1	Comparison of Niskin vs. in situ approaches for analysis of gene expression in deep
2	Mediterranean Sea water samples
3	
4	V. P. Edgcomb ^{1*} , C. Taylor ^{2*} M. G. Pachiadaki ¹ , S. Honjo ³ , I. Engstrom ³ , M. Yakimov ⁴ ,
5	
6	¹ Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Department of Geology and Geophysics, Woods Hole,
7	MA, USA
8	² Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Department of Biology, Woods Hole, MA, USA
9	³ McLane Research Laboratories, Inc., East Falmouth, MA 02536, USA
10	⁴ CNR – Institute for Coastal Marine Environment, Messina, Italy
11	
12	
13	Corresponding and Co-First Authors:
14	*V.P. Edgcomb, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA 02543, Tel: +01 508-
15	289-3734, Fax: +01 508-457-2192, Email: vedgcomb@whoi.edu and C. Taylor, Woods Hole
16	Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA 02543, Tel: +01 508-289-2354, Email:
17	ctaylor@whoi.edu

19 ABSTRACT

20 Obtaining an accurate picture of microbial processes occurring in situ is essential for our understanding of marine biogeochemical cycles of global importance. Water samples are 21 typically collected at depth and returned to the sea surface for processing and downstream 22 23 experiments. Metatranscriptome analysis is one powerful approach for investigating metabolic 24 activities of microorganisms in their habitat and which can be informative for determining responses of microbiota to disturbances such as the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. For studies of 25 microbial processes occurring in the deep sea, however, sample handling, pressure, and other 26 27 changes during sample recovery can subject microorganisms to physiological changes that alter 28 the expression profile of labile messenger RNA. Here we report a comparison of gene expression 29 profiles for whole microbial communities in a bathypelagic water column sample collected in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea using Niskin bottle sample collection and a new water column 30 31 sampler for studies of marine microbial ecology, the Microbial Sampler – In Situ Incubation 32 Device (MS-SID). For some taxa, gene expression profiles from samples collected and preserved in situ were significantly different from potentially more stressful Niskin sampling and 33 34 preservation on deck. Some categories of transcribed genes also appear to be affected by sample handling more than others. This suggests that for future studies of marine microbial ecology, 35 particularly targeting deep sea samples, an *in situ* sample collection and preservation approach 36 should be considered. 37

38

39

40 Keywords:, metatranscriptomics, Microbial Sampler – *In Situ* Incubation Device, pressure
41 effects

43 **INTRODUCTION**

Microbial metabolic activities are the basis of almost every major biogeochemical cycle 44 in the oceans, and as the research community transitions away from purely descriptive studies of 45 46 marine microbes to system-level investigations of community activity and responses to changing environmental conditions, it is imperative that we obtain less biased samples for those studies. 47 As a consequence of the fact that the majority of microorganisms are not amenable to existing 48 cultivation approaches, many marine microbiologists and microbial ecologists have embraced 49 culture-independent methods. Metatranscriptomics, or the isolation and sequencing of messenger 50 51 RNA (mRNA) from an environmental sample, is one powerful method currently used for linking diversity with activity, and for examining microbial activities in response to changing conditions. 52 Metatranscriptomics provides an overview of (at a minimum) the most highly expressed genes in 53 54 a sample. These transcripts inform about the metabolic pathways that are utilized by microbiota in that sample at the time of sample preservation, and specific proteins that were expressed. 55 Enabled by recent advances in high-throughput sequencing technologies and bioinformatics for 56 processing datasets that can contain tens of millions of reads, metatranscriptomics has become 57 one of the most powerful tools for examining microbial community activities. 58

The metatranscriptomics approach has been used successfully to examine gene expression in varied marine habitats. Examples include deep subsurface sediments (Orsi, *et al.*, 2013), the North Pacific Subtropical gyre (Frias-Lopez, *et al.*, 2008, Poretsky, *et al.*, 2009), eastern tropical South Pacific oxygen minimum zone (Ulloa, *et al.*, 2012), coastal waters (Hollibaugh, *et al.*, 2010, Gifford, *et al.*, 2011), hydrothermal vent plumes (Li, *et al.*, 2013), microcosm experiments on mixed water layers from the NE Pacific Ocean (Marchetti, *et al.*, 2012). Metatranscriptomics was also recently used to study microbial responses to the Deep

66 Water Horizon oil spill. Mason et al. (2012) found a rapid increased expression of genes associated with motility, chemotaxis, and aliphatic hydrocarbon degradation originating from 67 members of the Oceanospirallales in hydrocarbon plume samples (Mason et al. 2012). Rivers et 68 69 al. (2013) also applied metatranscriptomics to show increased activity (primarily associated with 70 methane- and petroleum-degrading Gammaproteobacteria) within specific metabolic pathways 71 for the degradation of alkanes, aromatic compounds and methane following the Deepwater Horizon spill. Metatranscriptomic studies in the future will be enhanced by sampling 72 technologies that allow us to minimize potential artifacts that can be introduced due to sample 73 74 handling.

75 For studies of gene expression it is necessary to minimize time between sample collection and chemical preservation. Historically, oceanographers studying marine microbiota have relied 76 77 on ship-based hydrocasting operations whereby water samples from various depths in the ocean 78 are brought to the surface via Niskin rosette samplers for shipboard water processing. This approach is likely not appropriate for mRNA-based investigations due to the typically large and 79 variable lapses in time and accompanying physicochemical shifts samples are exposed to 80 between collection and preservation. When working in the near-surface (top 1-200m) up to 30 81 82 minutes may pass between when a water sample is collected and when it is returned to the 83 surface, preserved and processed in the ship's laboratory. In addition, samples are exposed to 84 pressure, and potentially temperature and redox changes before preservation. Pressure changes, 85 potential physicochemical changes, and separation in time between sample collection and 86 processing are exacerbated when working in the deep sea and/or collecting water samples from low-oxygen or anoxic zones. Impacts on transcription by microbes captured in water samples are 87 also likely to vary between taxa depending fragility of cell structures, and on their strategies (or 88

89 lack thereof) for responding to such changes. Given that average lifetimes of prokaryotic transcripts can be on the order of several minutes (Wang, et al., 2002, Andersson, et al., 2006, 90 Steglich, et al., 2010), the gene expression profiles of microorganisms can potentially be altered 91 92 significantly. While delays in the preservation of DNA and rRNA (often used as a phylogenetic identifier of viable organisms) is less susceptible to such biases because of their significantly 93 94 longer half-lives, delayed preservation of Niskin samples can still be an issue if cell integrity is lost due to unnatural and changing conditions during transport from the ocean to the ship's 95 laboratory. Variable and unknown fractions of genetic material from lysed cells can be lost 96 97 during filtration. This problem is particularly severe for microbial eukaryotes and potentially compounded when sampling greater depths (Edgcomb, et al., 2011). 98

99 Numerous technical approaches have been undertaken for microbial sampling of the sea 100 and include hydrowire deployed devices (Zobell, 1941, Nikin, 1962, Lewis, et al., 1963), devices 101 that minimize exogenous contamination (e.g. Jannasch & Maddux, 1967, Taylor, et al., 2006), samplers that preserve the conditions of the deep sea (e.g. Jannasch, et al., 1973, Jannasch & 102 103 Wirsen, 1977, Tabor, et al., 1981, Bianchi, et al., 1999), a sampler that can preserve a whole water sample *in situ* from 120m depth (Feike, *et al.*, 2012), samplers that collect hydrothermal 104 vent fluids (e.g., Malahoff, et al., 2002, Phillips, et al., 2003, Taylor, et al., 2006), AUV 105 106 (autonomous underwater vehicle) based water samplers (Bird, et al., 2007, Ryan, et al., 2010) those that conduct *in situ* molecular analyses, such as the Environmental Sample Processor (ESP) 107 108 (Scholin, et al., 2006, Roman, et al., 2007, Scholin, 2010), assess phytoplankton assemblages via 109 imaging flow cytometry (Olson & Sosik, 2007, Sosik & Olson, 2007) and that sample remote biospheres (Carsey, et al., 2000, French, et al., 2001, Blake & Price, 2002, Siegert, et al., 2003, 110 111 Cardell, et al., 2004). A common limitation of available instrumentation for in situ preservation

of deep-sea samples, or that might be adapted for this purpose, is the restriction to one or a few samples of limited volume. Sample replication is desirable when examining microbial diversity and activities, and when working in the deep sea, greater total volumes are often required due to low cell densities. Additionally, when working in the mesopelagic and bathypelagic zones, wire time is often precious, and the ability to sample multiple depths is an advantage.

