

6-10-2010

Estuarine Nitrifiers: New Players, Patterns and Processes


Anne E. Bernhard

Connecticut College, aeber@conncoll.edu

Annette Bollmann

Miami University - Oxford

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.conncoll.edu/biofacpub>

 Part of the [Biochemistry, Biophysics, and Structural Biology Commons](#), [Marine Biology Commons](#), and the [Microbiology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bernhard, Anne E. and Bollmann, Annette, "Estuarine Nitrifiers: New Players, Patterns and Processes" (2010). *Biology Faculty Publications*. 34.

<http://digitalcommons.conncoll.edu/biofacpub/34>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Biology Department at Digital Commons @ Connecticut College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Biology Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Connecticut College. For more information, please contact bpancier@conncoll.edu.

The views expressed in this paper are solely those of the author.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Estuarine Nitrifiers: New Players, Patterns and Processes

Anne E. Bernhard^{1,*} and Annette Bollmann²

¹ Department of Biology, Connecticut College, New London, CT 06320

² Department of Microbiology, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056

* corresponding author
(860) 439-2580 (phone)
(860) 439-2519 (fax)
aeber@conncoll.edu

1 **Abstract**

2

3 Ever since the first descriptions of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria by Winogradsky in the late
4 1800's, the metabolic capability of aerobic ammonia oxidation has been restricted to a
5 phylogenetically narrow group of bacteria. However, the recent discovery of ammonia-oxidizing
6 Archaea has forced microbiologists and ecologists to re-evaluate long-held paradigms and the
7 role of niche partitioning between bacterial and archaeal ammonia oxidizers. Much of the
8 current research has been conducted in open ocean or terrestrial systems, where community
9 patterns of archaeal and bacterial ammonia oxidizers are highly congruent. Studies of archaeal
10 and bacterial ammonia oxidizers in estuarine systems, however, present a very different picture,
11 with highly variable patterns of archaeal and bacterial ammonia oxidizer abundances. Although
12 salinity is often identified as an important factor regulating abundance, distribution, and diversity
13 of both archaeal and bacterial ammonia oxidizers, the data suggest that the variability in the
14 observed patterns is likely not due to a simple salinity effect. Here we review current knowledge
15 of ammonia oxidizers in estuaries and propose that because of their steep physico-chemical
16 gradients, estuaries may serve as important natural laboratories in which to investigate the
17 relationships between archaeal and bacterial ammonia oxidizers.

18

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Nitrification, the sequential oxidation of ammonia to nitrite and then nitrate, is a critical
3 step in the nitrogen cycle, and is carried out by phylogenetically and physiologically distinct
4 microorganisms. In coastal systems, nitrification is often coupled to denitrification (Jenkins and
5 Kemp, 1984; Sebilo et al., 2006), resulting in the ultimate return of nitrogen to the atmosphere.
6 Thus, the fate of ammonia plays a major role in the regulation of primary productivity,
7 particularly in marine systems where nitrogen is often the limiting nutrient (Howarth, 1988).
8 Despite the obvious ecological importance of nitrification, regulation of microbial populations
9 that mediate it is poorly understood, particularly as new pathways of ammonia oxidation and
10 new groups of ammonia-oxidizing organisms are discovered. Identifying environmental factors
11 that regulate the diversity, distribution, and activity of nitrifiers is paramount to gain a more
12 complete understanding of nitrogen-cycling, particularly in nitrogen-sensitive environments,
13 such as estuaries and salt marshes.

14 The mixing of freshwater and saltwater in estuaries and salt marshes creates steep
15 physico-chemical gradients that are accompanied by shifts in the resident microbial
16 communities. Steep gradients of salinity, nitrogen, pH, oxygen, sulfide, and organic loading are
17 common and some of these have been shown to correlate with shifts in microbial communities
18 (del Giorgio and Bouvier, 2002; Crump et al., 2004; Hewson and Fuhrman, 2004; Bernhard et
19 al., 2005). Many of the parameters known to shift along the estuarine gradient are also known to
20 be important factors impacting ammonia oxidizers (e.g. Bernhard et al., 2005; Bernhard et al.,
21 2007; Mosier and Francis, 2008; Santoro et al., 2008). Because of the steep gradients and the
22 documented changes in activity and community composition of nitrifiers in estuaries and salt
23 marshes, these habitats are ideal natural laboratories in which to study the dynamics of nitrifiers.

24 To date, there are no known microbes that can oxidize ammonia all the way to nitrate.
25 Instead, ammonia-oxidizers convert ammonia to nitrite, while another group of organisms,
26 nitrite-oxidizing bacteria, convert nitrite to nitrate. Until recently, the only known aerobic
27 ammonia oxidizers belonged to two separate lineages within the domain *Bacteria*, the *Beta*- and

1 *Gammaproteobacteria* (Woese et al., 1984; Woese et al., 1985). Ammonia-oxidizing bacteria
2 (AOB) use O₂ as their electron acceptor and NH₃ as their sole energy source, channeling some of
3 the energy produced to fix CO₂. Although both ammonia- and nitrite-oxidizers are required for
4 the complete oxidation of ammonia, most research has focused on ammonia oxidizers since they
5 carry out the rate limiting step (Prosser, 1989).

6 What was once a fairly simple phylogenetic and physiological picture, however, is now
7 known to be far more complex. The recent discovery of aerobic ammonia oxidation within the
8 domain *Archaea* (Könneke et al., 2005; Treusch et al., 2005) has led to a dramatic shift in the
9 current model of nitrification, and to new questions of niche differentiation between ammonia
10 oxidizing *Archaea* (AOA) and the more well-studied AOB. Much of what we know about
11 marine AOA has come from studies in open ocean environments, where patterns of AOA are
12 generally similar, with AOA far outnumbering AOB (Wuchter et al., 2006; Mincer et al., 2007;
13 Beman et al., 2008), suggesting that AOA are likely the predominant nitrifiers in the ocean.
14 However, several recent studies of AOA and AOB in estuarine systems suggest a more complex
15 picture of ammonia oxidizer ecology, so we focus here on the ammonia oxidizers in estuarine
16 systems, where the patterns and processes appear to differ significantly from those in pelagic
17 systems.

18

19 **1. 1. Nitrification in estuaries and salt marshes**

20 Effects of changes in physico-chemical conditions along an estuarine gradient on
21 nitrification rates have been well documented, and indicate decreased nitrification as the salinity
22 increases (Seitzinger, 1988; Rysgaard et al., 1999). However, the precise cause of the decrease
23 in nitrification is less clear. It is known that salinity plays a major role in controlling NH₄⁺
24 adsorption capacity of the sediment (Boatman and Murray, 1982), with increased NH₄⁺ efflux as
25 salinity increases (Boynton and Kemp, 1985). But salinity has also been shown to affect species
26 composition of nitrifying communities (de Bie et al., 2001; Bollmann and Laanbroek, 2002), and
27 functionally distinct communities of AOB along a salinity gradient have recently been reported

1 (Bernhard et al., 2007). Thus, decreases in nitrification may be due to substrate limitation or,
2 alternatively, a shift in the nitrifying community.

