

PERSPECTIVE

Fifty important research questions in microbial ecology

Rachael E. Antwis^{1,*}, Sarah M. Griffiths², Xavier A. Harrison³, Paz Aranega-Bou¹, Andres Arce⁴, Aimee S. Bettridge⁵, Francesca L. Brailsford⁶, Alexandre de Menezes¹, Andrew Devaynes⁷, Kristian M. Forbes⁸, Ellen L. Fry⁹, Ian Goodhead¹, Erin Haskell¹⁰, Chloe Heys¹¹, Chloe James¹, Sarah R. Johnston^{5,†}, Gillian R. Lewis⁷, Zenobia Lewis¹¹, Michael C. Macey¹², Alan McCarthy¹¹, James E. McDonald¹³, Nasmille L. Mejia-Florez¹², David O'Brien¹⁴, Chloé Orland¹⁵, Marco Pautasso¹⁶, William D. K. Reid¹⁷, Heather A. Robinson⁹, Kenneth Wilson¹⁸ and William J. Sutherland¹⁹

¹School of Environment and Life Sciences, University of Salford, The Crescent, Salford M5 4WT, UK, ²School of Science and the Environment, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, Greater Manchester M1 5GD, UK, ³Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, London, London NW1 4RY, UK, ⁴Silwood Park, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Imperial College London, London, London SW7 2AZ, UK, ⁵School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, South Glamorgan CF10 3XQ, UK, ⁶School of Environment, Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2DG, UK, ⁷Biosciences, Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, Lancashire L39 4QP, UK, ⁸Department of Virology, University of Helsinki, Helsinki 00014, Finland, ⁹School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PT, UK, ¹⁰Department of Biology, University of York, York, North Yorkshire YO10 5DD, UK, ¹¹Institute of Integrative Biology/School of Life Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, Merseyside L69 3BX, UK, ¹²School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK, ¹³School of Biological Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2DG, UK, ¹⁴Scottish Natural Heritage, Inverness IV3 8NW, UK, ¹⁵Department of Plant Sciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB2 1TN, UK, ¹⁶Animal and Plant Health Unit, European Food Safety Authority, Parma 43126, Italy, ¹⁷School of Biology, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear NE1 7RU, UK, ¹⁸Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, Lancaster, Lancashire LA1 4YW, UK and ¹⁹Conservation Science Group, Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB2 1TN, UK

*Corresponding author: School of Environment and Life Sciences, University of Salford, Room 336, Peel Building, University of Salford, The Crescent, Salford M5 4WT, UK. Tel: +44 161 295 4641; E-mail: r.e.antwis@salford.ac.uk

One sentence summary: We identify research questions in the field of microbial ecology, with emerging themes that recognise vast microbial functions that could benefit humanity, and the need to integrate knowledge across organisms.

Editor: Marcus Horn

†Sarah R. Johnston, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3806-3416>

ABSTRACT

Microbial ecology provides insights into the ecological and evolutionary dynamics of microbial communities underpinning every ecosystem on Earth. Microbial communities can now be investigated in unprecedented detail, although there is still a wealth of open questions to be tackled. Here we identify 50 research questions of fundamental importance to the science or application of microbial ecology, with the intention of summarising the field and bringing focus to new research avenues. Questions are categorised into seven themes: host–microbiome interactions; health and infectious diseases; human health and food security; microbial ecology in a changing world; environmental processes; functional diversity; and evolutionary processes. Many questions recognise that microbes provide an extraordinary array of functional diversity that can be harnessed to solve real-world problems. Our limited knowledge of spatial and temporal variation in microbial diversity and function is also reflected, as is the need to integrate micro- and macro-ecological concepts, and knowledge derived from studies with humans and other diverse organisms. Although not exhaustive, the questions presented are intended to stimulate discussion and provide focus for researchers, funders and policy makers, informing the future research agenda in microbial ecology.

Keywords: environmental processes; evolutionary processes; functional diversity; host–microbiome interactions; priority setting, research agenda

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been an explosion in microbial ecological research, which is reflected in broad-scale research projects such as the Human Microbiome Project and the Earth Microbiome Project, as well as in the peer-reviewed literature (e.g. Boers, Jansen and Hays 2016). Recent rapid technological advances, including next-generation sequencing, (meta)genomics, metabolomics, (meta)transcriptomics and (meta)proteomics, have vastly increased our ability to study microbial community complexity and function (Morris *et al.* 2002; Hiraoka, Yang and Iwasaki 2016). These provide unprecedented opportunities to assess genomic potential, gene regulation, expression and function *in situ* (Schneider *et al.* 2012; Franzosa *et al.* 2015), especially when combined with detailed knowledge of natural history and environmental parameters (Peay 2014). Such techniques have been applied to a vast range of fields within the scope of ‘microbial ecology’ in order to better understand how microorganisms interact with and affect their environment, each other and other organisms.

With an overwhelming and ever-growing number of potential and critical research avenues in microbial ecology, it is timely to identify major questions and research priorities that would progress the field. Here we present the results of a workshop hosted by the British Ecological Society’s Microbial Ecology Special Interest Group in June 2016, which used a discussion and voting-based system to identify 50 research questions of importance to the field of microbial ecology. Similar exercises identifying important research questions have been conducted in conservation (Sutherland *et al.* 2009; Dicks *et al.* 2012), pure ecology (Sutherland *et al.* 2013a), marine biodiversity (Parsons *et al.* 2014), sustainability (Dicks *et al.* 2013; Jones *et al.* 2014) and non-ecological subjects including UK poverty (Sutherland *et al.* 2013b). These papers have been widely accessed and are directly applicable to the development of policy, as highlighted by Jones *et al.* (2014).

METHODS

Participants

The methods used here were based broadly on those presented in Sutherland *et al.* (2011). A 1-day workshop was held by the British Ecological Society’s Microbial Ecology Special Interest Group at the University of Salford (UK) in June 2016. Invitations to attend the meeting were distributed via the British Ecological Society’s membership mailing list and through social media (Twitter and Facebook). In total, 34 participants from 20 institutions attended and contributed to the development of the 50 questions listed below, with the majority listed as authors on this paper.

Questions

Prior to the workshop, attendees were asked to submit questions via an online form that they thought most closely met the following brief:

We are aiming to identify 50 questions that, if answered, will make a considerable difference to the use of microbial ecology by practitioners and policy makers, or to the fundamentals of the field of microbial ecology. These should be questions that are unanswered, could be answered, and could be tackled by a research programme. This is expected to set the agenda for future research in the field of microbial ecology.

