding higher termite species *Nasutitermes corniger*¹³ found the dominance of Spirochaetes, particularly *Treponema*. Our study, however, shows that Proteobacteria are the most dominant group in cellulose degradation. Similarly, previous studies suggested Firmicutes, particularly Clostridia, as the other most abundant bacterial

group in termite gut community. The uncultured termite gut in our study indeed showed Firmicutes to be the most dominant in the whole microbiota, but in all the three cellulose selective cultures they consistently appeared to be secondary in abundance (Figure 1), and class-level analysis (Supplementary Figure 2) revealed it was not Clostridia, but Bacilli, to be the dominant and almost exclusive group of Firmicutes involved in cellulose degradation. Altogether, it suggests that while direct termite gut microbiota studies are useful in characterizing the whole microbial community, one should be very careful in using the result to interpret the roles of various bacteria in the cellulose degradation process itself.

Within the most dominant group of bacteria in cellulose cultures, different classes of Proteobacteria dominated the different cultures, which surprisingly depended not on the type of sample (soil versus termite) but on the location of the collection site. As shown in Supplementary Figure 1, Gamma-proteobacteria dominated the cellulose cultures of the soil and termite samples collected at the same location while Beta-proteobacteria is the most dominant group in the cellulose culture of the other termite sample collected at a different location. The dominance of Gamma-proteobacteria and Bacilli at the class level in very

similar proportion are major contributors to the overall similarity in cellulose-degrading bacterial community in the termite and soil samples collected at the East Wood site as revealed by the various analyses in our study.

At the genus level, 88% of the sequence reads from the cellulose culture of the Termite_AX sample belonged to one genus, *Burkholderia*, though several other genera also existed in the community. This genus contains members that are human pathogens, plant pathogens, plant symbionts, as well as fungal symbionts²⁸. They are common soil inhabitants but their distribution is strongly affected by soil pH^{29,30}. A number of studies also demonstrated that members of this genus have also formed symbiotic relationships with many insect species^{31,32}, including a very tight association with the bean bug *Riptortus pedestris*³³. A related study suggested the symbiotic *Burkholderia* was environmentally transmitted to the host *R. pedestris*³⁴. These studies, together with the finding from our study that termite cellulose-degrading microbiota is strongly influenced by that of soil, suggest members of *Burkholderia* in the Termite_AX sample might have come from the soil, while their absence in the termite and soil samples of the East Wood site may be explained by different pH of the soil and historical processes. This genus has also been recognized to have tremendous biotechnological potential to produce a large variety of commercially important hydrolytic enzymes and bioactive substances^{28,35,36}.

In the two cellulose cultures of the termite and soil samples from the East Wood site, *Dyella* emerged as the most dominant group at the genus level (with 36% and 28% relative abundance in the two samples, respectively). Various species of this genus, in the class of Gamma-proteobacteria, have been isolated from soil in a variety of habitats^{37–42}. Members of this genus were also discovered from the lower termite species *R. speratus*⁴³, as well as wood-feeding huhu beetle *Prionoplus reticularis*⁴⁴. The discovery of *Dyella* species in a variety of soil habitats, termite gut, and wood-feeding beetles strongly suggest their involvement in cellulosic plant material degradation. In fact, both *Dyella* and *Burkholderia* have been shown to be metabolically active in the wood-feeding huhu beetle⁴⁴.

The other major genera of bacteria found in the termite/soil samples from the East Wood site include *Paenibacillus*, *Ammoniphilus*, *Citrobacter*, and *Fontibacillus*. While *Paenibacillus* (25%) and *Fontibacillus* (8%) were very abundant in the Termite_EW culture, *Ammoniphilus* (26%) and *Citrobacter* (14%) were very prominent in the Soil_EW culture with *Paenibacillus* (5%) taking a minor role. Members of the genus *Paenibacillus* have been isolated from both soil^{45–47} and termite gut^{48,49}. Studies have shown that species produce a variety of enzymes involved in lignocellulose degradation^{50–54}. *Fontibacillus* has been discovered in soil^{55,56} but not in termite before, the discovery of this genus in cellulose culture of termite from the East Wood site represents a new finding. *Citrobacter* has been discovered in soil before⁵⁷ but their role in cellulose degradation was previously unknown. Existing study on *Ammoniphilus* is even rarer, so the discovery of this genus in the soil sample and its involvement in cellulose degradation probably was very interesting and deserving further detailed studies.

