

Article

Different distribution of soil core microbiota in two places of Huabei plain, central China

Luan Wang^{1,†}, Qian Zhang^{1,†}, Hongtao Mei², Xiaohan Cui¹, Meijie Wang¹, Yu Zhu¹, Boyang Ji^{3,*}, Yongjun Wei^{1,*}

¹ School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, and Key Laboratory of State Ministry of Education, Zhengzhou University, 100 Kexue Avenue, Zhengzhou, Henan 450001, PR China; luanwangzzy@163.com (L.W.); qianzhangzzy@163.com (Q.Z.); xhcuizzu@163.com (X.C.); mjwangzzy@163.com (M.W.); yuzhuzzu@163.com (Y.Z.)

² School of International Education, HuangHuai University, 76 Keyuan Avenue, Zhumadian, Henan 463000, PR China; meihongtao0128@126.com (H.M.);

³ Department of Biology and Biological Engineering, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Correspondence: boyangji@gmail.com (B.J.); yongjunwei@zzu.edu.cn (Y.W.)

Abstract: Soils harbor diverse bacteria, and these bacteria play important roles in soil nutrition cycling and carbon storage. Numerous investigations of soil microbiota had been performed, and the core microbiota in different soil or vegetation soil types had been described. However, the complexity of soil environments and relatively limited information of many geographic areas had attracted great attention on comprehensive exploration of soil microbes in enormous types of soil. To reveal the core soil microbiota in Huabei plain, soil samples from metropolis and countryside regions in the Huabei plain were investigated using high-throughput sequencing strategy. The results showed that the most dominant bacteria are *Proteobacteria* (38.34%), *Actinobacteria* (20.56%), and *Acidobacteria* (15.18%). At the genus-level, the most abundant known genera are *Gaiella* (3.66%), *Sphingomonas* (3.6%), *Acidobacteria* Gp6 (2.1%), and *Arthrobacter* (2%). Moreover, several dominant operational taxonomic units (OTU), such as OTU_3 and OTU_17, were identified to be associated with the soil environment. Microbial distributions of the metropolis samples were different from the countryside samples, which may reflect the environments in the countryside were more diverse than in the metropolis. Microbial diversity and evenness were higher in the metropolis than in the countryside, which might due to the fact that human activity increased the microbial diversity in the metropolis. The soil core microbiota of the Huabei plain were complex, and microbial distributions in the Huabei plain might be mainly affected by the human activity and environmental factors, not by the distance. Our data highlights the soil core microbiota in Huabei Plain, and provides insights for future soil microbiota distribution studies in central China.

Keywords: Soil core microbiota; countryside and metropolis; Huabei plain; Central China

1. Introduction

The Soils harbor abundant microbial resources and contain high numbers of microbes [1, 2]. Among these microbes, bacteria play important roles in various aspects, especially in carbon storage and nutrient cycling [3-5]. The environmental factors played important roles in microbial distribution, while the geographic distances showed little effect on microbial diversity in soil [6-8]. A global analysis of drylands indicates that increasing aridity reduces soil microbial diversity [6]. Recently, the global topsoil microbiota structure and function analyses demonstrate that the microbial distribution patterns are mainly associated with precipitation and soil pH [2, 9]. The microbial community during corpse decomposition in different vegetation soil types are similar, and the dominant factor driving community development is the nitrogen and carbon input [10]. Moreover, deforestation would affect the soil microbiota and the alpha diversity would be increased after the slash-and-burn forest cleaning in Amazon [11].

The microbial distribution in different biogeographical areas was different, and the dominant bacteria in soils worldwide are Proteobacteria, Actinobacteria, Verrucomicrobia, Acidobacteria and Firmicutes [12, 13]. The most dominant bacteria in drylands are assigned to Actinobacteria, which composes 23%-29% of the total bacteria [6], and the desert soil microbiota is obviously distinct from microbiotas of nondesert soils [14]. In relatively undisturbed soil samples collected from North America, the most dominant bacteria are Acidobacteria, Verrucomicrobia and Bacteroidetes [15, 16]. The investigation of the East European plain soils showed that the most abundant bacteria are Actinobacteria, Proteobacteria and Verrucomicrobia [17]. The soil microbial diversity would be affected by vegetation type, and the rhizospheric microbial distribution of different plants are distinct [18, 19]. Despite many efforts have been tried to understand global soil microbial distribution, such as the Earth Microbiota Project [20], the microbial distribution in many geographic areas is still unknown.

