618 Supplementary Information for

- 619 Resource limitation modulates the fate of dissimilated nitrogen in a dual-pathway
- 620 Actinobacterium
- 621 David C. Vuono, Robert W. Read, James Hemp, Benjamin W. Sullivan, John A. Arnone III, Iva
- 622 Neveux, Bob Blank, Carl Staub, Evan Loney, David Miceli, Mari Winkler, Romy Chakraborty,
- 623 David A. Stahl, Joseph J. Grzymski
- 624 Joseph Grzymski
- 625 Email: Joe.Grzymski@dri.edu
- 626
- 627 This PDF file includes:

628	
629	Supplementary Introduction
630	Supplementary Materials and Methods
631	Supplementary Results
632	Supplementary Discussion
633	Figs. S1 to S8
634	Tables S1 to S5
635	SI reference citations
636	

637 SI Introduction

638 Dual-pathway respiratory nitrite reducers, where respiratory ammonification and denitrification 639 modules are encoded in the same genome, provide a unique system to investigate the molecular 640 mechanisms of C:NO₃⁻ control on pathway selection as they blend the presumptively ancient 641 (NrfA) and modern (NirK) N-reducing modules. While many dual-pathway denitrifiers and respiratory ammonifiers have been identified (many of which use LP ETCs), most still lack 642 phenotypic characterization[21-23]. Only Shewanella loihica PV-4, a Gram-negative, y-643 644 proteobacterium that uses UQ and dimethylmenaquinone (DMK)-based bioenergetics has been 645 thoroughly characterized [3, 24, 43]. Nonetheless, these dual-pathway nitrite reducers are capable 646 of differential energy conservation through pathway bifurcation of nitrite. Yet no mechanistic or metabolic models exist to explain how these dual-pathway organisms partition electron flow and 647 648 proton translocation between pathways to maximize resource-use efficiency. It is not known if these organisms differentially distribute electron flow through alternative respiratory chains in 649

650 response to shifting resource availability or control each pathway independently in response to 651 resource thresholds. Is there an evolutionary and biochemical basis for pathway selection?

652 It has long been postulated that $C:NO_3^-$ ratio modulates the activity of respiratory 653 ammonification versus denitrification[2], with numerous studies in recent years differing in the 654 methods used to calculate C:NO₃⁻ ratio, carbon sources used, range of C:N ratios tested, 655 magnitudes of C and N concentrations, sample types (enrichment cultures vs isolates), and 656 culturing mode (chemostat/batch culture) (Table S4)[3–6, 34]. The hypothesis for C:NO₃⁻ 657 control states that high $C:NO_3^{-1}$ ratios (stoichiometric limitation of nitrate relative to C) drive respiratory ammonification while low C:NO₃ ratios (stoichiometric limitation of C relative to 658 659 nitrate) drive denitrification. This hypothesis is based on the rationale that denitrification 660 theoretically yields more free energy per electron, but respiratory ammonification yields more 661 free energy per nitrate due to the stoichiometry of each reaction: one nitrate is needed to make 662 ammonium while two are needed to make $N_2O/N_2[2, 39]$. Thus, when C:NO₃ ratio is low, cells select denitrification to maximize the free energy advantage per electron. When C:NO₃ is high, 663 664 cells select respiratory ammonification to maximize the free energy advantage per nitrate. 665 However, the theoretical basis for this prediction is inconsistent with the observation that growth 666 yields of pure denitrifiers are significantly lower than expected and lower than growth yields of 667 respiratory ammonification[39]. This observation suggests that despite a lower free energy yield 668 (ΔG) compared to denitrification, respiratory ammonification conserves more energy during 669 catabolism, through the generation of a proton motive force (Δp) in the ETC, to build more 670 biomass during anabolism. Thus, there is a need to better understand the effects of different 671 nutrient limitations on growth and pathway selection (i.e., allocation of C and N to dissimilatory 672 and assimilatory processes), which are often confounded by C:NO₃. For example, reportedly 673 "low" C:NO₃⁻ ratios rarely fall below 1.5 have rarely been tested (Table S4), conditions in which 674 C would be a growth-limiting resource. Instead, pathway selection should be better predicted by 675 1) Liebig's law of the minimum (LM) and 2) the maximum power principle (MPP)[37]. Under 676 the MPP, which states that biological systems are designed to maximize power intake and energy 677 transformation, the cell's aim is therefore to maximize power (i.e., realized in the form of growth 678 rate and yield) given the constraints of a growth-limiting nutrient (i.e., LM). Therefore, limitation 679 of a growth-limiting nutrient, whether it be C or NO_3^{-} , should dictate the selection of the most 680 efficient respiratory module to maximize power (i.e., MPP).

