Current perspectives in food-based studies exploiting multi-omics approaches

Current perspectives in food-based studies exploiting multi-omics approaches

Ilario Ferrocino*, Luca Cocolin

Addresses

DISAFA - Microbiology and food technology sector, University of Turin, Grugliasco, Torino, Italy

Abstract

Corresponding author: Ilario Ferrocino (ilario.ferrocino@unito.it)

Abstract

The new frontiers of microbial ecology are concerned pertain to what microbes are do in a complex ecosystem, such as food, and how the environmental conditions (e.g changes in the process parameters, storage temperature, the addition of a starter culture and changes in ingredients) can affect the development and functioning of microbiota. A multi-omics approach can help researchers to obtain an unprecedented insight into the mechanisms that can affect the final characteristics of products, in term of organoleptic proprieties, as well as safety.

Highlights

- Bioinformatics tools have been developed to provide information on microbe diversity
- Shotgun metagenomics is a promising approach to discover the functions of microbiota
- Data generated through a multi-omics approach can improve the knowledge on what happens in food

Introduction

Next-generation sequencing and metagenomics were first used in microbial ecology in the second decade of the 2000s. At present, a search on the ISI Web of Knowledge on the topics "metagenomics" and "food" shows the presence of 660 research papers, with less than 90 per year before 2013, a peak of 132 in 2015 and 109 in the first 10 months of 2016. This exponential increase in studies is due to the greater availability of sequencing centers with competitive prices, along with a growing population of scientists with a good background in bioinformatics and biostatistics, as well as the development of online platforms that allow a huge amount of data to be analyzed, even by inexperienced researchers. The term metagenomics is a miscellaneous term that is often misused by many researchers. Metagenomics is the appropriate term for a shotgun approach in which all the genome contents from the matrix are sequenced (host, gene fragments of taxonomic interest, as well as functional genes); instead, if a taxonomic region is massively sequenced (16S, ITS or 26S), the term that should be used is amplicon based sequencing. The first decision that a researcher has to make is whether to adopt global or live high throughput sequencing (HTS). This is the crucial issue that has to be resolved before starting an experiment, since the use of DNA or rRNA as targets can lead to both advantages and disadvantages. DNA is more stable and easier to extract and manipulate, but a DNA experiment displays the global microbial population, including DNA from dead and damaged cells, as well as from live cells, with the consequence that a researcher will not be able to discern whether the microbiota is still alive and active or dead at a specific sampling point. The decision to use RNA as a target eliminates this bias, because RNA, after cell lysis, is less stable than DNA, and allows the analysis to be focused only on live and active microbiota [1]. On the other hand, the disadvantage of using rRNA as a target is the amplification of ribosomal genes, due to the operon copy number, which varies widely across the taxa, and can even distort the quantitative diversity estimates [2]. Another possible way of detecting live populations is through the use of the DNA of ethidium monoazide (EMA) and propidium monoazide (PMA), which can prevent the amplification of DNA from dead cells.

53 Increased data analysis skills can allow the study of microbial composition (amplicon target
54 sequencing), gene content (meta-genomics), gene function (meta-transcriptomics), functional
55 activity (meta-proteomics) and metabolites (meta-metabolomics) to be joined together. The huge
56 amount of data generated through a multi-omics approach can improve the knowledge on what
57 really happens in a complex process, such as in the food fermentation process, or in general during
58 a process that involves microbes.
59
60 **High-throughput amplicon target sequencing.**
61 The first and most frequently applied HTS technique is the application of amplicon target
62 sequencing to the microbial composition of a food matrix in order to study the microbiota (targeting
63 the 16S gene) or the mycobiome (targeting the ITS or the 26S gene) of the food. The flurry of
64 research has been witnessed over the past couple of years aimed at estimating the microbial
65 diversity in different dairy ecosystems using 16S DNA as the target. Several studies on food have
66 clearly shown the presence of several contaminant taxa, probably originating from the environment,
67 which can play a role in the decay of food quality. However, the main objective of all of these
68 studies has been to assess the microbial structure of the analyzed product in order to find a
69 correlation between the external perturbations (e.g. changes in the process, ingredients and
70 sampling point) and the evolution of the microbial composition. Table 1 reports an extensive,
71 although not complete, list of these studies.
72 In the targeted amplicon technique, the most common approach adopted to study the mycobiome is
73 that of amplifying the fungal "internal transcribed spacer" (ITS) regions. Since these ITS regions
74 are not part of the conserved transcribed regions of the structural ribosomal RNAs, they are highly
75 divergent between fungi, and are often sufficiently different to allow the fungi to be classified at
76 species level. The locus in fungi is generally duplicated 100–200 times, thus caution must be used
77 when trying to derive quantitative comparisons between various species in mixed populations
78 through this approach. First, unlike bacterial 16S amplicons, fungal ITS sequences from different