Differences in microbial gene expression have been observed between samples preserved 117 in situ vs. those recovered to the deck prior to preservation from suboxic samples collected from 118 119 70-120m depth in the Baltic Sea (Feike, et al., 2012). Additionally, we have documented that changing physicochemical conditions during Niskin sampling can cause lysis of some microbial 120 121 eukaryotes (Edgcomb, et al., 2011). Obtaining accurate information on in situ microbial 122 activities is of fundamental importance to understanding microbially-driven ocean processes and responses of microbiota (and the major biogeochemical cycles that they mediate) to global 123 124 climate change. To date, no data exist comparing the profile of microbial community gene expression in the deep sea using in situ vs. conventional Niskin-based approaches. Here we 125 126 compare the profile of community gene expression by microbiota in waters from 2222m depth in 127 the Eastern Mediterranean Sea using conventional Niskin rosette collection vs. in situ filtering and sample preservation performed using a newly-developed oceanographic instrument for 128 129 marine microbiological studies, the Microbial Sampler – Submersible Incubation Device (MS-SID) that allows for collection and *in situ* preservation of up to 48 filtered or whole water 130 131 samples during a single hydrocasting operation. While not an ecological study of microbial 132 activities at this location, the aim of this work was to conduct a general comparison of transcriptome results obtained using both methods, and to analyze the reproducibility of 133 134 biological replicates collected sequentially using the MS-SID.

135

136 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study site: The Ionian Sea extends from the Sicily Strait to the Cretan passage, in the Eastern
Mediterranean Sea, which is characterized by an eastward progression of increasingly
oligotrophic conditions (Sarmiento, *et al.*, 1988, Danovaro, *et al.*, 1999, Thingstad, *et al.*, 2005).
The study was conducted using samples collected at a site named KM3 (36° 29'98''N, 15°
39'97''E) from 2222m water depth in September, 2012 using the R/V *Urania* of the Italian
National Research Council (CNR).

143

Niskin bottle water collection: Water was collected using 12L Niskin bottles mounted on a 144 General Oceanics rosette sampler equipped with conductivity-temperature and depth (CTD) and 145 146 pressure sensors. Dissolved oxygen was measured with a SBE oxygen sensor mounted on the CTD, and nutrient concentrations were determined previously at this site using a nutrient auto-147 analyzer (La Cono, et al., 2010). After transferring water from Niskin bottles to a large sterile 148 149 carboy, 30 liters of water were pumped through a 0.22µm Sterivex filter cartridge using a peristaltic pump operating around 125 ml/min containing a Durapore filter (Millipore, Millford, 150 MA, USA), which was immediately filled with RNAlater (Life Technologies Inc., Grand Island, 151 NY, USA) and frozen at -80°C until extraction. 152

153

Use of the MS-SID: Water samples from the same depth and on the same day were also collected and preserved *in situ* using the MS-SID equipped with a CTD, two turbidity sensors, and an oxygen optode (Figure 1). C. Taylor and McLane Research Laboratories developed automated micro-laboratories for conducting multiple tracer incubation studies during cabled or free158 drifting deployments (Taylor & Doherty, 1990, Taylor, et al., 1993, Taylor & Howes, 1994). 159 This technology was recently modified by C. Taylor, V. Edgcomb, and McLane Research 160 Laboratories into an instrument (Figure 1) that conducts in situ tracer incubations in combination 161 with *in situ* microbial sampling and preservation. The modular MS-SID (Figure 1) consists of a 2L syringe-like incubation chamber, a 50-port Fluidic Distribution Valve, a micro- gear pump 162 for microbial sampling, a tracer injector, 48 Fixation Filter Units (Figure 1 inset) for collection & 163 in situ preservation, a High Range CTD (Neil Brown Ocean Sensors, Inc., Falmouth MA, USA), 164 Aanderaa oxygen optode (Aanderaa Data Instruments, Inc., Attleboro, MA, USA), 2 NTURTD 165 166 0-124 turbidity sensors (WET Labs, Inc., Philomath, OR, USA), and real-time bi-directional 167 communication, and electronic control. The MS-SID possesses a Synchronous Digital Subscriber Line (SDSL) data link (Swartz, et al., 2012) that multiplexes digital signals from up to 5 sensors 168 169 at once, and bi-directionally transmits signals to and from the instrument for triggering "adaptive sampling" operations via ordinary conducting hydro-wire. This allowed us to precisely position 170 the instrument at the target depth in the water column and then to trigger sampling for our 171 172 transcriptome studies.

The MS-SID collected three consecutive and separate samples for this analysis from the 173 174 exact same depth as the Niskin rosette based on pressure readings from both instruments, and were collected within 3 hours of the Niskin collections. All samples were filtered in situ at 125 175 ml/min through a 47mm 0.2 µm Durapore (Millipore, USA) filter that, upon cessation of 176 177 filtration was within 10-20 seconds flooded with the preservative RNAlater following filtration. The three filters collected 4L, 3L and 3.4L of water, respectively. Upon retrieval of the 178 instrument to the ship's deck, the Fixation Filter Units were disassembled, and the filters and 179 180 associated RNA later solutions were transferred aseptically to three separate sterile cryovials, and

181 frozen at -80°C until extraction. The Sterivex capsule (from Niskin bottle collection) was also
182 stored at -80°C until extraction.

183

Extraction of RNA: For each of the 3 MS-SID filters total RNA was extracted separately from 184 185 the filter and RNA atter in order to capture the mRNA from any cells that may have lysed during 186 sample storage. The filters were transferred to 2ml tubes and homogenized without beads for 20 seconds at speed 4.0m s⁻¹ on a FastPrep®-24 homogenizer (MP Biomedicals, Solon, OH, USA) 187 188 in 600 µl of RLT Plus buffer (All Prep DNA/RNA Mini Kit, Qiagen). An equal volume of 70% 189 ethanol was added and the manufacturer's instructions were followed for remaining steps. The 190 final volume of extracted RNA was 50 µl in distilled deionized water. The RNA later from each filter's original tube was transferred to a 50 ml centrifuge tube. Four ml of RLT buffer (RNeasy 191 192 Midi Kit, Qiagen, USA) were added and gently mixed. An equal volume of 70% ethanol was added and mixed. Total RNA was then extracted using the RNeasy Midi Kit protocol beginning 193 194 at step 3 and contained in 500 µl of distilled deionized water. Since some cell lysis may have occurred between sample preservation in situ and recovery of the filter from each Fixation Filter 195 Unit, we also retained and extracted RNA from the RNAlater contained within the Fixation Filter 196 197 Unit. For each filter separately, this RNAlater was transferred to a 50 ml centrifuge tube (~15ml). Approximately 7.5 ml of Buffer RLT were added and the samples were run through the 198 199 All Prep DNA spin column (Qiagen, USA). An equal volume of 70% ethanol was mixed with 200 the sample and total RNA was then extracted using the RNeasy Midi Kit beginning at step 3 and 201 contained in 500µl of distilled, deionized water. The combined extractions for each sample were cleaned and precipitated following the instructions in the MEGAclear kit protocol (Life 202 Technologies, Grand Island NY, USA). The RNA pellet was suspended in 100 µl of distilled, 203

deionized water, and DNAsed for 1 hour at 37°C (Turbo DNAse, Life Techologies, Grand Island
NY, USA). Finally all samples were purified using the MegaClear kit one final time.

