1   **Mainstreaming microbes across biomes**

2   Laurence J. Clarke^{1,2*}, Penelope J. Jones³, Hans Ammitzbohl^{4,5}, Leon A. Barmuta⁴, Martin F.
3   Breed⁶, Anthony Chariton⁷, Michael Charleston⁴, Vongai Dakwa⁸, Fera Dewi^{8,9}, Rajaraman
4   Eri¹⁰, Nicholas M. Fountain-Jones⁴, Jules Freeman¹¹, Dave Kendal¹², Rebecca McDougal¹¹,
5   Eric Raes¹³, Swan Li San Sow^{1,13}, Timothy Staples^{14,15}, Brodie Sutcliffe⁷, Ravichandra
6   Vemuri^{10,16}, Laura Weyrich^{17,18}, Emily J. Flies⁴

7
8   * Corresponding author: laurence.clarke@utas.edu.au

9   **Addresses**

- 10   1. Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart,
11   Australia
- 12   2. Antarctic Climate and Ecosystems Cooperative Research Centre, University of
13   Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
- 14   3. Menzies Institute for Medical Research, University of Tasmania, Hobart,
15   Australia
- 16   4. School of Natural Sciences, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
- 17   5. ARC Training Centre for Forest Value, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
- 18   6. College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia
- 19   7. Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia
- 20   8. Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
- 21   9. Research Centre for Marine and Fisheries Product Processing and Biotechnology,
22   Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Jakarta, Indonesia 10260
- 23   10. School of Health Sciences, College of Health and Medicine, University of
24   Tasmania, Launceston, Australia

11. Scion, New Zealand Forest Research Institute Ltd., Rotorua, New Zealand
12. School of Technology, Environments and Design, University of Tasmania,
Hobart, Australia
13. Oceans and Atmosphere, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research
Organisation, Hobart, Australia
14. Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James
Cook University, Townsville, Australia
15. School of Biological Sciences, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
16. Comparative Medicine, School of Medicine, Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center,
Winston-Salem, NC, USA
17. School of Biological Sciences, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
18. Department of Anthropology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park,
PA, USA

Author biographical information:

Drs Laurence Clarke, Emily Flies, Penelope Jones, Eric Raes, and Nicholas Fountain-Jones are all postdoctoral Research Fellows, Vongai Dakwa, Fera Dewi, Hans Ammitzboll, Swan Li San Sow are PhD students/candidates, Dave Kendal is Senior Lecturer, and Michael Charleston, Leon Barmuta, Rajaraman Eri are Associate Professors at the University of Tasmania (UTas). Dr Martin Breed is a Lecturer at Flinders University. Dr Anthony Chariton is a Senior Lecturer and Brodie Sutcliff is a Postdoctoral Researcher at Macquarie University. Drs Jules Freeman (geneticist) and Rebecca McDougal (microbiologist) work for Scion, New Zealand Forest Research Institute Ltd. Dr Timothy Staples is a postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of Queensland. Ravichandra Vemuri completed his PhD at UTas and is currently a Research Fellow at Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center. Laura Weyrich, formerly of University of Adelaide is now an Associate Professor at the University of Pennsylvania.

Abstract

Bacteria, fungi and other microorganisms in the environment (i.e. “environmental microbiomes”) provide vital ecosystem services and impact on human health. Despite their importance, public awareness of environmental microbiomes has lagged behind that of human microbiomes. A key problem has been a scarcity of research demonstrating the microbial connections across environmental biomes (e.g. marine, soil) and between environmental and human microbiomes. We show here through analyses of almost 10,000 microbiome papers and three global datasets, that there are significant taxonomic similarities in microbial communities across biomes, yet very little cross-biome research exists. This disconnect may be hindering advances in microbiome knowledge and translation. In this review, we highlight current and potential applications of environmental microbiome research, and the benefits of an interdisciplinary, cross-biome approach. Microbiome scientists need to engage with each other, government, industry and the public to ensure research and applications proceed ethically, maximizing the potential benefits to society.

Introduction: Environmental microbiomes

There are seemingly daily revelations about the influence that microbial communities have on human health. Such revelations have generated significant public interest in the human microbiome, highlighted by the rise of products such as ‘gut health’ cookbooks, probiotic supplements, microbially-enhanced yoghurts and the revival of fermented foodstuffs, such as kombucha. There is growing awareness that humans are walking ecosystems, dependent on the microbial communities living in and on our bodies.