681 SI Materials and Methods

682 <u>Sample collection</u>: *I. calvum* was isolated from a groundwater well (GW247) collected on

683 2/18/2013 at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (Lat: 35.97990, Long: 84.27059) with a

684 groundwater temperature of 15.57 °C, conductivity of 521.9 μS/cm, and pH of 7.71. *I. calvum*

685 was isolated and obtained from Dr. R. Chakraborty (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory).

686 We began our experimental process by first picking single colonies from LB agar plates and

transferring the clonal isolates to LB broth.

688 Media preparation: Media preparation was conducted in a 2L Widdel Flask. After autoclaving,

the media was immediately put under an anoxic headspace (N2/CO2 80:20 mix) and sterile

filtered $(0.2\mu m)$ trace elements, trace vitamins, and reducing agent were added. The media was

691 cooled under an anoxic headspace and buffered with bicarbonate to maintain a pH of 7.2.

Hungate technique was used to dispense media into culture tubes (20 mL) and serum vials (100

mL) pre-flushed with a sterile stream of ultra-high purity (UHP) N₂ and sealed with blue 1" butyl

rubber stoppers. End-point cultures were grown in Balch tubes (18x150-mm glass tube) sealed

695 with butyl rubber stoppers. Cultures for time-course sampling were grown in 160ml serum vials.

All end-point experiments were terminated after 100 hours unless otherwise noted.

697 Growth Curve/Cell counts/Yield Measurements: Growth curves were measured from scratch-

free Balch-tubes grown cultures using an automated optical density reader at OD_{600} nm

699 (Lumenautix LLC, Reno, NV). End-point cultures were monitored until all replicates reached

stationary phase (65-100 hours depending on $C:NO_3^-$ treatment) (Figure S6).

701 Cell counts were performed by fixing cells in 4% paraformaldehyde (final concentration) for 20

minutes, filtered onto 0.2µm pore-sized black polycarbonate filters, and washed three times with

phosphate buffered saline (PBS, pH 7.2). Filtered cells captured on the black polycarbonate

filters were stained with SYBR[®] Gold nucleic acid stain (10-minute incubation) (ThermoFisher

Scientific) and counted manually with a fluorescence microscope (Olympus BX60, Tokyo,

Japan). We collected cells from during lag phase, exponential phase, and stationary phase in

order to create a standard curve of cell counts versus optical density (OD_{600}) . We fit a linear

model to cell count versus OD_{600} (R²=0.99) and used the resulting linear equation for cell count

rog enumeration for growth curves during our various treatment conditions.

710 Biomass concentrations were measured by filtration and drying as per standard protocol [26] for 711 8mM lactate/12mM nitrate and 0.8mM lactate/1.2mM nitrate treatments and conducted in 712 parallel with growth curve/cell counts as described above. Analysis from triplicate cultures vielded (0.064 ± 0.003) and (0.016 ± 0.001) mg of biomass (dry weight) ml⁻¹ for 8mM and 0.8 713 mM lactate cultures, respectively. Cell counts from stationary phase cultures were (1.5 ± 0.05) x 714 10^7 and $(1.16 \pm 0.09) \times 10^6$ for 8mM and 0.8 mM lactate cultures, respectively. From these 715 values the dry weight of a single *I. calvum* cell was estimated to be 1.09×10^{-10} g. Growth yield 716 717 (Y) (Table S3) was calculated by dividing biomass (g) by lactate mass (g) and moles consumed, 718 as described by [56]. Lactate measurements are described below. 719 Thermodynamic calculations for anaerobic lactate oxidation with nitrate and nitrite were carried out using standard Gibbs free-energy values defined by Thauer et al., [57]. 720 721 Ion and Gas Chromatography Measurements: New glass IC vials were used for every sample in order to ensure no cross contamination of analytes. Ammonium production via respiratory nitrite 722 723 ammonification was measured as described by [24]. Briefly, because the bacterium 724 simultaneously produces (via dissimilation) and consumes (via assimilation) ammonium, 725 ammonium consumption was first measured with O₂ and lactate by calculating the difference 726 between starting and ending ammonium concentrations. These ammonium consumption values were then normalized to lactate consumed (0.31 μ mols NH₄⁺/lactate) (7.07x10⁻⁷ μ mols NH₄⁺/cell 727 728 calculated from average cell number of stationary phase biomass; Figure S6). Ammonium 729 production during nitrate reducing conditions was then calculated using the mass balance 730 approach from [58] for Total Belowground Carbon Allocation (TBCA) but adapted for nitrogen 731 flux instead of carbon flux:

732

$$\Delta NH_4^+ = (\Delta lactate_{start-end} \times 0.31 \mu mols NH_4^+ / lactate) + \Delta NH_4^+ end-start$$
(1)

Here, the Δ lactate_{start-end} variable (µmols) is multiplied by the ammonium consumed per lactate consumed constant. This value is added to the $\Delta NH_4^+_{end-start}$ variable (µmols), denoted as ending minus starting concentration, which defines whether the change in ammonium is positive (more ammonium produced than consumed) or negative (more ammonium consumed than produced). 737 Headspace gas from Balch tubes and serum vials was sampled with volume appropriate gastight 738 syringes (Hamilton Company, Reno, NV) pre-flushed with UHP N₂. For high and low nutrient 739 treatments, 10µl and 100µl of headspace were sampled and diluted into 12ml exetainters (Labco, 740 Lampter, Wales, UK) over-pressurized with 15ml UHP N₂, respectively. Similar dilutions were 741 performed for nitrite as e-acceptor experiments, ammonium-deplete experiments, and time-series 742 experiments. For time-series experiments, an equal volume of headspace gas that was removed at 743 each time-point was replaced with sterile UHP N2. N2O and NO were measured by gas chromatography (Shimadzu Greenhouse Gas Analyzer GC-2014) using a 500µl injection 744 745 volume. The rubber septa on the injection port of the GC was replaced after 100 injections in 746 order to prevent leakage of the sample after the injection needle was lifted out from the injection 747 port. Aqueous concentrations of N₂O were calculated using a Henry's constant of 1.751 (mM 748 (g)/mM (aq)) corrected for the medium's ionic strength and temperature. A total of 8-11 749 replicates per treatment were analyzed for all experiments discussed in this work (Table S5). 750 Phylogenetic, Genomic, and Transcriptomic Analysis: A set of 34 NrfA amino acid sequences,

751 representing 33 complete genome sequences and 1 octaheme nitrite reductase (ONR) from 752 known respiratory ammonification organisms were downloaded from GenBank (Table S1). A 753 multiple sequence alignment (MSA) was generated from the sequences annotated as cytochrome 754 c nitrite reductase and ONR using MUSCLE [59]. The resulting alignment was visualized within 755 MEGA5 [60] where the alignment was manually screened for the presence of conserved amino 756 acid residues consistent with those found in NrfA (i.e., heme motifs). A maximum likelihood tree 757 was created from the alignment using RAxML [61] with 500 bootstrap iterations. The presence 758 of NapA, NarG, NirK, and Nor modules were manually queried from each NCBI genome in our 759 set and confirmed by MSA, as described above. Metabolic pathway for pool quinone type was 760 queried on BioCyc Pathway/Genome Database (biocyc.org) for each organism in our set. The 761 structure of *I. calvum*'s NirK protein was predicted using the protein structure predicting 762 algorithm Phyre2 [62]. Protein atomic composition for C and N was calculated from amino acid 763 sequences as input files, as described by [14, 15], using custom python scripts for each element 764 separately (github.com/dvuono/Cost minimization).

Due to the high similarity of C5 to 7KIP, reads were aligned to the *Intrasporangium calvum*genomic reference sequence and gtf file (Acc: NC_014830.1) using the STAR RNA-seq

aligner[63], with the --limitBAMsortRam parameter set to the recommended value by STAR.

- 768 Sequence reads were mapped to genomic features to obtain count data using featureCounts [64].
- 769 Systematic changes across experimental conditions were performed on normalized read counts in
- 770 DESeq2 [65]. The RNA-seq data reported in this study are available within the NCBI BioProject
- number PRJNA475609.