Here, we present a soil microbial community study to assess the microbial diversity using a high-throughput sequencing approach in two different areas in the Huabei plain, central China. The sampling places have been used for agriculture for thousands of years, encompassing the countryside and the metropolis area. We analyze the dominant microbes in these samples and compare their microbial distribution. Moreover, the potential relationship between the soil samples and the environmental factors are discussed.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Sample collection and analysis

The 13 soil samples were collected from two different regions in the Huabei plain, Xincui county and Zhengzhou of Henan province, China, in March, 2018 (Table 1). Sampled soils are moist clay in these two places (Figure S1). Among them, 7 soil samples were collected from Xincui county (countryside place, named as XC group), and another 6 samples were collected from Zhengzhou (metropolis, about 300 kilometres from Xincui, named as ZZ group). The soil samples were collected from 5-10 cm of the soils, and were transferred to the laboratory and stored at -20 °C before use (Table 1). To measure pH, 0.5 g soil of each sample was thoroughly mixed with 2ml water. The pH was read with a digital pH meter (Shanghai Lei-ci Co. Ltd) [21]. Temperature and other soil parameters were collected from the public database of China meteorological administration (Table 1).

2.2. Soil DNA extraction

Soil DNA was extracted from 0.5 g soil of each sample, and the soil was prewashed with 1 ml of 0.5 M EDTA to remove organic matters in soils [22, 23]. The soil mixture was collected by centrifugation at 12000 rpm for 5 min. Each prewashed soil precipitates were further treated with 0.6 ml of 0.5 M CaCl₂ and 1.4 ml of ddH₂O, and the soil precipitates were collected by centrifugation at 12000 rpm for 5 min [22]. The pretreated soil was lysed with 1 ml DNA extraction buffer (100 mM Tris-HCl, 100 mM EDTA, 100 mM sodium phosphate, 1.5 M NaCl, and 1% (w/v) cetyltrimethylammonium bromide, pH8.0), 2 µl proteinase K (20 mg/ml) and 200 µl of 20% SDS under the incubation at 65 °C for 2 hours. The crude lysate was centrifuged at 17000 g for 10 min and the supernatant was collected. The DNA in the supernatant was purified with the equal volume of phenol:chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1) for two times and chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (24: 1) for one time. The final supernatant after purification was precipitated with 0.6 volumes of isopropanol, and the soil DNA were collected by centrifugation at 12000 rpm for 5 min. The DNA was dissolved in 30 µl TE buffer with 2 µl RNase (10 mg/ml), and RNA was removed by incubation at 37 °C for 30 min [24].

2.3. 16S rDNA gene fragment amplification and soil microbial community analyses

The V3-V4 regions of microbial 16S rDNA genes were amplified with primers of 341F (5'-CCTAYGGGRBGCASCAG-3') and 806R (5'GGACTACNNGGGTATCTAAT-3'). The 25 μ l PCR amplification mixture contained 25 ng DNA, 1 μ l each primer (10 μ M), 0.5 μ l dNTP (2.5 mM), 12.5 μ l 2* Vazyme Phata max buffer, 0.5 μ l Vazyme Polymerase (Vazyme Biotech). The PCR was performed with an initial denaturation (5 minutes at 95 $^{\circ}$ C), followed by 27 cycles of 15 seconds at 95 $^{\circ}$ C, 15 seconds at 55 $^{\circ}$ C, and 30 seconds at 72 $^{\circ}$ C, and final with one cycle of 5 min at 72 $^{\circ}$ C. The PCR products were purified with the KAPA Pure Beads (Roche) according to the manufacturer's instructions and further sequenced with an Illumina Miseq system (Illumina). The raw reads were processed and analyzed as described before [25]. The operational taxonomic unit was classified based on 97% identity. The principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) and Non-metric Multidimensional Scaling (NMDS) analyses based Unweighted UniFrac distance were generated by the Vegan 2.4.2 package in R. The raw reads had been submitted to the NCBI Sequences Read Archive (SRA) database and the accession numbers were SAMN10602944-SAMN10602956.