species can differ to a great extent in size and sequence content [28]. ITS fragments generally vary in length from between 100 and 550 base pairs, and it is not yet clear how the variable lengths affect the recovery of sequences through the various steps of sequencing on high-throughput platforms. In addition, there is no well-established database of ITS sequences. The publicly available repositories of fungal sequences are replete with redundant sequences containing incomplete and/or incorrect taxonomic assignments [29]. Most fungi show high interspecific variability in the variable D1/D2 domain of large subunit (26S) ribosomal DNA [30], and sequencing appears most robust because strain comparisons can easily be made. Recent studies [11,29-32] have indicated that the use of the D1/D2 region of the 26S rRNA gene, using NL1 primers to investigate the fungal distribution in the samples, appears to be the most robust approach. However, more work still needs to be done to implement and make a database, such as Greengenes, available for 16S.

Only a few papers have been aimed at understanding what the microbiota really does in a food matrix by coupling HTS with other techniques, thus representing complete and comprehensive studies. Interesting results have been obtained from these studies, and they clearly show that only a few taxa really play important roles during the food process, and that it is only by coupling different techniques that it is possible to study complex food ecosystems. In addition, one of the important questions that need to be addressed, once the microbiota composition has been evaluated, is how this microbiota (in most cases a few taxa) can affect the final characteristics of the products. One possible approach is to couple the HTS-amplicon based approach with metabolomics (both targeted and untargeted) to create a tool that can be used to identify the potential candidate metabolites (biomarkers) related to specific taxa [33].

Bioinformatic tools to translate sequences into data for interpretation purposes

Recently, several tools have been developed to use the data from amplicon base sequencing as input and to analyze these data so as to provide information on the diversity of the microbes. Network

105 analysis [34••] has emerged as an important tool that can be used to easily observe the structure and
106 dynamics of microbes, from an interactive point of view of the microbiota distribution, which can
107 also be used for food process development. Gephi or Cytoscape software can help scientists to
108 visualize data and to easily extract information about the development or the interaction of the
109 microbiota in the samples. Foodmicrobionet (http://www.foodmicrobionet.org/fmbn1_0_3web/) is a
110 recently developed application that collects data from multiple food-based studies with the aim of
111 allowing an easy and visual-effective comparison of one's own samples with several others from
112 the same food environment [34••].
113 Amplicon-based sequencing is a key tool for studies on microbial communities, but does not
114 provide direct evidence on a community's functional capabilities. An easy way of getting an idea of
115 the potential function of the microbial community is to use a computational approach to predict the
116 functional composition of a metagenome, using marker gene data and a database of reference
117 genomes. PICRUSt (phylogenetic investigation of communities by reconstruction of unobserved
118 states) shows that the phylogenetic information contained in 16S marker gene sequences is
119 sufficiently well correlated to the genomic content to provide an accurate prediction of the gene
120 repertoires, associated with their microbiota [35]. The main application of this tool is to
121 environmental samples, however, in food associated studies, the tool has been found to be able to
122 find correlations among taxa and metabolic functions associated with spoilage [5,7].
123 Another promising NGS data analysis method relies on the use of oligotyping, a novel supervised
124 computational method that can elucidate concealed diversity from within the final operational units
125 of classification or clustering approaches. Unlike clustering methods, which compare all the
126 positions in sequence reads to assess similarity, oligotyping utilizes the nucleotide positions that
127 have been identified as the most information-rich, and allows resolution at a species level or even
128 below [36]. Till now, only human-based and environmental studies have used this tool to identify
129 sub-OTU level differences across samples [37], or to track changes in specific populations across
130 seasons and geography [38]. However, this tool can also be easily applied to food based studies in