3 Nitrification has received much attention in estuaries and other coastal systems, but
4 relatively few studies have been conducted in salt marshes. Despite the paucity of measurements
5 in salt marshes, reported values of nitrification vary widely, and may depend on the type of
6 vegetation sampled or the methods used. Dollhopf et al. (2005) found an order of magnitude
7 difference in nitrification rates in tall-form *Spartina alterniflora* compared to short-form *S.*
8 *alterniflora* and unvegetated creek banks. However, Moin et al. (2009) reported no significant
9 differences in potential rates among three different salt marsh grasses. Other studies have
10 reported nitrification in only one type of vegetation (Anderson et al., 1997; Tobias et al., 2001)
11 or have not provided detailed information on the vegetation types (Thompson et al., 1995).
12 Because the roots help to oxygenate the sediments (Mendelssohn et al., 1981), it is thought that
13 this may help to stimulate nitrification (An and Joye, 2001). Conversely, others have reported
14 inhibition by the presence of microalgae, possibly due to competition for ammonium (Risgaard-
15 Petersen et al., 2004). Therefore, our understanding of nitrification in salt marshes and the
16 microorganisms responsible is severely lacking at present, despite the importance of nitrification
17 in regulating nitrogen in these systems.

18 It is possible that much of the variability observed among nitrifying communities in
19 estuaries and salt marshes is due at least in part to the difficulties of collecting comparable
20 samples in these systems. Tidal cycles, type of vegetation or distance from vegetation are all
21 critical factors that may significantly impact the communities that are present or active, but are
22 often not adequately reported or accounted for in the studies. As tides ebb and flow, edaphic
23 conditions may shift dramatically over only a few hours. The dynamic nature of estuaries and
24 salt marshes may create a unique natural laboratory for studying nitrifying communities and the
25 factors that regulate them, but it also creates inherent sampling difficulties and subsequent
26 comparisons between studies, and may contribute to some of the variability in estuarine
27 nitrifying communities.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1.2 Taxonomy of AOB

The majority of AOB form a monophyletic lineage within the *Betaproteobacteria* (Figure 1), comprised of two major genera *Nitrosomonas* and *Nitrospira* (Head et al., 1993). Two other species, *Nitrosococcus oceani* and *N. halophilus*, are affiliated with the *Gammaproteobacteria* (Holmes et al., 1995; Purkhold et al., 2000), and appear to be restricted to marine or saline environments.

All autotrophic aerobic ammonia-oxidizing bacteria have ammonia monooxygenase (AMO), the enzyme responsible for the first step in ammonia oxidation. The gene encoding the alpha subunit of AMO (*amoA*) has been used extensively as a molecular marker for studies of ammonia oxidizer diversity and distribution (see review by Kowalchuk and Stephen, 2001). The forms of AMO differ significantly between the *Beta*- and *Gammaproteobacteria* AOB. In fact, analysis of *amoA* sequences (the gene encoding the subunit containing the active site) indicate that genes from *Gammaproteobacteria* AOB have higher similarities to sequences of *pmoA*, the gene coding for a subunit of the particulate methane monooxygenase, than to *amoA* genes from the *Betaproteobacteria* AOB (β -AOB) (Holmes et al., 1995). However, due to the apparent lack of gammaproteobacterial ammonia oxidizers in estuaries (Bernhard et al., 2005; Ward et al., 2007) or salt marshes (Moin et al., 2009), they will not be considered further in this review.

Although all aerobic AOB carry out the same basic metabolic processes, there exists great ecophysiological diversity among the cultivated strains. The β -AOB are represented by 14 cultivated strains (Koops and Pommerening-Roser, 2001), divided into two main clusters, *Nitrosomonas* and *Nitrospira*. The greatest physiological and phylogenetic diversity exists within the *Nitrosomonas* cluster, which contains the type species, *Nitrosomonas europaea*. Several species (*Nitrosomonas marina*, *Nitrosomonas aestuarii*, and *Nitrosomonas cryotolerans*) are obligately halophilic, while the remaining species in the *Nitrosomonas* and *Nitrospira* genera either have no salt requirement, are halotolerant or moderately halophilic (Koops and Pommerening-Roser, 2001). Among the 14 species, there are also widely differing substrate

1 affinities, with *Nitrosomonas oligotropha* and *Nitrosomonas ureae* displaying the lowest K_s
2 values (1.9-4.2 $\mu\text{M NH}_3$), and *N. europaea* and related species having the highest K_s values (30-
3 61 $\mu\text{M NH}_3$) (Koops and Pommerening-Roser, 2001). Based on the broad physiological
4 differences among the AOB, one might expect that they will be differentially distributed in the
5 environment.

6 Unfortunately, most cultured ammonia-oxidizing bacteria do not represent the majority of
7 AOB found in natural environments based on sequence analysis of 16S rRNA genes and the
8 functional gene, ammonia monooxygenase (see review by Kowalchuk and Stephen, 2001). The
9 lack of environmentally-relevant AOB in culture collections represents a significant barrier to
10 understanding their ecophysiology and is likely a reflection of substantial differences in their
11 nutritional requirements and physiological limitations compared to cultivated AOB.

12

13 **1.3 Discovery of Ammonia Oxidizing Archaea**

14 Until recently, our understanding of the diversity of aerobic ammonia oxidizers was
15 restricted to members of the *Proteobacteria*. However, the new taxonomy for ammonia
16 oxidizers must now include members from the Domain *Archaea*. When *Archaea* were first
17 described in the late 1970's, they were considered extremophiles, found primarily in
18 environments such as hydrothermal vents, acidic hot springs, and anoxic environments.
19 However, in the early 1990's DeLong (1992) and Fuhrman et al. (1992) independently
20 documented the unexpected presence in temperate ocean samples of members of a group of
21 *Archaea* known as the *Crenarchaeota*. The group of marine *Archaea* was named the Group I
22 Crenarchaea (Figure 2) and have been found to account for up to 20% of the picoplankton and
23 are estimated to account for up to 10^{28} cells in the world's oceans (Karner et al., 2001).
24 Additional studies revealed that members of the *Crenarchaeota* closely related to marine Group I
25 were also found in soils (Bintrim et al., 1997) and freshwater sediments (MacGregor et al.,
26 1997). Despite their ubiquity and abundance, the physiology of the Group I *Crenarchaeota* was
27 unknown since their laboratory cultivation remained elusive.

1 The only *Crenarchaeota* that had been grown in pure culture up until this point were
2 thermophilic or hyperthermophilic *Archaea*, such those belonging to the *Sulfolobus* and
3 *Desulfococcus* genera (Figure 2), with sulfur-based metabolisms. The first hint of the potential
4 metabolic role of the Group I *Crenarchaeota* came from two independent metagenomic studies.
5 Venter et al. (2004) reported the presence of a gene that appeared to be a homolog of the
6 bacterial *amoA* gene on an archaeal scaffold obtained from the metagenome of the Sargasso Sea.
7 Shortly thereafter, Treusch et al. (2005) reported finding a similar gene from a large DNA
8 fragment from soil that also had an archaeal 16S rRNA gene belonging to the Group I.1b
9 *Crenarchaeota*. The two studies provided independent evidence for the genetic potential of the
10 Group I *Crenarchaeota* to oxidize ammonia, but further work would be necessary to definitively
11 establish the nitrifying potential among members of the *Archaea*.

12 Fortunately, the definitive proof of the ability of an archaeon to oxidize ammonia was
13 established soon thereafter by the cultivation of a saltwater aquarium isolate representing the
14 Group I.1a *Crenarchaeota* (Könneke et al., 2005). The isolate, *Nitrosopumilus maritimus*,
15 represents the first mesophilic crenarchaeal isolate. It grows autotrophically with bicarbonate as
16 its sole carbon source and a stoichiometric conversion of ammonia to nitrite, thus firmly
17 establishing the physiology of at least one member of the Group I *Crenarchaeota*. Since this
18 discovery, putative genes for ammonia oxidation have also been reported in the sponge
19 symbiont, *Cenarchaeum symbiosum*, along with genes for ammonia and urea transporters and
20 urease, all consistent with the metabolic potential to utilize reduced nitrogen compounds (Hallam
21 et al., 2006).