3. Results

Table 1. Characterization of the sampling sites.

3.1. Overall soil microbial community composition

Two groups of 13 soil samples were collected, and assigned to be XC group and ZZ group (Table 1). For the 13 soil samples, a total of 716,285 high-quality 16S rDNA gene fragments were obtained, and they were classified into 4838 operational taxonomy units (OTU) based on 97% identity (Table S1). The average sequence and OTU numbers for each sample were 55099 and 1693, respectively, showing there was a large number of common OTUs distributed in these 13 soil samples. The richness and Chao1 indices of these two groups were similar, indicating most microbes in the soil samples had been revealed (Table S2). The Shannon_2 parameters suggested the diversity in these samples were high. Other indices of Simpson, dominance, equitability and the rank abundance hinted that the microbial distribution was not definite evenness and some abundant species were available in the soil samples (Tables S2). The microbial richness, Chao1, Shannon_2, dominance and equitability parameters of samples in ZZ group were higher than the corresponding indices in XC group. The microbial Simpson parameter of samples in ZZ group was lower than that in XC group (Table 3).

Table 1. Characterization of the sampling sites.

Samples	Location	Vegetation types	Altitude (meters)	Mean Annual Precipitation (mm / year)	pH	Average Temperature ($^{\circ}$ C)
HN-S1	Xincai County	Wheat	40	926.7	6.97	15
HN-S2	Xincai County	Wheat	40	926.7	6.76	15
HN-S8	Xincai County	Riverside	40	926.7	7.66	15
HN-S9	Xincai County	Riverside	40	926.7	7.35	15
HN-S10	Xincai County	Pig Farm	40	926.7	6.24	15
HN-S11	Xincai County	Pig Farm	40	926.7	7.54	15
HN-S12	Xincai County	Pig Farm	40	926.7	6.69	15
HN-S13	Zhengzhou City	Grass	105	632	7.81	14.3
HN-S14	Zhengzhou City	Grass	105	632	7.72	14.3
HN-S15	Zhengzhou City	Grass	105	632	7.79	14.3
HN-S18	Zhengzhou City	Riverside	105	632	7.59	14.3

HN-S19	Zhengzhou City	Riverside	105	632	7.75	14.3
HN-S21	Zhengzhou City	Riverside	105	632	7.74	14.3

At the phylum level, the most dominant bacteria in the XC soil samples were *Proteobacteria*, *Actinobacteria*, *Acidobacteria*, and *Bacteroidetes*, and they composed 44.5%, 15.5%, 12.3%, and 6.1%, respectively (Figure 1A and Table S3); while the most the most dominant bacteria in the ZZ soil samples were *Proteobacteria*, *Actinobacteria*, *Acidobacteria*, and *Bacteroidetes*, and they composed 31.1%, 26.4%, 18.5%, and 2.8%, respectively (Figure 1A and Table S3). At the genus level, 312 genera were identified, and 56.6% of all the sequences cannot be assigned to the known genera, indicating that most bacteria in these soils were unknown (Table S4). Among the assigned genera, the most dominant species were assigned to 13 genera of *Gaiella*, *Sphingomonas*, *Acidobacteria* Gp6, *Nocardioideis*, *Arthrobacter*, *Acidobacteria* Gp4, *Acidobacteria* Gp16, *Gemmatimonas*, *Rhodanobacter*, *Nitrososphaera*, *Acidobacteria* Gp3, *Pseudomonas*, and *Streptomyces*. These dominant genera were accounted for 22.7% and 26.5% of the XC group and ZZ group, respectively. Moreover, the distributed of these genera in these two groups were different (Figure 1B and Table S4). For all the 13 genera, the distribution of the two groups are different (Figure 1B and Table S4). Especially, the distribution of *Sphingomonas*, *Acidobacteria* GP6, *Acidobacteria* Gp4, *Acidobacteria* Gp16 and *Nitrososphaera* between the two groups showed obvious difference.