While public interest in the human microbiome has flourished, awareness of environmental microbiomes – including ambient marine, freshwater, aerial and terrestrial microbiomes - and their importance has not. Environmental microbiology has played a key role in the history and development of microbiome technology. Most clinically relevant antibiotics were isolated from soil microbes, and the majority of antimicrobial resistance genes may have originated from environmental bacteria (Cantas et al. 2013). Similarly, the first shotgun metagenomes and single-cell genomes were sequenced from marine microbes (Breitbart et al. 2002, Zhang et al. 2006). Environmental microbiomes are at the heart of nutrient cycling in both aquatic and terrestrial environments; provide essential ecosystem services, such as CO₂ drawdown and oxygen production, with a central role in determining the impact of climate change (Cavicchioli et al. 2019); and are intimately linked to human microbiomes and health (Hanski et al. 2012, Stein et al. 2016). A greater awareness of the importance of environmental microbial communities is therefore critical from both ecological and human health perspectives.

In this review, we highlight the value of environmental microbiome science by describing current and potential future applications. We use global microbial datasets to explore how microbial communities are shared across human, terrestrial and aquatic environments. We then analyse microbiome citation trends across disciplines to investigate the degree of

interdisciplinarity between human and environmental microbiome research. We conclude by raising key challenges in advancing interdisciplinary microbiome science, including the emerging ethical complexities and engaging the public in the debates at the centre of shared human/environment microbiome science.

Applications of environmental microbiome science

Environmental microbiome research has an extraordinary range of applications (Figure 1). Early applications of environmental microbiome science included monitoring the safety of food and water supplies, and this remains an important function today. More recently, applications in areas such as agriculture, biosecurity, environmental impact assessment and ecological restoration have vastly expanded, boosted by developments in high-throughput DNA sequencing that allow us to rapidly characterise microbial communities. Specific examples include using microbiome science to detect plant pathogens in terrestrial ecosystems (Tremblay et al. 2018), identify harmful microalgal taxa in ship ballast and marine port sediments (Shaw et al. 2019), and assess the impact of aquaculture on benthic communities (Pawlowski et al. 2014). Microbiomes have been validated as an indicator of ecosystem health: in terrestrial environments, soil bacterial communities match stages of ecological restoration (Liddicoat et al. 2019), and microbial eukaryotic communities can indicate the ecological condition of an estuary (Chariton et al. 2015).

Future applications of environmental microbiome research are certain to expand with developments in microbiome engineering – that is, actively altering microbial communities to achieve desired outcomes. Microbiome engineering for health outcomes is already apparent in the widespread availability of pre-, pro- and synbiotics for human use. In an environmental microbiome context, indirect microbiome engineering has been used to improve wastewater treatment (Barnard et al. 2017), while agricultural scientists have begun to use microbiome

engineering to improve plant resilience to disease and other environmental stresses (Berg and Koskella 2018, Qin et al. 2016) and manipulate key traits such as flowering time (Panke-Buisse et al. 2015).

With further development, there is the potential for much broader applications of microbiome engineering; for example, inoculating soils or seeds to improve restoration outcomes (Muñoz-Rojas et al. 2018, Wubs et al. 2016), engineering coral microbiomes to enhance their resilience to climate change (Epstein et al. 2019), and modifying urban environmental microbiomes for human health outcomes (Flies et al. 2017, Mills et al. 2017). The pinnacle of microbiome engineering may be creating synthetic microbial communities (Großkopf and Soyer 2014), which have already been developed for biotechnology applications such as biofuel production (Minty et al. 2013).

The enormous potential of environmental microbiome science to support ecological and social outcomes is therefore clear. However, if we are to harness environmental microbiome research – particularly environmental microbiome engineering - safely, and to full its potential, we must ensure a solid understanding of cross-biome interactions. Unless we know how microbes are shared across individuals, species and ecosystems, and how environmental and human microbiomes interact, we cannot best apply microbiome science for human and ecological benefit, nor know the potential repercussions of such microbiome manipulations.