order to ascertain an association between an oligotype and a process, or to have a better idea of the distribution of a specific taxon in a food-based system.

Who is there and what are they doing?

The shotgun metagenomic approach (DNA-seq or RNA-seq) is a valuable approach that is applied extensively to environmental microbiology, but which is also of increasing interest in food microbiology. The main purpose of this technique is to obtain, at the same time, information about the microbe composition and the gene content without any PCR bias. Interest in the shotgun RNA-seq approach, applied to food matrix, is growing, due to its ability to discover the functions of microbes during a food process. This technique has recently been applied to cheese matrices in order to find differences in gene expression associated with a particular ripening time [39], to select biological markers in order to improve cheese quality assessment [40], or just to assess the microbial physiology during cheese manufacturing [41,42]. The main problem of using RNA-seq alone is the lack of availability of genome sequences to map the reads, and the need to couple them to DNA-seq data and to the amplicon-based HTS data, which results in an increase in the cost of sequencing. The use of the shotgun DNA-seq approach is interesting, because it provides higher-resolution taxonomic information than 16S rRNA sequencing and can profile hundreds of uncharacterized species, especially those present in low abundances, and at the same time obtain information about the gene content from a global point of view. The main application in food concerns the possibility of detecting foodborne pathogens in a food matrix [43,44], or of understanding the change in the gene content during a process [45-48]. A possible application of DNA-seq concerns the possibility of performing a de novo extraction of strains from metagenomes. Pangenome [49] is used extensively in epidemiology studies with the aim of analyzing strain-specific gene sets, and of providing a comprehensive view of the functional and pathogenic potential of the organisms. When reference genomes are included in the analysis, it is also possible to compare different strains or to identify new ones. This tool is promising for food ecologists, and

157 can easily be applied to food systems in a variety of ways, such as the selection of species/strains
158 for starter cultures, or the discovery of possible associations between a specific strain and a process
159 point. The increase in scientists' bioinformatic skills, the availability of online tools to analyze data
160 (e.g. MG-RAST, Galaxy) and the increase in the number of pipeline applications, such as
161 PanPhlAn [50] or Anvio's [51], all allow the huge amount of data produced with/through the
162 shotgun metagenomic approach to be analyzed.
163
164 **Multi-Omics Approach**
165 Most of the studies based on NGS just give a partial representation of the food-based ecosystem,
166 because only one of the techniques is applied, and a final remark, such as "…needs further study
167 …", is often added. In the authors' opinion, this is probably due to the cost of the experiment or the
168 need for different specialties, which are generally lacking in a single research unit. Only a few
169 examples that combine different omics approaches have been found for food. Dugat-Bony et al.
170 have recently shown an example in which data from metagenomic, metatranscriptomic and
171 biochemical analyses have been combined to obtain a complete view of what really happens during
172 the process [42••]. De Filippis et al. [39••] have also clearly shown that coupling
173 metatranscriptomic and metabolome data is effective in discovering the functional diversity of
174 cheese microbiota affected by different ripening conditions. Coupling the genetic potential and
175 final phenotype to, for example, metabolomics and metaproteomics, which is also called
176 proteogenomics [52], can offer the possibility of resolving the main functional components that
177 drive the function of the microbial ecosystem [53]. Proteogenomics can in particular offer the
178 possibility of exploring the microbial function, although metagenomics analysis can detect the
179 presence of different bacterial species and genes, metaproteomics can/is able to provide information
180 on the most representative metabolic pathways that are active during the food process [54].
181
182

Conclusion

At the moment, several tools are available to help one really understand what happens in a food-based system. Unfortunately, only a few examples of multi-omics approaches are available in the literature and these approaches need to be implemented to obtain a better understanding of food microbial ecosystems. However, this approach also suffers from certain limitations, due to its relatively high cost and the need for specific bioinformatics and biostatistics skills for the data analysis.