Figure 1 Phylum (a) and genus-level (b) microbial distribution of the two soil groups. Above_phylum and Above_genus mean microbial sequences can't be assigned to phylum and genus, respectively.

3.2. Dominant OTUs in the microbial communities

Though most microbes in the samples were uncultured, 7 of the 10 most abundant OTUs showed > 97% identities with isolated microbes, suggesting the function of these

OTUs can be predicted from the known isolates (Table 2). OTU-4 is the most abundant identified OTU in the samples, and it is *Sphingomonas limnosediminicola*, which mainly distributed in the wet environment [26]. OTU-1 showed 100% identity with *Pseudarthrobacter phenanthrenivorans*, which is isolated from a creosote-contaminated soil [27]. OTU-3 was the 3rd most abundant OTU distributed in the soils, it composed 15.94% of microbes in HN-S2 [28]. OTU-17 is *Rhodanobacter spathiphylli*, which was firstly isolated from a compost-amended potting mix [29]. OTU-9 is *Bradyrhizobium namibiense*, which is a nitrogen-fixing bacterium [30]. OTU-44 is *Nocardioides mesophilus*, which is firstly isolated from soil [31]. OTU-94 is *Sphingomonas aquatilis*, which is widely distributed in the environments.

3.3. Microbial diversity in different soil samples

Usually, the microbial diversity of the soil samples in the same environment would be similar and clustered at phylum-level, for example, HN-S13, HN-S14, and HN-S15 soil samples covered with grass, HN-S18, HN-S19, and HN-S21 soil samples near one small stream were clustered in the phylogenetic tree (Figure 1A). However, some microbial communities from the same area were different and were not clustered at phylum-level, for example, HN-S10, HN-S11, and HN-S12 were collected from the soils near a pig farm, but they distributed in different clusters in the phylogenetic tree (Figure 1A). The same situation was available at the genus-level analyses, for example, HN-S18, HN-S19, and HN-S21 collected near the stream were clustered together; HN-S13, HN-S14, and HN-S15 were distributed at different clusters in the phylogenetic tree (Figure 1B).

Table 2 The 10 most dominant OTUs of the 13 soil samples and their closest isolates and clones.

OTU	Average composition	Closest uncultured bacteria (Accession number)	Identity	Closest cultured bacteria (Accession number)	Identity
OTU_4	2.93%	Uncultured <i>Sphingomonas</i> sp. clone DM8-116 (KC172330.1)	100%	<i>Sphingomonas limnosediminicola</i> O3SUJ6 (NR_157773.1)	99%
OTU_1	1.93%	Uncultured <i>Actinobacterium</i> clone 89_2_42 (MH478460.1)	100%	<i>Pseudarthrobacter phenanthrenivorans</i> Sphe3 (NR_074770.2)	100%
OTU_3	1.33%	Uncultured <i>Xanthomonadaceae</i> bacterium clone T92F04c (HM447944.1)	99%	<i>Chujaibacter soli</i> KIS55-21 (NR_145539.1)	98%
OTU_19	1.10%	Uncultured <i>Laceyella</i> sp. clone strain KCTC 3666 (MK121196.1)	100%	<i>Dehalogenimonas alkenigignens</i> IP3-3 (NR_109657.1)	86%
OTU_17	1.08%	Uncultured Gammaproteobacterium clone S1-051 (KF182794.1)	100%	<i>Rhodanobacter spathiphylli</i> B39 (NR_042434.1)	99%
OTU_9	0.96%	Uncultured Alphaproteobacterium (LC378491.1)	100%	<i>Bradyrhizobium namibiense</i> 5-10 (NR_159233.1)	100%
OTU_44	0.94%	Uncultured microorganism clone SGG-SWU35 (KX925255.1)	100%	<i>Nocardioides mesophilus</i> MSL 22 (NR_116027.1)	100%
OTU_2	0.89%	Uncultured Chitinophagaceae bacterium clone 516_28 (MF002164.1)	99%	<i>Flavitalea antarctica</i> AQ6-291 (NR_157626.1)	94%
OTU_5	0.88%	Uncultured bacterium clone OTU_7933 (MH531581.1)	100%	<i>Dongia soli</i> D78 (NR_146690.1)	95%

