

Microbial communities associated with mounds of the Orange-footed scrubfowl *Megapodius reinwardt*

Karla Cardenas Gomez, Alea Rose, Karen Susanne Gibb and Keith A. Christian

Research Institute for the Environment and Livelihoods, Charles Darwin University, Darwin, Northern Territory, Australia

ABSTRACT

Megapodius reinwardt, the orange-footed scrubfowl, belongs to a small family of birds that inhabits the Indo-Australian region. Megapodes are unique in incubating their eggs in mounds using heat from microbial decomposition of organic materials and solar radiation. Little is known about the microorganisms involved in the decomposition of organic matter in mounds. To determine the source of microbes in the mounds, we used 16S and 18S rRNA gene sequencing to characterize the microbial communities of mound soil, adjacent soil and scrubfowl faeces. We found that the microbial communities of scrubfowl faeces were substantially different from those of the mounds and surrounding soils, suggesting that scrubfowls probably do not use their faeces to inoculate their mounds although a few microbial sequence variants were present in both faeces and mound samples. Further, the mound microbial community structure was significantly different to the adjacent soils. For example, mounds had a high relative abundance of sequence variants belonging to *Thermomonosporaceae*, a thermophilic soil bacteria family able to degrade cellulose from plant residues. It is not clear whether members of *Thermomonosporaceae* disproportionately contribute to the generation of heat in the mound, or whether they simply thrive in the warm mound environment created by the metabolic activity of the mound microbial community. The lack of clarity in the literature between designations of heat-producing (thermogenic) and heat-thriving (thermophilic) microbes poses a challenge to understanding the role of specific bacteria and fungi in incubation.

Submitted 24 November 2021

Accepted 26 May 2022

Published 25 July 2022

Corresponding author

Keith A. Christian,

Keith.Christian@cdu.edu.au

Academic editor

Xavier Harrison

Additional Information and
Declarations can be found on
page 13

DOI [10.7717/peerj.13600](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13600)

© Copyright

2022 Cardenas Gomez et al.

Distributed under

Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

OPEN ACCESS

Subjects Ecology, Microbiology, Molecular Biology

Keywords Orange-footed Scrubfowl, Megapode, Mound, Microbial communities, Soil microbes, *Thermomonosporaceae*, Thermogenesis

INTRODUCTION

The orange-footed scrubfowl (*Megapodius reinwardt*) belongs to the small family of birds *Megapodiidae* that inhabits tropical and subtropical monsoon rainforests, mangrove forests, beach forests, and savannah woodlands of the Indo-Australian region (Jones & Göth, 2008; Jones, Dekker & Roselaar, 1995; Monk, De Fretes & Reksodiharjo-Lilley, 1997; Pattiselanno & Arobaya, 2014; Sinclair, 2002; White, 1998). Unlike other birds, members of this family incubate their eggs by burying them in soil, often associated with mounds of

decaying organic material (Frith, 1956; Jones & Göth, 2008; Sinclair, 2002), beach sands or volcanically heated soils (Crome & Brown, 1979; Frith, 1956).

In Australia, the orange-footed scrubfowl has adapted to live successfully among humans in urban areas where scrubby vegetation is abundant (Jones, 2014). Their mounds are volcano shaped structures of various sizes but reaching heights over 3 m and weights of five tonnes (Banfield, 1912; Harris et al., 2014). Their composition depends upon location: near beaches, mounds tend to have a high proportion of sand mixed with a small proportion of leaf litter (Palmer, Christian & Fisher, 2000; Wiles & Conry, 2001); in areas with heavier clay-type soils, mounds have a higher volume of leaf litter and a small proportion of soil (Crome & Brown, 1979).

After eggs are laid inside chambers up to half a metre within the mounds (Harris et al., 2014), the female checks the temperature and then covers the mound with abundant leaf litter (Crome & Brown, 1979; Imansyah et al., 2009). Mound maintenance is shared between the female and male, occasionally several pairs use a single mound simultaneously (Crome & Brown, 1979; Jones, Dekker & Roselaar, 1995). The parents return to maintain the same mound over several years by adding new materials and increasing the size of the mound (Crome & Brown, 1979; Frith, 1956; Palmer, Christian & Fisher, 2000). Some mounds have been recorded in continual use over 40 years (Banfield, 1912; Jones, Dekker & Roselaar, 1995; Palmer, Christian & Fisher, 2000). Twelve to thirteen eggs are laid individually at intervals of approximately 13 days during a breeding season (Crome & Brown, 1979).

The heat required for incubation in the mounds results from a combination of solar radiation and microbial decomposition of organic materials (Frith, 1956; Harris et al., 2014; Jones & Birks, 1992; Jones, 2014; Palmer, Christian & Fisher, 2000; Pattiselanno & Arobaya, 2014; Seymour & Ackerman, 1980; Sinclair, 2002). Adequate levels of moisture are essential for microbial activity, however, excess water can result in a quick decomposition of leaf litter and a subsequent mound collapse (Booth & Seymour, 1984; Frith, 1956; Palmer, Christian & Fisher, 2000; Seymour, 1995; Seymour & Bradford, 1992). Factors driven by microbial activity such as temperature and gas levels play a pivotal role during the incubation period (Seymour & Bradford, 1992).

Temperatures exceeding 70 °C can be produced by microbes in organic mulches, hay, and manure in a process historically termed “microbial thermogenesis” (Bartholomew & Norman, 1953; Brock, 2012; Wedberg & Rettger, 1941). Microbes can be categorised as being mesophilic (thriving in moderately warm temperatures) or thermophilic (thriving in extremely warm environments, including up to ~70 °C) (Beffa et al., 1996), but the latter term is sometimes used more broadly to include the mesophilic temperature range. Little is known about the species of microorganisms involved in the generation of heat associated with organic material decomposition in scrubfowl mounds, and it is unclear how microbial communities related to incubation become established in the mound. The generation of heat by microbes in the mound may simply be a by-product of general microbial decomposition, or it may be dependent on the presence of specialist thermogenic microorganisms.