RNA from the Sterivex capsule was extracted in an identical fashion, with the exception 206 207 that RLT buffer (Qiagen, USA) was initially added directly into the cartridge with the RNA later 208 already inside the cartridge. The buffer and RNAlater were then collected into a single 50 ml 209 centrifuge tube. An additional 2 ml of RLT buffer (final volume same as for the MS-SID samples) were added to the filter cartridge, and the collection steps were repeated. All extraction 210 protocols were performed as described above for the MS-SID samples. The final suspension 211 volume was 10 µl for all samples. To verify the absence of genomic DNA in the RNA extracts, 212 213 one µl was used as a template for PCR using 40 cycles and the bacterial primers 8F and 1492R 214 (Edwards, et al., 1989, Stackebrandt & Liesack, 1993). RNA was quantified using a Qubit @2.0 fluorometer (Life Technologies, USA). cDNA was synthesized using the Ovation RNA-Seq 215 system V2 (NuGEN, San Carlos, CA, USA) following the manufacturer's protocol, and sent for 216 217 transcriptome library sequencing. One lane of Illumina HiSeq 2x100 bp was requested for each of the four samples. 218

219

Analysis of transcriptome data: Quality trimming of the reads (minimum quality score 28,
minimum read length 94 bp and no ambiguous nucleotides) as well as read assembly into contigs
and mapping of reads to contigs were performed using CLC Genomics Workbench 6.0, CLCBio,
Cambridge, MA, USA). The Rapid Analysis of Multiple Metagenomes with a Clustering and
Annotation Pipeline (RAMMCAP) (Weizhong, 2009) was used to assign contigs to clusters of
orthologous gene (COG) families, gene ontologies (GO), and protein families (Pfam).
Taxonomic assignments of contigs were made using PhymmBL (Brady & Salzberg, 2009),

incorporating all available fungal and protist genomes in public databases. The total number of
annotated reads assigned to different COG families for each dataset was expressed as a
percentage of the total annotated reads for each dataset.

230 The degree of variation in gene expression profiles observed between each of the three 231 replicates collected and preserved *in situ* using the MS-SID was assessed by comparing each of the three replicate expression profiles to each of the other two replicate profiles using R version 232 3.0.2 (http://www.r-project.org), 233 the DEGseq package (http://bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/manuals/DEGseq/man/DEGseq.pdf) and a MA-234 plot-based method with Random Sampling (Wang, et al., 2010), as implemented within R. This 235 236 approach was also used to assess the variation in expression profile obtained with the single 237 Niskin sample relative to the three replicated samples that were preserved *in situ* with the MS-SID. Data for each sample were first normalized to the total number of reads within each 238 239 taxonomic group being analyzed. Within DEGseq we calculated a MA-plot with random 240 sampling to compare our three replicate MS-SID samples to our Niskin sample. This method assigns a score to each gene transcript on the basis of its differential expression relative to the 241 242 standard deviation of repeated measurements and permutations of these repeated measurements are used to estimate the false discovery rate (Wang, et al., 2009). 243

244

245 **RESULTS**

Study site: At 2222m depth, the water temperature was 13.81° C, and salinity was 38.723 PSU. Oxygen concentration was 204μ M, representative of the oxygen profiles between the nearsurface and 2222m at this site. Nitrate and phosphate concentrations were measured previously at this site (La Cono et al. 2010), showing an increasing trend with depth, reaching 3.75 ± 0.54

and 0.13 +/- 0.02 μ mol L⁻¹, respectively at 3010m depth. Nitrite was constant at 0.04 +/- 0.01 μ mol L⁻¹ from the sea surface to 3010 m.

252

253 Transcriptome library sequencing: For each of the 4 samples (one Niskin 30L water sample and 3 MS-SID samples) the number of recovered reads, reads remaining after trimming, number of 254 contigs formed, annotated reads, and annotated contigs can be found in Table 1. 78.3 million 255 sequence reads were obtained from the Niskin sample. From the 4L, 3L, and 3.4L MS-SID 256 samples, 122.4, 96.1, and 118.9 million sequence reads were obtained, respectively. After 257 trimming sequences for low-quality and short reads, we obtained 37.9, 66.3, 51.5, and 63.9 258 million reads from the Niskin, MS-SID 4L, MS-SID 3L, and MS-SID 3.4L samples, 259 respectively. Of the total reads that passed quality control, 8.9 million were possible to annotate 260 261 from the Niskin sample, and these formed 11.8 thousand annotated contigs. From the MS-SID replicate samples, 26.6, 25.0, and 27.0 million reads were annotated, and these formed 9.7, 8.5, 262 6.1 thousand contigs. 263 and annotated Data are deposited in CAMERA 264 (https://portal.camera.calit2.net) and the Short Read Archive (SRP042349).

265

Transcriptome library analyses. The majority of annotated reads for both MS-SID and Niskin samples affiliated with the Gammaproteobacteria (47% and 38% for MS-SID and Niskin samples, respectively, data not shown). Percent representation of COG categories (out of total reads recovered for each library) for gammaproteobacterial transcripts recovered from the Niskin sample and from each of the three MS-SID replicate samples is shown in Figure 2 for all COG categories representing >0.001% of total reads in either library. For COG categories T (signal transduction mechanisms), M (cell wall, membrane, and envelope biogenesis), H (coenzyme 273 transport and metabolism), F (nucleotide transport and metabolism), C (energy production and 274 conversion), L (replication, recombination and repair), P (inorganic ion transport and metabolism), and E (amino acid transport and metabolism), percent representation out of total 275 276 reads for Gammaproteobacteria was higher by ~1-2% in the MS-SID samples. In the case of 277 COGs V (defense mechanisms), U (intracellular trafficking, secretion, and vesicular transport), Z (cytoskeleton), Q (secondary metabolites biosynthesis, transport and catabolism), N (cell 278 279 motility), K (transcription), J (translation, ribosomal structure and biogenesis), I (lipid transport and metabolism), G (carbohydrate transport and metabolism), D (cell cycle control, cell division, 280 281 chromosome partitioning), expression levels as a percentage of total annotated reads for each library were approximately the same (within approximately half a percent) in the Niskin and MS-282 SID samples. For COG categories O (posttranslational modification, protein turnover, 283 284 chaperones), and A (RNA processing and modification), expression levels were slightly higher in the Niskin sample than in each of the MS-SID samples. The COG categories with the most 285 abundant annotated transcripts for Gammaproteobacteria included amino acid transport and 286 287 metabolism (4.8-7.3% of total reads in each of the 4 libraries), inorganic ion transport and metabolism (3.5-6.1%), replication, recombination and repair (3.5-6.4%), and energy production 288 and conversion (4.9-6.4%) (Figure 2). 289

The degree of variation in gene expression profiles, defined here as the relative abundance of annotated transcripts, between the three MS-SID replicates was assessed using the *DEGseq* package, which revealed 9.2-9.8% variation in pairwise expression profiles (relative transcript abundance) between replicates. Differentially expressed transcripts included peptidases, three RNA methylases, ATPases, and a NCAIR synthetase. MA plots for pairwise

comparisons of the three replicates depicting the \log_2 fold change in gene expression vs. the mean of normalized counts showed a balanced distribution of the contigs (data not shown).