191 **Table 1** Amplicon target sequencing studies on different food matrices
192

Target	Short description	Food matrix	Referen
16S DNA	Bacterial diversity of Salame Piacentino PDO during ripening	Meat	[3]
16S RNA (cDNA)	Piedmontese fermented meat during ripening	Meat	[4]
16S RNA (cDNA)	Beef burger (controls or with added preservatives, nisin +EDTA) vacuum packed	Meat	[5]
16S DNA	Vacuum-packaged, cooked sausage	Meat	[6]
16S DNA	Fresh beef and pork cuts	Meat	[7]
16S DNA	Fresh and spoiled meat and seafood samples	Meat/fish	[8]
16S DNA	Chicha, a maize-based fermented beverage from Argentina	Fermented beverages	[9]
16S DNA	French organic sourdoughs	Doughs	[10]
16S RNA (cDNA)/16S DNA	Olive surfaces and brine during spontaneous and inoculated fermentation	Vegetables	[11•]
16S RNA (cDNA)	Wheat flour grown under organic and conventional farming conditions	Doughs	[12•]
16S DNA/26S DNA	Milk kefir grains collected in different Italian regions	Fermented beverages	[13]
16S DNA/ITS DNA	Samples from spontaneous 'Vino Santo Trentino' fermentation	Fermented beverages	[14]
16S DNA	Microbiota of Belgian white pudding after refrigerate storage	Meat	[15]
16S DNA	Rind and core microbiota of Caciotta and Caciocavallo cheese	Dairy and fermented milks	[16]
16S DNA	Mozzarella cheese made from cow's milk and produced with different acidification methods	Dairy and fermented milks	[17]
16S DNA/18S DNA	Naturally fermented cow's milk collected from Mongol-ethnic families	Dairy and fermented milks	[18]
16S DNA	Pico cheese made from raw cow milk	Dairy and fermented milks	[19]
16S DNA	Spoiled hard cheeses during ripening	Dairy and fermented milks	[20]
16S DNA	Brine-salted continental-type cheese	Dairy and fermented milks	[21]
16S DNA	Poro cheeses manufactured with different milk	Dairy and fermented milks	[22]
16S DNA	Herve cheeses from both raw and pasteurized milk	Dairy and fermented milks	[23]
16S RNA (cDNA)	Piedmont hard cheese made from raw milk: milk, curd and cheese throughout ripening	Dairy and fermented milks	[24]
16S RNA (cDNA)	Milk, curd and Caciocavallo cheese during ripening	Dairy and fermented milks	[25•]
16S RNA (cDNA)	Milk (from different lactation stages), curd and Fontina cheese from three different dairies	Dairy and fermented milks	[26]
16S DNA/18S DNA	Fermentation of Pu-erh tea	Fermented beverages	[27••]

194 **References and recommended reading**

195 Papers of particular interest, published within the review period, have been highlighted as:

196 • of special interest

197 •• of outstanding interest

198

199 [1]. Ceuppens S, Li D, Uyttendaele M, Renault P, Ross P, Ranst M Van, Cocolin L, Donaghy J:
200 **Molecular Methods in Food Safety Microbiology: Interpretation and Implications of**
201 **Nucleic Acid Detection.** *Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf* 2014, **13**:551–577.

202 [2]. Dolci P, Zenato S, Pramotton R, Barmaz A, Alessandria V, Rantsiou K, Cocolin L: **Cheese**
203 **surface microbiota complexity: RT-PCR-DGGE, a tool for a detailed picture?.** *Int J*
204 *Food Microbiol* 2013, **162**:8–12.