Our study also identified a core set of bacteria shared by all three cellulose cultures, which includes thirteen members at the genus level (Figure 6, Supplementary Table 1). However, the abundances of individual taxa in the three cultures vary significantly. While the abundance of each taxon in each of the three samples might have been affected by the competition and bias in the PCR process to some degree, their presence across all three cellulose cultures *per se* might be significant. Though, one should be aware that not all the members of the core cellulose-degrading microbiota are equally important, and nor are all of them more important than habitat-specific cellulose-degrading taxa.

The biochemical analyses of the cellulose cultures, however, showed the community of microbes in each of the cultures had worked very efficiently to break down cellulose. The community composition, as well as the major taxa in each sample and shared taxa among the samples, may be useful to develop cellulose-based production of biofuel or other valuable molecules. Upon further studies, the genes/enzymes extracted from these microbes could be used for genetic engineering or directly used for cellulose treatment, a key step in processing cellulose for a variety of biotechnological developments.

Factors influencing cellulose-degrading microbiota composition

The design of this project made possible comparisons in various ways, including uncultured vs. cultured termite gut microbiomes, comparison between different termite colonies, as well as between termite and soil samples collected at the same location. The uncultured termite gut sample contained much higher bacterial diversity than the same sample that had been selectively cultured with cellulose medium, or any cellulose selective culture. This is consistent with the expectation that only a subset of the microbes in the termite gut community actually breaking down cellulosic plant materials. It also highlights the importance to use cellulose selective cultures to identify the cellulose-degrading microbes and separate them from other cohabitants.

Among all the three selective cultures, the soil sample had the highest level of diversity in cellulose-degrading bacteria, higher than both termite gut microbial cultures. This suggests that soil in the natural habitats, as a much larger ecosystem than the termite digestive system, serves as a reservoir of cellulose-degrading bacteria for decomposition and nutrient cycling. This should not be surprising given the vastness, historical continuity, and complexity of the natural forest ecosystems.

The cluster dendrogram, PCA, PCoA analyses all revealed two interesting patterns: (i) the two termite colonies collected at different locations harbored very different communities of cellulose-degrading bacteria; (ii) the termite and soil samples collected from the same location contained very similar compositions of cellulose-degrading bacterial communities. In short, the cellulose-degrading bacterial flora in termite gut was much more similar to that in the soil from the same location than to the other termite colony from a different location. This suggests that the microbiota composition, at least that of cellulose-degrading bacteria, in the gut of the eastern subterranean termite is strongly influenced by its living environment, *i.e.*, soil.

However, previous studies have offered different hypotheses on this question. A comparative study of the microbiota in two higher termite species, the dung-feeding *Amitermes wheeleri* and the wood-feeding *N. corniger*, using a combination of metagenomic and metatranscriptomic analysis suggested the microbial community composition and functional divergence were consistent with the dietary differences of the two species¹³. But a follow-up study of multiple genera of both higher and lower termites in Australia and North America⁷ inferred that vertical inheritance was the primary force shaping termite gut microbiomes based on the observed similarity between the termite phylogeny and the clustering pattern of their gut microbiomes from the analysis when not taking OTU abundance into account. However, when the OTU abundance was taken into consideration, the study did show the correlation between termite phylogeny and their microbiome similarity was reduced, suggesting the role of diet in shaping the termite microbiomes. A separate study¹⁵, however, suggested diet was clearly the primary determinant of bacterial community structure in the guts of higher termites. A related study of six species of higher termites feeding on wood, litter, humus, or soil revealed that the gut microbial community structure was correlated with the corresponding habitat⁵⁸. A third study¹⁴ demonstrated that the bacterial communities changed throughout the life stages of higher termite *Nasutitermes arborum* as a result of dietary changes. The study also suggested that wood-degrading symbionts were gradually introduced in later developmental stages. The present study provides strong evidence that the cellulose-degrading bacterial community in the termite gut has largely been shaped by the one in the soil where subterranean termites live in, though the process to build this functional microbial community may have been gradual.

