

# Metagenomic Assessment of the Eastern Oyster-Associated Microbiota

Ashvini Chauhan, Denis Wafula,\* Dawn E. Lewis,\* Ashish Pathak

Environmental Biotechnology Laboratory, School of the Environment, FSH Science Research Center, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida, USA

\* Present address: Denis Wafula, College of Pharmacy, the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA; Dawn E. Lewis, Department of Biology, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida, USA.

**Bacteria associated with the Eastern oysters (*Crassostrea virginica*) native to Apalachicola Bay, FL, were investigated using 16S rRNA gene amplicon metagenomic sequencing which revealed that the oyster microbiome was predominated by *Cyanobacteria* and *Proteobacteria*. We also found that the oyster tissues were predominated by the pathogenic and symbiotic *Photobacterium* spp. (formerly known as *Vibrio damsela*).**

Received 11 September 2014 Accepted 16 September 2014 Published 23 October 2014

Citation Chauhan A, Wafula D, Lewis DE, Pathak A. 2014. Metagenomic assessment of the Eastern oyster-associated microbiota. *Genome Announc.* 2(5):e01083-14. doi:10.1128/genomeA.01083-14.

Copyright © 2014 Chauhan et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/).

Address correspondence to Ashvini Chauhan, ashvini.chauhan@famou.edu.

Estuaries in the Gulf of Mexico contribute more than 83% of the total Eastern oysters (*Crassostrea virginica*) harvested in the United States (U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/>). As a keystone species, oysters and their reef assemblages serve as critical habitats for seafood, while also performing ecosystem services such as water filtration and nitrogen sequestration (1–4).

Due to the filter feeding behavior of oysters, marine microorganisms have been found to concentrate within their tissues such that the oyster microbiome differs from the overlying water in both species composition and abundance (5–9). However, previous studies have mostly relied on either culturing the oyster microbiota to study their diversity or focused solely on pathogens such as *Vibrio* spp. The purpose of this study was to utilize next-generation sequencing such that a comprehensive understanding of the bacterial assemblages from within oyster tissues, mantle fluid, gut and the overlying water column can be obtained. Toward this end, oysters were collected from Dry bar (29°40.474N, 085°03.497W), the most productive oyster harvesting reef in Apalachicola Bay, Florida (10). Twenty oysters were collected using a tong along with 1 liter of water from directly above the oyster bed. All samples were stored on ice and transported to Florida A&M University where they were processed the same day as reported in our recent studies (11, 12). In addition to the collection of oyster tissues and mantle fluid, selected oysters were dissected to collect their stomach contents. Metagenomic DNA was extracted from the samples using the PowerSoil DNA Isolation kit (MoBio Laboratories, Inc., Carlsbad, CA, USA). Bar-coding pyrosequencing of the 16S rRNA gene V4 region was performed using the Earth Microbiome Project (EMP) standard protocols (<http://www.earthmicrobiome.org/emp-standard-protocols/>) (13) and sequenced on a Roche 454 FLX instrument (Roche, Indianapolis, IN, USA) with titanium reagents, following manufacturers recommended procedures. Sequences that passed quality controls were uploaded to mothur (14) where tags, low-quality sequences, and chimeric reads were removed. A total of 21.39 Mb data containing 60,455 16S rRNA gene sequences were obtained and iden-

tified using the Ribosomal Database Project (RDP) (15) and compared against MG-RAST (16) and Integrated Microbial Genomes with Microbiome Samples-Expert Review (IMG/MER) (17) databases. Using MG-RAST, heatmap analysis revealed that the microbiota from the oyster tissues, gut and mantle fluid were taxonomically more similar than the overlying water column assemblages.

Overall, this metagenomic analysis revealed a total of 28 bacterial phyla within the oyster microbiome along with a significant number of unclassified bacteria suggesting that the filter-feeding oysters are likely a rich source of bacterial repository that continues to be under examined. *Cyanobacteria* (50 to 75%) was the predominant phyla in the oyster tissues, gut and the mantle fluid, whereas the water column was mainly dominated by *Cyanobacteria* spp. (35 to 40%) and *Pelagibacter* spp. (25 to 38%), respectively. Of major interest was the predominance of *Photobacterium* spp. (50 to 80%) within the oyster tissue; both pathogenic and symbiotic traits are associated with *Photobacterium* spp. (18). Additional sampling and metagenomic analysis of the oyster host species will provide additional clues on this unique environmental niche that fosters colonization of symbiotic, parasitic, or pathogenic microbiota.

**Nucleotide sequence accession number.** The DNA sequences from this metagenomic project were deposited in the NCBI Short Read Archive under the accession no. [SRP046057](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra/SRP046057).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this study was provided by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Doris Duke Conservation Fellowship, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) grants W911NF-10-1-0146 and W911NF-10-R-0006, and the U.S. Department of Education's Title III program.

We thank Charles Jagoe, Jesse Thomas, and Megan Lamb for help in sample collection.