A total of 244 questions were submitted by attendees (see Supplementary Information), and assigned (by R.E. Antwis and S.M. Griffiths) to the following themes:

- i. Host–microbiome interactions
- ii. Health and infectious diseases
- iii. Human health and food security
- iv. Microbial ecology in a changing world
- v. Environmental processes

- vi. Functional diversity
- vii. Evolutionary processes

An additional eighth theme named 'society and policy' was created to encompass questions that were generally applicable across the biological sciences, as well as those specific to the field of microbial ecology, which could not necessarily be addressed through laboratory based microbial ecology research, *per se*.

Question selection process

Prior to the workshop, participants were asked to identify the top ~20% of questions in each theme that most closely aligned with the brief (selection of 5–11 questions from a total of 26–57 questions per theme via an online form; Supplementary Information). Participants were asked to consider all questions within a theme and to select questions based on the theme's context and the brief for the workshop. Some questions were included in more than one theme to encourage discussion and to increase the likelihood that pertinent questions remained in the selection process. Questions were then ranked according to the number of online votes they received, and this formed the material for the workshop.

Parallel sessions to discuss each theme were run at the workshop, with participants free to select which theme sessions they attended. Questions were discussed in order of lowest ranking to highest, with duplicates removed and questions reworded as necessary. For each theme, a final set of 'gold' (~15% of questions, total of 47 questions across all themes) and 'silver' questions (~10% of questions, total of 29 questions) were identified. Where necessary, a show of hands was used to ensure the democratic process was upheld.

A final plenary session was held in which all gold and silver questions were discussed. For gold questions, duplicates among categories were removed and questions reworded to reflect the discussion in the room, resulting in 43 gold questions. A similar process was then completed for silver questions, and a show of hands used to vote for seven questions that could be elevated to gold status to form the final set of 50 questions.

Limitations

All but four participants were from British universities, although there were representatives from a range of nationalities and research areas. The manner in which this paper was developed (*i.e.* through a physical workshop and via the British Ecological Society) means that, without a substantial travel budget, a bias towards UK institutions was inevitable. However, many participants have worked on, or currently collaborate in, research projects on non-UK ecosystems and species, and therefore the questions proposed are drawn from considerable knowledge and experience of the field internationally. Additionally, although most individuals were from academic institutions, many individuals had previous or ongoing collaborations with industrial partners and governmental/non-governmental organisations.

RESULTS

The following 50 questions are presented by theme, and are not ordered according to relevance or importance. Due to the nature of the process, some questions may appear similar across themes, but within the context of each theme can take on a different meaning. Some questions may relate to research

areas that are already somewhat active, and these serve to highlight the importance of and encourage further work in these areas. Some of these questions apply across multiple biomes and ecosystems, and can be considered in the context of multiple host organisms and across varying temporal and spatial scales.

Host–microbiome interactions

Host–microbiome interactions determine many host life history traits such as behaviour, reproduction, physiological processes and disease susceptibility (Archie and Theis 2011; Koch and Schmid-Hempel 2011; Willing, Russell and Finlay 2011; Daskin and Alford 2012; King et al. 2016). Increasingly, we are discovering that host–microbiome interactions produce complex and dynamic communities that fluctuate in compositional abundance correlated with factors as diverse as host genotype, developmental stage, diet and temporal changes, among others (*e.g.* Spor, Koren and Ley 2011). Even in otherwise well-studied organisms, very little is known about the consequences of microbiome variation for host processes, particularly across different spatial and temporal scales. Considerations of host microbiomes are also likely important for global issues, such as the efficacy of conservation efforts including species reintroduction programmes (reviewed in Redford et al. 2012; McFall-Ngai 2015). Additionally, interactions between native and non-native species are correlated with transmission of microbiota, often determined by relatedness or diet type (Ley et al. 2008), and the microbiome plays a key role in the control and competence of insect crop pests and vectors of disease (reviewed in Weiss and Aksoy 2011). The following questions aim to address the shortfall in our understanding of the interactions between microbiomes and their human and non-human hosts.

1. What are the primary mechanisms within a host that mediate microbe–microbe and host–microbe interactions?
2. What are the relative contributions of host-associated and environmental factors in determining host microbial community composition?
3. How do microbial communities function to affect the phenotype of the host?
4. Can compositional or evolutionary changes in microbiomes help hosts adapt to environmental change within the lifetime of the host?
5. What is the role of the microbiota in host speciation processes?
6. How can the associated microbiota be effectively included in risk assessments of invasive non-native species?
7. How does the microbiome of captive animals affect the success of reintroduction programmes?
8. How can a 'systems biology' approach improve our understanding of host–microbe interactions?

Health and infectious diseases

The last 50 years have seen the emergence of several hyper-virulent wildlife pathogens in animals (reviewed in Tompkins et al. 2015) and plants (Pautasso et al. 2015). Although the role of microorganisms as pathogens is well known, the importance of host-associated microbiomes in regulating disease susceptibility is becoming more apparent (Koch and Schmid-Hempel 2011; Daskin and Alford 2012; King et al. 2016). A major outstanding research goal is to understand how within-host interactions

among microbes and invading pathogens may shape patterns of infection intensity and disease progression (see also 'evolutionary processes'). Several studies have sought to determine how manipulation of host microbiomes may ameliorate the spread and impact of such diseases (e.g. reviewed in Rebolgar *et al.* 2016).

While for many disease states the paradigm holds true that one microorganism causes one disease, polymicrobial infections are becoming more apparent through metagenomic and metatranscriptomic sequencing of disease-associated microbial communities (Gilbert *et al.* 2016). Consequently, the 'pathobiome' concept, where a disease state is influenced by complex interactions between commensal and pathogenic microorganisms, presents new challenges for applying Koch's postulates to diseases arising from polymicrobial interactions (Vayssier-Taussat *et al.* 2014), such as black band disease in corals (Sato *et al.* 2016) and olive knot disease (Buonauro *et al.* 2015).

In this theme, we have identified research questions relating to the microbial ecology of infectious diseases and host health. Although much can be learnt from the comparatively high number of studies in the human and biomedical literature (e.g. using network approaches in epidemiology), the questions selected in this theme predominantly relate to non-human animals and plants, as humans are covered later ('human health and food security').