22

23 **2. Autotrophy, heterotrophy, or mixotrophy among the AOA?**

24 All aerobic AOB are known to be chemolithoautotrophs, although some have been
25 recently shown to be facultative chemolithoautotrophs (Hommes et al., 2003). Initial tests of *N.*
26 *maritimus* suggest that it, too, is inhibited by even small concentrations of organic carbon
27 (Könneke et al., 2005), but it remains unclear whether the physiology of *N. maritimus* is

1 representative of all ammonia oxidizing *Archaea*. Previous studies using radiolabeled substrates
2 indicate that at least some of the marine *Crenarchaeota* can take up organic compounds (Ingalls
3 et al., 2006), particularly amino acids (Ouverney and Fuhrman, 2000; Teira et al., 2006).
4 Additionally, genes for carbon fixation by a modified 3-hydroxypropionate pathway (indicative
5 of autotrophy) and genes for a nearly complete TCA cycle (indicative of heterotrophy) in the
6 genome of *Cenarchaeum symbiosum* suggest at least the genetic potential for mixotrophic
7 metabolism (Hallam et al., 2006). And, finally, Agogue et al. (2008) report that most
8 bathypelagic *Crenarchaeota* in the North Atlantic are not autotrophic, based on dark carbon
9 fixation rates and *amoA* gene abundance.

10 Equally convincing data exists, however, for an autotrophic lifestyle of the marine
11 *Crenarchaeota*. Pearson et al. (2001) reported δ -¹⁴C signatures in archaeal isoprenoids that were
12 consistent with chemoautotrophic growth below the euphotic zone. In a study in the North Sea,
13 Wuchter et al. (2003) provided evidence that marine *Crenarchaeota* can take up bicarbonate in
14 the absence of light by measuring incorporation of radiolabeled bicarbonate into crenarchaeol, a
15 lipid specific to *Crenarchaeota*. Additionally, Herndl et al. (2005) also found increased
16 bicarbonate uptake by *Crenarchaeota* with depth to 3000 m in the Atlantic Ocean. These
17 seemingly conflicting data leave several unanswered questions for future research. First, are all
18 the marine *Crenarchaeota* capable of ammonia oxidation, and second, are they heterotrophic,
19 autotrophic or mixotrophic? The answers to these questions will likely only be adequately
20 addressed by additional enrichment and cultivation work.

21

22 **3. Diversity of AOA and AOB in estuaries**

23 A recurring paradox in microbial ecology is high species diversity within a functionally
24 similar group. Because all autotrophic ammonia oxidizers require NH₃, O₂, and CO₂, there is the
25 potential for intense competition among ammonia oxidizers. Because estuaries experience high
26 spatial and temporal heterogeneity of physico-chemical parameters, such as pH, NH₄⁺
27 availability, O₂ tension, CO₂ availability, salinity, sulfide, and temperature, they are particularly

1 interesting habitats in which to study niche differentiation among ammonia oxidizers. Daily tidal
2 fluctuations are typically accompanied by changes in a suite of physico-chemical properties,
3 demanding physiological plasticity of the resident microbes or, alternatively, a community of
4 microbes with varying tolerance to these conditions. Studies of AOB from natural environments
5 have found differences in substrate affinity (Stehr et al., 1995; Suwa et al., 1997), differences in
6 NH₃ oxidation rates (Bodelier et al., 1996) and distribution of nitrifying bacteria related to
7 oxygen (Schramm et al., 2000; Gieseke et al., 2001) among different species, suggesting
8 differences in the physiological tolerance. Diversity and distribution of AOA and AOB
9 undoubtedly reflect differences in their environments, but because of a lack of cultured
10 representative strains, much of the ecophysiology of estuarine ammonia oxidizers remains
11 unresolved. Correlations of community composition with environmental variables, however,
12 may provide some clues into physiological limits of estuarine AOA and AOB.

13 Studies of microbial diversity often focus on characterization of the 16S ribosomal RNA
14 genes, which have universally conserved regions that are suitable targets for diversity studies.
15 However, to study diversity within a functional group of microorganisms, the organisms must be
16 monophyletic or, alternatively, one of the genes responsible for the function of interest may be
17 targeted. Although the β -AOB form a monophyletic group, many of the primers targeting the
18 16S rRNA genes are selective rather than specific (Utaker and Nes, 1998), so diversity studies
19 targeting this gene are more problematic. Distribution of ammonia oxidation among the *Archaea*
20 is still under investigation, so targeting 16S rRNA genes may not necessarily correspond with
21 metabolic potential. Therefore, diversity of AOA and β -AOB has been characterized primarily
22 by analysis of the alpha subunit of ammonia monooxygenase gene (*amoA*) sequences. Although
23 the archaeal and betaproteobacterial *amoA* genes are thought to be homologs, it is not possible to
24 detect them both with the same set of PCR primers. However, primers for the two distinct *amoA*
25 genes have previously been published (Rotthauwe et al., 1997; Francis et al., 2005; Koenneke et
26 al., 2005) and used successfully in a variety of habitats.

1 Sequences of the *amoA* gene from different β -AOB indicate that although they are more
2 variable than the 16S rRNA genes (Purkhold et al., 2000), they have phylogenetically conserved
3 regions, providing a suitable target gene for primers (Rotthauwe et al., 1997; Nold et al., 2000).
4 In fact, because of its greater diversity, the *amoA* gene may be a more effective marker for fine-
5 scale diversity studies (Rotthauwe et al., 1997; Alzerreca et al., 1999; Oved et al., 2001).
6 Analysis of 16S rRNA and *amoA* genes from most of the cultivated species of β -AOB suggests
7 high congruence between the phylogenies based on each gene (Purkhold et al., 2000). Initial
8 reports also suggest similar congruence of 16S rRNA and *amoA* genes among the Archaea (Nicol
9 et al., 2008; Prosser and Nicol, 2008; Sahan and Muyzer, 2008).

11 **3.1. Betaproteobacterial AOB phylogeny in estuaries**

12 Phylogeny of the β -AOB appears to be quite consistent and predictable in estuaries. The
13 majority of *amoA* sequences recovered from estuaries are affiliated with a group of nitrifiers that
14 is currently unrepresented in culture collections, but is most closely related to the *Nitrosospira*
15 group (Figure 3). Since there are no cultured representatives of these β -AOB, we can only infer
16 their physiological tolerances. It is interesting to note, however, that the cluster of uncultured
17 *Nitrosospira*-like β -AOB is comprised exclusively of sequences from marine or estuarine sites,
18 suggesting specific adaptations to a saline environment. Despite their apparent numerical
19 abundance, the ecological role of the uncultured *Nitrosospira*-like β -AOB remains uncertain. In
20 a study of β -AOB richness and activity along a salinity gradient in the Ythan Estuary in
21 Scotland, Freitag et al. (2006) found the usual β -AOB based on 16S rRNA gene sequencing, but
22 were unable to confirm the activity of the *Nitrosospira* cluster 1-like AOB using a stable isotope
23 probing approach with $^{13}\text{C-HCO}_3^-$. Instead, they identified sequences related to *Nitrosomonas*
24 *cryotolerans* and *Nitrosospira* sp. Nm143 in the fraction of the labeled DNA, indicating active
25 nitrifiers. Although the results of Freitag and colleagues may bring into question the ecological
26 role of the *Nitrosospira*-like β -AOB found to be so prevalent in estuaries, their results may

1 simply indicate that these β -AOB do not respond well to laboratory manipulations, which would
2 explain why they have evaded cultivation attempts to date.