Biomes share microbes

To demonstrate the interdependence of (micro)biomes, we compared the class and genus-level taxonomic composition of three large bacterial 16S ribosomal DNA datasets representing marine, soil and human microbiomes (Human Microbiome Project Consortium 2012, Earth Microbiome Project, Thompson et al. 2017, International Census of Marine Microbes, Zinger et al. 2011, see Supporting Information for methods). The combined dataset

141 contained more than 4000 samples and over 330 million reads. Thirty-four classes of bacteria
142 were abundant ($>1\%$ relative abundance) in ocean, soil or human microbiomes; of these taxa,
143 67.6% were shared across two or more biomes, showing the microbial connectedness of these
144 seemingly disparate environments (Figure 2). Studies examining the forces shaping the
145 human microbiome have underlined this point, demonstrating that environmental microbes
146 influence human microbiomes and impact our health (Hanski et al. 2012, Rothschild et al.
147 2018, Stein et al. 2016). Research into the cross-biome comparative function and ecology of
148 these bacterial taxa would advance both human and environmental microbiome science.

149 Only a few taxonomic classes in this analysis were restricted to a single biome (e.g.
150 Spartobacteria and Acidobacteriia for soil, Deferribacteres and Cyanobacteria for oceans).
151 Interestingly, though the human microbiome dataset was much less diverse at the class level
152 than the soil or marine data sets (three classes with $> 1\%$ relative abundance compared to 21
153 and 14 classes in the soil and marine data sets, respectively; Figure 2), all classes abundant in
154 humans - Bacteroidia, Betaproteobacteria and Clostridia – were shared with both marine and
155 soil biomes. At a finer taxonomic level, we found 72 genera were detected in all three biomes
156 (Table S1 in Supporting Information). Most shared genera (55/72, 76%) belonged to five
157 classes: the Gammaproteobacteria and Bacilli, as well as the three classes abundant in
158 humans. Co-occurrence patterns such as these are consistent with overlapping niche
159 characteristics in human and environmental biomes. Species or strain-level data is needed to
160 confirm whether bacterial taxa are able to move between biomes.

161 [The need for interdisciplinary microbiome research](#)

162 Given the number of bacterial taxa shared between human and environmental microbiomes,
163 do microbiome researchers also cross biomes? We conducted a citation analysis of almost

10,000 microbiome papers (see Supporting Information for methods) to investigate research links between environmental and human microbiome science (Figure 3).

We found that connectivity is currently low between research in the human, soil and ocean microbiome disciplines. Despite the taxonomic crossover and growing evidence of linkages between human and environmental microbiomes, human microbiome papers have a low proportion and probability of citing papers from environmental microbiome disciplines (Figure 3a & d). Some notable exceptions have highlighted linkages between the human and environmental microbiomes: for example, Hanski *et al.* (2012) demonstrated that environmental biodiversity impacts the human skin microbiome, allergy levels and immune function; Rothschild *et al.* (2018) showed that, surprisingly, we can better predict human gut microbiomes based on environmental rather than host genetic factors. However, human microbiome research is largely yet to realise the potential for human-environmental microbiome interactions.

In contrast, soil and ocean microbiome papers are more likely to cite human microbiome papers, but this has declined over time (Figure 3a-c) as, presumably, each sub-discipline has become more established and suggests that early citations were perhaps out of necessity, rather than an awareness of the shared relevance. There is some connectivity between soil and ocean disciplines and, whilst modest, this does show an upward trend (Figure 3b & c). Human microbiome publications represent ~3% of the citations in papers from ocean and soil disciplines, likely for methods and/or context (e.g., building on the success of the Human Microbiome Project), and this proportion has remained relatively steady through time (Figure 3e-f). Similar studies of interdisciplinarity in fields such as applied ecology found much higher probabilities and proportions of cross-field citations (Staples *et al.* 2019).