9. How can we better track the source and dispersal of particular microorganisms in real time?
10. Many microorganisms are unculturable, and many microbiome studies reveal that diseases are polymicrobial; how can we re-evaluate Koch's postulates in this context?
11. Which factors trigger 'covert' infections to become 'overt', impacting host health?
12. At the population level, how is the burden and shedding intensity of intracellular microbes affected by co-infection by extracellular parasites?
13. What is the ecological relevance of the internalisation of bacterial pathogens by protozoa in terms of their survival and spread?
14. How can network theory best be used to predict and manage infectious disease outbreaks in animals and plants?
15. Can microbiomes of wildlife (plants and animals) be used or manipulated to enhance health and/or disease resistance?

Human health and food security

With the human population due to exceed eight billion by 2024, food security and human health are high on political and scientific agendas. The human microbiome has been the focus of intense research efforts in recent years, (e.g. Spor, Koren and Ley 2011; Walter and Ley 2011; Mueller *et al.* 2012), because gut symbionts shape the immune response (Round and Mazmanian 2009), and diversity fluctuates through chronic conditions and infectious diseases including diabetes, obesity (Ridaura *et al.* 2013; Baotherman *et al.* 2016; Serino *et al.* 2016), asthma (Smits *et al.* 2016) and HIV (Lozupone *et al.* 2013). Improving our understanding of the core human microbiome and individual variation will underpin pharmomicrobiomics, enabling development of novel therapeutic treatments and, ultimately, personalised medicine (e.g. Ubeda *et al.* 2013).

Antibiotic resistance resulting from selective pressures generated by the use and misuse of antibiotics is a global threat to public health (Levy 1997; Tam *et al.* 2012). The volume of antibiotics used in agriculture now exceeds the amount used in hu-

man medicine in many countries (WHO 2011). Antibiotics are still widely used in livestock for prophylaxis and growth promotion, often at subtherapeutic concentrations, exacerbating resistance (Krishnasamy, Otte and Silbergeld 2015). The impact of the leaching of antibiotics into the natural environment and subsequent impacts on natural microbial communities remains poorly characterised (Franklin *et al.* 2016). Current practices of growing high-intensity monoculture crops have a negative impact on the microbial biodiversity of soils through a combination of tillage, subsequent erosion and chemical applications (Helgason *et al.* 1998; Jacobsen and Hjelmsø 2014; Zuber and Villamil 2016), which imposes selection pressures on pathogenic microbes, fungal symbiotic partners and plant growth promoting bacteria (Chaparro *et al.* 2012; Hartmann *et al.* 2015). Thus, there is a need to maintain and enhance microbial populations of crop ecosystems, especially in light of antibiotic resistance (El-louze *et al.* 2014). As antibiotic resistance increases, along with our concern about potential impact on both human and animal health, there is an increasing drive to find new forms of antibiotics.

Though the remit for this section is relatively broad, the questions focus around two main areas: (i) studying the human microbiome to improve the treatment of disease, including the development of personalised medicine and novel antibiotics; and (ii) understanding how 'current' antibiotic regimes and farming practices may negatively impact the diversity of the environmental microbiome and food production capacity.

16. How can human microbiome studies improve personalised medicine?
17. What ecological principles can be applied in the search for new antibiotics and alternatives?
18. What are the main determinants of waterborne infection outbreaks, and what is the best strategy to control these in water distribution systems?
19. What are the consequences of antibiotic and pharmaceutical use in human medicine on microbial communities in freshwater and soil environments?
20. To what extent are microbial species distributions influenced by climate, and what are the consequences for food security and human health?
21. How much microbial diversity in the soil has been lost through monoculture and what is the importance of this?
22. Intensive farming may involve high levels of agrochemicals and broad-spectrum antibiotic usage: what will be the long-term effects on microbial communities?
23. How best can we harness microbial communities to enhance food production?

Microbial ecology in a changing world

Global changes resulting from human activity impact almost every habitat on earth. It is imperative that we focus efforts on understanding the impacts of human activities such as climate change, urbanisation, agriculture and industrial processes on microbial communities, ecosystem functioning equilibrium and host health. Microbial populations have a tremendous capacity to adapt to changes in their abiotic environment, yet the functional implications of these transitions in microbial ecology are still poorly understood and characterised (Bissett *et al.* 2013), and the role of microbes in mediating the response of larger organisms to change is equally understudied. Global environmental changes (GECs) are complex and multifaceted. Human

activities such as urbanisation, land-use change and introduction of invasive species have played a role in shifting global ecosystems via desertification, climate change and habitat degradation. Although such changes have been quantified in aquatic and terrestrial habitats (e.g. Haberl et al. 2007; Halpern et al. 2008), their effects on microbial communities and impacts on ecosystem function are often hindered by a lack of characterisation of communities, or limited understanding of microbial functional traits. Shifts in basic nutrients and gases such as CO₂, along with temperature fluctuations and water availability, greatly influence the distribution and behaviour of species (Tylianakis et al. 2008). GECs can alter host fitness or ecosystem functioning (Shay et al. 2015; Webster et al. 2016) and are likely to occur in combination. While there is a great deal of research into the effects of each of these on microbial communities (e.g. Schimel et al. 2007; Shurin et al. 2012; Lloret et al. 2014), literature considering the effect of multiple GECs is sparser, and these have complicated and often unpredictable consequences when combined (see Boyd & Hutchins, 2012; Ryalls et al. 2013). In this section, we consider how human activities directly and indirectly influence the microbial world. Where applicable, these questions can be considered across multiple biomes and ecosystems, with reference to resulting trophic cascades, in addition to the impacts on multiple biogeochemical processes. We also consider how microbes can be used as a tool for mitigation or bioremediation of human-induced environmental changes, and the ways in which microbes can be included in current evaluations of global change.

24. How can we integrate microbial communities into models of global change?
25. Will ocean acidification, temperature increases and rising sea levels lead to changes in microbial diversity or function, and what will the cascading effects of this be?
26. How do human activities, such as oil and gas drilling, influence the sub-surface microbiome(s)?
27. How will increasing urbanisation affect environmental and host-associated microbial communities?
28. How resilient are different microbial functional groups to ecosystem disturbance?
29. Can we manipulate microbial succession in species-poor soils to encourage repopulation by flora and fauna?