If specialist heat-producing microbes are required for the generation of heat, then this raises questions about the source of these microbes and how a new mound becomes inoculated with the appropriate microbes. Animals exchange microorganisms with their immediate surroundings, including nests, hollows and burrows (Brandl *et al.*, 2014; Goodenough & Stallwood, 2012; Koller, Dworschak & Abed-Navandi, 2006). Bacterial assemblages in nest materials of the reed warbler (*Acrocephalus scirpaceus*) have some overlaps regarding bacteria species with nestling faeces, suggesting that a certain amount of bacterial transmission from bird faeces to nesting materials is likely to occur (Brandl *et al.*, 2014). Alternatively, the source of microbes in the mound may simply be the soil that the birds routinely scratch onto the mound from the surrounding shallow soil.

To investigate the source of microbes in the mounds we used 16S and 18S rRNA gene sequencing to describe the bacteria and fungi communities associated with mounds, soil around mounds and scrubfowl faeces. We tested two hypotheses related to the source of microbes in the mound: (1) scrubfowls inoculate their mounds with thermogenic microbes found in their faeces, and (2) the microbial composition of mounds is similar to that of the surrounding shallow soil.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Types of samples, locations and sampling scheme

The samples were collected from the vicinity of four different mounds (labeled as A, B, C and D) located in the urban area of Darwin, Northern Territory, Australia on a single day in February 2019. The sampling scheme and collection method were approved by the Animal Ethics Committee of Charles Darwin University (project number: A19002) and by the Parks and Wildlife Commission of the Northern Territory, Australia (field study approval number: 64780). The four mounds were located within 1.0 km of each other. Two mounds (A and B) were located on the Charles Darwin University campus (<200 m apart), and the other two (<200 m apart) were located in an adjacent residential area. The samples (approximately 50 g) were collected <24 h prior to DNA extraction. We collected four types of samples: mound soil, deep soil, shallow soil and scrubfowl faeces. Mound soil was collected at a depth of 30 cm to replicate the depth of holes commonly dug in the mounds by birds, and to minimize litter or surface soil contamination (three samples per mound, thus $N = 12$), shallow soil was collected 2 m from the mounds at a depth of approximately 2–5 cm (3 samples per mound, thus $N = 12$), deep soil was only collected 2 m from mound C from a depth of 30 cm ($N = 3$) and scrubfowl faeces were collected from footpaths to reduce the mixing of faeces and soil ($N = 6$). The replicate samples were extracted, sequenced and analysed individually. Although the faecal samples were collected near mounds A, B and C, it was not possible to determine if these samples originated from the birds associated with the respective mounds.

DNA extraction

DNA was extracted from samples using the Qiagen DNeasy PowerSoil Kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA), following the manufacturers protocol without modifications.

16S and 18S rRNA sequencing and data processing

We sent ten nanograms of DNA per sample to the Australian Centre for Ecogenomics (ACE) for sequencing the 16S and 18S rRNA genes on an Illumina MiSeq following the manufacturer's guidelines. Primers 515-F (GTGYCAGCMGCCGCGGTAA) and 806-R (GGACTACNVGGGTWTCTAAT) (Apprill *et al.*, 2015; Parada, Needham & Fuhrman, 2016) amplified the 16S rRNA gene, while ITS3-F (GCATCGATGAAGAACGCAGC) and ITS4-R (TCCTCCGCTTATTRATATGC) (White, Nagarajan & Pop, 2009) amplified the 18S rRNA gene. ACE processed the sequences to sequence variants (SVs) using the following pipeline. Poor quality sequences (<15 bases) were removed from the reads with Trimmomatic software (Bolger, Lohse & Usadel, 2014), then hard trimmed to 250 bases. Reads were converted to SVs using the QIIME-2 workflow with default parameters and the DADA-2 algorithm (Callahan *et al.*, 2016; Caporaso *et al.*, 2010). SVs were assigned taxonomy through BLAST+ using the reference databases SILVA (Quast *et al.*, 2013) for 16S, and UNITE (Kõljalg *et al.*, 2013) for the 18S data. SVs were removed if they occurred in <1% of samples or contained fewer sequences than 0.01% of the total sequence abundance. Additionally, sequences were excluded if they were not classified as bacteria or Archaea (16S dataset) or fungi (18S dataset). All sequences were rarefied to the lowest common sequence number per sample using a threshold of 10,000 for the 16S and 5,000 for the 18S datasets. Similar to (Epstein *et al.*, 2021), we compared the nMDS outputs for the rarefied and unrarefied datasets and found that rarefying did not change the output (*e.g.* 16S stress of unrarefied data = 0.11 compared to 0.1 for rarefied data). Rarefaction resulted in the removal of two faecal samples and one sample from mound soil from the 16S dataset, and three faecal samples from the 18S. Raw data files in FASTQ format were deposited in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive under BioProject ID [PRJNA806506](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/PRJNA806506) and project information is accessible through this NCBI project link.