772 SI Results

Genomic analysis of *I. calvum* C5. *I. calvum* C5 was isolated from a nitrate contaminated well
(>200mM nitrate) at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory Field Research Station in Oak Ridge,
TN. The strain was selected for further analysis due to its nitrate reducing phenotype in minimal
media. The genome consists of a 4,025,044-base pair chromosome and encodes for 3,722
predicted genes, 2,665 protein coding genes, 57 RNA genes, and two rRNA operons.

778 *I. calvum* encodes for a functional NrfAH complex and assimilates NH₄⁺ via respiratory

779 nitrite ammonification. The potential routes for N-assimilation were screened using aerobic 780 minimal media with defined C-source/e-donor and e-acceptor, and with nitrate or ammonium as 781 assimilatory N-sources. Based on genomic information, the bacterium possesses no known assimilatory nitrate reductase, but encodes for an ammonium transporter (Intca RS11655) and 782 783 GS/GOGAT pathways (Intca RS13810; Intca RS11930; Intca RS08335, 08340), suggesting 784 that ammonium is its sole assimilatory N source. Indeed, we observed no aerobic growth with 8mM lactate, O₂, and nitrate as N-source. However, when grown on 8mM lactate, O₂, and 785 786 1.5mM ammonium as N-source, *I. calvum* displayed a typical growth curve with a specific 787 growth rate of $0.4\pm0.02 \mu$ (1.7±0.1 doublings/hour) (Figure S7).

788 SI Discussion

S. loihica PV-4 (a Gram-negative dual-pathway γ-proteobacterium) and *I. calvum* use different
 types of nitrate reducing modules. *S. loihica* PV-4 utilizes NapA whereas *I. calvum* utilizes NarG

- 791 (Figure 1). The latter translocates two H^+ per nitrate reduced while NapA consumes two H^+ in
- the periplasm [17]. Both reductases would generate a Δp via NADH dehydrogenase H⁺
- translocation, but the NapA module would result in a net loss of two H⁺, which may impact the
- selection of downstream respiratory modules. For example, given the lower-than-expected
- observed growth yields of denitrifiers compared to respiratory ammonifiers [39], if a NapA

- module is used, it would make sense for respiratory ammonification to be selected under high
- 797 C:N ratios because the cell would need to compensate for less energy conservation during nitrate
- reduction. Nitric oxide reductase composition may also impact pathway selection. For example,
- qNor does not translocate H^+ , while sNor, eNor, and gNor are predicted to conserve energy
- through H^+ translocation [41]. Thus, the modularity of dissimilatory N reduction processes, and
- 801 whether those modules conserve energy or not, may impose certain constraints on pathway
- selection in different organisms and should be further investigated.





Figure S1. Relationship between growth rate and the fraction of N dissimilated by respiratory

ammonification for high and low nutrient concentrations. Treatments under C and NO₃⁻ scarcity,

- even with low C:NO₃⁻ ratios, disproportionately produce more ammonium and have higher
 growth rates.
- 814



817 Figure S2. Time-series metabolite profiles of a 96-hour incubation for lactate, nitrate, and nitrite

(top pane), production of dissimilated end-products as N_2O-N and net change in NH_4^+

ammonium production (middle pane), and corresponding growth curve of *I. calvum* cells grown

under 0.8 mM lactate 1.2 mM nitrate (C:NO₃⁻ ratio = 2) (bottom pane).



823

Figure S3. Time-series metabolite profiles of a 300-hour incubation for (A) high nutrient and (B)

low nutrient concentrations. Shown are the profiles of lactate, nitrate, and nitrite (top pane),

826 production of dissimilated end-products as N_2O-N and net change in NH_4^+ ammonium

production (middle pane), and corresponding growth curves of *I. calvum* cells (C:NO₃⁻ ratio = 2) (bottom pane).





grown under 8mM lactate 12mM nitrite (C:NO₂ ratio = 2). Profiles for lactate and nitrite (top

833 pane) and production of dissimilated end-products as N_2O-N and net change in NH_4^+ ammonium 834 production (bottom pane).