Environmental processes

Microbes play a fundamental role in environmental processes and ecosystem services, including nutrient cycling and organic matter decomposition (Wieder, Bonan and Allison et al. 2013; Creamer et al. 2015; Chin, McGrath and Quinn 2016), bioremediation of contaminated habitats or waste systems (Haritash and Kaushik 2009; Oller, Malato and Sanchez-Perez 2011) and influencing greenhouse gas emissions (Singh et al. 2010; Bragazza et al. 2013; Hu, Chen and He 2015). The ability to use and manipulate these processes has great potential for societal and environmental applications, particularly in extremophiles, which frequently reveal metabolic capabilities and evolutionary solutions not witnessed elsewhere in the microbial world (Coker 2016). However, it is rarely possible to directly link the presence of a specific microbial taxon to a particular ecological process. Other methodological challenges include establishing the relative importance of biotic and abiotic factors in microbial ecosystem function, and determining the appropriate spatial and temporal scale neces-

sary to discriminate links between microbiota and their ecological functions (Bissett et al. 2013). Concurrently, a deeper understanding is required of human-induced impacts on the global microbiome through urbanisation, habitat degradation, climate change and the introduction of invasive species, amongst others.

30. How do we successfully establish microbial communities used in bioremediation?
31. How important is the rare microbiome in ecosystem function, and how does this change with stochastic events?
32. To what extent is microbial community diversity and function resilient to short- and long-term perturbations?
33. What is the importance of spatial and temporal variation in microbial community structure and function to key environmental processes and geochemical cycles?
34. How can we accurately measure microbial biomass in a reproducible manner?
35. Which mechanisms do extremophiles use for survival and how can they be exploited?

Functional diversity

Ecologists are increasingly turning their attention to classifying species based on their activity (function) within an ecosystem, rather than their genotype (Crowther et al. 2014). This is particularly relevant for microbial ecology, in which species are hard to define, horizontal gene transfer is rife and taxonomy is often blurred. Understanding how membership within complex and dynamic microbial communities relates to the function of that community is one of the key challenges facing microbial ecology (Widder et al. 2016). This is true across a vast range of spatial scales, from microbial dyads to the gut of a *Drosophila* fly to ancient trees and their associated ecosystems, right through to global biogeochemical processes. There is an urgent need to understand how the genome of a microbial community (and in some cases, its host) relates to metabolic capacities. Conversely, there is also a need to understand how ecosystems depend on a particular organism or group of organisms for any given process and function. This section describes the need to move from simply describing microbial diversity to understanding what these organisms are doing, how they are doing it, and what biotic and abiotic drivers are controlling their activity. Each question may derive a suite of different answers, depending on the group of organisms, the habitat and the process.

36. What are the mechanisms driving microbial community structure and function, and are these conserved across ecosystems?
37. What is the relative importance of stochastic vs deterministic processes in microbial community assembly?
38. How conserved are microbial functions across different spatial and temporal scales?
39. What is the relative importance of individual 'species' for the functioning of microbial communities?
40. How much functional redundancy is there in microbial communities, and how does functional redundancy affect measures of diversity and niche overlap?
41. How often are functional traits of microbes successfully conferred through horizontal gene transfer?
42. What methods can we use to marry microbial diversity with function; how do we link transcriptomics, proteomics and metabolomics?

43. How do we move beyond correlation to develop predictive models that advance our understanding of microbial community function and dynamics?"
44. How useful are synthetic communities for testing theories about microbial community dynamics and function?

Evolutionary processes

The role of microorganisms in determining evolutionary outcomes of hosts is being investigated in increasing detail (McFall-Ngai *et al.* 2013). Experimental evolution studies represent a powerful means of quantifying host-microbe and microbe-microbe coevolution, and have highlighted the extraordinary capacity of microbes to act as key mediators of host fitness (e.g. King *et al.* 2016). Whilst experimental coevolution studies provide a framework for linking dyadic interactions to community-scale dynamics (Brockhurst and Koskella 2013), evolutionary principles stemming from macroecology are being applied to microbial communities of humans (Robinson, Bohannan and Young 2010). However, fundamental biological questions that are well studied in macrobiology remain controversial for microbial ecology, for example, the species concept remains a source of debate (Freudenstein *et al.* 2016). The operational taxonomic unit (OTU) has become the standard unit for identifying bacteria at the highest taxonomic resolution possible, yet it is hard to clearly define where taxonomic boundaries lie between two bacteria, and what an OTU really represents in biological terms. This is especially problematic in the context of horizontal gene transfer, which is commonly observed in bacteria and has turned our understanding of evolutionary processes upside down. This section relates to how general ecological principles influence microbial evolution and vice versa, what this means for global biodiversity, and whether evolutionary principles can be utilised for anthropogenic gain.

45. How can a bacterial 'species' be defined?
46. To what extent is faunal and floral biodiversity influenced by microbial communities?
47. To what extent do microbial communities have an equivalent to keystone 'species'?
48. Does the structure of microbial communities conform to the same ecological rules/principles as in other types of communities?
49. How do fundamental shifts in environmental conditions impact the trajectory of microbial evolution?
50. What are the relative selective forces favouring microbial genome expansion or reduction?

Society and policy

We need to find ways to apply fundamental biological research to the benefit of society and policy. For example, collaboration with social scientists is crucial when investigating public understanding of microbial ecology, as well as using citizen science approaches to tackle microbial ecology research questions. Many questions relating to this area were discussed at the workshop, and here we present four additional questions that were developed at the meeting that relate to societal and policy-based aspects of microbial ecology.

- i. How can we best address supply and demand of information about microbial ecology between researchers, clinicians, policy makers and practitioners?

- ii. How can we best use social and traditional mass media for early identification of emerging threats to animal and plant health?
- iii. How can we develop an open access data repository or integrate existing databases to create a centralised and standardised method for data and methods sharing in microbial ecology?
- iv. How can we replace fear-based regulation with risk-based regulation, specifically with regard to the use of microbes in bioremediation and bioaugmentation?

DISCUSSION

Here we present 50 important research questions across a number of themes relating to the field of microbial ecology. Although there are many other research issues worthy of investigation, it is intended that these questions will be used to inform and direct future research programmes and agendas, particularly in areas where microbial ecology has not previously been considered or applied. In many cases, these questions are deliberately broad to allow researchers to adapt them to their own areas of interest, for example across different systems, or to varying spatial scales. Across many questions there was strong recognition of the vast metabolic capabilities of microorganisms and microbial communities, and the need to utilise this power to improve human and animal health and wellbeing. Some themes addressed various existing mechanisms for exploiting microbial processes, namely bioremediation, soil improvement, water treatment and probiotic suppression of pathogen resistance. As these are already active areas of research, the questions posed here are structured to provide a framework by which these efforts can be directed in the future.