205 [3]. Połka J, Rebecchi A, Pisacane V, Morelli L, Puglisi E: **Bacterial diversity in typical Italian**
206 **salami at different ripening stages as revealed by high-throughput sequencing of 16S**
207 **rRNA amplicons.** *Food Microbiol* 2015, **46**:342–356.

208 [4]. Greppi A, Ferrocino I, La Storia A, Rantsiou K, Ercolini D, Cocolin L: **Monitoring of the**
209 **microbiota of fermented sausages by culture independent rRNA-based approaches.** *Int*
210 *J Food Microbiol* 2015, **212**:67–75.

211 [5]. Ferrocino I, Greppi A, La Storia A, Rantsiou K, Ercolini D, Cocolin L: **Impact of Nisin-**
212 **Activated Packaging on Microbiota of Beef Burgers during Storage.** *Appl Environ*
213 *Microbiol* 2016, **82**:549–559.

214 [6]. Hultman J, Rahkila R, Ali J, Rousu J, Björkroth KJ: **Meat processing plant microbiome**
215 **and contamination patterns of cold-tolerant bacteria causing food safety and spoilage**
216 **risks in the manufacture of vacuum-packaged cooked sausages.** *Appl Environ Microbiol*
217 2015, **81**:7088–7097.

218 [7]. Stellato G, La Storia A, De Filippis F, Borriello G, Villani F, Ercolini D: **Overlap of**
219 **spoilage-associated microbiota between meat and the meat processing environment in**

small-scale and large-scale retail. 2016, **82**:4045–4054.

[8]. Chaillou S, Chaulot-Talmon A, Caekebeke H, Cardinal M, Christieans S, Denis C, Hélène Desmonts M, Dousset X, Feurer C, Hamon E, *et al.*: **Origin and ecological selection of core and food-specific bacterial communities associated with meat and seafood spoilage.** *ISME J.* 2015, **9**:1105–18.

[9]. Elizaquível P, Pérez-Cataluña A, Yépez A, Aristimuño C, Jiménez E, Cocconcelli PS, Vignolo G, Aznar R: **Pyrosequencing vs. culture-dependent approaches to analyze lactic acid bacteria associated to chicha, a traditional maize-based fermented beverage from Northwestern Argentina.** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2015, **198**:9–18.

[10]. Lhomme E, Orain S, Courcoux P, Onno B, Dousset X: **The predominance of *Lactobacillus sanfranciscensis* in French organic sourdoughs and its impact on related bread characteristics.** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2015, **213**:40–48.

[11. De Angelis M, Campanella D, Cosmai L, Summo C, Rizzello CG, Caponio F: **Microbiota and metabolome of un-started and started Greek-type fermentation of Bella di Cerignola table olives.** *Food Microbiol* 2015, **52**:18–30.

• Selected starter cultures provided more controlled and consistent fermentation and to positively impact the overall table olive quality by affecting the amount of FAAs and phenolic and volatile organic compounds

[12]. Rizzello CG, Cavoski I, Turk J, Ercolini D, Nionelli L, Pontonio E, De Angelis M, De Filippis F, Gobbetti M, Di Cagno R: **Organic cultivation of *Triticum turgidum* subsp. *durum* is reflected in the flour-sourdough fermentation-bread axis.** *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2015, **81**:3192–3204.

• The environment microbiota is an important factor that can affect sourdoughs and it has been found to be closely correlated to the abundance of free and bound phenolic compounds, assessed by means of HPLC

[13]. Garofalo C, Osimani A, Milanović V, Aquilanti L, De Filippis F, Stellato G, Di Mauro S, Turchetti B, Buzzini P, Ercolini D, *et al.*: **Bacteria and yeast microbiota in milk kefir**

grains from different Italian regions. *Food Microbiol* 2015, **49**:123–133.