Our analysis paints a picture of unrealised research connections across biomes, and a particularly stark lack of integration between human and environmental microbiome science. This lack of interdisciplinary microbiome science could be limiting advances in both human and environmental microbiome sub-disciplines for two key reasons. First, the sheer degree of taxonomic cross-over between biomes means that if research remains ‘siloe within disciplines’, important interactions between microbes and biomes will be missed. Second, even disregarding these ecological cross-overs, interdisciplinarity is well-established as a building block of innovation through its potential to connect seemingly unrelated ideas (Johansson 2006, Johnson 2010) and introduce concepts without precedent in a given discipline (Graham and Dayton 2002). In the microbiome context, there is rich potential for new understandings to arise in this way. For example, by viewing pathogens as opportunistic microorganisms most likely to successfully colonise disturbed (microbial) ecosystems, we can use ecological theory to create robust microbial communities resistant to invasion (De Schryver and Vadstein 2014, Shade et al. 2012). This approach has already seen success across disciplines including aquaculture (Attramadal et al. 2014) and ecosystem restoration (Liddicoat et al. 2019), but can also be applied in fields such as agriculture (Berg and Koskella 2018), hospital design (Kembel et al. 2012), and urban environments in general (Flies et al. 2017, Mills et al. 2017). Lastly, environmental microbiome science may also miss valuable opportunities to ‘piggy back’ off developments in better-funded human microbiome endeavours. Overall, there can be little doubt that we must do better as a scientific community to achieve the cross-pollination needed to realise the full potential of both human and environmental microbiome science.

Ethics, risks, and interdisciplinary complications

With stronger and more holistic scientific understanding of microbial communities across biomes comes a clear responsibility to consider the ethical and social implications of

environmental microbiome research and application. As with other interdisciplinary biological innovations (e.g., genetic engineering or food web biomanipulation), environmental microbiome applications can have unanticipated risks and unintended social and ecological outcomes (Dittami et al. 2019). We should therefore pause to ask: how will engineering of environmental microbiomes affect primary sector productivity, ecological services, biodiversity and human health?

In most cases, ethical issues surrounding microbiome engineering and beneficial outcomes centres around the definition of ‘health’. In humans, health is widely understood to be a state of the absence of disease and a high level of wellbeing (WHO 2018), but its extension into other domains has been problematic. For example, in restoration ecology, an ecosystem is regarded as ‘healthy’ when it has an ecological community similar to an undisturbed, reference site (SER 2004). However, there are many instances where such undisturbed, reference conditions no longer exist because of permanent, widespread or extreme anthropogenic changes. The assessment of ecosystem health according to this definition is further complicated by the natural variation in ecosystems (Hobbs et al. 2014) and, from a microbiome perspective, connectivity between microbial communities across biomes. Lastly, other definitions of ‘healthy’ have focused on diversity, assuming greater diversity indicates health, and while this is often the case, the relationship between ecosystem health and biodiversity is complex (Ives and Carpenter 2007). Defining health across domains is challenging; different fields may disagree on what is healthy for a system, e.g., aquaculture versus freshwater ecology. Furthermore, there can be discordance between healthy environmental states and environmental states healthiest for people. Microbes, such as *Vibrio cholerae*, that are a normal part of healthy, natural environmental microbial communities (Worden et al. 2006) can have negative impacts on human health. Healthy human microbiomes are also likely to be population-specific. For example, the predominant health

challenges in low and middle-income countries are infectious disease, and in high-income countries are non-communicable chronic disease. The optimal microbiome characteristics are likely to differ between these populations, as well as between individuals with different genotypes, phenotypes and living environments. The concept of health underpinning any microbiome engineering intentions would need to be clearly articulated and interrogated in an interdisciplinary way to reduce the likelihood of any unintended consequences.

Risk assessments for microbiome engineering should address the potential for inadvertent, negative environmental and health effects using the precautionary principle, and strive to incorporate the numerous sources of uncertainty (Hayes et al. 2007). An example of not enacting the precautionary principle are commercial human microbiome products (probiotics, synbiotics, gut microbiome pills for travellers etc.) that are already marketed despite our incomplete understanding of the functions and interactions of even the relatively well-studied human gut microbiota. Risk assessment of environmental microbiome engineering should include environmental and health information, as well as economic and cultural considerations, combined with extensive public discussion and engagement (Stirling et al. 2018). The decision framework around microbiome engineering should evaluate the potential degree and probability of harm, and how to manage that harm. The current lack of research across biomes exposes microbiome research to unforeseen risks and inadequate frameworks for assessing risks to human health via environmental pathways.

There are also risks associated with rapid technical and analytical developments in microbiome science. For example, the sensitivity of high-throughput DNA sequencing has raised issues with detecting contaminating organisms and cross-contamination between samples (Eisenhofer et al. 2019). There is also some argument over important experimental and analytical steps, such as whether to rarefy data to control for the number of DNA sequences obtained per sample (McMurdie and Holmes 2014, Weiss et al. 2017), although

several best-practice guides have recently been published (e.g., Eisenhofer et al. 2019, Knight et al. 2018, Zinger et al. 2019).