297 For comparisons of Niskin to MS-SID profiles for protists and Fungi, the data for each of the MS-SID libraries were combined, representing a total of 10.4L filtered seawater. All 298 299 together, annotated reads assigned to eukaryotes represented a small fraction of the 300 metatranscriptome recovered in the MS-SID and Niskin datasets (1.3 and 1.0%, respectively). 301 The percent representation of GOC categories for transcripts assigned to protists (Figure 3) 302 reveal some differences from the results for Gammaproteobacteria. In most cases, the relative abundance of transcripts (within each of the categories) was higher in the MS-SID dataset than in 303 304 the Niskin dataset. These categories include defense mechanisms (0.12 vs. 0.02%), signal transduction mechanisms (0.04 vs. 0.01%), secondary metabolites biosynthesis, transport and 305 306 catabolism (0.06 vs. 0.01%), carbohydrate transport and metabolism (0.09 vs. 0.01%), nucleotide 307 transport and metabolism (0.03 vs. ~0%), energy production and conversion (0.08 vs. 0.03%), replication, recombination and repair (0.29 vs. 0.08%), inorganic ion transport and metabolism 308 (0.22 vs. 0.06%), and amino acid transport and metabolism (0.07 vs. 0.03%). There were some 309 exceptions, however. Protists exhibited higher expression of genes in the Niskin sample 310 311 associated with posttranslational modification, protein turnover, and chaperones (higher by 312 (0.12%), cell wall, membrane and envelope biosynthesis (by (0.1%)), transcription (by (0.18%)), 313 cytoskeleton (by 0.02%), cellular trafficking, secretion, and vesicular transport (by 0.03%), translation, ribosomal structure and biogenesis (by 0.35%), and coenzyme transport and 314 315 metabolism (by 0.03%).

Fungal transcripts represented 1.8 and 0.3% of the MS-SID and Niskin datasets, respectively. For Fungi, transcript relative abundances for almost every COG category were

consistently higher by 0.02 to 0.3 in the combined MS-SID vs. the Niskin library
(Supplementary Figure 1). Only for the two COG categories, transcription and cytoskeleton,
were expression levels higher (0.015 and 0.005%, respectively) in the Niskin sample.

Analysis of variation in relative transcript abundance obtained with the Niskin sample vs. 321 the three replicated samples that were preserved *in situ* with the MS-SID was performed for both 322 323 the dominant bacterial group, the Gammaproteobacteria, and the dominant eukaryotic group, 324 Fungi, using the DEGseq package (Wang, et al., 2009). These analyses revealed that 75% of the fungal (n=319) and 99% of gammaproteobacterial transcripts (n=1713) showed differential 325 expression (p<0.001). Supplementary Figure 2A and B show the differentially expressed 326 327 transcripts for Gammaproteobacteria and Fungi on MA-plots for the MS-SID vs. Niskin comparisons, with red dots representing transcripts with significantly different (p<0.001) 328 expression between the two types of samples. Supplementary Figure 2C and D show boxplots of 329 330 the read counts per gene for libraries prepared using the two sampling methods for 331 Gammaproteobacteria and Fungi, respectively. When transcribed genes within COG category O (posttranslational modification, protein turnover, chaperones) were compared for Niskin and the 332 three MS-SID samples, 86% of the reads assigned to the 118 transcripts detected, were 333 334 differentially expressed (p<0.001).

335

336 **DISCUSSION**

Profiles of gene expression obtained for these water column samples from 2222m in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea using *in situ* preservation of water samples vs. Niskin bottle collection were not the same. While it can not be entirely ruled out that some differences were due to the use of membrane filters in the MS-SID sampler vs. Sterivex filters aboard the ship where the Niskin

341 waters were processed, or due to differences in total volumes filtered (10.4L total for MS-SID 342 and 30L for Niskin), it is intuitive to consider that increased handling and physicochemical alterations prior to preservation likely alters the profile of community activities. Sample 343 344 collection approaches that rely on returning water samples to the surface prior to processing and preservation may be completely appropriate for many types of investigations, however our 345 346 results and the results of Feike et al. who conducted a similar experiment using water samples from 70-120m depth in the Baltic Sea (Feike, et al., 2012) suggest that for examinations of 347 microbial activities, in situ preservation is desirable. This may be increasingly important for 348 349 deeper water samples.

350 Obtaining an accurate snapshot of *in situ* microbial activities requires collecting and preserving samples in a fashion that minimizes detectable environmental perturbations. All 351 352 existing water-sampling technologies that involve drawing water through intake plumbing into a 353 chamber or bag or drawing water through a filter have the potential to introduce artifacts 354 resulting from detected perturbations that cause microbes to alter transcription of particular types of genes. Nonetheless, the primary advantage of *in situ* approaches is that they minimize artifacts 355 associated with sample handling, and allow for almost immediate preservation of sensitive 356 molecules. Furthermore, moored *in situ* technologies are useful for studies of temporal variations 357 358 in microbial communities. For example, Ottesen et al. (2011) used a moored ESP to automatically filter and preserve (in RNAlater) near-surface water samples from Monterey Bay 359 at four time points over the course of a day. Using this technology to capture and preserve RNA 360 361 allowed these researchers to track changes in community composition and gene expression over this timeframe. This was expanded upon by Ottesen and colleagues (2013) who used the moored 362 ESP to detect coordinated gene expression between microbial groups over a 2 day timeframe at 363

364 23m depth off the coast of California, possibly in response to specific environmental cues. Preserving samples *in situ* in the deep ocean prior to returning them to the sea surface has the 365 obvious advantage of avoiding potentially significant pressure and other physicochemical 366 367 changes that can occur during sample retrieval and prior to processing/preservation in the ship laboratory. Preserving a whole water sample immediately upon collection by drawing it into a 368 369 bag preloaded with preservative (as can be performed by the MS-SID) or into a container that is 370 immediately injected with preservative (Feike, et al., 2012) accomplishes this goal. However, this approach limits the volume that one can collect. In some cases, such as for water samples 371 372 where cell densities are low, it is desirable to collect information (e.g., RNA) from a much 373 greater volume of water via filtration. During filtration and prior to preservation, cells impinged on filters earlier in the filtration routine undoubtedly experience more significant environmental 374 375 changes than those that are captured toward the end of filtration. This is a concern not only for Niskin-based sample collection, but also for *in situ* filtration technologies such as the MS-SID. In 376 contrast to waters collected using *in situ* filtration and preservation methods, all cells on filters 377 378 from Niskin water samples have undergone depressurization and have spent variable lengths of 379 time on deck prior to filtration. This is not the case for *in situ* preserved filters, where until 380 impinged on a filter the cells are in their natural environment. The composite mRNA pools within the filtered organisms reflect an average residence time on the filter surface that is 381 approximately one-half the total filtration time (e.g., ~10 min for our 20 min filtrations), which 382 383 additionally enhances the fidelity of the samples collected. While the MS-SID will capture in situ gene expression patterns with improved fidelity, there may be some genes that reflect the stresses 384 of being impinged on a filter during filtration. In all cases, artifacts introduced into expression 385 386 profiles by filtration can be minimized by shortening filtration times.