3 Sequences related to *Nitrosomonas aestuarii*, *N. marina*, or *N. ureae* are also frequently
4 recovered from estuarine sites. However, very few sequences have been found in estuaries that
5 are closely related to the well-studied *Nitrosomonas europaea*, and most of these are from low
6 salinity environments. In general, β -AOB communities vary along the salinity gradient, with
7 communities at the freshwater end composed of sequences related to both the *Nitrosomonas* and
8 *Nitrospira* genera, while communities at the marine end of the gradient tend to be dominated
9 by *Nitrospira*-like sequences (de Bie et al., 2001; Francis et al., 2003; Bernhard et al., 2005;
10 Ward et al., 2007). Finding similar β -AOB in geographically disparate estuaries suggests there
11 are common factors regulating β -AOB distribution in estuaries. Although the primary factor
12 may simply be the presence or absence of salt, other factors that covary with salinity, such as
13 nitrogen or oxygen, may also be important. Controlled laboratory manipulations may be
14 necessary to separate the effects of salinity from other potential regulating factors.

15 Temperature, pH, net primary productivity and organic loading have been implicated,
16 along with salinity, as important factors regulating the distribution of β -AOB. Sahan and
17 Muyzer (2008) investigated β -AOB diversity and distribution along a salinity gradient in the
18 Westerschelde Estuary, and identified salinity and temperature as the most important factors
19 regulating β -AOB distribution and reported higher β -AOB richness and diversity (measured by
20 H') when salinity and temperature were low. Additionally, variability in net primary productivity
21 was correlated with β -AOB community composition. In a study of eutrophic Tokyo Bay
22 sediments, Urakawa et al. (2006) found shifts in the β -AOB communities that corresponded to
23 changes in nutrients and organic inputs from river run-off. Interestingly, no sequences related to
24 *Nitrospira* spp. were detected, even in samples collected from the more marine end of the bay,
25 suggesting that organic loading may be more important than increased salinity in regulating AOB
26 communities. In other cases (O'Mullan and Ward, 2005), no correlation between β -AOB
27 richness and environmental variables was detected.

1 Salinity also appears to affect the richness as well as the community composition of
2 β -AOB. Several studies have reported a decrease in the number of AOB phylotypes as salinity
3 increases (Bernhard et al., 2005; Ward et al., 2007; Sahan and Muyzer, 2008). The decrease in
4 richness of β -AOB with increasing salinity may indicate a decrease in the importance of β -AOB
5 in more saline environments, and may suggest a shift in the dominant nitrifiers. One popular
6 hypothesis is that ammonia oxidizing *Archaea* may be the more important nitrifiers in marine
7 systems.

9 **3.2 Archaeal *amoA* phylogeny**

10 Since the discovery of ammonia-oxidizing *Archaea*, the distribution and diversity of
11 presumptive archaeal *amoA* genes has been investigated in various soils and sediments
12 (Leininger et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2008; Jia and Conrad, 2009), oxic and suboxic marine layers
13 (Wuchter et al., 2006; Coolen et al., 2007; Mincer et al., 2007; Beman et al., 2008), estuaries
14 (Beman and Francis, 2006; Caffrey et al., 2007; Mosier and Francis, 2008; Sahan and Muyzer,
15 2008), salt marshes (Moin et al., 2009), subterranean environments (Weidler et al., 2007),
16 wastewater sludge (Park et al., 2008), and corals (Beman et al., 2007). The similarity of putative
17 AMO-encoding genes (subunits A, B, and C) to bacterial AMO genes is relatively low (38-51%
18 amino acid sequence similarity) (Könneke et al., 2005), and whether the AMO-related genes are
19 in fact homologs has not been confirmed. However, the presence of the archaeal *amoA* subunit
20 has been correlated with the detection of nitrification activity (Könneke et al., 2005; Treusch et
21 al., 2005; Leininger et al., 2006; Wuchter et al., 2006; Beman et al., 2008), and the wide
22 distribution of archaeal *amoA* genes suggests a potentially important role in nitrification in many
23 habitats.

24 Archaeal *amoA* sequences fall into one of two major clusters, a cluster dominated by
25 sequences recovered from water column and sediments and a cluster dominated by sequences
26 from soils and sediments (Figure 4). Sequences from both clusters have been recovered from

1 estuarine sediments, but in most estuaries, the majority of the sequences fall into the water
2 column/sediment cluster (Table 1).

3 From the handful of studies in estuaries, AOA richness is generally much greater than
4 β -AOB richness, based on numbers of different gene sequences (Table 1). Differences in the
5 richness between AOA and β -AOB may reflect differences in metabolic activity. Although the
6 only cultivated AOA is thought to be an obligate aerobic ammonia oxidizer (Könneke et al.,
7 2005), it remains unknown whether all related *Crenarchaeota* are obligate ammonia oxidizers or
8 even if they are capable of ammonia oxidation at all. As previously discussed, there is
9 convincing evidence of heterotrophic metabolism among at least some of the group I
10 *Crenarchaeota* (Ouverney and Fuhrman, 2000; Hallam et al., 2006; Ingalls et al., 2006).
11 Alternatively, differences in richness of AOA and β -AOB may reflect differences in
12 evolutionary history. The recent discoveries of thermophilic (de la Torre et al., 2008) and
13 moderately thermophilic (Hatzenpichler et al., 2008) AOA raises interesting questions about the
14 ancestry of AOA and ammonia oxidation.

15 Although factors that regulate AOA diversity have not yet been fully elucidated, Sahan
16 and Muyzer (2008) found salinity, temperature, nitrite concentrations, and net primary
17 productivity to produce major effects on the community structure. Dissolved oxygen has also
18 been implicated as an important factor affecting AOA communities, leading to a shift in the AOA
19 to β -AOB ratios (Santoro et al., 2008), as well as selecting for specific AOA phylotypes (Lam et
20 al., 2007; Park et al., 2008). Temperature was found to be a key factor in regulating AOA and
21 β -AOB richness in an aquarium biofilter system (Urakawa et al., 2008). Not surprisingly, many
22 of the same factors have been shown to have significant effects on β -AOB communities (Francis
23 et al., 2003; Bernhard et al., 2005; Ward et al., 2007).

24 The vast majority of AOA *amoA* sequences recovered from other marine systems, such as
25 pelagic waters and coral reefs, affiliate primarily with the water column/sediment cluster. Only
26 in coral reefs (Beman et al., 2007) and coastal marine sediments (Park et al., 2008) were
27 sequences recovered that were related to the soils/sediment cluster. Within the water

1 column/sediment cluster, however, there appear to be distinct clades of archaeal *amoA* genes that
2 roughly correlate with habitat. For example, Hallam et al. (2006) found shallow (0-130 m) and
3 deep (500-4000 m) ecotypes of archaeal *amoA* genes recovered from the Central Pacific,
4 Monterey Bay, and the Antarctic peninsula. A similar distinction with depth was reported by
5 Mincer et al. (2007), who suggested the separation may reflect differences in responses to
6 photoinhibition, although photoinhibition has not been reported in cultures of *N. maritimus*.
7 Such clear habitat-specific AOA sequence types have not emerged from estuarine studies.
8 Mosier and Francis (2008) observed a cluster of AOA sequences that is dominated by sequences
9 from low salinity environments, but several new sequences from a salt marsh also fall into this
10 cluster (Moin et al., 2009), thus bringing into question the low-salinity phylotype hypothesis. It
11 is likely that the current data set does not yet cover the entire depth and breadth of archaeal
12 ammonia oxidizer diversity.