Conclusions

Our study characterized the whole microbiota from a colony of the eastern subterranean termite (*R. flavipes*) and cellulose-enriched microbiota from the same termite colony, from the soil sample collected at the same site, and a second termite colony collected at a different site. The study demonstrates that the cellulose-enriched microbiota is significantly different from the whole microbiota in the termite digestive system, and indicates the importance to use selective cellulose culture to study the cellulose-degrading microbial community. Comparative analyses of the termite colony with the soil sample collected at the same site and the second termite colony from a different site reveals the termite and soil samples from the same location are much more similar to each other for cellulose-degrading bacteria, revealing the interrelation between the two. Biochemical analyses revealed that the microbial communities in all the three cultures were efficient in degrading cellulose. A core set of cellulose-degrading bacteria has been identified among the three cultured samples, which deserves further and detailed functional study.

Data availability

The 16S rRNA gene marker sequences generated from and used in this study have been deposited with NCBI under accession numbers [SAMN07414062](#) to [SAMN07414065](#).

The raw data for the biochemical analysis of remaining cellulose after the culture is available on OSF: <http://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/RZCBX>⁵⁹

Extended data

Figshare.com: Characterization of cellulose-degrading microbiota from the eastern subterranean termite and soil

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025584>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025614>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025662>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025680>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025689>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025701>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025713>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15025734>

<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.15026853>

This project contains the following underlying data:

- Supplementary Figure 1: Composition of Proteobacteria at the class level in the four samples.
- Supplementary Figure 2: Composition of Firmicutes at the class level in the four samples.
- Supplementary Figure 3: Comparison of the four samples at the class level.
- Supplementary Figure 4: The abundance of each class of at least 1% in each sample. The figure does not include the unclassified classes.
- Supplementary Figure 5: Principal component analysis (PCA) of the four samples.
- Supplementary Figure 6: Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) using the *phyloseq* package based on weighted UniFrac values.
- Supplementary Figure 7: Distribution of the 20 most abundant cellulose-degrading OTUs in each of the cultured samples.
- Supplementary Table 1: Bacterial taxa shared among all three cellulose cultures. The numbers indicate the number of reads found in each sample.
- Supplementary Table 2: Archaeal taxa in all samples. The number indicates the number of read(s) for each taxon.

Data are available under the terms of the [Creative Commons Zero "No rights reserved" data waiver](#) (CC0 1.0 Public domain dedication).

Acknowledgments

Sequencing was performed in the Genomics Core of the Nucleic Acids Research Facilities at the Virginia Commonwealth University.