[14]. Stefanini I, Albanese D, Cavazza A, Franciosi E, De Filippo C, Donati C, Cavalieri D: **Dynamic changes in microbiota and mycobiota during spontaneous "Vino Santo Trentino" fermentation.** *Microb Biotechnol* 2016, **9**:195–208.

[15]. Cauchie E, Gand M, Kergourlay G, Taminiau B, Delhalle L, Korsak N, Daube G: **The use of 16S rRNA gene metagenetic monitoring of refrigerated food products for understanding the kinetics of microbial subpopulations at different storage temperatures: the example of white pudding.** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2016, doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2016.10.012.

[16]. Calasso M, Ercolini D, Mancini L, Stellato G, Minervini F, Di Cagno R, De Angelis M, Gobbetti M: **Relationships among house, rind and core microbiotas during manufacture of traditional Italian cheeses at the same dairy plant.** *Food Microbiol* 2016, **54**:115–126.

[17]. Guidone A, Zotta T, Matera A, Ricciardi A, De Filippis F, Ercolini D, Parente E: **The microbiota of high-moisture mozzarella cheese produced with different acidification methods.** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2016, **216**:9–17.

[18]. Liu W, Zheng Y, Kwok L-Y, Sun Z, Zhang J, Guo Z, Hou Q, Menhe B, Zhang H: **High-throughput sequencing for the detection of the bacterial and fungal diversity in Mongolian naturally fermented cow's milk in Russia.** *BMC Microbiol* 2015, **15**:45.

[19]. Riquelme C, Câmara S, Enes Dapkevicius M de LN, Vinuesa P, da Silva CCG, Malcata FX, Rego OA: **Characterization of the bacterial biodiversity in Pico cheese (an artisanal Azorean food).** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2015, **192**:86–94.

[20]. Bassi D, Puglisi E, Cocconcelli PS: **Understanding the bacterial communities of hard cheese with blowing defect.** *Food Microbiol.* 2015, **52**:106–118.

[21]. O'Sullivan DJ, Cotter PD, O'Sullivan O, Giblin L, McSweeney PLH, Sheehan JJ: **Temporal and spatial differences in microbial composition during the manufacture of a continental-type cheese.** *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2015, **81**:2525–2533.

[22]. Aldrete-Tapia A, Escobar-Ramírez MC, Tamplin ML, Hernández-Iturriaga M: **High-throughput sequencing of microbial communities in Poro cheese, an artisanal Mexican cheese.** *Food Microbiol* 2014, **44**:136–141.

[23]. Delcenserie V, Taminiau B, Delhalle L, Nezer C, Doyen P, Crevecoeur S, Roussey D, Korsak N, Daube G: **Microbiota characterization of a Belgian protected designation of origin cheese, Herve cheese, using metagenomic analysis.** *J Dairy Sci* 2014, **97**:6046–56.

[24]. Alessandria V, Ferrocino I, De Filippis F, Fontana M, Rantsiou K, Ercolini D, Cocolin L: **Microbiota of an Italian Grana like cheese during manufacture and ripening unraveled by 16S rRNA-based approaches.** *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2016, **82**:3988 –3995.

[25]. De Pasquale I, Di Cagno R, Buchin S, De Angelis M, Gobbetti M: **Spatial distribution of the metabolically active microbiota within Italian PDO ewes' milk cheeses.** *PLoS One* 2016, **11**:1–23.

• Only a few taxa from the metabolically active microbiota have been related to the proteolysis index in ewe's milk cheese and correlated with the synthesis of volatile compounds.

[26]. Dolci P, De Filippis F, La Storia A, Ercolini D, Cocolin L: **rRNA-based monitoring of the microbiota involved in Fontina PDO cheese production in relation to different stages of cow lactation.** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2014, **185**:127–35.

[27]. Zhao M, Zhang D-L, Su X-Q, Duan S-M, Wan J-Q, Yuan W-X, Liu B-Y, Ma Y, Pan Y-H: **An integrated metagenomics/metaproteomics investigation of the microbial communities and enzymes in solid-state fermentation of pu-erh tea.** *Sci Rep* 2015, **5**:10117.