13

14 **4. Distribution and abundance of AOA and AOB**

15 Although AOA and β -AOB are both present in estuarine systems, the proportion of
16 archaeal versus bacterial ammonia oxidation still remains under investigation. Currently, only a
17 small number of studies are available that have investigated AOA and β -AOB at the same time
18 in the same environment. Most studies have measured abundance of AOA and β -AOB by
19 measuring the abundance of the *amoA* gene using real-time or quantitative PCR (QPCR).
20 Archaeal *amoA* genes range in abundance from 10^4 to 10^9 gene copies per gram of sediment
21 (Mosier and Francis, 2008; Santoro et al., 2008; Moin et al., 2009). The magnitude of this
22 variation may simply reflect the extraordinary variation in AOA abundance among different sites,
23 but it may also be an artifact of methodology since the primers used in the QPCR varied in
24 different studies. In a review of the current literature, we have found at least six different PCR
25 primers and/or primer combinations used for quantification. It is unknown at this point how
26 differences in primer specificity may affect the absolute numbers of AOA detected. However, in
27 our analyses of salt marsh and estuarine AOA, abundance varied over 4 orders of magnitude

1 within the same system (Moin et al., 2009), using the same primers and cycle parameters, so we
2 think it is unlikely that the variability in AOA abundance in estuarine systems is due to
3 methodology differences alone.

4 Abundance of betaproteobacterial *amoA* genes in estuaries is also quite variable, ranging
5 from 10^4 to 10^8 copies per gram of sediment (Bernhard et al., 2007; Mosier and Francis, 2008;
6 Santoro et al., 2008; Moin et al., 2009). Unlike quantification methods for archaeal *amoA*, most
7 studies have used the PCR primers for betaproteobacterial *amoA* published by Rotthauwe et al.
8 (Rotthauwe et al., 1997), although some shortcomings of these commonly-used primers have
9 recently been identified (Hornek et al., 2006). Part of the difference in primer development for
10 archaeal and bacterial *amoA* genes undoubtedly stems from a more complete characterization of
11 β -AOB in estuaries compared with the current, and ever-changing, diversity of archaeal *amoA*.

12

13 **4.1 Relationship of AOA and AOB to estuarine gradients**

14 Although the richness of archaeal *amoA* is much higher than the richness of
15 betaproteobacterial *amoA* based on the phylotypes detected (Table 1), it is clear that the absolute
16 abundance differs among systems, and likely reflects differences in physico-chemical properties
17 that change along the estuarine gradient. Several studies have focused on AOA and β -AOB in
18 coastal areas of California (Beman and Francis, 2006; Mosier and Francis, 2008; Santoro et al.,
19 2008). Two of these studies found a correlation between increasing salinity and increasing
20 number/proportion of β -AOB (Mosier and Francis, 2008; Santoro et al., 2008). Additional
21 factors that appear to influence the ratio between the AOA and β -AOB in those systems are
22 oxygen availability and C/N ratio, in which increasing oxygen availability and decreasing C/N
23 ratio led to an increase of the number of AOA (Beman and Francis, 2006; Mosier and Francis,
24 2008). In the Westerschelde estuary (between Belgium and The Netherlands) AOA and β -AOB
25 were present at all sampling points, but the community composition shifted with changing
26 salinity and temperature (Sahan and Muyzer, 2008).

1 Although salinity is often identified as a key factor in regulating nitrifier community
2 composition and abundance, it is likely that salinity is not the only factor involved, since many
3 other factors may covary with salinity. AOA abundance has also been strongly correlated with
4 lead concentrations and percent clay (Mosier and Francis, 2008) pore water sulfide (Caffrey et
5 al., 2007), and pH (Moin et al., 2009). However, because salinity often covaries with many of
6 these variables in estuaries, it is difficult to identify causative factors. Interestingly, strong
7 correlations between dissolved inorganic nitrogen species and AOA abundance have not been
8 detected in estuarine studies, but enrichment studies in soils have reported increased AOA
9 abundance when ammonium is added (Leininger et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2008).

11 **4.2 Ratios of AOA to AOB**

12 Unlike most studies in pelagic or terrestrial systems where AOA always outnumber
13 β -AOB, often by orders of magnitude, ratios of AOA to β -AOB in estuaries are more variable,
14 with β -AOB often outnumbering AOA. Ratios of AOA to β -AOB within studies typically show
15 lower ratios at sites with higher salinity, but the pattern is certainly far from robust (Figure 5).
16 Mosier and Francis (2008) and Santoro et al. (2008) found a shift in the AOA to β -AOB ratios
17 related to changes in salinity, with β -AOB outnumbering AOA as salinity increased, due
18 primarily to changes in the abundance of β -AOB. Caffrey et al. (2007) also found β -AOB to
19 outnumber AOA at estuarine sites in Weeks Bay. In Plum Island samples, the direction of the
20 change in the ratio of AOA to β -AOB followed the same pattern as in Mosier and Francis
21 (2008), with ratios generally decreasing with increasing salinity, but AOA were always more
22 abundant than β -AOB (Bernhard et al., 2010). In the marsh samples, salinity is not significantly
23 different among sites, but the ratios (\log_{10}) range from -0.03 to 2.91 in surface (0-2 cm)
24 sediments, indicating a shift from β -AOB dominance at some sites to AOA dominance at other
25 sites. These patterns suggest a strong spatial structure within estuaries, perhaps driven by
26 changes in salinity, but the evidence so far does not indicate a simple salinity effect.
27 Interestingly, from most oceanic studies of AOA and β -AOB, AOA are thought to be the

1 dominant nitrifiers. Based on this, one would predict that as salinity increases in the estuary,
2 ratios of AOA to β -AOB would also increase, yet the reverse appears to be true. The driving
3 force behind this shift in numerical dominance, and possibly metabolic dominance, in estuaries
4 versus oceanic systems has yet to be explained. Possible niche differentiating factors could
5 include ammonium availability, oxygen partial pressure, sulfide concentrations or organic
6 loading.

7

8 **5. Correlation of abundance patterns with rates**

9 One of the primary questions about AOA is how much do they actually contribute to
10 nitrification? Wuchter et al. (2006) provide evidence via enrichment cultures and a correlation
11 between ammonia oxidation rates and abundance of the marine *Crenarchaeota*, supporting the
12 hypothesis that marine *Crenarchaeota* are nitrifying in pelagic waters. In the Gulf of California,
13 Beman et al. (2008) also provide convincing evidence that the marine *Crenarchaeota* are actively
14 oxidizing ammonia and are far more abundant than β -AOB. Additionally, Mincer et al. (2007)
15 reported distribution patterns of the *Crenarchaeota* and nitrite-oxidizing *Nitrospina* species that
16 suggests a metabolic link. Thus, it is clear from studies in pelagic systems that AOA are
17 abundant and often outnumber β -AOB, and the current evidence suggests that at least some of
18 the group I *Crenarchaeota* are involved in nitrification. However, the evidence from estuarine
19 systems suggests a more complex story.