References

1. Breznak JA: **Phylogenetic diversity and physiology of termite gut spirochetes.** *Integr Comp Biol.* 2002; **42**(2): 313–318.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
2. Hongoh Y, Ohkuma M, Kudo T: **Molecular analysis of bacterial microbiota in the gut of the termite *Reticulitermes speratus* (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae).** *FEMS Microbiol Ecol.* 2003; **44**(2): 231–242.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
3. Hongoh Y, Ekpornprasit L, Inoue T, et al.: **Intracolony variation of bacterial gut microbiota among castes and ages in the fungus-growing termite *Macrotermes gilvus*.** *Mol Ecol.* 2006; **15**(2): 505–516.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
4. Warnecke F, Luginbuhl P, Ivanova N, et al.: **Metagenomic and functional analysis of hindgut microbiota of a wood-feeding higher termite.** *Nature.* 2007; **450**(7169): 560–565.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
5. Boucias DG, Cai Y, Sun Y, et al.: **The hindgut lumen prokaryotic microbiota of the termite *Reticulitermes flavipes* and its responses to dietary lignocellulose composition.** *Mol Ecol.* 2013; **22**(7): 1836–1853.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
6. Otani S, Mikaelyan A, Nobre T, et al.: **Identifying the core microbial community in the gut of fungus-growing termites.** *Mol Ecol.* 2014; **23**(18): 4631–4644.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
7. Abdul Rahman N, Parks DH, Willner DL, et al.: **A molecular survey of Australian and North American termite genera indicates that vertical inheritance is the primary force shaping termite gut microbiomes.** *Microbiome.* 2015; **3**: 5.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
8. Benjamino J, Graf J: **Characterization of the Core and Caste-Specific Microbiota in the Termite, *Reticulitermes flavipes*.** *Front Microbiol.* 2016; **7**: 171.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
9. Li H, Dietrich C, Zhu N, et al.: **Age polyethism drives community structure of the bacterial gut microbiota in the fungus-cultivating termite *Odontotermes formosanus*.** *Environ Microbiol.* 2016; **18**(5): 1440–1451.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
10. Su L, Yang L, Huang S, et al.: **Variation in the Gut Microbiota of Termites (*Termitidae*) Against Different Diets.** *Appl Biochem Biotechnol.* 2017; **181**(1): 32–47.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
11. Peterson BF, Stewart HL, Scharf ME: **Quantification of symbiotic contributions to lower termite lignocellulose digestion using antimicrobial treatments.** *Insect Biochem Mol Biol.* 2015; **59**: 80–88.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
12. Peterson BF, Scharf ME: **Metatranscriptome analysis reveals bacterial symbiont contributions to lower termite physiology and potential immune functions.** *BMC Genomics.* 2016; **17**(1): 772.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
13. He S, Ivanova N, Kirtan E, et al.: **Comparative metagenomic and metatranscriptomic analysis of hindgut paunch microbiota in wood- and dung-feeding higher termites.** *PLoS One.* 2013; **8**(4): e61126.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
14. Diouf M, Roy V, Mora P, et al.: **Profiling the Succession of Bacterial Communities throughout the Life Stages of a Higher Termite *Nasutitermes arborum* (Termitidae, Nasutitermitinae) Using 16S rRNA Gene Pyrosequencing.** *PLoS One.* 2015; **10**(10): e0140014.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
15. Mikaelyan A, Dietrich C, Kohler T, et al.: **Diet is the primary determinant of bacterial community structure in the guts of higher termites.** *Mol Ecol.* 2015; **24**(20): 5284–5295.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
16. Sadasivam S, Manickam A: **Biochemical Methods (2nd edition).** New Delhi, India: New Age International Publishers, 1996.
[Reference Source](#)
17. Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, et al.: **Introducing mothur: open-source, platform-independent, community-supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities.** *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2009; **75**(23): 7537–7541.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
18. Cannone JJ, Subramanian S, Schnare MN, et al.: **The comparative RNA web (CRW) site: an online database of comparative sequence and structure information for ribosomal, intron, and other RNAs.** *BMC Bioinformatics.* 2002; **3**: 2.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
19. Nawrocki EP, Eddy SR: **Infernal 1.1: 100-fold faster RNA homology searches.** *Bioinformatics.* 2013; **29**(22): 2933–2935.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
20. Cole JR, Wang Q, Fish JA, et al.: **Ribosomal Database Project: data and tools for high throughput rRNA analysis.** *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2014; **42**(Database issue): D633–42.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