•• Proteobacteria have been found to be responsible for the characteristics of Post-fermented Pu-erh tea (also known as Chinese tea), which was investigated by coupling amplicon HTS with a metaproteomic approach

[28]. Santamaria M, Fosso B, Consiglio A, De Caro G, Grillo G, Licciulli F, Liuni S, Marzano M, Alonso-alemany D, Valiente G, *et al.*: **Reference databases for taxonomic assignment in**

metagenomics. *Brief Bioinform* 2012, **13**:682–695.

[29]. Tang J, Iliev ID, Brown J, Underhill DM, Funari VA: **Mycobiome : Approaches to analysis of intestinal fungi.** *J Immunol Methods* 2015, **421**:112–121.

[30]. Kurtzman CP, Robnett CJ: **Identification and phylogeny of ascomycetous yeasts from analysis of nuclear large subunit (26S) ribosomal DNA partial sequences.** *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek, Int J Gen Mol Microbiol* 1998, **73**:331–371.

[31]. Wang C, García-Fernández D, Mas A, Esteve-Zarzoso B: **Fungal diversity in grape must and wine fermentation assessed by massive sequencing, quantitative PCR and DGGE.** *Front Microbiol* 2015, **6**:1–8.

[32]. Stellato G, De Filippis F, La Storia A, Ercolini D: **Coexistence of lactic acid bacteria and potential spoilage microbiota in a dairy-processing environment.** *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2015, **22**:7893-7904.

[33]. Pinu FR: **Early detection of food pathogens and food spoilage microorganisms: Application of metabolomics.** *Trends Food Sci Technol* 2016, **54**:213–215.

[34]. Parente E, Cocolin L, De Filippis F, Zotta T, Ferrocino I, O'Sullivan O, Neviani E, De Angelis M, Cotter PD, Ercolini D: **FoodMicrobionet: A database for the visualisation and exploration of food bacterial communities based on network analysis.** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2016, **219**:28–37.

•• This paper describe an easy-to-use tool for the visualization and comparison of microbiota in diverse foodstuffs. Users can easily extract subsets of samples for the food matrix of interest, visualize them in a network and/or use them in comparative studies.

[35]. Langille MGI, Zaneveld J, Caporaso JG, McDonald D, Knights D, Reyes J a, Clemente JC, Burkepile DE, Vega Thurber RL, Knight R, *et al.*: **Predictive functional profiling of microbial communities using 16S rRNA marker gene sequences.** *Nat Biotechnol* 2013, **31**:814–21.

[36]. Eren AM, Maignien L, Sul WJ, Murphy LG, Grim SL, Morrison HG, Sogin ML: **Oligotyping: Differentiating between closely related microbial taxa using 16S rRNA**

gene data. *Methods Ecol Evol* 2013, **4**:1111–1119.

[37]. Berni Canani R, Sangwan N, Stefka AT, Nocerino R, Paparo L, Aitoro R, Calignano A, Khan A a, Gilbert J a, Nagler CR: ***Lactobacillus rhamnosus*** **GG-supplemented formula expands butyrate-producing bacterial strains in food allergic infants.** *ISME J* 2015, **10**:1–9.

[38]. Fisher JC, Levican A, Figueras MJ, McLellan SL: **Population dynamics and ecology of *Arcobacter* in sewage.** *Front Microbiol* 2014, **5**:1–9.

[39. De Filippis, F, Genovese A, Ferranti P, Gilbert JA, Ercolini D: **Metatranscriptomics reveals temperature-driven functional changes in microbiome impacting cheese maturation rate.** *Sci Rep* 2016, **6**:1–12.

•• The study has clearly shown that the ripening temperature can significantly affect the gene expression, with a clear correlation with the metabolomic profiles of volatile organic compounds during cheese ripening. NOT CLEAR

[40]. Lessard M-H, Viel C, Boyle B, St-Gelais D, Labrie S: **Metatranscriptome analysis of fungal strains *Penicillium camemberti* and *Geotrichum candidum* reveal cheese matrix breakdown and potential development of sensory properties of ripened Camembert-type cheese.** *BMC Genomics* 2014, **15**:235.