387 The three MS-SID samples for which we present data represent biological replicates, however we note that they were collected sequentially, and not concurrently, from the same 388 water feature. Figure 2 shows that these replicates captured essentially the same profile of 389 390 relative gene expression between different COG categories for Gammaproteobacteria, and this was true of all other taxonomic groups (data not shown). This is supported by analysis of 391 392 variation in relative transcript abundance between the three MS-SID replicates for all taxa using 393 the DEGseq package, which revealed 9.2-9.8% of genes were differentially expressed between replicates (<p=0.05 levels). *DEGseq* is suspected to overestimate differentially expressed genes 394 395 between samples (Guo et al. 2013), so the amount of differential expression between replicates 396 might be lower than this.. The 9.2-9.8% variation between replicates is still much lower than the percent of differentially expressed genes detected using the same method comparing the Niskin 397 398 and the average MS-SID overall gene expression profiles (discussed below). MA plots for pairwise comparisons of the three replicates depicting the \log_2 fold change in gene expression vs. 399 the mean of normalized counts showed a balanced distribution of contigs between the replicates 400 401 (data not shown). Although many metatranscriptome studies of marine samples published to date have relied upon single samples from selected habitats (e.g., Frias-Lopez, et al., 2008, Poretsky, 402 et al., 2009, Feike, et al., 2012, Orsi, et al., 2013), we would have preferred to analyze replicate 403 samples, however replicate Niskin samples from a separate cast were not available for this study. 404 Having biological replicates for the Niskin collection would have helped to confirm that some 405 406 differences in observed profiles in the MS-SID and Niskin samples were not due to temporal variation. For this deep-sea location, however, we doubt that the 3 hours difference in sample 407 collection between the methods could account for observed differences, although this possibility 408 409 cannot be entirely ruled out.

410 It is noteworthy that the Niskin sample produced 64-81% of the number of initial reads 411 obtained from the 3 MS-SID samples, and 59-73% after quality control trimming, in spite of identical library preparation protocols, equal sequencing efforts and the fact that the Niskin filter 412 413 represented 30L of filtered water compared to 3-4L of water for each of the MS-SID samples. This lower number of initial reads however, assembled into roughly twice as many contigs. 414 Approximately 23% of Niskin initial reads were successfully annotated, in comparison to 49, 40, 415 and 42% of the initial reads for the 3 MS-SID replicates, and 29% of Niskin contigs were 416 successfully annotated vs. an average of 44% of MS-SID contigs (Table 1). The N50 lengths for 417 418 the MS-SID contigs were slightly higher than the Niskin sample (473, 447, and 428 vs. 424 bp), 419 however this does not likely explain differences in contig formation or annotation. We hypothesize that some aspect of Niskin water collection and processing (pressure changes, 420 421 increased time delays between sample collection and processing, or other unknown 422 physicochemical alterations to the sample) reduced the community complexity in this sample (possible cell lysis, cell death) for some taxa. Lower complexity could lead to greater contig 423 424 formation, and if remaining complexity favored taxa that are less represented in public sequence databases, then this may explain the lower percentage of annotated contigs for the Niskin sample. 425 426 Pressure changes and sample handling are likely to have differential impacts on cell integrity and gene transcription of different taxa, and some cell activities are also likely to be 427 more sensitive to perturbations than others. This was observed in our datasets. For example, for 428 429 Gammaproteobacteria, which appear to be one of the dominant bacterial groups in our samples, certain COG categories appear to show a greater difference than others in gene expression 430 between the Niskin and MS-SID data sets (Figure 2). However, a test for differential expression 431 432 revealed that almost all unique transcripts annotated to Gammaproteobacteria in Niskin vs. the

three MS-SID datasets were expressed differentially (p<0.001). This suggests that for investigations of specific metabolic pathways within a particular COG category, that *in situ* fixation may provide a different picture than Niskin sampling.

436 While the percentages of reads associated with certain functional categories, such as genes associated with the 3-hydroxypropionate/4-hydroxybutyrate carbon fixation cycle were 437 detected at approximately equal levels (0.27% of Niskin library and 0.25-0.39% of the MS-SID 438 439 libraries) for many other transcribed genes, expression in Niskin vs. MS-SID libraries varied. Although it was not the objective of this study proof-of-concept study to closely examine 440 441 specific microbial activities (ecological function) within different COG categories of expressed genes in these samples, a closer examination of specific transcripts and taxonomic affiliation of 442 those transcripts within COG O (posttranslational modification, protein turnover, and 443 444 chaperones) provides insight into the types of variation underlying observed differences in overall results. Transcripts annotated to COG category O represented 2.8% (annotated to 29 445 taxa) and 1.1% (annotated to 18 taxa) of total transcripts in each library for Niskin and MS-SID 446 447 samples, respectively. Transcripts in the Niskin library were annotated to 10 taxonomic groups that were not also detected in the MS-SID samples; Bacillariophycea, Chlamydiae, Chlorobia, 448 449 Chloroflexi, Choanoflagellata, Crenarchaeota, Tenericutes, Thaumarchaeota, Thermotogae, and Verrucomicrobia (results presented at different taxonomic levels due to variance in annotation 450 detail). This suggests that in situ filtration and preservation may have reduced stresses 451 experienced by some taxa. Looking within the COG O transcripts annotated to protozoa and 452 metazoa provides insight into observed variations between Niskin and MS-SID samples, and 453 illustrates that sensitivity to sample handling is variable between taxa. 454

455 Among transcript types that were unique to the Niskin library, 5478, 4858, 529, and 456 4103 reads were detected for molecular chaperones of choanoflagellates, ciliates, Bacillariophyta, and metazoa, respectively. Also unique to the Niskin library was 62 and 1301 457 458 reads annotated to molecular chaperone HSP90 of choanoflagellates and various metazoan, respectively. Heat shock proteins such as HSP90 assist the proper folding of proteins under cell 459 stress. Expression of transcripts for the protein ubiquitin was detected in both libraries, but at 460 higher levels (1786 vs. 42 reads) in Niskin vs. MS-SID samples. Ubiquitin is a small protein 461 associated with post-translational modification that is expressed in many eukaryotes and can 462 463 among other functions, signal for the degradation of a damaged protein (Glickman and Ciechanover 2002). Some types of COG O transcripts were detected only in the MS-SID 464 samples, and these were all affiliated with various metazoan (echinoderms, nematodes). These 465 466 included metazoan transcripts for thioredoxin reductase (511 reads), FKBP-type peptidyl prolyl cis-trans isomerase (190 reads), transcripts annotated to disulfide bond chaperone activity (345 467 reads), an ATPase with chaperone activity (345 reads), and a predicted metalloendopeptidase 468 469 associated with peptide breakdown (8729 reads). Transcriptional responses to sample handling also differed between taxa. Illustrating this, in comparison to protists (Figure 3), Fungi 470 (Supplementary Figure 1) exhibit greater differences in percentage representation within many 471 COG categories between MS-SID and Niskin samples. 472