21. Price MN, Dehal PS, Arkin AP: **FastTree 2--approximately maximum-likelihood trees for large alignments.** *PLoS One.* 2010; **5**(3): e9490.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
22. McMurdie PJ, Holmes S: **phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis and graphics of microbiome census data.** *PLoS One.* 2013; **8**(4): e61217.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
23. Oksanen JF, Blanchet G, Kindt R, et al.: **vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.0-10.** 2013.
[Reference Source](#)
24. Schliep KP: **phangorn: phylogenetic analysis in R.** *Bioinformatics.* 2011; **27**(4): 592–593.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
25. Chen J, Bittinger K, Charlson ES, et al.: **Associating microbiome composition with environmental covariates using generalized UniFrac distances.** *Bioinformatics.* 2012; **28**(16): 2106–2113.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
26. Ondov BD, Bergman NH, Phillippy AM: **Interactive metagenomic visualization in a Web browser.** *BMC Bioinformatics.* 2011; **12**: 385.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
27. Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu D, et al.: **limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies.** *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2015; **43**(7): e47.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
28. Eberl L, Vandamme P: **Members of the genus *Burkholderia*: good and bad guys [version 1; referees: 3 approved].** *F1000Res.* 2016; **5**: F1000 Faculty Rev-1007.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
29. Stopnisek N, Bodenhausen N, Frey B, et al.: **Genus-wide acid tolerance accounts for the biogeographical distribution of soil *Burkholderia* populations.** *Environ Microbiol.* 2014; **16**(6): 1503–1512.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
30. Hall CM, Busch JD, Shippy K, et al.: **Diverse *Burkholderia* Species Isolated from Soils in the Southern United States with No Evidence of *B. pseudomallei*.** *PLoS One.* 2015; **10**(11): e0143254.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
31. Santos AV, Dillon RJ, Dillon VM, et al.: **Occurrence of the antibiotic producing bacterium *Burkholderia* sp. in colonies of the leaf-cutting ant *Atta sexdens rubropilosa*.** *FEMS Microbiol Lett.* 2004; **239**(2): 319–323.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
32. Kikuchi Y, Hosokawa T, Fukatsu T: **An ancient but promiscuous host-symbiont association between *Burkholderia* gut symbionts and their heteropteran hosts.** *ISME J.* 2011; **5**(3): 446–460.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
33. Kikuchi Y, Meng XY, Fukatsu T: **Gut symbiotic bacteria of the genus *Burkholderia* in the broad-headed bugs *Riptortus clavatus* and *Leptocoris chinensis* (Heteroptera: Alydidae).** *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2005; **71**(7): 4035–4043.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
34. Kikuchi Y, Yumoto I: **Efficient colonization of the bean bug *Riptortus pedestris* by an environmentally transmitted *Burkholderia* symbiont.** *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2013; **79**(6): 2088–2091.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
35. Mohana S, Shah A, Divecha J, et al.: **Xylanase production by *Burkholderia* sp. DMAX strain under solid state fermentation using distillery spent wash.** *Bioresour Technol.* 2008; **99**(16): 7553–7564.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
36. Raposo RS, de Almeida MC, de Oliveira MD, et al.: **A *Burkholderia sacchari* cell factory: production of poly-3-hydroxybutyrate, xylitol and xylonic acid from xylose-rich sugar mixtures.** *N Biotechnol.* 2017; **34**: 12–22.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
37. Xie CH, Yokota A: ***Dyella japonica* gen. nov., sp. nov., a gamma-proteobacterium isolated from soil.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2005; **55**(Pt 2): 753–756.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
38. Kim BY, Weon HY, Lee KH, et al.: ***Dyella yeajuensis* sp. nov., isolated from greenhouse soil in Korea.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2006; **56**(Pt 9): 2079–2082.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
39. Jung HM, Ten LN, Kim KH, et al.: ***Dyella ginsengisoli* sp. nov., isolated from soil of a ginseng field in South Korea.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2009; **59**(Pt 3): 460–465.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
40. Son HM, Yang JE, Yi EJ, et al.: ***Dyella kyungheensis* sp. nov., isolated from soil of a cornus fruit field.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2013; **63**(Pt 10): 3807–3811.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
41. Chen MH, Lv YY, Wang J, et al.: ***Dyella humi* sp. nov., isolated from forest soil.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2016; **66**(11): 4372–4376.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
42. Chen MH, Xia F, Lv YY, et al.: ***Dyella acidisoli* sp. nov., *D. flagellata* sp. nov. and**