Data analysis

The two datasets (16S for bacterial and 18S for fungal taxa) were analysed in R (version 3.2.2) (R Core Team, 2017) and Primer -7 (Clarke & Gorley, 2015) by permutational MANOVA (PERMANOVA; 999 permutations) with the sampled mound locations (A, B, C and D) as the fixed factors within the four sample categories (faeces, soil from mounds, shallow and deep soil). Alpha diversity was examined between the four sample categories and a Bray Curtis distance matrix was calculated and visualized by a nonmetric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) graph using the *phyloseq* package (McMurdie & Holmes, 2013). Bacterial and fungal phyla with a relative abundance higher than 1% across all samples were viewed in taxa plots. For both fungal and bacterial communities, we calculated the contribution of each species (%) to the dissimilarity between mound and shallow soil (SIMPER analysis) and also compared samples pairwise. The relative abundances of bacterial and fungal taxa for each sample category and location were visualised in shade plots.




Figure 1 Taxa plot. Percentage of contribution of each bacterial (A) and fungal (B) phylum for each sample category (mound, shallow soil, deep soil, faeces). Taxa shown are those that contributed to greater than one percent of all samples. [Full-size !\[\]\(b345a1c4255362eec3746050dd71ccac_img.jpg\) DOI: 10.7717/peerj.13600/fig-1](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13600/fig-1)

RESULTS

Microbial composition and diversity

Microbial composition of the mounds is broadly illustrated at the level of phyla in [Fig. 1](#). A total of 17,736 bacterial and 1,887 fungal SVs were identified in this study. The bacterial and fungal alpha diversity for mound soil, shallow soil, deep soil and faeces in every mound location is represented by the Shannon index ([Table 1](#)). The highest bacteria diversity was in shallow soil near mound C (7.58 ± 0.18) and the lowest in faeces from the same location (3.30 ± 0.75). The highest fungal alpha diversity was in shallow soil near mound A (4.83 ± 0.36), whereas the lowest was in deep soil near mound C (2.36 ± 1.76). Alpha diversity and P values across sample categories are shown in [Tables S1](#) and [S2](#), [Fig. S1](#).

Comparisons of microbial communities

The sample sizes for mound soil and shallow soil were sufficiently large to allow a statistical comparison of the replicates of these soil categories. “PermDISP” is a permutational distance-based test for homogeneity among the replicates within the locations, and this statistic was not significantly different among replicate samples of mound soil for either bacteria ($p = 0.07$) or fungi ($p = 0.99$) ([Table S3](#)). However, there was a significant

Table 1 Shannon's alpha diversity.

Sample	Bacteria mean \pm SD (N)	Fungi mean \pm SD (N)
Mound_A	6.40 \pm 0.37 (3)	4.23 \pm 1.05 (3)
Mound_B	6.35 \pm 0.27 (3)	4.30 \pm 1.03 (3)
Mound_C	5.97 \pm 1.52 (3)	3.49 \pm 1.46 (3)
Mound_D	7.36 \pm 0.23 (3)	4.06 \pm 0.44 (3)
Shallow_Soil_A	6.02 \pm 0.04 (3)	4.83 \pm 0.36 (3)
Shallow_Soil_B	6.22 \pm 0.12 (3)	4.00 \pm 1.31 (3)
Shallow_Soil_C	7.58 \pm 0.18 (3)	3.97 \pm 0.55 (3)
Shallow_Soil_D	6.67 \pm 0.25 (3)	4.41 \pm 0.37 (3)
Deep_Soil_C	6.64 \pm 0.12 (3)	2.36 \pm 1.76 (3)
Faeces_A	4.63 \pm 0.38 (2)	3.21 \pm 0.43 (2)
Faeces_B	3.50 \pm – (1)	2.79 \pm – (1)
Faeces_C	3.30 \pm 0.75 (3)	2.79 \pm 0.57 (3)

Note:

Average (\pm one standard deviation) Shannon's alpha diversity for the bacterial and fungal taxa sampled at each mound location (labelled A–D) from each sample category (mound, shallow soil, deep soil, faeces). SD = standard deviation.

difference in microbial communities among replicate samples of shallow soil for both bacteria ($p < 0.01$) and fungi ($p < 0.001$) (Table S4).

An nMDS (Fig. 2) illustrates how bacterial and fungal communities differed between mounds A–D for faeces, soil from the mounds and shallow and deep soils. Bacterial and fungal communities of faeces did not cluster with any other type of sample in any mound location. The PERMANOVA showed that there were significant differences among all sample categories and locations for both fungal and bacterial communities ($p = 0.001$ for both bacterial and fungal samples; Tables 2 and 3). Given that the faecal samples did not cluster with any other sample category, this type of sample was excluded from further statistical analysis including the pairwise tests.

The shade plots (Figs. 3 and 4) show the microbial composition at the lowest possible taxonomic resolution in each sample category and mound location. Bacteria communities of soil from mounds, deep and shallow soils had substantial overlaps in bacteria composition, but these soil categories had much less overlap with the faecal samples (Fig. 3). The SVs with the highest relative abundance among the soil categories belonged to the bacteria families *Solirubrobacteraceae*, *Acidothermaceae*, *Bacillaceae* and *Nitrososphaeraceae*. Soils from the four mounds had a relatively high abundance of SVs belonging to the bacteria family *Thermomonosporaceae*, SVs from this family were in lower quantities in shallow and deep soils. SVs belonging to the family *Pyrinomonadaceae* had a relatively high abundance in shallow soil and were absent in the rest of sample categories. Deep soil contained a high abundance of SVs belonging to uncultured *Choloflexi* and *Gaiellales* families. Faeces contained a relatively high abundance of SVs of the bacteria families *Enterobacteriaceae*, *Peptostreptococcaceae* and *Diplorickettsiaceae*, SVs from these families were absent in the other sample categories.