20 In a previous study of the abundance of β -AOB and potential nitrification rates along an
21 estuarine salinity gradient, strong site-specific correlations between ammonia oxidation rates and
22 β -AOB abundance were detected that suggested functionally distinct β -AOB communities
23 along the gradient (Bernhard et al., 2007). Highest rates, but lowest β -AOB abundances, were
24 detected at the low salinity site, suggesting that there may be other ammonia oxidizers
25 contributing to nitrification, or that there are significant differences in cell-specific oxidation
26 kinetics. It was hypothesized that the distribution of AOA could explain the varying correlations
27 between rates and β -AOB abundance along the salinity gradient. However, inclusion of AOA

1 abundance with β -AOB abundance caused the correlation with rates to collapse completely at the
2 low and mid salinity sites, and decreased by more than 10% at the high salinity site (Bernhard et
3 al., 2010), suggesting that AOA are not actively nitrifying in the Plum Island estuary, despite
4 relatively high numbers.

5 In a recent study of AOA abundance in several southeastern estuaries (Caffrey et al.,
6 2007), AOA abundance positively and significantly correlated with potential nitrification rates at
7 only 2 of 6 sites. A similar lack of correlation between potential rates and AOA abundance was
8 also reported in a Connecticut salt marsh system (Moin et al., 2009). Interestingly, β -AOB
9 abundance did not correlate with potential rates in either of these studies, suggesting that either
10 our understanding of the relationship between nitrification activity and the organisms responsible
11 is incomplete or that the methodology is flawed.

12 Potential rates are typically measured by adding ammonium to sediment slurries and
13 incubating them with shaking for hours to days, thus disrupting any sediment structure, and rates
14 are calculated by following the generation of nitrate. Potential nitrification rates are typically
15 much higher than in situ rates, but whether it is the addition of ammonium or non-limiting
16 oxygen conditions that is responsible for stimulating nitrification is not clear. It is thought that
17 potential nitrification rates should correlate with the abundance of ammonia oxidizers
18 (Henriksen, 1980). Thus, inaccurate measurements of either the potential rates or the abundance
19 of ammonia oxidizers will lead to a collapse in the expected relationship. Physiological diversity
20 among cultivated isolates of AOB has been well-documented (see review by Koops and
21 Pommerening-Roser, 2001), and because of the great genetic diversity of archaeal *amoA* genes,
22 it is also likely that there is great diversity in physiological optima among AOA. A recent study
23 reported extremely high affinity for ammonium of the cultivated AOA, *N. maritimus* (Martens-
24 Habbena et al., 2009), but did not show inhibition at ammonium concentrations typical of
25 potential rate experiments (i.e. 0.3-0.5 mM). However, due to vastly different oxidation kinetics
26 among AOA and AOB and the recently-reported sensitivity to agitation of *N. maritimus*
27 (Martens-Habbena et al., 2009), it is unlikely that potential nitrification rates reflect the

1 contribution of all nitrifiers present. It is also possible that some nitrifiers are not active at the
2 time of sampling, and thus might show a lag in activity upon the addition of ammonium or
3 oxygen. Significant differences in recovery after starvation have been demonstrated in some
4 cultivated AOB (Bollmann et al., 2002). It would be useful, in future studies, to measure in situ
5 rates using stable isotopes, instead of relying on the simpler, but likely biased, measures of
6 potential rates.

7 In most of the recent studies, AOA and β -AOB abundances are measured by quantitative
8 PCR, which is vulnerable to a variety of potential biases. For instance, the primers may not
9 target all the nitrifiers. Primers are generally designed to target previously determined
10 sequences, but the sequence database for AOA is constantly expanding, with new sequence types
11 discovered in almost every study. Biases associated with DNA extractions and PCR
12 amplification have also been well-documented (e. g. Suzuki et al., 1998; Acinas et al., 2005), and
13 are often not fully explored or controlled for in most studies due to time and financial
14 constraints. Additionally, since *amoA* gene abundance does not necessarily indicate activity (e.g.
15 Jia and Conrad, 2009), we suggest that measures of gene expression in addition to gene
16 abundance may be helpful to determine which populations are contributing to nitrification under
17 different conditions.

18

19 **6. Future directions**

20 Since the first hint of AOA from metagenomic data sets, followed shortly by
21 confirmation in a pure culture, evidence on the distribution and abundance of AOA in a variety
22 of environments continues to mount. Molecular surveys of 16S rRNA and archaeal *amoA* genes
23 indicate that AOA are widely distributed, and quantitative analyses from soils, open ocean,
24 coastal sediments, and even wastewater treatment plants suggest AOA are abundant members of
25 the microbial community. Furthermore, enrichment cultures from hot springs, estuarine
26 sediments, and soils indicate that they are active, and probably play a role in both the nitrogen
27 and carbon cycles. Although it appears that AOA are ubiquitous, abundant, and undoubtedly

1 important to global nutrient cycles, many questions remain unanswered about their ecology and
2 physiology.

3

4 **6.1. Estuaries as a natural laboratory for AOA and AOB ecology**

5 Estuarine and salt marsh sediments appear to be suitable habitat for members of both
6 major clusters of AOA (water column and soil) and may serve as ideal natural laboratories to
7 explore niche differentiation between AOA and β -AOB. Although in most cases, AOA and β -
8 AOB coexist, their relative contributions to nitrification remains unclear. Based on changing
9 ratios of AOA to β -AOB along salinity gradients, it is likely that the contribution to nitrification
10 of the two groups also changes. Unfortunately, there are currently no methods available that can
11 discriminate archaeal from bacterial ammonia oxidation, but several approaches may provide
12 some clues. For example, Schauss et al. (2009) reported differential responses of soil
13 communities of AOA and β -AOB to additions of sulfadiazine (an antibiotic that inhibits the
14 growth of most Gram-positive and many Gram-negative bacteria), and provided strong evidence
15 for a significant archaeal contribution to nitrification. Conversely, using stable isotope probing,
16 Jia and Conrad (2009) showed that β -AOB were functionally more important in agricultural soils
17 than AOA. Conducting similar experiments with estuarine AOA and β -AOB under different
18 salinity, substrate, and redox regimes will be critical to understanding how AOA and β -AOB
19 utilize resources.

20

21 **6.2. Importance of continued cultivation of AOA and AOB**

22 In the past two decades, the field of microbial ecology has moved away from cultivation
23 and relied very heavily on molecular surveys of microbial genes to study populations and
24 communities (Pace et al., 1986; Amann et al., 1995). The lack of cultivation work, however, has
25 now become a deficit to progress in understanding the role of different microbes in their natural
26 environment. Molecular techniques must be ground-truthed with pure cultures and enrichment
27 experiments. Without being able to grow a microbe in the lab, it is difficult to ever really

1 understand their physiology and metabolism. The presence of a gene (or even the expression of
2 it) tells only of the metabolic potential. The lack of AOA pure cultures is a perfect example.
3 Until we have more isolates in culture, we will not be able to definitively answer some of the
4 most pressing questions. For example, although genes for AMO A, B, and C subunits have been
5 identified in *Archaea* (Könneke et al., 2005; Hallam et al., 2006), no gene for the oxidation of
6 hydroxylamine (the intermediate produced by AOB) has been identified in the genomes studied
7 to date (Hallam et al., 2006). The lack of a complete pathway for ammonia oxidation as found in
8 AOB raises the possibility that AOA may oxidize ammonia with a different metabolic pathway.
9 The answer to this will be best addressed by directed biochemical and genetic studies of pure
10 cultures.

11 Carbon utilization remains another question plaguing the AOA research community.
12 Understanding the trophic status is paramount to understanding the impact of *Archaea* on global
13 systems. Evidence for heterotrophy, or at least mixotrophy, among marine *Crenarchaeota* is
14 mounting (Ouverney and Fuhrman, 2000; Ingalls et al., 2006; Teira et al., 2006; Agogue et al.,
15 2008), and it is clear that some marine *Crenarchaeota* are not obligate autotrophs. However,
16 what is still unclear is whether the *Crenarchaeota* that can take up organic carbon also have
17 *amoA* and can nitrify. Cultures obtained so far indicate only obligate autotrophy. Until
18 heterotrophic or mixotrophic *Crenarchaeota* can be isolated, the evidence will likely remain
19 ambiguous.