OTU_94	0.80%	Uncultured bacterium clone DMA-B01-29 (KU886630.1)	100%	Sphingomonas aquatilis NBRC 16722 (NR_113867.1)	99%
--------	-------	---	------	--	-----

PCoA analyses based on Unweighted UniFrac distance showed that 6 soil samples of HN-S13, HN-S14, HN-S15, HN-S18, HN-S19 and HN-S21 in ZZ group were clustered together (Figure 2A). In the meanwhile, HN-S11 and HN-S12 in XC group were clustered, and another 5 soil samples in the XC group formed the third clusters. The NMDS based on Unweighted UniFrac distance also indicated similar results. The 6 soil samples in ZZ group were clustered together, and another 7 soil samples in the XC group were clustered at two different area (Figure 2B). Both PCoA and NMDS presented consistent beta diversity between groups. Besides, the distance between 6 soil samples in ZZ group and 5 soil samples HN-S1, HN-S2, HN-S8, HN-S9 and HN-S10 were close in PCoA and NMDS analyses.

4. Discussion

The dominant bacteria in these 13 soil samples are similar to previous soil microbiota investigations that the dominant bacteria in soils are *Proteobacteria* and *Actinobacteria* [2, 13, 32]. However, the microbial diversity in these 13 soil samples collected from Huabei plain is different from the microbial diversity in the East European plain where the most dominant bacteria are *Actinobacteria* (46.5%) and *Proteobacteria* (25.6%), it might due to the fact that the environment factors between them are distinct [17]. Moreover, the samples collected from the same place, especially samples from XC group, were not completely clustered at the phylum level, hinting even the microbial communities in same area with different environment factors were slightly different (Figure 1A).

Table 3 The alpha diversity of 13 soil samples.

Region	Richness	Chao1	Shannon_2	Simpson	Dominance	Equitability
XC	1386.3 ± 300	1388.64±300	7.92 ± 0.63	0.018 ± 0.01	0.98 ± 0.01	0.76 ± 0.06
ZZ	2050 ± 265	2051.73±264.6	9.04 ± 0.34	0.0054 ± 0.002	0.99 ± 0.002	0.82 ± 0.02

More than 50% sequences cannot be assigned to known genera, suggesting most species in soils were uncultured and investigation of soil microbes were valuable [2, 13]. The abundance of *Sphingomonas* genus, which has the ability to metabolized some pollutants, are higher in soils of XC group than in soils of ZZ group, hinting the pollutants in XC are higher than in ZZ group, this might due to the livestock breeding and other agriculture activities in the rural area (XC) group [33, 34]. Bacteria from *Gaiella* genus can reduce nitrate to nitrite, and its distribution in all these two groups are abundant [35], hinting that these samples might contain high-level of nitrate. The *Rhodanobacter* genus can converse nitrate to nitrogen and its distribution in HN-S1 and HN-S11 are higher than other samples [36, 37], this might due to the fact that a large amount of nitrate was fertilized in HN-S1 and a large amount of nitrate was available in HN-S11 which might derive from pig manure. Besides, the distribution of *Nitrososphaera* in ZZ group are higher than in XC group, this might due to the fact that some nitrogenous fertilizer was added to the soil samples collected in ZZ group.




Figure 2 The PCoA (A) and NMDS (B) based on unweighted Unifrac distance were used to show the bacterial distribution differences among the 13 soil samples.

Most OTUs in the soil samples showed < 97% identity with isolated bacteria (Table 2), further indicating most species were uncultured. Among the top10 dominant OTUs, OTU-1 is able to metabolize phenanthrene, suggesting there might be some phenanthrene in the soils of HN-S8 which harbored high-level of OTU-1 (Figure S1a) [38]. OTU-17 is very abundant in HN-S10, HN-S11 and HN-S12 which sampled from a pig farm and is related with compost, showing this OTU might be functioned in pig manure pollution removal. Some identified OTUs, including OTU-9 and OTU-94, are correlated with soil nutrition cycling and contaminant removal [30, 33], and it might be due to the availability of small amount of pollutants in the soil samples.