Figure 2 Non-metric Multidimensional scaling (nMDS) graph. Unrarefied bacterial (A) and fungal (B) communities sampled at each mound location (labelled A–D) from each sample category (mound, shallow soil, deep soil, faeces). Bacterial community stress = 0.1, and fungal community stress = 0.18. Number of dimensions for each nMDS graph = 2, $N = 30$. [Full-size !\[\]\(fcc3264021d438d9732560e78099f674_img.jpg\) DOI: 10.7717/peerj.13600/fig-2](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13600/fig-2)

Fungal communities of mounds and adjacent shallow soils overlapped at all mound locations (Fig. 4). SVs belonging to the fungal families *Aspergillaceae*, *Nectriaceae*, *Didymosphaeriaceae*, *Chaetomiaceae*, *Savoryellaceae* and the order Pleosporales had a relatively high abundance in these two sample categories. Fungal communities in deep soil

Table 2 PERMANOVA analysis testing differences in bacterial taxa between sample categories.

a) Mains test				
Factor PERMANOVA	Pseudo-F (df)	ECV	P value	PermDISP P value
Location	3.4 (3)	27.8	0.001	>0.05
Sample category (location)	2.7 (7)	38.1	0.001	<0.05
b) Pairwise tests				
Groups	t (df)	P value	Permutations	
Location				
A, B	1.9 (8)	<0.01	986	
A, C	2.2 (7)	<0.01	988	
A, D	2.0 (8)	<0.01	985	
B, C	1.6 (7)	<0.01	988	
B, D	1.9 (8)	<0.01	985	
C, D	1.9 (7)	<0.01	977	
Sample category				
Mound, shallow soil	1.6 (21)	<0.01	998	
Mound, deep soil	1.7 (12)	<0.05	348	
Shallow soil, deep soil	1.6 (13)	0.001	401	

Note:

The sample categories (mound, shallow soil, deep soil, faeces) were fixed in the sampled mound locations (labelled A–D). (a) mains test. (b) pairwise tests. “df” degrees of freedom, “ECV” square root of estimates of components of variation indicating the size of the effect due to that factor as average % SV dissimilarity (residual ECV 47.0). P value is based on >995 unique permutations; “PermDISP” permutational distance-based test for homogeneity of multivariate dispersions for main factors.

contained a relatively high abundance of SVs belonging to the family *Venturiaceae*, but this was absent in the other sample categories. Faeces contained relatively high abundance of SVs of the fungal families *Pleosporaceae*, *Nectriaceae*, *Aurebasidiaceae* and the orders Hypocreales and Pezizales, SVs from these families and orders had a relatively low abundance in the other sample categories.

DISCUSSION

We found that the replicate samples of mound soil were homogeneous (Table S3), but the replicate samples of shallow soil were heterogeneous (Table S4). Heterogeneity among soil samples is common, reflecting the complex and extremely variable physical and compositional differences in soil, even among samples taken from close proximity (Brockman & Murray, 1997; Nunan, 2017). The homogeneity among the samples taken from the mound likely reflects the frequent and thorough mixing of the soil by the birds. We also found that the microbial communities of scrubfowl faeces differed significantly in composition from those of the mounds and surrounding shallow and deep soils. However, faeces and soil from the mounds had slight overlaps in bacterial composition. SVs belonging to the families *Solirubrobacteriaceae*, *Bacillaceae* and *Thermomonosporaceae* that were in high relative abundance in mounds, were in very low relative abundance in faeces. The SVs with the highest relative abundance detected in scrubfowl faeces corresponded to common intestinal microflora of wild birds. Members of

Table 3 PERMANOVA analysis testing differences in fungal taxa between sample categories.

a) Mains test				
Factor PERMANOVA	Pseudo-F (df)	ECV	P value	PermDISP P value
Location	2.1 (3)	22.4	0.001	0.01
Soil category (Location)	2.2 (6)	34.0	0.001	0.01
b) Pairwise tests				
Groups	t (df)	P value	Permutations	
Location				
A, B	1.9 (10)	<0.01	412	
A, C	1.9 (10)	<0.01	401	
A, D	1.8 (10)	<0.01	395	
B, C	1.6 (10)	<0.01	416	
B, D	1.6 (10)	<0.01	404	
C, D	1.5 (10)	<0.01	401	
Sample category				
Mound, Shallow soil	1.4 (22)	0.001	994	
Mound, Deep soil	1.3 (13)	<0.01	405	
Shallow soil, Deep soil	1.2 (13)	<0.05	402	

Note:

The sample categories (mound, shallow soil, deep soil, faeces) were fixed in the sampled mound locations (labelled A–D). (a) mains test. (b) pairwise tests. “df” degrees of freedom, “ECV” square root of estimates of components of variation indicating the size of the effect due to that factor as average % SV dissimilarity (residual ECV 53.8). P value is based on >995 unique permutations; “PermDISP” permutational distance-based test for homogeneity of multivariate dispersions for main factors.

Enterobacteriaceae, *Peptostreptococcaceae*, *Pleosporaceae* and *Aureobasidiaceae* have been previously isolated from the faeces and bills of turkey vultures (*Cathartes aura*) (González-Braojos et al., 2012; Winsor, Bloebaum & Mathewson, 1981), penguins (Dewar et al., 2013), hummingbirds (Lee et al., 2019) rooks (Vlahović et al., 2010) and beaks and cloacas of Mallard ducks (Dynowska, Meissner & Pacyńska, 2013). Although we cannot exclude the possibility that there is some bacteria transmission from the bird faeces to the mound, we do not have direct evidence that they inoculate their mounds with faeces, and any such transmission would only involve a small component of the mound microbiota (Figs. 3 and 4).