Figure S5. The genome-wide transcriptional changes of early exponential, late exponential, and
stationary phase *I. calvum* cells. The first and second outermost rings (dark and light green
indicate the open reading frames (ORFs) on the positive and negative strands. The third, fourth,
and fifth rings are the relative abundance of transcripts mapped onto the *I. calvum* genome based

on the transcript read counts from early exponential phase, late exponential phase and stationary

842 phase, respectively. The position and locus IDs are marked for the most highly expressed genes

and genes involved in the ETC.



849 Figure S6. Mean cell concentrations for I. calvum cultures grown over a range of C:NO₃⁻ ratios

(columns) at high nutrient (top row) and low nutrient (bottom row) concentrations of the same

ratio. Each growth curve consists of n=6 replicates.



855 Figure S7. Growth curve of *I. calvum* in a sealed Balch-tube with lactate and O_2 as electron donor/acceptor pair and with ammonium as sole nitrogen source.

Table S1. Organism accession numbers for N	NrfA and	NirK n	nodules.
Organisms			

Organisms	Accession #
	NrfA
Escherichia_coli_K-12	NC_000913.3
Salmonella_enterica CT18	NC_003198.1
Yersinia_kristensenii	NZ_CP009997.1
Yersinia_frederiksenii	NZ_CP009364.1
Vibrio fischeri_ES114	NC_006840.2
Sloihica-PV-4	NC_009092.1
Shewanella_oneidensis_MR-1	NC_004347.2
Desulfotalea_psychrophila_LSv54	NC_006138.1
Sulfurospirillum_deleyianum	NC_013512.1
Wolinella_succinogenes	NC_005090.1
Flexibacter_tractuosus	NC_014759.1
Porphyromonas_gingivalis_W83	NC_010729.1
Symbiobacterium_thermophilum	NC_006177.1
Carboxydothermus_hydrogenoformans	NC_007503.1
Desulfovibrio_vulgaris_Hildenborough	NC_002937.3
Bacillus_vireti	NZ_LDNB01000003.1
Bacillus_bataviensis	NZ_AJLS01000002.1
Bacillus_azotoformans	NZ_AJLR01000001.1
Bacillus_selenitireducens_MLS10	NC_014219.1
Campylobacter_jejuni	NC_002163.1
Opitutus_terrae	NC_010571.1
Anaeromyxobacter_dehalogenans_2_CP-1	NC_011891.1
Rhodopirellula_baltica	NC_005027.1
Intrasporangium calvum 7KIP	NC_014830.1
Intrasporangium calvum C5	This study
Bdellovibrio_bacteriovorus	NC_005363.1
Gimesia_maris	NZ_ABCE01000001.1
Candidatus_Nitrospira_inopinata	NZ_LN885086.1
Myxococcus_xanthus	NC_008095.1
Geobacter_metallireducens_GS_15	NC_007517.1
Geobacter_sulfurreducens_PCA	NC_002939.5
Thioalkalivibrio_nitratireducens	NC_019902.2
Thermodesulfovibrio_yellowstonii_THEYE_A0193	NC_011296.1
	NirK
multicopper_oxidase_[Intrasporangium_calvum]	WP_013494195.1
nitrite_reductase,_copper-containing_[Shewanella_loihica]	WP_011867131.1
nitrite_reductase_[Candidatus_Nitrospira_inopinata]	WP_062488124.1
nitrite_reductase,_copper-containing_[Marivirga_tractuosa]	WP_013454821.1
nitrite_reductase,_copper-containing_[Symbiobacterium_thermophilum]	WP_070105442.1
nitrite_reductase_[Opitutus_terrae]	WP_012373845.1

nitrite reductase, copper-containing [Bdellovibrio bacteriovorus] Nitrite reductase OS=Bacillus azotoformans GN=nirK Ochrobactrum anthropi ATCC 49188 Bradyrhizobium_japonicum_USDA_110 Agrobacterium_fabrum_str._C58 Sinorhizobium_meliloti_1021 Pseudomonas_citronellolis_strain_SJTE-3 Rhodanobacter denitrificans strain 2APBS1 Taylorella equigenitalis ATCC 35865 Flavobacterium columnare ATCC 49512 Actinobacillus suis ATCC 33415 Chromobacterium violaceum ATCC 12472 Halopiger_xanaduensis_SH-6 Halopiger_xanaduensis_SH-6 inorhizobium_fredii_HH103 Pseudomonas_entomophila_str._L48 Pseudomonas denitrificans ATCC 13867 Flavobacterium johnsoniae UW101 Rhizobium etli CFN 42 Ochrobactrum anthropi ATCC 49188 Caulobacter_segnis_ATCC_21756 Rhizobium_giardinii_bv._giardinii_H152