A predominant theme that emerged was the need to integrate knowledge between different research areas, for example, the application of information from human microbiome studies to the study of other non-model host organisms, and the potential to apply macroecological frameworks to microecological concepts. Many fundamental biological questions that are well studied in classical ecology remain controversial for microbial ecology, and the species concept (Freudenstein *et al.* 2016), taxonomy, and how the OTU should be defined for microorganisms, generated multiple questions (e.g. see 'evolutionary processes' theme). Classical community ecology concepts should not be overlooked when considering microbial dynamics (Rynkiewicz, Pedersen and Fenton 2015) and, conversely, microbial communities may prove useful models for general ecology due to their short generation times, reproducibility and ease of use in the laboratory environment (Brockhurst and Koskella 2013; Libberton, Horsburgh and Brockhurst 2015; King *et al.* 2016). There have been a number of calls for the medical profession to look to ecological and evolutionary tools when seeking to understand epidemiology (Johnson, de Roode and Fenton 2015), investigating novel antibacterial agents (Vale *et al.* 2016), and considering multihost, multiagent disease systems (Buhnerkempe *et al.* 2015).

The 'host-microbiome interactions' theme considered the need to understand factors influencing microbiome composition, which in turn have consequences for a myriad of host traits, including disease susceptibility and host evolution (Chisholm *et al.* 2006; Archie and Theis 2011; Spor, Koren and Ley 2011; Cho and Blaser 2012; Zilber-Rosenberg and Rosenberg 2008; McFall-Ngai *et al.* 2013; McFall-Ngai 2015). As this theme considered microbiota from the perspective of the host, there was some overlap with the 'health and infectious diseases' and

'evolutionary processes' themes. Probiotics were discussed as a viable and promising alternative to current strategies in a number of contexts in these themes, to improve individual health; to decrease disease susceptibility of humans and other animals; to enhance nutritional quality of food; and to mitigate the negative impacts of antibiotic use across humans, livestock, aquaculture and agriculture (Martín et al. 2013; Newaj-Fyzul, Al-Harbi and Austin 2014; Smith 2014; Fox 2015). Developing personalised probiotic-based therapies requires complementary diversity and functional-based studies in order to elucidate the specific roles of microbiota in health and disease, and thus how microbial communities can be manipulated.

Questions considered in both the 'functional diversity' theme and the 'environmental processes' theme raised a common need to understand changes in microbial community structure and function across spatial and temporal scales (Carmona et al. 2016). Establishing appropriate spatial scales for studying microbial processes is an outstanding challenge: microorganisms can orchestrate ecosystem functioning across whole biomes (Sheffer et al. 2015), yet fungi exhibit low mobility on tree barks (Koufopanou et al. 2006; Robinson, Pinharanda and Bensasson 2016), and an air void in soil can be an insuperable barrier for a bacterium. Similarly, drawing meaningful conclusions about microbial processes requires understanding of their temporal variability, for example, diurnal influences (Shurpali et al. 2016) or lags behind changes in ecosystem drivers (Allison and Martiny 2008).

A subject common to a number of themes was the role of individual species versus consortia in community functioning. The question of defining bacterial species is a contentious topic, and the issue remains whether some microbial taxa act as keystones in ecosystem functions. Many microbial surveys carry the implicit assumption that the most abundant taxa are also the most important, yet rare species can be hugely significant if they are highly active and/or monopolise a particular process (Lynch and Neufeld 2015). The collective metabolic capabilities of microorganisms have great potential for *in situ* applications such as bioremediation, particularly when used in multispecies consortia (Mikesková et al. 2012). Successful bioremediation and environmental management requires the introduction of new assemblages into an established community, or stimulation of key members of the community *in situ* (Rillig et al. 2006). In turn, predicting the successful establishment of deliberately introduced organisms depends on an understanding of the principles underlying microbial community formation and structure. Despite these challenges, functional diversity modelling has successfully been applied to the ecological restoration of some plant communities (Laughlin 2014). Closely linked to this is the issue of functional redundancy, and to what extent it is possible to lose species without affecting ecosystem functions. Already there is evidence that microbial communities may be less functionally redundant than macroorganism communities (Delgado-Baquerizo et al. 2016). This issue ties into fundamental ecological concepts, such as niche theory (Carmona et al. 2016); if multiple organisms are carrying out the same process, apparently interchangeably, how do they avoid competitively excluding one another? The concept of keystone species has been shown to be applicable to microbes (Neufeld et al. 2008; Pester et al. 2010; Ze et al. 2012; Yu et al. 2016), yet further work is needed to characterise the extent to which keystone functions occur in different environments and whether these can be consistently identified (Anderson 2003; Pester et al. 2010).

The need for open access databases and repositories, both in the context of data sharing and for methods and protocols, was reflected in the questions shortlisted for the 'society and

policy' theme. Discussions included the benefits of forming collaborative and open research communities, and the need to ensure the legacy of academic research through improving regulation and policy and engagement with the public. Fear-based regulation of research, grounded in alarmist or populist campaigns, as opposed to risk-based regulation built upon evidence, was identified as a possible obstacle to progress, which could be addressed through greater interaction between microbial ecologists and the public at both governmental and grass roots levels. Large-scale assessments of ecosystem services and degradation acknowledge the paucity of data on microbial impacts, presumably because there are no convincing large-scale messages that can be derived at this stage (Norris et al. 2011). Microbial diversity is therefore rarely considered when estimates of biodiversity are required for policy or management decisions. That said, the increasing recognition of the fundamental impact of the microbial world on the functioning of larger-scale processes has made the deliberate manipulation of the microbial world a controversial subject, which was reflected in the number of draft questions submitted related to bioremediation and bioaugmentation (see Supplementary Information). Collaboration with social scientists was identified as crucial in gauging public understanding of microbial ecology, and citizen science approaches were considered as tools to tackle key microbial ecology research questions.