With respect to our hypothesis that the microbial composition of mounds is similar to that of the surrounding shallow soil, the PERMANOVA analysis indicated that the structure of the microbial community of the mounds was significantly different to that of the surrounding shallow soil. Nevertheless, the taxa plot (Fig. 1) and shade plots (Figs. 3 and 4) showed that mounds and shallow soils had overlapping microbial composition, indicating that the microbial communities of these sample categories differed in relative abundance rather than in microbial composition. Interestingly, previous studies on microbial communities in nests of mound-building ants demonstrated that bacteria and fungal communities of the nest differed significantly from those of the surrounding soils with respect to both community structure and taxonomic composition (Lindström, Timonen & Sundström, 2021; Lindström et al., 2019). It is possible that the differences in relative abundance between microbial communities of scrubfowl mounds




Figure 3 Relative abundance heat map of the top 50 most abundant bacterial taxa. Sampled at each mound location (labelled A–D) from each sample category (mound, shallow soil, deep soil, faeces). Bacterial SVs are assigned to the family where possible, but if family is not resolved, then SVs are assigned to orders. [Full-size !\[\]\(1663bb69f307a960345edb0e712f8c02_img.jpg\) DOI: 10.7717/peerj.13600/fig-3](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13600/fig-3)

and surrounding soils are related to the increased temperatures resulting from microbial metabolic activity in the mound. Thus, the source of the microbes in the mound is probably the surrounding soil, but the environmental conditions of the mound favour some microbes over others, resulting in a microbial community that is structurally different from the adjacent soil.

Our description of the microbial communities in the different soil categories is consistent with previous studies of microbes in the environment. Members of the families *Solirubrobacteraceae*, *Acidothermaceae*, *Bacillaceae*, *Nitrososphaeraceae*, *Aspergillaceae* and *Nectriaceae* have been isolated from different types of soil samples, including woody substrata, decaying herbaceous material and soil aggregates (Furlong *et al.*, 2002; Horn, 2003; Kerou *et al.*, 2016; Kim *et al.*, 2007; Klich, 2017; Mohagheghi *et al.*, 1986; Rempfert *et al.*, 2017; Rossman *et al.*, 1999; Samuels, 1988; Stenfors Arnesen, Fagerlund & Granum, 2008; Stieglmeier *et al.*, 2014), where some species of these families are involved in fundamental roles, including the cycling of organic matter (Stenfors Arnesen, Fagerlund & Granum, 2008)

wastes (*Kroppensted & M, 2006; Lawrence et al., 1986*). It is possible that members of *Thermomonosporaceae* play a role in heat production in mounds, contributing to the incubation of eggs. One important unanswered question is whether the heat generated through decomposition of organic material in the mound is simply a metabolic product of typical soil microbial metabolism, or if specialist thermogenic microbes are involved. The high abundance of the family *Thermomonosporaceae* in mounds but not in the nearby shallow soil seemingly support a model involving specialist microbes. Nevertheless, the cause and effect relationships are not known because it is not clear whether *Thermomonosporas* and/or other microbes are disproportionately contributing to the generation of metabolic heat, or if they are simply thermophilic and therefore thrive in the warm environment created by other microbes. The fact that most environmental microbes are difficult to culture (*Bodor et al., 2020*) poses a serious challenge to answering this question.

In some organic mulches, successional stages characterised by different microbial communities result in increasingly higher temperatures. Although scrubfowl eggs benefit from a moderately warm mound environment, they would certainly perish if microbial metabolism resulted in temperatures as high as those that routinely occur in some organic mulch mixtures (*Beffa et al., 1996*). The extent to which the behaviour of the adult birds or the dominance of mesophilic microbes act to maintain moderately warm temperatures in the mound without the production of extreme temperatures is unknown. For there to be thermal conditions appropriate for successful incubation, there must be a delicate balance between external environmental conditions, microbial activity within the mound, and the periodic manipulation and excavation of the mound by adults. The relative roles of each of these factors remain unknown.

CONCLUSIONS

We found that the microbial communities of scrubfowl faeces were significantly different from those of the surrounding deep and shallow soils, suggesting that scrubfowls probably do not use their faeces to inoculate their mounds, although a small component of the mound microbiota was also found in faecal samples. The microbial communities of the mound differed significantly from those of the surrounding soils in terms of relative abundance. We speculate that the relative high abundance of the family *Thermomonosporaceae* in mounds compared to its very low relative abundance in surrounding shallow soils might indicate a model of specialist microbes in the mound. Nevertheless, the extent of specialist microbes involved in the production of heat and the complexities of the heat-producing metabolic pathway in scrubfowl mounds remain unknown. Future studies of fungi and bacteria in mounds and surrounding soils using metagenomics and RNA sequencing might help to identify specific metabolic pathways related to the production of heat and the identification of any specialist microbes involved in the process. Further, it is important to study the role of adult bird activity to facilitate the conditions for incubation and the appropriate levels of heat production inside the mounds.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

Funding

This project was funded by the Charles Darwin University “Rainmaker Scheme”. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Grant Disclosures

The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:
Charles Darwin University “Rainmaker Scheme”.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author Contributions

- Karla Cardenas Gomez performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Alea Rose analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Karen Susanne Gibb conceived and designed the experiments, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Keith A Christian conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, collected the samples from the field, and approved the final draft.

Animal Ethics

The following information was supplied relating to ethical approvals (*i.e.*, approving body and any reference numbers):

The Animal Ethics Committee of Charles Darwin University approved the study (project number: A19002).

Field Study Permissions

The following information was supplied relating to field study approvals (*i.e.*, approving body and any reference numbers):

Field experiments were approved by the Parks and Wildlife Commission of the Northern Territory, Australia (field study approval number: 64780).

Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

The sequences are available at GenBank: [PRJNA806506](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/GenBank/PRJNA806506).

Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13600#supplemental-information>.