20 The depth and breadth of ammonia oxidation within *Archaea* also remains unresolved.
21 Recent studies suggest that ammonia oxidation may be much more deeply distributed throughout
22 the *Archaea* and is not restricted to the Group I *Crenarchaeota*. Two distinct AOA enriched from
23 hot springs, one that is related to other AOA from soils (Hatzenpichler et al., 2008), the other
24 forming a distinct cluster that does not fall within either the water column/sediment or the
25 soil/sediment clusters (de la Torre et al., 2008), have recently been identified, and Mincer et al.
26 (2007) provide evidence that another group of *Archaea* known as pSL12 (currently unrepresented

1 in the culture collection) may also harbor *amoA* genes. As more cultures of putative AOA are
2 obtained, we will gain a more complete picture of their distribution and phylogeny.

3

4 **Conclusions**

5 Over four decades ago, Stanley Watson calculated that the number of AOB in the ocean
6 did not account for the estimated rates of nitrification (Watson, 1965) and predicted that there
7 must be other ammonia oxidizers in the ocean, but until now, none had been discovered. Thus,
8 the discovery of ammonia oxidation among *Archaea* has helped solve a forty-year old mystery,
9 but it has also led to an entirely new set of questions about the ecology and physiology of
10 ammonia oxidizers. Although much of the evidence in the last few years has come from ocean
11 and soil environments, we think the steep environmental gradients found in estuaries provide an
12 ideal natural laboratory in which to study AOA and AOB dynamics and ecology.

13

1 **References**

- 2
- 3 Acinas, S. G., Sarma-Rupavtarm, R., Klepac-Ceraj, V., Polz, M. F. 2005. PCR-induced sequence
4 artifacts and bias: Insights from comparison of two 16S rRNA clone libraries constructed
5 from the same sample. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 71, 8966-8969.
- 6 Agogue, H., Brink, M., Dinasquet, J., Herndl, G. J. 2008. Major gradients in putatively nitrifying
7 and non-nitrifying Archaea in the deep North Atlantic. *Nature* 456, 788-792.
- 8 Alzerreca, J. J., Norton, J. M., Klotz, M. G. 1999. The amo operon in marine, ammonia-
9 oxidizing gammaproteobacteria. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 180, 21-29.
- 10 Amann, R. I., Ludwig, W., Schleifer, K.-H. 1995. Phylogenetic identification and in situ
11 detection of individual microbial cells without cultivation. *Microbiological Reviews* 59,
12 143-169.
- 13 An, S., Joye, S. B. 2001. Enhancement of coupled nitrification-denitrification by benthic
14 photosynthesis in shallow estuarine sediments. *Limnology & Oceanography* 46, 62-74.
- 15 Anderson, I. C., Tobias, C. R., Neikirk, B. B., Wetzel, R. L. 1997. Development of a process-
16 based nitrogen mass balance model for a Virginia (USA) *Spartina alterniflora* salt marsh:
17 Implications for net DIN flux. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 159, 13-27.
- 18 Beman, J. M., Francis, C. A. 2006. Diversity of ammonia-oxidizing archaea and bacteria in the
19 sediments of a hypernutrified subtropical estuary: Bahi'a del To'bari, Mexico. *Applied*
20 *and Environmental Microbiology* 72, 7767-7777.
- 21 Beman, J. M., Popp, B. N., Francis, C. A. 2008. Molecular and biogeochemical evidence for
22 ammonia oxidation by marine Crenarchaeota in the Gulf of California. *ISME Journal* 2,
23 429-441.
- 24 Beman, J. M., Roberts, K. J., Wegley, L., Rohwer, F., Francis, C. A. 2007. Distribution and
25 diversity of archaeal ammonia monooxygenase genes associated with corals. *Applied and*
26 *Environmental Microbiology* 73, 5642-5647.
- 27 Bernhard, A. E., Colbert, D., McManus, J., Field, K. G. 2005. Microbial community dynamics
28 based on 16S rRNA gene profiles in a Pacific Northwest estuary and its tributaries.
29 *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* 52, 115-128.
- 30 Bernhard, A. E., Donn, T., Giblin, A. E., Stahl, D. A. 2005. Loss of diversity of ammonia-
31 oxidizing bacteria correlates with increasing salinity in an estuary system. *Environmental*
32 *Microbiology* 7, 1289-1297.
- 33 Bernhard, A. E., Landry, Z. C., Blevins, A., de la Torre, J. R., Giblin, A. E., Stahl, D. A. 2010.
34 Abundance of ammonia-oxidizing archaea and bacteria along an estuarine salinity
35 gradient in relationship to potential nitrification rates. *Applied and Environmental*
36 *Microbiology* 76, in press.
- 37 Bernhard, A. E., Tucker, J., Giblin, A. E., Stahl, D. A. 2007. Functionally distinct communities
38 of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria along an estuarine salinity gradient. *Environmental*
39 *Microbiology* 9, 1439-1447.
- 40 Bintrim, S. B., Donohue, T. J., Handelsman, J., Roberts, G. P., Goodman, R. M. 1997. Molecular
41 phylogeny of Archaea from soil. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
42 *United States of America* 94, 277-282.
- 43 Boatman, C. D., Murray, J. W. 1982. Modeling Exchangeable NH₄⁺ Adsorption in Marine-
44 Sediments - Process and Controls of Adsorption. *Limnology & Oceanography* 27, 99-
45 110.