The 50 questions identified here cover a broad range of topics, but some over-arching themes recur across multiple questions, including a recognition that microbes play an important role in a variety of different processes and systems, which may be exploited to solve real-world problems. There were some similarities between the questions identified here and those identified by previous workshops of a similar nature. For example, questions relating to soil health and biodiversity (Dicks et al. 2013), a requirement for developing a theoretical understanding of micro- and macroecological concepts (Prosser et al. 2007; Sutherland et al. 2013a) and disease dynamics (Prosser et al. 2007; Sutherland et al. 2013a) have a degree of commonality with this list. This indicates that the ecological theory underpinning many research questions transcends scientific disciplines, and that there is still much work to be done at both theoretical and applied levels. Within these 50 questions, we have tried to provide a focus for researchers addressing scientific questions from a microbial perspective, regardless of their background. It is expected that these questions will facilitate interesting discussion and new, exciting, interdisciplinary research. The list is by no means exhaustive, and we recognise that the questions presented here are relatively community-centric, primarily due to the recent expansion in methodological approaches that have improved our understanding of microbial community diversity and function. That said, other areas of microbial ecology should not be ignored or forgotten. Given the rapidly evolving field of microbial ecology, it is expected that future workshops with a wide draw will be held to ensure that the identification of research priorities and areas of interest is a continuing process.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary data are available at [FEMSEC](#) online.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Francis Brearley and Michael Cunliffe for their submissions to the pre-workshop questions, and Jessica

Hall, Daniel Henk and Matt Lloyd Jones for their contributions at the workshop.

FUNDING

This work was supported by contributions from the British Ecological Society and the University of Salford towards funding the workshop. KMF was funded by the Finnish Cultural Foundation, NLMF Colciencias, MCM by Earth and Life Systems Alliance, and WJS by Arcadia. The positions and opinions presented in this article are those of the authors alone and are not intended to represent the views or scientific works of the European Food Safety Authority.

Conflict of interest. None declared.

REFERENCES

- Allison S, Martiny J. Resistance, resilience, and redundancy in microbial communities. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2008;**105**:S1:11512–9.
- Anderson TH. Microbial eco-physiological indicators to assess soil quality. *Agr Ecosyst Environ* 2003;**98**:285–93.
- Archie EA, Theis KR. Animal behaviour meets microbial ecology. *Anim Behav* 2011;**82**:425–36.
- Baothman OA, Zamzami MA, Taher I et al. The role of gut microbiota in the development of obesity and diabetes. *Lipids Health Dis* 2016;**15**:108.
- Bissett A, Brown MV, Siciliano SD et al. Microbial community responses to anthropogenically induced environmental change: towards a systems approach. *Ecol Lett* 2013;**16**:128–39.
- Boers SA, Jansen R, Hays JP. Suddenly everyone is a microbiota specialist. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2016;**22**:581–2.
- Boyd PW, Hutchins DA. Understanding the responses of ocean biota to a complex matrix of cumulative anthropogenic change. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 2012;**470**:125–35.
- Bragazza L, Parisod J, Buttler A et al. Biogeochemical plant-soil microbe feedback in response to climate warmings in peatlands. *Nat Clim Change* 2013;**3**:273–7.
- Brockhurst MA, Koskella B. Experimental coevolution of species interactions. *Trends Ecol Evol* 2013;**28**:367–75.
- Buhnerkempe MG, Roberts MG, Dobson AP et al. Eight challenges in modelling disease ecology in multi-host, multi-agent systems. *Epidemics* 2015;**10**:26–30.
- Buonaurio R, Moretti C, Passos da Silva D et al. The olive knot disease as a model to study the role of interspecies bacterial communities in plant disease. *Front Plant Sci* 2015;**6**:434.
- Carmona C, de Bello F, Mason N et al. Traits without borders: integrating functional diversity across scales. *Trends Ecol Evol* 2016;**31**:382–94.
- Chin JP, McGrath JW, Quinn JP. Microbial transformations in phosphate biosynthesis and catabolism, and their importance in nutrient cycling. *Curr Opin Chem Biol* 2016;**31**:50–7.
- Chisholm ST, Coaker G, Day B et al. Host-microbe interactions: shaping the evolution of plant immune response. *Cell* 2006;**126**:803–14.
- Cho I, Blaser MJ. The human microbiome: at the interface of health and disease. *Nat Rev Genet* 2012;**13**:260–70.
- Coker JA. Extremophiles and biology: current uses and prospects. *F1000 Res* 2016;**5**: F1000 FacultyRev-396.
- Creamer CA, de Menezes AB, Krull ES et al. Microbial community structure mediates response of soil C decomposition to litter addition and warming. *Soil Biol Biochem* 2015;**80**:175–88.
- Crowther TW, Maynard D, Crowther TR et al. Untangling the fungal niche: the trait-based approach. *Front Microbiol* 2014;**5**:579.
- Daskin JH, Alford RA. Context-dependent symbioses and their potential roles in wildlife diseases. *Proc Biol Sci* 2012;**279**:1457–65.
- Delgado-Baquerizo M, Giaramida L, Reich P et al. Lack of functional redundancy in the relationship between microbial diversity and ecosystem functioning. *J Ecol* 2016;**104**:936–46.
- Dicks LV, Abrahams A, Atkinson J et al. Identifying key knowledge needs for evidence-based conservation of wild insect pollinators: a collaborative cross-sectoral exercise. *Insect Conserv Diver* 2012;**6**:435–46.
- Dicks LV, Bardgett RD, Bell J et al. What do we need to know to enhance the environmental sustainability of agriculture? A prioritisation of knowledge needs for the UK food system. *Sustainability* 2013;**5**:3095–115.
- Ellouze W, Esmaeili-Taheri A, Bainard LD et al. Soil fungal resources in annual cropping systems and their potential for management. *BioMed Res Int* 2014:531824.
- Freudenstein JV, Broe MB, Folk et al. Biodiversity and the species concept-Lineages are not enough. *Syst Biol* 2016;**10**:1093.
- Fox JL. Agricultural probiotics enter spotlight. *Nat Biotechnol* 2015;**33**:122.
- Franklin AM, Aga DS, Cytryn E et al. Antibiotics in agroecosystems: introduction to the special section. *J Environ Qual* 2016;**45**:377.
- Franzosa E, Hsu T, Sirota-Madi A et al. Sequencing and beyond: integrating molecular ‘omics’ for microbial community profiling. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2015;**13**:360–72.
- Gilbert JA, Quinn RA, Debelius J et al. Microbiome-wide association studies link dynamic microbial consortia to disease. *Nature* 2016;**535**:94–103.
- Haberl H, Erb KH, Krausmann F et al. Quantifying and mapping the human appropriation of net primary production in earth’s terrestrial ecosystems. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2007;**104**:12942–7.
- Halpern BS, Walbridge S, Selkoe KA et al. A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. *Science* 2008;**319**:948–52.
- Haritash AK, Kaushik CP. Biodegradation aspects of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs): A review. *J Hazard Mater* 2009;**169**:1–15.
- Hartmann M, Frey B, Mayer J et al. Distinct soil microbial diversity under long-term organic and conventional farming. *ISME J* 2015;**9**:1177–94.
- Helgason T, Daniell TJ, Husband R et al. Ploughing up the wood-wide web? *Nature* 1998;**394**:431.
- Hiraoka S, Yang CC, Iwasaki W. Metagenomics and bioinformatics in microbial ecology: current status and beyond. *Microbes Environ* 2016;**31**:204–12.
- Hu HW, Chen D, He JZ. Microbial regulation of terrestrial nitrous oxide formation: understanding the biological pathways for prediction of emission rates. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 2015;**39**:729–49.
- Jacobsen CS, Hjelmsø MH. Agricultural soils, pesticides and microbial diversity. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* 2014;**27**:15–20.
- Johnson PT, de Roode JC, Fenton A. Why infectious disease research needs community ecology. *Science* 2015;**349**:1259504.
- Jones AC, Mead A, Kaiser MJ et al. Prioritization of knowledge needs for sustainable aquaculture: a national and global perspective. *Fish Fisheries* 2014;**16**:668–83.
- Koch H, Schmid-Hempel P. Socially transmitted gut microbiota protect bumble bees against an intestinal parasite. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2011;**108**:19288–92.