REFERENCES

- Apprill A, McNally S, Parsons R, Weber L. 2015.** Minor revision to V4 region SSU rRNA 806R gene primer greatly increases detection of SAR11 bacterioplankton. *Aquatic Microbial Ecology* 75(2):129–137 DOI 10.3354/ame01753.
- Banfield E. 1912.** Megapode mounds and pits. *Emu* 12(4):281–283 DOI 10.1071/MU912278f.
- Bartholomew W, Norman A. 1953.** Microbial thermogenesis in the decomposition of plant materials IV: Influence of moisture content and of initial temperature. *Journal of Bacteriology* 65(3):228–232 DOI 10.1128/jb.65.3.228-232.1953.
- Beffa T, Blanc M, Marilley L, Fischer JL, Lyon P-F, Aragno M. 1996.** Taxonomic and metabolic microbial diversity during composting. In: *The Science of Composting*. New York: Springer, 149–161.
- Bodor A, Bounedjoum N, Vincze GE, Kis Á.E, Laczi K, Bende G, Szilágyi Á, Kovács T, Perei K, Rákhely G. 2020.** Challenges of unculturable bacteria: environmental perspectives. *Reviews in Environmental Science and Bio/Technology* 19(1):1–22 DOI 10.1007/s11157-020-09522-4.
- Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014.** Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 30(15):2114–2120 DOI 10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170.
- Booth DT, Seymour RS. 1984.** Effect of adding water to malleefowl mounds during a drought. *Emu-Austral Ornithology* 84:116–118 DOI 10.1071/MU9840116.
- Brandl HB, Van Dongen WF, Darolová A, Křištofík J, Majtan J, Hoi H. 2014.** Composition of bacterial assemblages in different components of Reed warbler nests and a possible role of egg incubation in pathogen regulation. *PLOS ONE* 9(12):e114861 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0114861.
- Brock TD. 2012.** *Thermophilic microorganisms and life at high temperatures*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Brockman FJ, Murray CJ. 1997.** Subsurface microbiological heterogeneity: current knowledge, descriptive approaches and applications. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews* 20(3–4):231–247 DOI 10.1111/j.1574-6976.1997.tb00311.x.
- Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJ, Holmes SP. 2016.** DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nature Methods* 13(7):581–583 DOI 10.1038/nmeth.3869.
- Caporaso JG, Kuczynski J, Stombaugh J, Bittinger K, Bushman FD, Costello EK, Fierer N, Pena AG, Goodrich JK, Gordon JL, Huttley GA, Kelley ST, Knights D, Koenig JE, Ley RE, Lozupone CA, McDonald D, Muegge BD, Pirrung M, Reeder J, Sevinsky JR, Turnbaugh PJ, Walters WA, Widmann J, Yatsunenko T, Zaneveld J, Knight R. 2010.** QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data. *Nature Methods* 7(5):335–336 DOI 10.1038/nmeth.f.303.
- Clarke K, Gorley R. 2015.** *Getting started with PRIMER v7*. Devon: PRIMER-E Ltd.
- Crome F, Brown H. 1979.** Notes on social organization and breeding of the Orange-footed Scrubfowl *Megapodius reinwardt*. *Emu* 79(3):111–119 DOI 10.1071/MU9790111.
- Dewar ML, Arnould JP, Dann P, Trathan P, Groscolas R, Smith S. 2013.** Interspecific variations in the gastrointestinal microbiota in penguins. *Microbiologyopen* 2(1):195–204 DOI 10.1002/mbo3.66.
- Dynowska M, Meissner W, Pacyńska J. 2013.** Mallard duck (*Anas platyrhynchos*) as a potential link in the epidemiological chain mycoses originating from water reservoirs. *Bulletin of the Veterinary Institute in Pulawy* 57(3):323–328 DOI 10.2478/bvip-2013-0056.

- Epstein HE, Hernandez-Agreda A, Starko S, Baum JK, Thurber RV. 2021.** Inconsistent patterns of microbial diversity and composition between highly similar sequencing protocols: a case study with reef-building corals. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **12**:403 DOI [10.3389/fmicb.2021.740932](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2021.740932).
- Frith H. 1956.** Breeding habits in the family *Megapodiidae*. *Ibis* **98**(4):620–640 DOI [10.1111/j.1474-919X.1956.tb01453.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.1956.tb01453.x).
- Furlong MA, Singleton DR, Coleman DC, Whitman WB. 2002.** Molecular and culture-based analyses of prokaryotic communities from an agricultural soil and the burrows and casts of the earthworm *Lumbricus rubellus*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **68**(3):1265–1279 DOI [10.1128/AEM.68.3.1265-1279.2002](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.68.3.1265-1279.2002).
- González-Braojos S, Vela AI, Ruiz-de-Castañeda R, Briones V, Moreno J. 2012.** Sources of variation in enterococci and *Enterobacteriaceae* loads in nestlings of a hole-nesting passerine. *Ardea* **100**(1):71–77 DOI [10.5253/078.100.0111](https://doi.org/10.5253/078.100.0111).
- Goodenough AE, Stallwood B. 2012.** Differences in culturable microbial communities in bird nestboxes according to orientation and influences on offspring quality in great tits (*Parus major*). *Microbial ecology* **63**:986–995 DOI [10.1007/s00248-011-9992-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-011-9992-7).
- Harris RB, Birks SM, Leaché AD, Patten M. 2014.** Incubator birds: biogeographical origins and evolution of underground nesting in megapodes (Galliformes: *Megapodiidae*). *Journal of Biogeography* **41**(11):2045–2056 DOI [10.1111/jbi.12357](https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12357).
- Horn BW. 2003.** Ecology and population biology of aflatoxigenic fungi in soil. *Journal of Toxicology: Toxin Reviews* **22**(2–3):351–379 DOI [10.1081/txr-120024098](https://doi.org/10.1081/txr-120024098).
- Imansyah MJ, Jessop TS, Sumner J, Purwandana D, Ariefiandy A, Seno A. 2009.** Distribution, seasonal use, and predation of incubation mounds of Orange-footed Scrubfowl on Komodo Island, Indonesia. *Journal of Field Ornithology* **80**(2):119–126 DOI [10.1111/j.1557-9263.2009.00213.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1557-9263.2009.00213.x).
- Jeffries P. 1999.** Scleroderma. In: *Ectomycorrhizal Fungi Key Genera in Profile*. New York: Springer, 187–200.
- Jones DN. 2014.** Megapodes in Northern Australia: a summary of recent research on the orange-footed scrubfowl and Australian brush turkey. In: *Proceedings of the Katanning National Malleefowl Forum*. 120–125.
- Jones D, Birks S. 1992.** Megapodes: recent ideas on origins, adaptations and reproduction. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **7**:88–91 DOI [10.1016/0169-5347\(92\)90247-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(92)90247-9).
- Jones DN, Dekker WRJ, Roselaar CS. 1995.** *The megapodes, megapodiidae, bird families of the world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones D, Göth A. 2008.** *Mound-builders*. Clayton: Csiro Publishing.
- Kerou M, Offre P, Valledor L, Abby SS, Melcher M, Nagler M, Weckwerth W, Schleper C. 2016.** Proteomics and comparative genomics of *Nitrososphaera viennensis* reveal the core genome and adaptations of archaeal ammonia oxidizers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **113**(49):E7937–E7946 DOI [10.1073/pnas.1601212113](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1601212113).
- Kim MK, Na JR, Lee TH, Im WT, Soung NK, Yang DC. 2007.** *Solirubrobacter soli* sp. nov., isolated from soil of a ginseng field. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **57**(7):1453–1455 DOI [10.1099/ijs.0.64715-0](https://doi.org/10.1099/ijs.0.64715-0).
- Klich MA. 2017.** Biogeography of *Aspergillus* species in soil and litter. *Mycologia* **94**(1):21–27 DOI [10.1080/15572536.2003.11833245](https://doi.org/10.1080/15572536.2003.11833245).