- D. nitratireducens* sp. nov., isolated from forest soil.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2017; **67**(3): 736–743.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
43. Cho MJ, Kim YH, Shin K, et al.: **Symbiotic adaptation of bacteria in the gut of *Reticulitermes speratus*: low endo-beta-1,4-glucanase activity.** *Biochem Biophys Res Commun.* 2010; **395**(3): 432–435.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 44. Reid NM, Addison SL, Macdonald LJ, et al.: **Biodiversity of active and inactive bacteria in the gut flora of wood-feeding huhu beetle larvae (*Prionoplus reticularis*).** *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2011; **77**(19): 7000–7006.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
 45. Cho SJ, Cho SH, Kim TS, et al.: ***Paenibacillus insulae* sp. nov., isolated from soil.** *J Microbiol.* 2015; **53**(9): 588–591.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 46. Sun Y, Guo Z, Zhao Q, et al.: ***Paenibacillus ripae* sp. nov., isolated from bank side soil.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2015; **65**(12): 4757–4762.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 47. Huang Z, Dai W, Zhou Z, et al.: ***Paenibacillus terreus* sp. nov., isolated from forest soil.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2016; **66**(1): 243–247.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 48. Ohkuma M, Yuki M, Oshima K, et al.: **Draft Genome Sequence of the Alkaliphilic and Xylanolytic *Paenibacillus* sp. Strain JCM 10914, Isolated from the Gut of a Soil-Feeding Termite.** *Genome Announc.* 2014; **2**(1): pii: e01144-13.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
 49. Wang XM, Ma S, Yang SY, et al.: ***Paenibacillus nasutitermitis* sp. nov., isolated from a termite gut.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2016; **66**(2): 901–905.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 50. Adlakha N, Yazdani SS: **Efficient production of (R,R)-2,3-butanediol from cellulosic hydrolysate using *Paenibacillus polymyxa* ICGEB2008.** *J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol.* 2015; **42**(1): 21–28.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 51. Hu D, Ju X, Li L, et al.: **Improved *in situ* saccharification of cellulose pretreated by dimethyl sulfoxide/ionic liquid using cellulase from a newly isolated *Paenibacillus* sp. LLZ1.** *Bioresour Technol.* 2016; **201**: 8–14.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 52. Itoh T, Hibi T, Suzuki F, et al.: **Crystal Structure of Chitinase ChiW from *Paenibacillus* sp. str. FPU-7 Reveals a Novel Type of Bacterial Cell-Surface-Expressed Multi-Modular Enzyme Machinery.** *PLoS One.* 2016; **11**(12): e0167310.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
 53. Baramée S, Teeravivattanakit T, Phitsuwan P, et al.: **A novel GH6 cellobiohydrolase from *Paenibacillus curdolanolyticus* B-6 and its synergistic action on cellulose degradation.** *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol.* 2017; **101**(3): 1175–1188.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 54. Sermsathanaswadi J, Baramée S, Tachaapaikoon C, et al.: **The family 22 carbohydrate-binding module of bifunctional xylanase/beta-glucanase Xyn10E from *Paenibacillus curdolanolyticus* B-6 has an important role in lignocellulose degradation.** *Enzyme Microb Technol.* 2017; **96**: 75–84.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 55. Lee KC, Kim KK, Eom MK, et al.: ***Fontibacillus panacisegetis* sp. nov., isolated from soil of a ginseng field.** *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* 2011; **61**(Pt 2): 369–374.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 56. Bektas KI, Belduz AO, Guvenmez HK, et al.: ***Fontibacillus pullulanilyticus* sp. nov. isolated from soil.** *J Basic Microbiol.* 2016; **56**(8): 857–863.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 57. Albaser A, Kazana E, Bennett MH, et al.: **Discovery of a Bacterial Glycoside Hydrolase Family 3 (GH3) β -Glucosidase with Myrosinase Activity from a *Citrobacter* Strain Isolated from Soil.** *J Agric Food Chem.* 2016; **64**(7): 1520–1527.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 58. Rossmassler K, Dietrich C, Thompson C, et al.: **Metagenomic analysis of the microbiota in the highly compartmented hindguts of six wood- or soil-feeding higher termites.** *Microbiome.* 2015; **3**: 56.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
 59. Xie X: **Characterization of Cellulose-Degrading Microbiota from The Eastern Subterranean Termite and Soil.** *Open Science Framework.* 2017.
<http://www.doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/RZC8X>