WP 011165004.1 ZP 08007035.1 NC 009668.1 NC_004463.1 NC_003063.2 NC_003037.1 NZ_CP015878.1 NC 020541.1 NC 018108.1 NC 016510.2 NZ CP009159.1 NC 005085.1 NC_015666.1 NC_015666.1 NC_016812.1 NC_008027.1 NC 020829.1 NC 009441.1 NC_007766.1 NC 009667.1 NC_014100.1 NZ_KB902685.1

[C]	[NO3]	C:NO3-	NH4 produced	NH4 produced	N ₂ O produced	% Recovery of
(mM)	(mM)	ratio	(μmoles)	(μmoles)	μmoles)	Dissimilated N
16	12	4	1.94 ± 1.31	7.79 ± 3.3	27.4 ± 7.5	91.64 ± 12.9
8	12	2	4.91 ± 1.07	10.8 ± 4.1	18.1 ± 6.7	72.87 ± 9.3
6	12	1.5	3.07 ± 4.50	10.2 ± 3.8	19.1 ± 6.2	72.77 ± 4.1
4	12	1	8.06 ± 2.19	14.5 ± 4.2	18.1 ± 6.8	61.79 ± 5.1
2	12	0.5	3.82 ± 1.92	8.76 ± 2.9	10.2 ± 3.7	64.21 ± 9.8
0.4	12	0.1	2.05 ± 0.50	1.55 ± 0.2	0.48 ± 0.1	24.44 ± 7.5
1.6	1.2	4	1.12 ± 0.99	2.39 ± 0.7	1.77 ± 0.2	70.47 ± 10.4
0.8	1.2	2	1.50 ± 0.57	2.32 ± 0.5	3.72 ± 0.4	90.71 ± 8.2
0.6	1.2	1.5	0.90 ± 0.53	2.27 ± 0.5	4.53 ± 0.7	88.31 ± 8.6
0.4	1.2	1	1.18 ± 1.17	2.45 ± 0.3	0.88 ± 0.3	50.20 ± 9.4
0.2	1.2	0.5	1.91 ± 0.33	1.13 ± 0.2	0.18 ± 0.0	43.34 ± 20.0
0.04	1.2	0.1	0.03 ± 0.95	0.28 ± 0.2	0.06 ± 0.0	18.10 ± 10.9

Table S2. Concentration and ratio experimental design and produciton values for NH_4^+ and N_2O-N . Ammonia per Cell Ammonia per Lactate