- Koller H, Dworschak PC, Abed-Navandi D. 2006.** Burrows of *Pestarella tyrrhena* (Decapoda: Thalassinidea): hot spots for Nematoda, Foraminifera and bacterial densities. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* **86**:1113–1122 DOI [10.1017/S0025315406014093](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315406014093).
- Kroppensted MR, M G. 2006.** The family *Thermomonosporaceae*: *Actinocorallia*, *Actinomadura*, *Spirillospora* and *Thermomonospora*. In: Dworkin M, Falkow S, Rosenberg E, Schleifer KH, Stackebrandt E, eds. *The Prokaryotes*. Third Edition. New York: Springer, 682–724.
- Köljalg U, Nilsson RH, Abarenkov K, Tedersoo L, Taylor AF, Bahram M, Bates ST, Bruns TD, Bengtsson-Palme J, Callaghan TM. 2013.** Towards a unified paradigm for sequence-based identification of fungi. *Molecular Ecology* **22**(21):5271–5277 DOI [10.1111/mec.12481](https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12481).
- Lawrence HM, Merivuori H, Sands JA, Pidcock KA. 1986.** Preliminary characterization of bacteriophages infecting the thermophilic actinomycete *Thermomonospora*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **52**(4):631–636 DOI [10.1128/aem.52.4.631-636.1986](https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.52.4.631-636.1986).
- Lee C, Tell LA, Hilfer T, Vannette RL. 2019.** Microbial communities in hummingbird feeders are distinct from floral nectar and influenced by bird visitation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **286**(1898):20182295 DOI [10.1098/rspb.2018.2295](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2295).
- Lindström S, Timonen S, Sundström L. 2021.** The bacterial and fungal community composition in time and space in the nest mounds of the ant *Formica exsecta* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Microbiologyopen* **10**(4):e1201 DOI [10.1002/mbo3.1201](https://doi.org/10.1002/mbo3.1201).
- Lindström S, Timonen S, Sundström L, Johansson H. 2019.** Ants reign over a distinct microbiome in forest soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **139**:107529 DOI [10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.107529](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2019.107529).
- McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. 2013.** phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis and graphics of microbiome census data. *PLOS ONE* **8**(4):e61217 DOI [10.1371/journal.pone.0061217](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061217).
- Mohagheghi A, Grohmann K, Himmel M, Leighton L, Updegraff D. 1986.** Isolation and characterization of *Acidothermus cellulolyticus* gen. nov., a new genus of thermophilic, acidophilic, cellulolytic bacteria. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **36**(3):435–443 DOI [10.1099/00207713-36-3-435](https://doi.org/10.1099/00207713-36-3-435).
- Monk KA, De Fretes Y, Reksodiharjo-Lilley G. 1997.** *Ecology of Nusa Tenggara and Maluku*. Hong Kong: Periplus Editions.
- Nunan N. 2017.** The microbial habitat in soil: scale, heterogeneity and functional consequences. *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science* **180**(4):425–429 DOI [10.1002/jpln.201700184](https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.201700184).
- Palmer C, Christian KA, Fisher A. 2000.** Mound characteristics and behaviour of the orange-footed scrubfowl in the seasonal tropics of Australia. *Emu* **100**(1):54–63 DOI [10.1071/MU9853](https://doi.org/10.1071/MU9853).
- Parada AE, Needham DM, Fuhrman JA. 2016.** Every base matters: assessing small subunit rRNA primers for marine microbiomes with mock communities, time series and global field samples. *Environmental Microbiology* **18**(5):1403–1414 DOI [10.1111/1462-2920.13023](https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.13023).
- Pattiselanno F, Arobaya A. 2014.** Components, ground temperature and status of incubation mounds of *Megapode freycinet* in Rumberpon Island, Indonesia. *Tigerpaper, Regional Quarterly Bulletin on Wildlife and National Parks Management* **41**:15–20.
- Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, Peplies J, Glockner FO. 2013.** The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids Research* **41**(D1):D590–D596 DOI [10.1093/nar/gks1219](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks1219).