The PCoA and NMDS analyses showed consistent sample classification based on Unweighted UniFrac distance, suggesting the sample classification based on the microbial community were reliable. The bacteria in the ZZ group was more abundant than in the XC group, suggesting that human activities in metropolis increased microbial diversity [19, 39]. The big differences between HN-S11, HN-S12 and another 11 soil samples might attribute to that the input of pig manure from HN-S11 and HN-S12 changed soil nutrition. The microbial distribution of HN-S10 was different from that of HN-S11 and HN-S12, as the pig farm had been abandoned for a few months before we sampled HN-S10, suggesting that the potential pig manure effects on soil microbial distribution had been disappeared [10]. As the pH and precipitation of all the samples are nearly the same (Table 1), the soil microbiota of ZZ group and XC group except HN-S11 and HN-S12 are similar, despite the distance between ZZ group and XC group is 300 kilometers. This soil microbiota similarity demonstrates similar pH and precipitation might result in similar core microbiota [6, 8, 9, 14].

5. Conclusions

In summary, we investigated the microbial diversity of 13 soil samples collected from Huabei plain and found that Proteobacteria, Actinobacteria, Acidobacteria, and Bacteroidetes were the dominant bacteria. Moreover, the microbial species in the Huabei plain was similar, but the microbial distribution are different, indicating different area would have different core microbiome. Input of nutrition, such as pig manure of HN-11

and HN-12, to the soil would change soil microbial distribution, showing environmental factors are the key ecosystem driving roles for microbial distribution.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, Y.W.; methodology, Y.W., L.W., Q.Z.; software, B.J.; validation, L.W., Q.Z., H.M., X.C., M.W., Y.Z. and Y.W.; formal analysis, B.J., Y.W.; investigation, L.W., Q.Z., H.M., X.C., M.W., Y.Z.; resources, X.X.; data curation, X.X.; writing—original draft preparation, L.W., Q.Z., X.C., M.W., and Y.Z.; writing—review and editing, B.J., Y.W.; visualization, Y.W.; supervision, Y.W.; project administration, Y.W.; funding acquisition, Y.W., L.W., Q.Z., H.M., X.C., M.W., and Y.Z.. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by Zhengzhou University startup foundation (No. 32210876) and Innovation and Entrepreneurship Training Program for College Students of Zhengzhou University (2018cxcy717), and Henan Shangxing Environmental protection Technology Co. LTD.

Data Availability Statement: The raw reads of the 16S rRNA data had been submitted to the NCBI Sequences Read Archive (SRA) database and the accession numbers were SAMN10602944-SAMN10602956.