Mainstreaming environmental microbiomes

Clearly, environmental microbiome science has much to offer a world grappling with fundamental environmental and human health challenges. However, some key questions remain: what must we do to help ‘mainstream’ environmental microbiome science into sectors as diverse as biosecurity, urban planning, agriculture and human health and across a diversity of countries and cultures? How can we best support well-informed decisions and ensure applications are grounded in a well-developed understanding of the opportunities, uncertainties and risks? How can we ensure that the benefits of microbiome science are not limited to the rich, but address challenges faced by all people, and are integrated into policy and practice to address some of the world’s most serious human and environmental challenges?

As well as collaborating across disciplines, microbiome science will benefit from engaging with practitioners, policy makers, regulators and a diverse range of human communities to achieve the greatest possible impact. Human microbiome science provides the best examples to date of achieving this engagement, helping to explain the growing public awareness of this field, and the comparative lag in environmental microbiome science. The American Gut Project (<http://humanfoodproject.com/americangut/>) exemplifies successful public engagement, having crowdsourced funding and samples from over 11,000 participants from more than 40 countries (McDonald et al. 2018). Microbiome science is now available to the general public via print and electronic media in popular science TV shows, TED talks, podcasts and books, many of which are presented or authored by leading scientists in the field. Greater collaboration between scientists and the media also reduces the potential for

sensationalised science reporting, which would facilitate communication, understanding and trust between the public and microbiomes researchers.

Projects such as the Healthy Urban Microbiome Initiative (www.humi.site) that integrate the natural, social and health sciences show the potential for international, transdisciplinary collaboration, but how can we encourage more transdisciplinary microbiome science collaboration? There are well-known barriers to transdisciplinary activity in any field (Rogers 2010), ranging from tension over appropriate methods of inquiry to differences in lexicon and communication practices used by scientists within disciplines. A unified microbiome vocabulary has been proposed that may help overcome these barriers and reduce misunderstandings among both the scientific and broader community (Marchesi and Ravel 2015). An emphasis on accessible data and analysis code, as well as minimum metadata standards (<http://gensc.org/mixs/>), help facilitate connectivity and reproducible science - all of which we strongly encourage. Bacterial and archaeal full-length 16S ribosomal RNA reference sequence databases are biased towards host-associated organisms, with less than 25% of sequences originating from soil or aquatic environments (Schloss et al. 2016). Integrating future sequencing efforts with multi-biome data storage options for both sequences and metadata will make connecting across biomes easier. For example, expanding the Human Microbiome Project repository to include environmental data from both soil and ocean biomes is likely to foster cross-discipline connections (Tasnim et al. 2017). Furthermore, multi-agency funding to develop broadly applicable tools can help reduce redundancy and facilitate cross-biome comparisons (Alivisatos et al. 2015).

Conclusion

Microbiome science is shifting the social perception of microbes from disease-causing, unhygienic organisms to potential partners vital for human and ecosystem health (Cavicchioli

et al. 2019). Scientists now recognise the importance of microorganisms for ecosystem function. However, our understanding of the contributions made by microbes within a system and how they are shared and interact across ecosystems and biomes is incomplete, hindering our ability to translate microbiome science into safe applications for greatest environmental and human health impact.

We are not the first to suggest that a co-ordinated, intensely collaborative research effort is needed to fill these gaps. For example, the interdisciplinary Unified Microbiome Initiative was proposed to develop cross-cutting microbiome technologies in order to facilitate translation into applications (Alivisatos et al. 2015). Furthermore, we should co-develop research with environmental and health practitioners and work across disciplines to understand how microbiome technology can be safely applied. We must be ready to help national and international watchdogs grapple with novel regulatory challenges and support policy makers to breach silos and build bridges between traditionally disparate sectors. It is highly important that we also engage the public with integrity, clarity and skill to maintain public trust and support the development of a ‘microbiome-literate’ community (Shamarina et al. 2017) - taking heed, as best we can, of the lessons from climate change science communication (Bostrom et al. 2013). Microbiome research and discourse should include people from a range of national, cultural, genetic and socioeconomic backgrounds to ensure the applications are distributed equitably. These are no small challenges, but ones that we must overcome to ensure that we are collectively equipped to develop, understand and translate microbiome science for maximal global benefit.