## REFERENCES

- Piehl MF, Smyth AR. 2011. Habitat-specific distinctions in estuarine denitrification affect both ecosystem function and services. *Ecosphere* 2(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/ES10-00082.1>.

2. Raj PS. 2008. Oysters in a new classification of keystone species. *Resonance* 13(7):648–654. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12045-008-0071-4>.
3. Rossi-Snook K, Ozbay G, Marengi F. 2010. Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) gardening program for restoration in Delaware's Inland Bays, USA. *Aquaculture Int.* 18(1):61–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10499-009-9271-5>.
4. Grabowski JH, Brumbaugh RD, Conrad RF, Keeler AG, Opaluch JJ, Peterson CH, Smyth AR. 2012. Economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by oyster reefs. *BioScience* 62(10):900–909. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/bio.2012.62.10.10>.
5. Kueh CSW, Chan KY. 1985. Bacteria in bivalve shellfish with special reference to the oyster. *J. Appl. Bacteriol.* 59(1):41–47.
6. Pujalte MJ, Ortigosa M, Macián MC, Garay E. 1999. Aerobic and facultative anaerobic heterotrophic bacteria associated to Mediterranean oysters and seawater. *Int. Microbiol.* 2(4):259–266.
7. Trabal N, Mazón-Suástegui JM, Vázquez-Juárez R, Asencio-Valle F, Morales-Bojórquez E, Romero J. 2012. Molecular analysis of bacterial microbiota associated with oysters (*Crassostrea gigas* and *Crassostrea corteziensis*) in different growth phases at two cultivation sites. *Microb. Ecol.* 64:1–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00248-012-0039-5>.
8. Campbell MS, Wright AC. 2003. Real-time PCR analysis of *Vibrio vulnificus* from oysters. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 69(12):7137–7144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AEM.69.12.7137-7144.2003>.
9. King GM, Judd C, Kuske CR, Smith C. 2012. Analysis of stomach and gut microbiomes of the eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) from coastal Louisiana, USA. *PLoS One* 7(12):e51475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0051475>.
10. Livingston RJ, Lewis FG, Woodsum GC, Niu XF, Galperin B, Huang W, Christensen JD, Monaco ME, Battista TA, Klein CJ, Howell IV RL, Ray GL. 2000. Modeling oyster population response to variation in freshwater input. *Estuar. Coast Shelf Sci.* 50:655–672. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ecss.1999.0597>.
11. Chauhan A, Green S, Pathak A, Thomas J, Venkatraman R. 2013. Whole-genome sequences of five oyster-associated bacteria show potential for crude oil hydrocarbon degradation. *Genome Announc.* 1(5):e00802-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/genomeA.00802-13>.
12. Thomas JC, Wafula D, Chauhan A, Green SJ, Gragg R, Jagoe C. 2014. A survey of Deepwater Horizon (DWH) oil-degrading bacteria from the eastern oyster biome and its surrounding environment. *Front Microbiol.* 5:149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00149>.
13. Gilbert JA, Meyer F, Antonopoulos D, Balaji P, Brown CT, Brown CT, Desai N, Eisen JA, Evers D, Field D, Feng W, Huson D, Jansson J, Knight R, Knight J, Kolker E, Konstantindis K, Kostka J, Kyrpides N, Mackelprang R, McHardy A, Quince C, Raes J, Szczyrba A, Shade A, Stevens R. 2010. Meeting report: the terabase metagenomics workshop and the vision of an Earth microbiome project. *Stand Genomic Sci.* 3(3):243–248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4056/sigs.1433550>.
14. Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T, Hall JR, Hartmann M, Hollister EB, Lesniewski RA, Oakley BB, Parks DH, Robinson CJ, Sahl JW, Stres B, Thallinger GG, Van Horn DJ, Weber CF. 2009. Introducing mothur: open-source, platform-independent, community-supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 75(23):7537–7541. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01541-09>.
15. Cole JR, Chai B, Farris RJ, Wang Q, Kulam SA, McGarrell DM, Garrity GM, Tiedje JM. 2005. The Ribosomal Database Project (RDP-II): sequences and tools for high-throughput rRNA analysis. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 33:294–296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gki038>.
16. Aziz RK, Bartels D, Best AA, DeJongh M, Disz T, Edwards RA, Formsma K, Gerdes S, Glass EM, Kubal M, Meyer F, Olsen GJ, Olson R, Osterman AL, Overbeek RA, McNeil LK, Paarmann D, Paczian T, Parrello B, Pusch GD, Reich C, Stevens R, Vassieva O, Vonstein V, Wilke A, Zagnitko O. 2008. The RAST server: Rapid Annotations using Subsystems Technology. *BMC Genomics* 9:75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-9-75>.
17. Markowitz VM, Mavromatis K, Ivanova NN, Chen I-MA, Chu K, Kyrpides NC. 2009. IMG ER: a system for microbial genome annotation expert review and curation. *Bioinformatics* 25:2271–2278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp393>.
18. Urbanczyk H, Ast JC, Dunlap PV. 2011. Phylogeny, genomics, and symbiosis of *Photobacterium*. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 35(2):324–342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2010.00250.x>.