Acknowledgments: We thank DeepBiome Co., Ltd. for bioinformatic assistance.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Thompson LR, Sanders JG, McDonald D, Amir A, Ladau J et al. A communal catalogue reveals Earth's multiscale microbial diversity. *Nature* 2017;551(7681):457-463.
2. Bahram M, Hildebrand F, Forslund SK, Anderson JL, Soudzilovskaia NA et al. Structure and function of the global topsoil microbiome. *Nature* 2018.
3. Nelson MB, Martiny AC, Martiny JBH. Global biogeography of microbial nitrogen-cycling traits in soil. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2016;113(29):8033-8040.
4. Regan K, Stempfhuber B, Schloter M, Rasche F, Prati D et al. Spatial and temporal dynamics of nitrogen fixing, nitrifying and denitrifying microbes in an unfertilized grassland soil. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 2017;109:214-226.
5. Jackson RB, Lajtha K, Crow SE, Hugelius G, Kramer MG et al. The Ecology of Soil Carbon: Pools, Vulnerabilities, and Biotic and Abiotic Controls. In: Futuyama DJ (editor). *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, Vol 48 (Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews; 2017. pp. 419-445.
6. Maestre FT, Delgado-Baquerizo M, Jeffries TC, Eldridge DJ, Ochoa V et al. Increasing aridity reduces soil microbial diversity and abundance in global drylands. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2015;112(51):15684-15689.
7. Kanaan H, Frenk S, Raviv M, Medina S, Minz D. Long and short term effects of solarization on soil microbiome and agricultural production. *Applied Soil Ecology* 2018;124:54-61.
8. Qi DH, Wieneke X, Tao JP, Zhou X, Desilva U. Soil pH Is the Primary Factor Correlating With Soil Microbiome in Karst Rocky Desertification Regions in the Wushan County, Chongqing, China. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 2018;9.
9. Zhalnina K, Dias R, de Quadros PD, Davis-Richardson A, Camargo FAO et al. Soil pH Determines Microbial Diversity and Composition in the Park Grass Experiment. *Microbial Ecology* 2015;69(2):395-406.
10. Metcalf JL, Xu ZZ, Weiss S, Lax S, Van Treuren W et al. Microbial community assembly and metabolic function during mammalian corpse decomposition. *Science* 2016;351(6269):158-162.
11. Navarrete AA, Tsai SM, Mendes LW, Faust K, de Hollander M et al. Soil microbiome responses to the short-term effects of Amazonian deforestation. *Molecular Ecology* 2015;24(10):2433-2448.
12. Fierer N, Ladau J, Clemente JC, Leff JW, Owens SM et al. Reconstructing the Microbial Diversity and Function of Pre-Agricultural Tallgrass Prairie Soils in the United States. *Science* 2013;342(6158):621-624.
13. Delgado-Baquerizo M, Oliverio AM, Brewer TE, Benavent-Gonzalez A, Eldridge DJ et al. A global atlas of the dominant bacteria found in soil. *Science* 2018;359(6373):320-325.
14. Neilson JW, Califf K, Cardona C, Copeland A, van Treuren W et al. Significant Impacts of Increasing Aridity on the Arid Soil Microbiome. *mSystems* 2017;2(3).
15. Crowther TW, Maynard DS, Leff JW, Oldfield EE, McCulley RL et al. Predicting the responsiveness of soil biodiversity to deforestation: a cross-biome study. *Global Change Biology* 2014;20(9):2983-2994.
16. Fierer N. Embracing the unknown: disentangling the complexities of the soil microbiome. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2017;15(10):579-590.
17. Pershina EV, Ivanova EA, Korvigo IO, Chirak EL, Sergaliev NH et al. Investigation of the core microbiome in main soil types from the East European plain. *Science of the Total Environment* 2018;631-632:1421-1430.
18. Leff JW, Jones SE, Prober SM, Barberan A, Borer ET et al. Consistent responses of soil microbial communities to elevated nutrient inputs in grasslands across the globe. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2015;112(35):10967-10972.
19. Hui N, Jumpponen A, Francini G, Kotze DJ, Liu X et al. Soil microbial communities are shaped by vegetation type and park age in cities under cold climate. *Environ Microbiol* 2017;19(3):1281-1295.