Acknowledgments

This paper is the product of the 'Microbiomes in Tasmania' meeting, funded through a University of Tasmania College of Science and Engineering Research Enhancement Program grant to EJF, LJC and DK.

References

- Alivisatos AP, et al. 2015. A unified initiative to harness Earth's microbiomes. *Science* 350: 507-508.
- Attramadal KJK, Truong TMH, Bakke I, Skjermo J, Olsen Y, Vadstein O. 2014. RAS and microbial maturation as tools for K-selection of microbial communities improve survival in cod larvae. *Aquaculture* 432: 483-490.
- Barnard JL, Dunlap P, Steichen M. 2017. Rethinking the Mechanisms of Biological Phosphorus Removal. *Water Environment Research* 89: 2043-2054.
- Berg M, Koskella B. 2018. Nutrient- and Dose-Dependent Microbiome-Mediated Protection against a Plant Pathogen. *Current Biology* 28: 2487-2492 e2483.
- Bostrom A, Böhm G, O'Connor RE. 2013. Targeting and tailoring climate change communications. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 4: 447-455.
- Breitbart M, Salamon P, Andresen B, Mahaffy JM, Segall AM, Mead D, Azam F, Rohwer F. 2002. Genomic analysis of uncultured marine viral communities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99: 14250.
- Cantas L, Shah S, Cavaco L, Manaia C, Walsh F, Popowska M, Garelick H, Bürgmann H, Sørum H. 2013. A brief multi-disciplinary review on antimicrobial resistance in medicine and its linkage to the global environmental microbiota. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 4: 96.

357 Cavicchioli R, et al. 2019. Scientists' warning to humanity: microorganisms and climate
358 change. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 17: 569–586.

359 Chariton AA, Stephenson S, Morgan MJ, Steven ADL, Colloff MJ, Court LN, Hardy CM.
360 2015. Metabarcoding of benthic eukaryote communities predicts the ecological
361 condition of estuaries. *Environmental Pollution* 203: 165-174.

362 De Schryver P, Vadstein O. 2014. Ecological theory as a foundation to control pathogenic
363 invasion in aquaculture. *ISME Journal* 8: 2360-2368.

364 Dittami SM, et al. 2019. A community perspective on the concept of marine holobionts:
365 state-of-the-art, challenges, and future directions. *PeerJ Preprints* 7: e27519v27511.

366 Eisenhofer R, Minich JJ, Marotz C, Cooper A, Knight R, Weyrich LS. 2019. Contamination
367 in low microbial biomass microbiome studies: issues and recommendations. *Trends in*
368 *Microbiology* 27: 105-117.

369 Epstein HE, Smith HA, Torda G, Oppen MJH. 2019. Microbiome engineering: enhancing
370 climate resilience in corals. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 17: 100-108.

371 Flies EJ, Skelly C, Negi SS, Prabhakaran P, Liu Q, Liu K, Goldizen FC, Lease C, Weinstein
372 P. 2017. Biodiverse green spaces: a prescription for global urban health. *Frontiers in*
373 *Ecology and the Environment* 15: 510-516.

374 Graham MH, Dayton PK. 2002. On the evolution of ecological ideas: paradigms and
375 scientific progress. *Ecology* 83: 1481-1489.

376 Großkopf T, Soyer OS. 2014. Synthetic microbial communities. *Current Opinion in*
377 *Microbiology* 18: 72-77.

378 Hanski I, et al. 2012. Environmental biodiversity, human microbiota, and allergy are
379 interrelated. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109: 8334-8339.

380 Hayes KR, Kapuscinski AR, Dana G, Sifa L, Devlin RH. 2007. Introduction to
381 environmental risk assessment for transgenic fish. Pages 1-28 in Kapuscinski AR, Li

382 S, Hayes KR, Dana G, eds. Environmental risk assessment of genetically modified
 383 organisms, vol. 3. Oxfordshire, UK: CABI Publishing.

384 Hobbs RJ, et al. 2014. Managing the whole landscape: historical, hybrid, and novel
 385 ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 12: 557-564.