- Koufopanou V, Hughes J, Bell G et al. The spatial scale of genetic variation in a model organism: the wild yeast *Saccharomyces paradoxus*. *Phil Trans B* 2006;**29**:1941–6.
- King KC, Brockhurst MA, Vasieva O et al. Rapid evolution of microbe-mediated protection against pathogens in a worm host. *ISME J* 2016; doi: 10.1038/ismej.2015.259.
- Krishnasamy V, Otte J, Silbergeld E. Antimicrobial use in Chinese swine and broiler poultry production. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2015;**4**:17.
- Laughlin D. Applying trait-based models to achieve functional targets for theory-driven ecological restoration. *Ecol Lett* 2014;**17**:771–84.
- Levy SB. Antibiotic resistance: an ecological imbalance. In: *Antibiotic resistance: Origins, Evolution, Selection and Spread*, vol. 207. Wiley, Chichester: Ciba Foundation Symposium, 1997, 1–17.
- Ley RE, Hamady M, Lozupone C et al. Evolution of mammals and their gut microbes. *Science* 2008;**320**:1647–51.
- Libberton B, Horsburgh MJ, Brockhurst MA. The effects of spatial structure, frequency dependence and resistance evolution on the dynamics of toxin-mediated microbial invasions. *Evol Appl* 2015;**7**:738–50.
- Lloret F, Mattana S, Yuste J-C. Climate-induced die-off affects plant-soil-microbe ecological relationship and functioning. *FEMS Microbiol*. 2014;**91**:1–12.
- Lozupone CA, Li M, Campbell TB et al. Alterations in the gut microbiota associated with HIV-1 infection. *Cell Host Microbe* 2013;**14**:329–39.
- Lynch M, Neufeld J. Ecology and exploration of the rare biosphere. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2015;**13**:217–29.
- Martín M, Miquel S, Ulmer J et al. Role of commensal and probiotic bacteria in human health: a focus on inflammatory bowel disease. *Microb Cell Fact* 2013;**12**:71.
- McFall-Ngai M, Hadeldb MG, Bosch TCG et al. Animals in a bacterial world, a new imperative for the life sciences. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2013;**110**:3229–36.
- McFall-Ngai MJ. Giving microbes their due—animal life in a microbially dominant world. *J Exp Biol* 2015;**218**:1968–73.
- Mikesková H, Novotný C, Svobodová K. Interspecific interactions in mixed microbial cultures in a biodegradation perspective. *Appl Microbiol Biot* 2012;**95**:861–70.
- Morris CE, Bardin M, Berge O et al. Microbial biodiversity: approaches to experimental design and hypothesis testing in primary scientific literature from 1975 to 1999. *Microbiol Mol Biol R* 2002;**66**:592–616.
- Mueller K, Ash C, Pennisi E et al. The gut microbiota. *Science* 2012;**336**:1245.
- Newaj-Fyzul A, Al-Harbi H, Austin B. Review: Developments in the use of probiotics for disease control in aquaculture, *Aquaculture* 2014;**431**:1–11.
- Neufeld JD, Chen Y, Dumont MG et al. Marine methylotrophs revealed by stable-isotope probing, multiple displacement amplification and metagenomics. *Environ Microbiol* 2008;**10**:1526–35.
- Norris K, Bailey M, Baker S et al. Biodiversity in the context of ecosystem services. *The UK National Ecosystem Assessment Technical Report*. UK National Ecosystem Assessment, UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, 2011.
- Oller I, Malato S, Sanchez-Perez JA. Combination of advanced oxidation processes and biological treatment for wastewater decontamination- a review. *Sci Total Environ* 2011;**409**:4141–66.
- Pautasso M, Petter F, Rortais A et al. Emerging risks to plant health: a European perspective. *CAB Reviews* 2015;**10**:21.
- Parsons ECM, Favero B, Aguirre AA et al. Seventy-one important questions for conservation of marine biodiversity. *Conserv Biol* 2014;**28**:1206–14.
- Peay K. Back to the future: natural history and the way forward in modern fungal ecology. *Fungal Ecol* 2014;**2**:4–9.
- Pester M, Bittner N, Deevong P et al. A ‘rare biosphere’ microorganism contributes to sulfate reduction in a peatland. *ISME J* 2010;**4**:1591–602.
- Prosser JL, Bohannan BJM, Curtis TP et al. The role of ecological theory in microbial ecology. *Nature* 2007;**5**:384–92.
- Rebollar EA, Antwis RE, Becker MH et al. Using ‘Omics’ and integrated multi-omics approaches to guide probiotic selection to mitigate chytridiomycosis and other emerging infectious diseases. *Front Microbiol* 2016;**7**:68.
- Redford KH, Segre JA, Salafsky N et al. Conservation and the microbiome. *Conserv Biol* 2012;**26**:195–7.
- Ridaura VK, Faith JJ, Rey FE et al. Gut microbiota from twins discordant for obesity modulate metabolism in mice. *Science* 2013;**341**:1241214.
- Rillig MC, Mummey DL. Mycorrhizas and soil structure. *New Phytol*. 2006;**171**:41–53.
- Robinson CJ, Bohannan BJ, Young VB. From structure to function: the ecology of host-associated microbial communities. *Microbiol Mol Biol R* 2010;**74**:453–76.
- Robinson HA, Pinharanda A, Bensasson DB. Summer temperature can predict the distribution of wild yeast populations. *Ecol Evol* 2016;**27**:1236–50.
- Round JL, Mazmanian SK. The gut microbiota shapes intestinal immune responses during health and disease. *Nat Rev Immun* 2009;**9**:313–23.
- Ryalls JMW, Riegler M, Moore BD et al. Effects of elevated temperature and CO₂ on aboveground-belowground systems: a case study with plants, their mutualistic bacteria and root/shoot herbivores. *Front Plant Sci* 2013;**4**:445.
- Rynkiewicz EC, Pedersen AB, Fenton A. An ecosystem approach to understanding and managing within-host parasite community dynamics. *Trends Parasitol* 2015;**31**:212–21.
- Sato Y, Civiello M, Bell S et al. Integrated approach to understanding the onset and pathogenesis of black band disease in corals. *Environ Microbiol* 2016;**18**:752–65.
- Schimel J, Balsler TC, Wallenstein M. Microbial stress-response physiology and its implications for ecosystem function. *Ecology* 2007;**88**:1386–94.
- Schneider T, Keiblinger K, Schmid E et al. Who is who in litter decomposition? Metaproteomics reveals major microbial players and their biogeochemical functions. *ISME J* 2012;**6**:1749–62.
- Serino M, Nicholas M, Trabelsi MS et al. Young microbes for adult obesity. *Pediatr Obes* 2016; 10.1111.
- Shay PE, Winder RS, Trofymow JA. Nutrient-cycling microbes in coastal Douglas-fir forests: regional-scale correlation between communities, in situ climate, and other factors. *Front Microbiol*. 2015;**6**:1097.
- Sheffer E, Batterman S, Levin S et al. Biome-scale nitrogen fixation strategies selected by climatic constraints on nitrogen cycle. *Nat Plants* 2015;**1**:15182.
- Shurin JB, Clasen JL, Greig HS et al. Warming shifts top-down and bottom-up control of pond food web structure and function. *Phil Trans B* 2012;**367**:3008–17.
- Shurpali N, Rannik U, Jokinen S et al. Neglecting diurnal variations leads to uncertainties in terrestrial nitrous oxide emissions. *Sci Rep* 2016;**6**:25739.
- Singh BK, Bardgett RD, Smith P et al. Microorganisms and climate change: terrestrial feedbacks and mitigation options. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2010;**8**:779–90.