[41]. Monnet C, Dugat-Bony E, Swennen D, Beckerich J-M, Irlinger F, Fraud S, Bonnarme P: **Investigation of the activity of the microorganisms in a reblochon-style cheese by metatranscriptomic analysis.** *Front. Microbiol.* 2016, **7**:536.

[42]. Dugat-Bony E, Straub C, Teissandier A, Onésime D, Loux V, Monnet C, Irlinger F, Landaud S, Leclercq-Perlat M-N, Bento P, *et al.*: **Overview of a surface-ripened cheese community functioning by meta-omics analyses.** *PLoS One* 2015, **10**:e0124360.

•• This study has clearly shown that the application of a multi-omics approach is able to furnish an overview of the cheese maturation process and to obtain a better understanding of the metabolic activities of the different community members and their possible interactions.

[43]. Yang X, Noyes NR, Doster E, Martin JN, Linke LM, Magnuson RJ, Yang H, Geornaras I, Woerner DR, Jones KL: **Use of metagenomic shotgun sequencing technology to detect**

foodborne pathogens within the microbiome of the beef production chain. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2016, **82**:2433–2443.

[44]. Leonard SR, Mammel MK, Lacher DW, Elkins CA: **Application of metagenomic sequencing to food safety: detection of shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* on fresh bagged spinach.** *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2015, **81**:8183–8191.

[45]. Jung JY, Lee SH, Kim JM, Park MS, Bae J, Hahn Y, Madsen EL, Jeon CO: **Metagenomic analysis of kimchi , a traditional korean fermented food.** *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2011, **77**:2264–2274.

[46]. Nieminen TT, Koskinen K, Laine P, Hultman J, Säde E, Paulin L, Paloranta A, Johansson P, Björkroth J, Auvinen P: **Comparison of microbial communities in marinated and unmarinated broiler meat by metagenomics.** *Int J Food Microbiol* 2012, **157**:142–149.

[47]. Nalbantoglu U, Cakar A, Dogan H, Abaci N, Ustek D, Sayood K, Can H: **Metagenomic analysis of the microbial community in kefir grains.** *Food Microbiol* 2014, **41**:42–51.

[48]. Escobar-Zepeda A, Sanchez-Flores A, Quirasco Baruch M: **Metagenomic analysis of a Mexican ripened cheese reveals a unique complex microbiota.** *Food Microbiol* 2016, **57**:116–127.

[49]. Nayfach S, Pollard KS: **Leading edge perspective toward accurate and quantitative comparative metagenomics.** 2016, *Cell* **116**:1103-1116.

[50]. Scholz M, Ward DV, Pasolli E, Tolio T, Zolfo M, Asnicar F, Truong DT, Tett A, Morrow AL, Segata N: **Strain-level microbial epidemiology and population genomics from shotgun metagenomics.** *Nat Methods* 2016, **13**:435–438.

[51]. Eren AM, Esen ÖC, Quince C, Vineis JH, Morrison HG, Sogin ML, Delmont TO: **Anvi'o: an advanced analysis and visualization platform for 'omics data.** *PeerJ* 2015, **3**:e1319.

[52]. Armengaud J, Hartmann EM, Bland C: **Proteogenomics for environmental microbiology**. *Proteomics* 2013, **13**:2731–2742.

[53]. Wilmes P, Heintz-Buschart A, Bond PL: **A decade of metaproteomics: Where we stand**

and what the future holds. *Proteomics* 2015, **15**:3409–3417.

[54]. Soggiu A, Piras C, Mortera SL, Alloggio I, Urbani A, Bonizzi L, Roncada P: **Unravelling the effect of clostridia spores and lysozyme on microbiota dynamics in Grana Padano cheese: A metaproteomics approach.** *J Proteomics* 2015, **147**:21–27.