386 Human Microbiome Project Consortium. 2012. A framework for human microbiome
 387 research. *Nature* 486: 215-221.

388 Ives AR, Carpenter SR. 2007. Stability and Diversity of Ecosystems. *Science* 317: 58-62.

389 Johansson F. 2006. The Medici Effect, With a New Preface and Discussion Guide: What
 390 Elephants and Epidemics Can Teach Us About Innovation. Harvard Business Review
 391 Press.

392 Johnson S. 2010. Where good ideas come from: The natural history of innovation. Riverhead
 393 Books.

394 Kembel SW, Jones E, Kline J, Northcutt D, Stenson J, Womack AM, Bohannan BJ, Brown
 395 GZ, Green JL. 2012. Architectural design influences the diversity and structure of the
 396 built environment microbiome. *ISME Journal* 6: 1469-1479.

397 Knight R, et al. 2018. Best practices for analysing microbiomes. *Nature Reviews*
 398 *Microbiology* 16: 410-422.

399 Liddicoat C, Weinstein P, Bissett A, Gellie NJC, Mills JG, Waycott M, Breed MF. 2019. Can
 400 bacterial indicators of a grassy woodland restoration inform ecosystem assessment
 401 and microbiota-mediated human health? *Environment International* 129: 105-117.

402 Marchesi JR, Ravel J. 2015. The vocabulary of microbiome research: a proposal. *Microbiome*
 403 3: 31.

404 McDonald D, et al. 2018. American Gut: an Open Platform for Citizen Science Microbiome
 405 Research. *mSystems* 3: e00031-00018.

406 McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. 2014. Waste Not, Want Not: Why Rarefying Microbiome Data Is
 407 Inadmissible. *PLoS Computational Biology* 10: e1003531.

408 Mills JG, Weinstein P, Gellie NJC, Weyrich LS, Lowe AJ, Breed MF. 2017. Urban habitat
 409 restoration provides a human health benefit through microbiome rewilding: the
 410 Microbiome Rewilding Hypothesis. *Restoration Ecology* 25: 866-872.

411 Minty JJ, Singer ME, Scholz SA, Bae C-H, Ahn J-H, Foster CE, Liao JC, Lin XN. 2013.
 412 Design and characterization of synthetic fungal-bacterial consortia for direct
 413 production of isobutanol from cellulosic biomass. *Proceedings of the National*
 414 *Academy of Sciences* 110: 14592-14597.

415 Muñoz-Rojas M, Chilton A, Liyanage GS, Erickson TE, Merritt DJ, Neilan BA, Ooi MKJ.
 416 2018. Effects of indigenous soil cyanobacteria on seed germination and seedling
 417 growth of arid species used in restoration. *Plant and Soil* 429: 91-100.

418 Panke-Buisse K, Poole AC, Goodrich JK, Ley RE, Kao-Kniffin J. 2015. Selection on soil
 419 microbiomes reveals reproducible impacts on plant function. *ISME Journal* 9: 980-
 420 989.

421 Pawlowski J, Esling P, Lejzerowicz F, Cedhagen T, Wilding TA. 2014. Environmental
 422 monitoring through protist next-generation sequencing metabarcoding: assessing the
 423 impact of fish farming on benthic foraminifera communities. *Molecular Ecology*
 424 *Resources* 14: 1129-1140.

425 Qin Y, Druzhinina IS, Pan X, Yuan Z. 2016. Microbially mediated plant salt tolerance and
 426 microbiome-based solutions for saline agriculture. *Biotechnology Advances* 34: 1245-
 427 1259.

428 Rogers EM. 2010. *Diffusion of innovations*. Free Press.

429 Rothschild D, et al. 2018. Environment dominates over host genetics in shaping human gut
 430 microbiota. *Nature* 555: 210-215.