- Smith JMA. Review of avian probiotics. *J Avian Med Surg* 2014;**28**:87–94.
- Smits HH, Hiemstra PS, Prazeres da Costa C et al. Microbes and asthma: opportunities for intervention. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2016;**137**:690–7.
- Spor A, Koren O, Ley R. Unravelling the effects of the environment and host genotype on the gut microbiome. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2011;**9**:279–90.
- Sutherland WJ, Adams WM, Aronson RB et al. One hundred questions of importance to the conservation of global biological diversity. *Conserv Biol* 2009;**23**:557–67.
- Sutherland WJ, Armstrong-Brown S, Armsworth PR et al. Identification of 100 fundamental ecological questions. *J Ecol* 2013a;**101**:58–67.
- Sutherland WJ, Fleishman E, Mascia MB et al. Methods for collaboratively identifying research priorities and emerging issues in science and policy. *Methods Ecol Evol* 2011;**2**:238–47.
- Sutherland WJ, Goulden C, Bell K et al. 100 Questions: Identifying research priorities for poverty prevention and reduction. *J Poverty Soc Justice* 2013b;**21**:189–205.
- Tam CC, Rodrigues LC, Viviani L et al. Longitudinal study of infectious intestinal disease in the UK (IID2 study): incidence in the community and presenting to general practice. *Gut* 2012;**61**:69–77.
- Tompkins DM, Carver S, Jones ME et al. Emerging infectious diseases of wildlife: a critical perspective. *Trends Parasitol* 2015;**31**:149–59.
- Tylianakis JM, Didham RK, Bascompte J et al. Global change and species interactions in terrestrial ecosystems. *Ecol Lett* 2008;**11**:1351–63.
- Ubeda C, Bucci V, Caballero S et al. Intestinal microbiota containing *Barnesiella* species cures vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* colonization. *Infect Immun* 2013;**81**:965–73.
- Vale PF, McNally L, Doeschl-Wilson A et al. Beyond Killing: Can we find new ways to manage infection? *Evol Med Public Health* 2016, doi: 10.1093/emph/eow012.
- Vayssier-Taussat M, Albina E, Citti C et al. Shifting the paradigm from pathogens to pathobiome: new concepts in the light of meta-omics. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2014;**4**:29.
- Walter J, Ley R. The human gut microbiome: ecology and recent evolutionary changes. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 2011;**65**:411–29.
- Webster NS, Negri AP, Botte ES et al. Host-associated coral reef microbes respond to the cumulative pressures of ocean warming and ocean acidification. *Sci Rep* 2016;**6**:19324.
- Weiss B, Aksoy S. Microbiome influences on insect host vector competence. *Trends Parasitol* 2011;**27**:514–22.
- WHO. Tackling Antibiotic Resistance from a Food Safety Perspective in Europe. Copenhagen, Denmark: WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2011. <http://www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/tackling-antibiotic-resistance-from-a-food-safety-perspective-in-europe> (date last accessed, 19 July 2016).
- Widder S, Widder S, Allen RJ et al. Challenges in microbial ecology: building predictive understanding of community function and dynamics. *ISME J* 2016, doi: 10.1038/ismej.2016.45.
- Wieder WR, Bonan GB, Allison SD. Global soil carbon projections are improved by modelling microbial processes. *Nat Clim Change* 2013;**3**:909–12.
- Willing BP, Russell SL, Finlay BB. Shifting the balance: antibiotic effects on host–microbiota mutualism. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2011;**9**:233–43.
- Yu Z, Krause SMB, Beck DAC et al. Synthetic ecology perspective: how well does behavior of model organisms in the laboratory predict microbial activities in natural habitats? *Front Microbiol* 2016;**7**:1–7.
- Ze X, Duncan SH, Louis P et al. *Ruminococcus bromii* is a keystone species for the degradation of resistant starch in the human colon. *ISME J* 2012;**6**:1535–43.
- Zilber-Rosenberg I, Rosenberg E. Role of microorganisms in the evolution of animals and plants: the hologenome theory of evolution. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 2008;**32**:723–35.
- Zuber SM, Villamil MB. Meta-analysis approach to assess effect of tillage on microbial biomass and enzyme activities. *Soil Biol Biochem* 2016;**97**:176–87.