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status: ? ✖

Version 2

Reviewer Report 28 September 2021

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.31364.r91136>

© 2021 Huang X. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Xing-Feng Huang

Department of Chemical & Biological Engineering, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

Thanks to the authors for addressing my previous comments. However, I still could not find the replicates information in the modified version which was my major concern. Please provide in the materials and methods section if I missed it. Thanks.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.

Version 1

Reviewer Report 12 December 2018

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.14262.r40805>

© 2018 Huang X. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Xing-Feng Huang

Department of Chemical & Biological Engineering, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA

This study has offered some potential values on characterization of cellulose-degrading microbiota from termite guts and soil.

However, it lacks the basics of experimental design. Two termites were selected, but only one soil sample was included, and also only one termite gut sample was included. The major issue was no replicates (biological and technical) in this study. All results, discussion, and conclusion were from one sample which does not make much sense in a scientific publication. I doubt about how much the conclusion was reliable based on 1 data point from each sample.

Therefore, I do not think this manuscript can be indexed as a research paper.

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Partly

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

No

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

Partly

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

No

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.

Author Response 09 Dec 2020

Xianfa Xie, Virginia State University, Petersburg, USA

Thanks for your comments. Sorry if the experimental design was not very clear to you in the original manuscript. An explicit explanation of the experimental design has been added to the revised manuscript, together with a new figure (Figure 1) to explain this design. Hopefully this has addressed your original concern.

Competing Interests: No competing interest.

Reviewer Report 05 November 2018

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.14262.r40167>

© 2018 Rajarapu S. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Swapna Priya Rajarapu

Department of Entomology, OARDC (Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center), Ohio State University, Wooster, OH, USA

Overview: The authors test the hypothesis that there is a relationship between the cellulose degrading bacteria in soil and ground dwelling termites such as eastern subterranean termite, *Reticulitermes flavipes*. The authors study the cellulose degrading bacterial profiles in two termite colonies and the soil samples corresponding to one of the colony. Microbiota groups present in the samples were identified using 16S rRNA bacterial marker. Results supported the hypothesis that there is a tight correlation between the cellulose degrading bacteria in soil and termite gut. Also, there was a significant difference between the bacterial profiles between two different termite colonies.

Overall comments: Authors fail to describe the rationale for the experimental design. Particularly, the reason for sampling soil from only one termite colony but not two is not explained well. If the differences between the two termite colonies are attributed to the difference in the soil where the colony exists, then sampling the soil sample from the second colony would have provided clear evidence. Moreover, the experimental design is not balanced. Why wasn't the termite-AX colony uncultured gut extract sequenced with 16S rRNA? Would the authors expect the uncultured termite guts from both the colonies cluster together? Authors also did not refer to the *R. flavipes* bacterial studies performed earlier in the following 2 citations ¹ - ².

A comparison of the microbial groups to these studies would be insightful as the termites used in the above mentioned studies used lab reared colonies. By addressing the above concerns the article will be complete and much stronger.

References

1. Peterson BF, Stewart HL, Scharf ME: Quantification of symbiotic contributions to lower termite lignocellulose digestion using antimicrobial treatments. *Insect Biochem Mol Biol*. 2015; **59**: 80-8 [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
2. Peterson B, Scharf M: Metatranscriptome analysis reveals bacterial symbiont contributions to lower termite physiology and potential immune functions. *BMC Genomics*. 2016; **17** (1). [Publisher Full Text](#)

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Partly

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Partly

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 17 Jan 2022

Xianfa Xie, Virginia State University, Petersburg, USA

Thanks for your comments. Sorry if the experimental design was not very clear to you in the original manuscript. An explicit explanation of the experimental design has been added to the revised manuscript, together with a new figure (Figure 1) to explain this design. We have also included the two references you suggested in the revision. Hopefully this has addressed your original concerns.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

The benefits of publishing with F1000Research:

- Your article is published within days, with no editorial bias
- You can publish traditional articles, null/negative results, case reports, data notes and more
- The peer review process is transparent and collaborative
- Your article is indexed in PubMed after passing peer review
- Dedicated customer support at every stage

For pre-submission enquiries, contact research@f1000.com

F1000Research