Increase in hydrostatic pressure is known to affect a wide range of cellular processes of microorganisms, including DNA structure and function, membrane synthesis and repair, cytochrome formation, cell division, enzyme function, and to affect certain taxa more than others (see review by Bartlett (2002) and Ishii et al. (2004)). In studies of *Escherichia coli*, cellular processes including motility, substrate transport, cell division, growth, DNA replication,

translation, transcription, and viability are repressed by increases in pressure (Bartlett, 2002). 478 479 Less is known about decompression effects on microorganisms. We observed lower expression 480 levels (as a percentage of total annotated reads) in the Niskin sample for many COG categories 481 for Fungi (Supplementary Figure 1), and decompression effects are one possible explanation for this. In comparison, for protists, some categories of transcripts appear to be suppressed and 482 others, such as COG M (cell wall/membrane/envelope biogenesis), enhanced. In the case of 483 COG M, this may indicate protists increase transcription of genes associated with cell membrane 484 repair in response to decompression. Pressure is the only stressor known to simultaneously 485 486 induce a wide range of both heat shock and cold shock proteins, likely in response to destabilization of protein quaternary and tertiary structures, and their simultaneous induction in 487 E. coli may represent an attempt to repair the damaging effects of elevated pressure on 488 489 membrane integrity, translation processes, and macromolecule stability (Bartlett, 2002). Heat 490 shock proteins are known to be induced in piezophiles such as the deep-sea piezophilic hyperthermophile *Thermococcus barophilus* upon decompression (Marteinsson, *et al.*, 1999). 491 492 While an increase in percent transcription within COG category O (posttranslational modification, protein turnover, chaperones) was not observed in the Niskin sample relative to the 493 MS-SID samples for Fungi (Supplementary Figure 1), an increase was observed for 494 Gammaproteobacteria (Figure 2), protozoa (Figure 3), and many other taxa (data not shown). 495 496 When the number of reads assigned to the 118 unique types of transcripts detected in our samples within this COG category in the Niskin sample were compared to those detected in the 497 three MS-SID samples, 86% of them showed evidence of differential levels of expression 498 (p<0.001). Given that high-pressure activation of gene expression is known among piezophilic 499

bacteria (Bartlett, 2002), it stands to reason that transcription of many types of genes may also beaffected by decompression for potentially, a wide range of taxa.

Lipid membranes are also known to be sensitive to pressure effects since lipids are highly 502 503 compressible (Weber & Drickamer, 1983), and during decompression, the bacterium Colwellia 504 responded by forming intracellular vesicles and releasing membrane fragments into the medium, 505 followed by cell lysis (Chastain & Yayanos, 1991). Our observations of differential transcription (repression or enhancement) between Niskin and MS-SID samples of genes associated with lipid 506 transport and metabolism, intracellular trafficking, secretion, and vesicular transport, and cell 507 508 wall, membrane, and envelope biogenesis may be indicative of such decompression responses for some taxa. 509

Free-living (dispersed in the water column), and detritus-associated protozoa are now 510 recognized as important components of marine microbial communities (Caron, 1991). While 511 piezotolerant protists (flagellates, ciliates, and amoebae) from the bathypelagic have been 512 observed using microscopic analysis of cultures grown under high pressure or preserved samples 513 514 (Patterson, et al., 1993, Atkins, et al., 2000, Edgcomb, et al., 2011), less is known about the effects of pressure changes on protozoa than for Bacteria and Archaea. Numbers of species of 515 516 free-living and particle-associated protists declines from the photic zone into the bathypelagic, and this decline is thought to be attributed to reductions in diversity and quantities of available 517 food, and potentially also due to pressure effects (Patterson, et al., 1993). Flagellates are known 518 519 to have variable sensitivities to changes in pressure, and even species within genera can vary 520 significantly in their responses (Turley & Carstens, 1991). This implies that significant depressurization may cause some protist taxa to lyse during recovery if cells are not preserved in 521 522 situ. Supporting this notion, in studies of anoxic waters from 900m depth in the Cariaco Basin,

523 Venezuela, it was necessary to preserve water samples *in situ* for fluorescence and scanning 524 electron microscopy in order to more accurately assess protist abundances (Edgcomb, et al., 525 2011). Deep ocean microorganisms are known to alter the phospholipid composition of their 526 membranes to maintain adequate membrane fluidity under higher pressures (Yano, et al., 1998). It is conceivable that for an unknown fraction of the microbial community from mesopelagic and 527 528 bathypelagic realms the higher membrane fluidity upon depressurization may make them more 529 susceptible to lysing or leaking. Depressurization during sample recovery not only has the potential to alter gene expression from what was occurring in the sampled habitat, but to bias 530 531 against the recovery of an unknown fraction of the community from any sample, due to loss of cell integrity for some taxa. 532

533

534 CONCLUSIONS

535

536 Collectively, the potential effects of depressurization during sample retrieval and on deck sample handling during filtration have the potential to confound our ability to gather an accurate 537 538 impression of *in situ* microbial metabolic activities. Results of this study suggest that such effects may be non-trivial when sampling deep-sea habitats, for certain taxa, and for certain categories 539 of transcribed genes. Further comparisons of gene expression in a variety of marine water 540 column and sedimentary habitats using different sampling methodologies are warranted. 541 Understanding the mechanisms underpinning our observed pressure and/or sample handing 542 543 effects on different types of microorganisms will require analyses of the integrity and/or changes 544 in specific enzymes catalyzing apparently pressure-sensitive processes in organisms preserved in situ vs. exposed to significant pressure changes and increased sample handling. 545

546

547 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

548

549 VE, CT, and MP designed experiments together with SH. CT and VE together with SH, IE and 550 McLane Research Laboratories personnel developed the MS-SID. VE, CT, MP, and MY 551 conducted experiments, and VE and MP analyzed results.

552

553 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

554

We would like to thank the captains and crews of the R/V Urania for their hard work to assure 555 the success of our sampling objectives, E. Leadbetter and D. Patterson for helpful discussions on 556 557 the data and their interpretation, R. Schmitt for generous help with repairs to the High Range CTD, G. LaSpada and F. Smedile for assistance with sampling, and L. Wang for helpful 558 559 discussion on analytical approaches using DEGexp. In addition to technical and engineering 560 contributions, we thank Y. Honjo and McLane Research Laboratories for assistance with funding the transcriptome library analyses. This research was funded by NSF OCE-1061774 to VE and 561 CT, NSF DBI-0424599 to CT and NSF OCE-0849578 to VE and colleague J. Bernhard. Cruise 562 participation was partially supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) grant 563 STO414/10-1 to T. Stoeck. 564

565

566 TABLE AND FIGURE LEGENDS

Table 1. Summary of transcriptome sequencing, quality control, and number of annotated reads
(based on the COG database) for the Niskin water sample and the three replicate MS-SID
samples.

571

Figure 1. Microbial Sampler-Submersible Incubation Device (MS-SID). Panel A, schematic of 572 the instrument illustrating major modular components. Each Fixation Filter Unit (lower left 573 inset) possesses a reservoir for containing an appropriate (denser than water) chemical 574 preservative (in our study RNAlater). During filtration, preservative loss is prevented by a 575 576 poppet that seals the access hole shown. Upon cessation of filtration, the poppet settles by gravity, opening the reservoir, allowing preservative to flow onto the filter surface by 577 convection. Panel B, deployment of SID-ISMS for collection of microbial samples from 578 579 Mediterranean Sea for grazing studies. 580 Figure 2. Percentage of total annotated reads assigned to Gammaproteobacteria in each COG 581 582 category for the Niskin sample (black) and the three replicate MS-SID samples (shades of grey). 583 Figure 3. Percentage of total annotated reads assigned to protist taxa in each COG category for 584 the Niskin sample (black) and the combined MS-SID samples (grey). 585 586 587 Supplementary Figure 1. Percentage of total annotated reads assigned to protist taxa in each COG category for the Niskin sample (black) and the pooled MS-SID samples (grey). 588 589

590 Supplementary Figure 2. *DEGseq* analysis comparing differential expression between the three

replicate MS-SID transcript libraries vs. the Niskin library. A) MA-plot B) Boxplot of read

592 counts (log2) for each gene in the MS-SID vs. Niskin libraries. Y axis depicts the log_2 fold

change in gene expression (M) and X axis depicts the mean of normalized counts (A). Red data

points are gene transcripts with significant differences (p<0.001) in expression levels.