431 Schloss PD, Girard RA, Martin T, Edwards J, Thrash JC. 2016. Status of the archaeal and
 432 bacterial census: an update. *mBio* 7: e00201-00216.
 433 SER. 2004. The SER International Primer on Ecological Restoration. Society for Ecological
 434 Restoration International.
 435 Shade A, et al. 2012. Fundamentals of microbial community resistance and resilience.
 436 *Frontiers in Microbiology* 3: 417.
 437 Shamarina D, Stoyantcheva I, Mason CE, Bibby K, Elhaik E. 2017. Communicating the
 438 promise, risks, and ethics of large-scale, open space microbiome and metagenome
 439 research. *Microbiome* 5: 132.
 440 Shaw JLA, Weyrich LS, Hallegraeff G, Cooper A. 2019. Retrospective eDNA assessment of
 441 potentially harmful algae in historical ship ballast tank and marine port sediments.
 442 *Molecular Ecology* 28: 2476-2485.
 443 Staples TL, Dwyer JM, Wainwright CE, Mayfield MM. 2019. Applied ecological research is
 444 on the rise but connectivity barriers persist between four major subfields. *Journal of*
 445 *Applied Ecology* 56: 1492-1498.
 446 Stein MM, et al. 2016. Innate Immunity and Asthma Risk in Amish and Hutterite Farm
 447 Children. *New England Journal of Medicine* 375: 411-421.
 448 Stirling A, Hayes KR, Delborne J. 2018. Towards inclusive social appraisal: risk,
 449 participation and democracy in governance of synthetic biology. *BMC Proceedings*
 450 12: 15.
 451 Tasnim N, Abulizi N, Pither J, Hart MM, Gibson DL. 2017. Linking the gut microbial
 452 ecosystem with the environment: does gut health depend on where we live? *Frontiers*
 453 *in Microbiology* 8: 1935.
 454 Thompson LR, et al. 2017. A communal catalogue reveals Earth's multiscale microbial
 455 diversity. *Nature* 551: 457-463.

Tremblay ED, Duceppe MO, Bérubé JA, Kimoto T, Lemieux C, Bilodeau GJ. 2018. Screening for Exotic Forest Pathogens to Increase Survey Capacity Using Metagenomics. *Phytopathology* 108: 1509-1521.

Weiss S, et al. 2017. Normalization and microbial differential abundance strategies depend upon data characteristics. *Microbiome* 5: 27.

WHO. 2018. Constitution. (<https://www.who.int/about/who-we-are/constitution>)

Worden AZ, Seidel M, Smriga S, Wick A, Malfatti F, Bartlett D, Azam F. 2006. Trophic regulation of *Vibrio cholerae* in coastal marine waters. *Environmental Microbiology* 8: 21-29.

Wubs ER, van der Putten WH, Bosch M, Bezemer TM. 2016. Soil inoculation steers restoration of terrestrial ecosystems. *Nature Plants* 2: 16107.

Zhang K, Martiny AC, Reppas NB, Barry KW, Malek J, Chisholm SW, Church GM. 2006. Sequencing genomes from single cells by polymerase cloning. *Nature Biotechnology* 24: 680-686.

Zinger L, Amaral-Zettler LA, Fuhrman JA, Horner-Devine MC, Huse SM, Welch DB, Martiny JB, Sogin M, Boetius A, Ramette A. 2011. Global patterns of bacterial beta-diversity in seafloor and seawater ecosystems. *PLoS One* 6: e24570.

Zinger L, et al. 2019. DNA metabarcoding—Need for robust experimental designs to draw sound ecological conclusions. *Molecular Ecology* 28: 1857-1862.

Figure 1. The applications of microbiome science span all environments and all facets of society. This figure depicts some current and possible future applications for public health, biosecurity, industry and the environment. *Potential future applications can best be realised with greater cross-talk among scientific fields.

Figure 2. The shared taxonomy among ocean, soil and human microbiomes. The plot shows the relative abundance of bacterial classes based on three large bacterial 16S ribosomal rDNA datasets representing marine, soil and human microbiomes (Human Microbiome Project Consortium 2012, Earth Microbiome Project, Thompson et al. 2017, International Census of Marine Microbes, Zinger et al. 2011). Some taxa were largely restricted to a single biome (e.g. Spartobacteria and Acidobacteriia for soil, Deferribacteres and Cyanobacteria for oceans). However, all taxa detected in the human microbiome are also present in both the soil and ocean microbiome. A more holistic understanding of microbial communities is required to better understand, conserve, restore and control microbial community function.

494

495 **Figure 3.** Citation patterns showing the probability of citing at least one paper from each
496 microbiome sub-discipline (human (H), ocean (O) & soil (S); a-c) and the proportion of
497 citations made from one sub-discipline to the other (excluding zeros; d-f). Trends in both
498 citation patterns were estimated using binomial generalised additive models (GAMs). The
499 splines in (d-f) begin when the first cross-discipline citation is made and do not include
500 papers in which there was no cross-discipline citation (hence the low proportions).

501