Table S3.	S3. Growth rate and growth yield values for concentration and ratio experiment.									
[C]	[NO3]	C:NO3-	Specific Growth Rate	Doubling Time	Growth Yield	Molar Growth Yield	Growth Yield	Molar Growth Yield	Growth Yield	Molar Growth Yield
(mM)	(mM)	ratio	(μ)	(hours/generation)	cells (g)/Lac(g)	cells (g)/moles Lac	cells (g)/NO3(g)	cells (g)/moles NO3	cells (g)/NO2(g)	cells (g)/moles NO2
			n=6	n=6	n=3	n=3	n=3	n=3	n=3	n=3
16	12	4	0.143 ± 0.02	4.96 ± 0.73	0.25 ± 0.05	22.3 ± 4.6	0.10 ± 0.02	6.43 ± 1.23	0.63 ± 0.19	28.8 ± 8.6
8	12	2	0.144 ± 0.02	4.86 ± 0.55	0.29 ± 0.02	26.4 ± 1.4	0.12 ± 0.03	7.61 ± 1.77	0.66 ± 0.21	30.1 ± 9.6
6	12	1.5	0.150 ± 0.03	4.77 ± 0.94	n.a.	n.a.	0.11 ± 0.02	6.84 ± 1.45	0.62 ± 0.21	28.6 ± 9.5
4	12	1	0.150 ± 0.01	4.65 ± 0.34	0.26 ± 0.11	23.5 ± 9.6	0.12 ± 0.05	7.46 ± 2.79	0.62 ± 0.25	28.5 ± 11.3
2	12	0.5	0.150 ± 0.03	4.82 ± 1.12	0.27 ± 0.02	24.3 ± 2.2	0.10 ± 0.03	6.38 ± 1.88	0.58 ± 0.18	26.7 ± 8.1
0.4	12	0.1	0.290 ± 0.05	2.46 ± 0.51	0.46 ± 0.003	41.1 ± 0.27	0.15 ± 0.01	9.41 ± 0.66	0.92 ± 0.20	42.5 ± 9.4
1.6	1.2	4	0.241 ± 0.05	2.98 ± 0.69	0.26 ± 0.03	23.5 ± 3.1	0.11 ± 0.01	6.86 ± 0.72	0.83 ± 0.05	38.32 ± 2.48
0.8	1.2	2	0.146 ± 0.05	5.31 ± 1.96	0.29 ± 0.02	25.7 ± 2.2	0.11 ± 0.00	6.99 ± 0.01	0.78 ± 0.06	36.07 ± 2.93
0.6	1.2	1.5	0.164 ± 0.03	4.39 ± 0.97	0.23 ± 0.02	20.8 ± 2.3	0.10 ± 0.00	6.47 ± 0.02	0.63 ± 0.09	29.06 ± 4.20
0.4	1.2	1	0.284 ± 0.02	2.45 ± 0.17	0.27 ± 0.01	23.9 ± 0.5	0.10 ± 0.00	6.51 ± 0.03	0.73 ± 0.09	33.72 ± 4.16
0.2	1.2	0.5	0.214 ± 0.04	3.33 ± 0.67	0.57 ± 0.01	51.4 ± 0.6	0.12 ± 0.00	7.67 ± 0.19	n.a.	n.a.
0.04	1.2	0.1	0.344 ± 0.10	2.16 ± 0.64	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Table S3. Growth rate and growth yield values for concentration and ratio experiment.

Citation	C-source	C:N range	C conc range	NO3 conc range	units	calc method
Kraft <i>et al.</i> 2014 (17)	amino acids	1.5-3	4.4-43.5	0.5-14.4	mmol	mmol-C/mmol- $\sum NO_x$
Yoon et al. 2015 (3)	lactate	1.5-150	0.1-10	0.2	mM	nC*mM-C/nN*mM-N
Van den Berg et al. 2015 (4)	acetate	1.8-7.7	160-595	82-93	mg/L	mg-COD/mg-N
Schmidt et al. 2011 (5)	Soil organic-C	not specified	2.7-11.4	22.4-79.8	C%,mg-N/kg soil	not specified
Hardison et al. 2015 (6)	complex	not specified	C+ - C-	0.6-5	μg	not specified
Fazzolari et al. 1998 (7)	glucose	2.5-10	250-1000	100	mg/kg dried soil	mg-C/mg-N
This study	lactate	0.1-4	0.004-16	1.2-12	mM	nC*mM-C/nN*mM-N

Table S4. Literature summary of C:N ratio controls on N dissimilation.

Table S5. Summary of all experimental conditions and replicate number in the current study (Figure 2 in main text).

NO ₃ ⁻ (mM)	Lactate (mM)	Ratio C:NO ₃ ⁻	experiment type	ammonium-deplete	replicates	Number of samples taken
1.2	0.04	0.1	end-point	n	9	2
1.2	0.2	0.5	end-point	n	9	2
1.2	0.4	1.0	end-point	n	10	2
1.2	0.6	1.5	end-point	n	10	2
1.2	0.8	2.0	end-point	n	9	2
1.2	1.6	4.0	end-point	n	10	2
12	0.4	0.1	end-point	n	10	2
12	2	0.5	end-point	n	8	2
12	4	1.0	end-point	n	8	2
12	6	1.5	end-point	n	10	2
12	8	2.0	end-point	n	10	2
12	16	4.0	end-point	n	8	2
12	8	2.0	time-series	n	3	17
1.2	0.8	2.0	time-series	n	3	17
12	8	2.0	time-series	n	3	59
1.2	0.8	2.0	time-series	n	3	59
12*	8	2.0	time-series	n	11	4
12	8	2.0	time-series	У	10	3

*nitrite is used as the electron acceptor