595

596 **REFERENCES**

- Andersson AF, Lundgren M, Eriksson S, Rosenlund M, Bernander R & Nilsson P (2006) Global
 analysis of mRNA stability in the archaeon Sulfolobus. *Genome Biology* 7: -.
- Atkins MS, Teske AP & Anderson OR (2000) A survey of flagellate diversity at four deep-sea
 hydrothermal vents in the Eastern Pacific Ocean using structural and molecular
 approaches. *J Eukaryot Microbiol* 47: 400-411.
- Bartlett DH (2002) Pressure effects on in vivo microbial processes. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 1595: 367-381.
- Bianchi A, Garcin J & Tholosan O (1999) A high-ressure serial sampler to measure microbial
 activity in the deep sea. *Deep-Sea Res I* 46: 2029-2142.
- Bird LE, Sherman AD & Ryan JP (2007) Development of an active, large volume, discrete
 seawater sampler for autonomous underwater vehicles. ed.^eds.), p.^pp. Vancouver,
 Canada.
- Blake EW & Price B (2002) A proposed sterile sampling system for Antarctic subglacial lakes.
 Memoirs of the Institute for Polar Research Special Issue 56: 253-263.
- Brady A & Salzberg SL (2009) Phymm and PhymmBL: Metagenomic phylogenetic
 classification with interpolated markov models. *Nature Methods* 6: 673-676.
- Cardell G, Hecht MH, Carsey FD, Engelhardt H, Fisher D, Terrell C & Thompson J (2004) The
 subsurface ice probe (sipr): a low-power thermal probe for the martian polar layered
 deposits. 35th Lunar and Planetary Science Conference, 15-19 March 2004, League City,
 Texas, Abstract no. 2041.
- Caron DA (1991) Heterotrophic flagellates associated with sedimenting detritus. *In The Biology of Free-living Heterotrophic Flagellates* (ed. D.J. Patterson and J. Larsen). pp. 77-92.
 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 621 Carsey FD, Chen G-S, Cutts J, *et al.* (2000) Exploring Europa's ocean: a challenge for marine
 622 technology of this century. *Mar Technol Soc J* 33: 5-12.
- Chastain RA & Yayanos AA (1991) Ultrastructural changes in an obligately barophilic marine
 bacterium after decompression. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 57: 1489-1497.
- Danovaro R, Dell'Anno A, Pusceddu A & Fabiano M (1999) Nucleic acid concentrations (DNA,
 RNA) in the continental and deep-sea sediments of the eastern Mediterranean:

- relationships with seasonally varying organic inputs and bacterial dynamics. *Deep-Sea Res.* 46: 1077-1094.
- Edgcomb V, Orsi W, Taylor GT, Vdacny P, Taylor C, Suarez P & Epstein S (2011)
 Commentary: In situ fixation provides insights into the diversity of marine protists. *ISME*J.
- Edgcomb VP, Orsi W, Breiner H-W, Stock A, Filker S, Yakimov MM & Stoeck T (2011) Novel
 kinetoplastids associated with hypersaline anoxic lakes in the Eastern Mediterranean
 deep-sea. *Deep-Sea Res I* 58: 1040-1048.
- Edwards U, Rogall T, Blocker H, Emde M & Bottger EC (1989) Isolation and direct complete
 nucleotide determination of entire genes: characterization of a gene coding for 16S
 ribosomal RNA. *Nuc Acids Res* 17: 7843-7853.
- Feike J, Jurgens K, Hollibaugh JT, Kruger S, Jost G & Labrenz M (2012) Measuring unbiased
 metatranscriptomics in suboxic waters of the central Baltic Sea using a new *in situ* fixation system. *The ISME J* 6: 461-470.
- French LC, Anderson FS, Carsey FD, Green JR, Lane AL & Zimmerman WF (2001) Subsurface
 exploration technologies and strategies for Europa. Forum on Innovative Approaches to
 Outer Planetary Exploration 2001-2020. 30.
- Frias-Lopez J, Shi Y, Tyson GW, Coleman ML, Schuster SC, Chisholm SW & DeLong EF
 (2008) Microbial community gene expression in ocean surface waters. *PNAS* 105: 38053810.
- Frias-Lopez J, Shi Y, Tyson GW, Coleman ML, Schuster SC, Chisolm SW & al. e (2008)
 Microbial community gene expression in ocean surface waters. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 105: 3805-3810.
- Gifford SM, Sharma S, Rinta-Kanto JM & Moran MA (2011) Quantitative analysis of a deeply
 sequenced marine microbial metatranscriptome. *ISME J* 5: 461-472.
- Glickman MH, Ciechanover A (April 2002). "The ubiquitin-proteasome proteolytic pathway:
 destruction for the sake of construction". *Physiol. Rev.* 82 (2): 373–428.
- Guo Y, Li C-I, Ye F, Shyr Y (2013) Evaluation of read count based RNAseq analysis methods.
 BMC Genomics 14(Suppl 8):52.
- Hollibaugh JT, Gifford SM, Sharma S, Bano N & Moran MA (2010) Metatranscriptomic
 analysis of ammonia-oxidizing organisms in an estuarine bacterioplankton assemblage. *ISME J* 5: 866-878.
- Ishii A, Sato T, Wachi M, Nagai K & Kato C (2004) Effects of high hydrostatic pressure on
 bacterial cytoskeleton FtsZ polymers *in vivo* and *in vitro*. *Microbiology* 150: 1965-1972.
- Jannasch HW & Maddux WS (1967) A note on bacteriological sampling in seawater. *J Mar Res*25: 185-189.
- Jannasch HW & Wirsen CO (1977) Retrieval of concentrated and undecompressed microbial
 populations from the deep sea. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 33: 642-646.
- Jannasch HW, Wirsen CO & Winget CL (1973) A bacteriological pressure-retaining deep-sea
 sampler. *Limnol and Oceanogr* 20: 661-664.
- La Cono V, Smedile F, Ferrer M, Golyshin PN, Giuliano L & Yakimov MM (2010) Genomic
 signatures of fifth autotrophic carbon assimilation pathway in bathypelagic
 Crenarchaeota. Microbial Biotechnology 3: 595-606.
- Lewis WM, McNail OD & Summerfelt RC (1963) A device for taking water samples in sterile
 bottles at various depths. *Ecology* 44: 171-173.