20. Gilbert JA, Jansson JK, Knight R. The Earth Microbiome project: successes and aspirations. *Bmc Biology* 2014;12.
21. Slessarev EW, Lin Y, Bingham NL, Johnson JE, Dai Y et al. Water balance creates a threshold in soil pH at the global scale. *Nature* 2016;540(7634):567-569.
22. Cheng F, Hou L, Woeste K, Shang Z, Peng X et al. Soil pretreatment and fast cell lysis for direct polymerase chain reaction from forest soils for terminal restriction fragment length polymorphism analysis of fungal communities. *Braz J Microbiol* 2016;47(4):817-827.
23. Zhou J, Bruns MA, Tiedje JM. DNA recovery from soils of diverse composition. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 1996;62(2):316-322.
24. Zhang J, Wei Y, Xiao W, Zhou Z, Yan X. Performance and spatial community succession of an anaerobic baffled reactor treating acetone–butanol–ethanol fermentation wastewater. *Bioresource technology* 2011;102(16):7407-7414.
25. Jiawei Liang, Wenning Mai, Jinfeng Tang, Wei Y. Highly effective treatment of petrochemical wastewater by a super-sized industrial scale plant with expanded granular sludge bed bioreactor and aerobic activated sludge. *Chem Eng J* 2019;360:15-23.
26. Lee JH, Kim DI, Choe HN, Lee SD, Seong CN. *Sphingomonas limnosediminicola* sp nov and *Sphingomonas palustris* sp nov., isolated from freshwater environments. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* 2017;67(8):2834-2841.
27. Sugiura M, Nakahara M, Yamada C, Arakawa T, Kitaoka M et al. Identification, functional characterization, and crystal structure determination of bacterial levoglucosan dehydrogenase. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 2018;293(45):17375-17386.
28. Kim S-J, Ahn J-H, Weon H-Y, Hong S-B, Seok S-J et al. *Chujaibacter soli* gen. nov., sp nov., isolated from soil. *Journal of Microbiology* 2015;53(9):592-597.
29. De Clercq D, Van Trappen S, Cleenwerck I, Ceustermans A, Swings J et al. *Rhodanobacter spathiphylli* sp. nov., a gammaproteobacterium isolated from the roots of *Spathiphyllum* plants grown in a compost-amended potting mix. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 2006;56(Pt 8):1755-1759.
30. Groenemeyer JL, Buenger W, Reinhold-Hurek B. *Bradyrhizobium namibiense* sp nov., a symbiotic nitrogen-fixing bacterium from root nodules of *Lablab purpureus*, hyacinth bean, in Namibia. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* 2017;67(12):4884-4891.
31. Dastager SG, Lee JC, Pandey A, Kim CJ. *Nocardioides mesophilus* sp. nov., isolated from soil. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* 2010;60:2288-2292.
32. Delgado-Baquerizo M, Reith F, Dennis PG, Hamonts K, Powell JR et al. Ecological drivers of soil microbial diversity and soil biological networks in the Southern Hemisphere. *Ecology* 2018;99(3):583-596.
33. Lee JS, Shin YK, Yoon JH, Takeuchi M, Pyun YR et al. *Sphingomonas aquatilis* sp. nov., *Sphingomonas koreensis* sp. nov., and *Sphingomonas taenionensis* sp. nov., yellow-pigmented bacteria isolated from natural mineral water. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 2001;51(Pt 4):1491-1498.
34. Koutinas M, Vasquez MI, Nicolaou E, Pashali P, Kyriakou E et al. Biodegradation and toxicity of emerging contaminants: Isolation of an exopolysaccharide-producing *Sphingomonas* sp. for ionic liquids bioremediation. *J Hazard Mater* 2018;365:88-96.
35. Albuquerque L, Franca L, Rainey FA, Schumann P, Nobre MF et al. *Gaiella occulta* gen. nov., sp. nov., a novel representative of a deep branching phylogenetic lineage within the class Actinobacteria and proposal of *Gaiellaceae* fam. nov. and *Gaiellales* ord. nov. *Syst Appl Microbiol* 2011;34(8):595-599.
36. Kostka JE, Green SJ, Rishishwar L, Prakash O, Katz LS et al. Genome sequences for six *Rhodanobacter* strains, isolated from soils and the terrestrial subsurface, with variable denitrification capabilities. *J Bacteriol* 2012;194(16):4461-4462.
37. Dahal RH, Kim J. *Rhodanobacter humi* sp. nov., an acid-tolerant and alkali-tolerant gammaproteobacterium isolated from forest soil. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 2017;67(5):1185-1190.
38. Kallimanis A, Kavakiotis K, Perisynakis A, Sproer C, Pukall R et al. *Arthrobacter phenanthrenivorans* sp. nov., to accommodate the phenanthrene-degrading bacterium *Arthrobacter* sp. strain Sphe3. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 2009;59(Pt 2):275-279.
39. Wang HT, Cheng MY, Dsouza M, Weisenhorn P, Zheng TL et al. Soil Bacterial Diversity Is Associated with Human Population Density in Urban Greenspaces. *Environ Sci Technol* 2018;52(9):5115-5124.