- R Core Team.** 2017. A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available at <https://www.r-project.org>.
- Rempfert KR, Miller HM, Bompard N, Nothaft D, Matter JM, Kelemen P, Fierer N, Templeton AS.** 2017. Geological and geochemical controls on subsurface microbial life in the samail ophiolite, Oman. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **8**:56 DOI [10.3389/fmicb.2017.00056](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.00056).
- Riquelme C, Marshall Hathaway JJ, Enes Dapkevicius Mde L, Miller AZ, Kooser A, Northup DE, Jurado V, Fernandez O, Saiz-Jimenez C, Cheeptham N.** 2015. Actinobacterial diversity in volcanic caves and associated geomicrobiological interactions. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **6**(00615):1342 DOI [10.3389/fmicb.2015.01342](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01342).
- Rossmann AY, Samuels GJ, Rogerson CT, Lowen R.** 1999. *Genera of bionectriaceae, hypocreaceae and nectriaceae (hypocreales, ascomycetes)*. Baarn: Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures (CBS).
- Samuels GJ.** 1988. Species of *Nectria* (Ascomycetes, Hypocreales) having orange perithecia and colorless, striate ascospores. *Brittonia* **40**(3):306–331 DOI [10.2307/2807484](https://doi.org/10.2307/2807484).
- Seymour RS.** 1995. Calorimetric investigations on mound-building birds. *Thermochimica Acta* **250**(2):319–328 DOI [10.1016/0040-6031\(94\)02104-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-6031(94)02104-V).
- Seymour RS, Ackerman RA.** 1980. Adaptations to underground nesting in birds and reptiles. *American Zoologist* **20**(2):437–447 DOI [10.1093/icb/20.2.437](https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/20.2.437).
- Seymour RS, Bradford DF.** 1992. Temperature regulation in the incubation mounds of the Australian Brush-turkey. *The Condor* **94**(1):134–150 DOI [10.2307/1368803](https://doi.org/10.2307/1368803).
- Sinclair JR.** 2002. Selection of incubation mound sites by three sympatric megapodes in Papua New Guinea. *The Condor* **104**(2):395–406 DOI [10.1093/condor/104.2.395](https://doi.org/10.1093/condor/104.2.395).
- Spiridonov NA, Wilson DB.** 1998. Regulation of biosynthesis of individual cellulases in *Thermomonospora fusca*. *Journal of Bacteriology* **180**:3529–3532 DOI [10.1128/JB.180.14.3529-3532.1998](https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.180.14.3529-3532.1998).
- Stenfors Arnesen LP, Fagerlund A, Granum PE.** 2008. From soil to gut: *Bacillus cereus* and its food poisoning toxins. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews* **32**(4):579–606 DOI [10.1111/j.1574-6976.2008.00112.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2008.00112.x).
- Stieglmeier M, Klingl A, Alves RJE, Rittmann SKR, Melcher M, Leisch N, Schleper C.** 2014. *Nitrososphaera viennensis* gen. nov., sp. nov., an aerobic and mesophilic, ammonia-oxidizing archaeon from soil and a member of the archaeal phylum *Thaumarchaeota*. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* **64**(Pt_8):2738–2752 DOI [10.1099/ijs.0.063172-0](https://doi.org/10.1099/ijs.0.063172-0).
- Vlahović K, Prukner-Radović E, Horvatek D, Pavlak M, Gomerčić T, Rumiha Z, Dovč A.** 2010. Bacterial and fungal flora in faecal samples from rooks (*Corvus frugilegus*) in the city of Zagreb, Croatia. *Veterinary Archives* **80**:81–92.
- Wedberg SE, Rettger LF.** 1941. Factors influencing microbial thermogenesis. *Journal of Bacteriology* **41**:725–743 DOI [10.1128/jb.41.6.725-743.1941](https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.41.6.725-743.1941).
- White CM.** 1998. Guide to the birds of wallacea: sulawesi, the moluccas and lesser Sunda Islands, Indonesia. *The Auk* **115**(3):811–813 DOI [10.2307/4089438](https://doi.org/10.2307/4089438).
- White JR, Nagarajan N, Pop M.** 2009. Statistical methods for detecting differentially abundant features in clinical metagenomic samples. *PLOS Computational Biology* **5**(4):e1000352 DOI [10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000352](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000352).
- Wiles GJ, Conry PJ.** 2001. Characteristics of nest mounds of Micronesian megapodes in Palau. *Journal of Field Ornithology* **72**:267–275 DOI [10.1648/0273-8570-72.2.267](https://doi.org/10.1648/0273-8570-72.2.267).

- Winsor DK, Bloebaum A, Mathewson JJ. 1981.** Gram-negative, aerobic, enteric pathogens among intestinal microflora of wild turkey vultures (*Cathartes aura*) in west central Texas. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 42:1123–1124 DOI [10.1128/aem.42.6.1123-1124.1981](https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.42.6.1123-1124.1981).
- Yamada T, Sekiguchi Y. 2009.** Cultivation of uncultured *Chloroflexi* subphyla: significance and ecophysiology of formerly uncultured Chloroflexi 'Subphylum I' with natural and biotechnological relevance. *Microbes and Environments* 24(3):205–216 DOI [10.1264/jsme2.me09151s](https://doi.org/10.1264/jsme2.me09151s).