- Li M, Jain S, Baker BJ, Taylor C & Dick GJ (2013) Novel hydrocarbon monooxygenase genes
 in the metatranscriptome of a natural deep-sea hydrocarbon plume. *Environ Microbiol*.
- Malahoff A, Gregory T, Bossuyt A, Donachie S & Alam M (2002) A seamless system for the
 collection and cultivation of extremophiles from deep-ocean hydrothermal vents. *IEEE J Oceanic Engineer* 27: 862-869.
- Marchetti A, Schruth DM, Durkin CA, *et al.* (2012) Comparative metatranscriptomics identifies
 molecular bases for the physiological responses of phytoplankton to varying iron
 availability. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*.
- Marteinsson VT, Reysenbach A-L, Birrien J-L & Prieur D (1999) A stress protein is induced in
 the deep-sea barophilic hyperthermophile *Thermococcus barophilus* when grown under
 atmospheric pressure. *Extremophiles* 3: 277-282.
- Mason OU, Hazen TC, Borglin S, Chain PSG, Dubinsky EA, Fortney JL, Han J, Holman H-YN,
 Hultman J, Lamendella R, Mackelprang R, Malfatti S, Tom LM, Tringe SG, Woyke T,
 Zhou J, Rubin EM, & Jansson JK (2012) Metagenome, metatranscriptome and singlecell sequencing reveal microbial response to Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *The ISME J*687 6:1715-1727.
- Nikin SJ (1962) A water sampler for microbiological studies. *Deep-Sea Res.* **9**: 501-503.
- Olson RJ & Sosik HM (2007) A submersible imaging-in-flow instrument to analyze nano- and
 microplankton: Imaging FlowCytobot. *Limnol and Oceanogr: Methods* 5: 195-203.
- 691 Orsi W, Edgcomb VP, Christman GD & Biddle JF (2013) Gene expression in the deep 692 biosphere. *Nature*.
- Patterson DJ, Nygaard K, Steinberg G & Turley CM (1993) Heterotrophic flagellates and other
 protists associated with oceanic detritus throughout the water column in the mid North
 Atlantic. J Mar Biol Ass U.K. 73: 67-95.
- Ottesen EA, Young CR, Eppley JM, Ryan JP, Chavez FP, Scholin CA, DeLong EF (2013)
 Pattern and synchrony of gene expression among sympatric marine microbial
 populaitons. *PNAS* 110:E488-E497, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1222099110.
- 699 Ottesen EA, Martin R 3rd, Preston CM, Young CR, Ryan JP, Scholin CA, DeLong EF (2011)
 700 Metatranscriptomic analysis of autonomously collected and preserved marine
 701 bacterioplankton. *ISME J* 5:1881-95.
- Phillips H, Wells LE, Johnson II RV, Elliott S & Deming JW (2003) LAREDO: a new instrument for sampling and in situ incubation of deep-sea hydrothermal vent fluids. *Deep-Sea Res I* 50: 1375-1387.
- Poretsky RS, Hewson I, Sun S, Allen AE, Zehr JP & Moran MA (2009) Comparative day/night
 metatranscriptomic analysis of microbial communities in the North Pacific subtropical
 gyre. *Environ Microbiol* 11: 1358-1375.
- Rivers AR, Sharma S, Tringe SG, Martin J, Joye SB & Moran MA (2013) Transcriptional
 response of bathypelagic marine bacterioplankton to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *The ISME J* 7:2315-2329.
- Roman BR, Scholin C, Jensen S, *et al.* (2007) Controlling a robotic marine water sampler with
 the Ruby scripting language. *J Assoc Lab Automat* 12: 56-61.
- Ryan JP, Johnson SB, Sherman A, *et al.* (2010) Mobile autonomous process sampling within
 coastal ocean observing systems. *Limnol and Oceanogr* 8: 394-402.
- Sarmiento JL, Herbert T & Toggweiler JR (1988) Mediterranean nutrient balance and episodes
 of anoxia. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 2: 427-444.

- Scholin C, Jensen S, Roman B, *et al.* (2006) The Environmental Sample Processor (ESP) An
 automated robotic device for detecting microoorganisms remotely using molecular probe
 technology. *Proceedings, OCEANS 2006 MTS/IEEE Conference, Boston, MA. Marine Technology Society, Columbia MD.*
- Scholin CA (2010) What are "ecogenomic sensors?" A review and thoughts for the future. *Ocean Sci* 6: 51-60.
- Siegert MJ, Tranater M, Ellis-Evans JC, Priscu JC & Lyons WB (2003) The hydrochemistry of Lake Vostok and the potential for life in Antarctic subglacial lakes. *Hydrological Proc* 17: 795-814.
- Sosik HM & Olson RJ (2007) Automated taxonomic classification of phytoplankton sampled
 with imaging-in-flow cytometry. *Limnol and Oceanogr: Methods* 5: 204-216.
- Stackebrandt E & Liesack W (1993) *Nucleic acids and classification*. Academic Press, London,
 England.
- Steglich C, Lindell D, Futschik M, Rector T, Steen R & Chisolm SW (2010) Short RNA half lives in the slow-growing marine cyanobacterium *Prochlorococcus. Genome Biology* 11.
- Swartz M, Torres D, Liberatore S & Millard R (2012) WHOI SDSL Data Link Project Ethernet
 Telemetry through sea cables. *J Atmos Oceanic Technol* in press.
- Tabor PS, Ohwada K & Colwell RR (1981) Filterable marine bacteria found in the deep sea:
 distribution, taxonomy, and response to starvation. *Microb Ecol* 7: 67-83.
- Taylor C & Howes B (1994) Effect of sampling frequency on measurements of seasonal primary
 production and oxygen status in near-shore coastal ecosystems. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 108: 193-203.
- Taylor C, Howes B & Doherty K (1993) Automated instrumentation for time-series
 measurement of primary production and nutrient status in production platform-accessible
 environments. *Marine Technology Society Journal* 27: 32-44.
- Taylor C, Doherty KW, Molyneaux SJ, *et al.* (2006) Autonomous Microbial Sampler (AMS), a
 device for the uncontaminated collection of multiple microbial samples from submarine
 hydrothermal vents and other aquatic environments. *Deep-Sea Res I* 56: 1266-1283.
- Taylor CD & Doherty KW (1990) Autonomous instrumentation for the in situ measurement of
 primary production and other microbial rate processes. *Deep-Sea Res* 37: 343-358.
- Thingstad TF, Krom MD, Mantoura RFC, *et al.* (2005) Nature of phosphorus limitation in the
 ultraoligotrohic Eastern Mediterranean. *Science* 309: 1068-1071.
- Turley CM & Carstens M (1991) Pressure tolerance of oceanic flagellates: implications for remineralization of organic matter. *Deep-Sea Res* 39: 403-413.
- Ulloa O, Canfield DE, DeLong EF, Letelier RM & Stewart FJ (2012) Microbial oceanography of
 anoxic oxygen minimum zones. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109: 15996-16003.
- Wang L, Feng Z, Wang X, Wang X & Zhang X (2009) DEGseq: an R package for identifying differentially expressed genes from RNA-seq data. *Bioinformatics* 26: 136-148.
- Wang LK, Feng Z, Wang X & Zhang X (2010) DEGseq: an R package for identifying differentially expressed genes from RNA-seq data. *Bioinformatics* 26: 136-138.
- Wang Y, Liu CL, Storey JD, Tibshirani RJ, Herschlag D & Brown PO (2002) Precision and functional specificity in mRNA decay. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 99: 5860-5865.
- Weber G & Drickamer HG (1983) The effect of high pressure upon proteins and other
 biomolecules. *Q Rev Biophys* 16: 89-112.
- Weizhong L (2009) Analysis and comparison of very large metagenomes with fast clustering and
 functional annotation. *BMC Bioinformatics* 10: 359.

- Yano Y, Nakayama A, Ishihara K & Saito H (1998) Adaptive changes in membrane lipids of
 barophilic bacteria in response to changes in growth pressure. *Appl Environ Microbiol*64: 479-485.
- Zobell CE (1941) Apparatus for collecting water samples from different depths for
 bacteriological analysis. *J Mar Res* 4: 173-188.

768







			Initial			
	Volume		Reads		Total	Total
	Filtered	Initial	After		Annotated	Annotated
Sample	(L)	Reads	Trimming	Contigs	Reads	Contigs
Niskin	30	78,307,034	37,947,773	41,372	8,968,832	11,888
MS-						
SID_1	4	122,435,482	65,237,000	20,973	26,658,601	9,731
MS-						
SID_2	3	96,136,502	51,529,890	18,606	25,003,471	8,542
MS-						
SID_3	3.4	118,922,488	63,968,753	17,000	27,057,430	6,153

Table 1. Overall sequencing results for each sample collected from 2222m depth.