- 1 Bodelier, P. L. E., Libochant, J. A., Blom, C., Laanbroek, H. J. 1996. Dynamics of nitrification
2 and denitrification in root-oxygenated sediments and adaptation of ammonia-oxidizing
3 bacteria to low-oxygen or anoxic habitats. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 62,
4 4100-4107.
- 5 Bollmann, A., Bar-Gilissen, M. J., Laanbroek, H. J. 2002. Growth at low ammonium
6 concentrations and starvation response as potential factors involved in niche
7 differentiation among ammonia-oxidizing bacteria. *Applied and Environmental*
8 *Microbiology* 68, 4751-4757.
- 9 Bollmann, A., Laanbroek, H. J. 2002. Influence of oxygen partial pressure and salinity on the
10 community composition of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria in the Schelde estuary. *Aquatic*
11 *Microbial Ecology* 28, 239-247.
- 12 Boynton, W. R., Kemp, W. M. 1985. Nutrient regeneration and oxygen-consumption by
13 sediments along an estuarine salinity gradient. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 23, 45-55.
- 14 Caffrey, J. M., Bano, N., Kalanetra, K., Hollibaugh, J. T. 2007. Ammonia oxidation and
15 ammonia-oxidizing bacteria and archaea from estuaries with differing histories of
16 hypoxia. *ISME Journal* 1, 660-662.
- 17 Chen, X.-P., Zhu, Y.-G., Xia, Y., Shen, J.-P., He, J.-Z. 2008. Ammonia-oxidizing archaea:
18 important players in paddy rhizosphere soil? *Environmental Microbiology* 10, 1978-
19 1987.
- 20 Coolen, M. J. L., Abbas, B., Van Bleijswijk, J., Hopmans, E. C., Kuypers, M. M. M., Wakeham,
21 S. G., Sinninghe Damste, J. S. 2007. Putative ammonia-oxidizing Crenarchaeota in
22 suboxic waters of the Black Sea: A basin-wide ecological study using 16S ribosomal and
23 functional genes and membrane lipids. *Environmental Microbiology* 9, 1001-1016.
- 24 Crump, B. C., Hopkinson, C. S., Sogin, M. L., Hobbie, J. E. 2004. Microbial biogeography along
25 an estuarine salinity gradient: combined influences of bacterial growth and residence
26 time. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 70, 1494-1505.
- 27 de Bie, M. J. M., Speksnijder, A., Kowalchuk, G. A., Schuurman, T., Zwart, G., Stephen, J. R.,
28 Diekmann, O. E., Laanbroek, H. J. 2001. Shifts in the dominant populations of ammonia-
29 oxidizing beta-subclass Proteobacteria along the eutrophic Schelde estuary. *Aquatic*
30 *Microbial Ecology* 23, 225-236.
- 31 de La Torre, J. R., Walker, C. B., Ingalls, A. E., Könneke, M., Stahl, D. A. 2008. Cultivation of a
32 thermophilic ammonia oxidizing archaeon synthesizing crenarchaeol. *Environmental*
33 *Microbiology* 10, 810-818.
- 34 del Giorgio, P. A., Bouvier, T. C. 2002. Linking the physiologic and phylogenetic successions in
35 free-living bacterial communities along an estuarine salinity gradient. 47, 471-486.
- 36 DeLong, E. F. 1992. Archaea in coastal marine environments. *Proceedings of the National*
37 *Academy of Science of the United States of America* 89, 5685-5689.
- 38 Dollhopf, S. L., Hyun, J.-H., Smith, A. C., Adams, H. J., O'Brien, S., Kostka, J. E. 2005.
39 Quantification of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria and factors controlling nitrification in salt
40 marsh sediments. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 71, 240-246.
- 41 Francis, C. A., O'Mullan, G. D., Ward, B. B. 2003. Diversity of ammonia monooxygenase
42 (*amoA*) genes across environmental gradients in Chesapeake Bay sediments. *Geobiology*
43 1, 129-140.
- 44 Francis, C. A., Roberts, K. J., Beman, J. M., Santoro, A. E., Oakley, B. B. 2005. Ubiquity and
45 diversity of ammonia-oxidizing archaea in water columns and sediments of the ocean.

1 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 102,
2 14683-14688.

3 Freitag, T. E., Chang, L., Prosser, J. I. 2006. Changes in the community structure and activity of
4 betaproteobacterial ammonia-oxidizing sediment bacteria along a freshwater-marine
5 gradient. *Environmental Microbiology* 8, 684-696.

6 Fuhrman, J. A., McCallum, K., Davies, A. A. 1992. Novel major archaeobacterial group from
7 marine plankton. *Nature* 356, 148-149.

8 Gieseke, A., Purkhold, U., Wagner, M., Amann, R., Schramm, A. 2001. Community structure
9 and activity dynamics of nitrifying bacteria in a phosphate-removing biofilm. *Applied
10 and Environmental Microbiology* 67, 1351-1362.

11 Hallam, S. J., Konstantinidis, K. T., Putnam, N., Schleper, C., Watanabe, Y. I., Sugahara, J.,
12 Preston, C., De La Torre, J., Richardson, P. M., DeLong, E. F. 2006. Genomic analysis of
13 the uncultivated marine crenarchaeote *Cenarchaeum symbiosum*. *Proceedings of the
14 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103, 18296-18301.

15 Hatzenpichler, R., Lebedeva, E. V., Spieck, E., Stoecker, K., Richter, A., Daims, H., Wagner, M.
16 2008. A moderately thermophilic ammonia-oxidizing crenarchaeote from a hot spring.
17 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 105,
18 2134-2139.

19 Head, I. M., Hiorns, W. D., Embley, T. M., McCarthy, A. J., Saunders, J. R. 1993. The
20 Phylogeny of autotrophic ammonia-oxidizing bacteria as determined by analysis of 16S
21 ribosomal-RNA gene-sequences. *Journal of General Microbiology* 139, 1147-1153.

22 Henriksen, K. 1980. Measurement of in situ rates of nitrification in sediment. *Microbial Ecology*
23 6, 329-337.

24 Herndl, G. J., Reinthaler, T., Teira, E., van Aken, H., Veth, C., Pernthaler, A., Pernthaler, J.
25 2005. Contribution of Archaea to total prokaryotic production in the deep Atlantic Ocean.
26 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 71, 2303-2309.

27 Hewson, I., Fuhrman, J. A. 2004. Richness and diversity of bacterioplankton species along an
28 estuarine gradient in Moreton Bay, Australia. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*
29 70, 3425-3433.

30 Holmes, A. J., Costello, A., Lidstrom, M. E., Murrell, J. C. 1995. Evidence that particulate
31 methane monooxygenase and ammonia monooxygenase may be evolutionarily related.
32 *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 132, 203-208.

33 Hommes, N. G., Sayavedra-Soto, L. A., Arp, D. J. 2003. Chemoorganotrophic growth of
34 *Nitrosomonas europaea* on fructose. *Journal of Bacteriology* 185, 6809-6814.

35 Hornek, R., Pommerening-Roser, A., Koops, H. P., Farnleitner, A. H., Kreuzinger, N.,
36 Kirschner, A., Mach, R. L. 2006. Primers containing universal bases reduce multiple
37 *amoA* gene specific DGGE band patterns when analysing the diversity of beta-ammonia
38 oxidizers in the environment. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 66, 147-155.

39 Howarth, R. W. 1988. Nutrient limitation of net primary production in marine ecosystems.
40 *Annual Reviews in Ecology* 19, 89-110.

41 Ingalls, A. E., Shah, S. R., Hansman, R. L., Aluwihare, L. I., Santos, G. M., Druffel, E. R. M.,
42 Pearson, A. 2006. Quantifying archaeal community autotrophy in the mesopelagic ocean
43 using natural radiocarbon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
44 United States of America* 103, 6442-6447.

45 Jenkins, M. C., Kemp, W. M. 1984. The coupling of nitrification and denitrification in two
46 estuarine sediments. *Limnology and Oceanography* 29, 609-619.

- 1 Jia, Z., Conrad, R. 2009. Bacteria rather than Archaea dominate microbial ammonia oxidation in
2 an agricultural soil. *Environmental Microbiology* 11, 1658-1671.
- 3 Karner, M. B., DeLong, E. F., Karl, D. M. 2001. Archaeal dominance in the mesopelagic zone of
4 the Pacific Ocean. *Nature* 409, 507-510.
- 5 Könneke, M., Bernhard, A. E., de la Torre, J. R., Walker, C. B., Waterbury, J. B., Stahl, D. A.
6 2005. Isolation of an autotrophic ammonia-oxidizing marine archaeon. *Nature* 437, 543-
7 546.
- 8 Koops, H. P., Pommerening-Roser, A. 2001. Distribution and ecophysiology of the nitrifying
9 bacteria emphasizing cultured species. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* 37, 1-9.
- 10 Kowalchuk, G. A., Stephen, J. R. 2001. Ammonia-oxidizing bacteria: A model for molecular
11 microbial ecology. *Annual Reviews in Microbiology* 55, 485-529.
- 12 Lam, P., Jensen, M. M., Lavik, G., McGinnis, D. F., Muller, B., Schubert, C. J., Amann, R.,
13 Thamdrup, B., Kuypers, M. M. M. 2007. Linking crenarchaeal and bacterial nitrification
14 to anammox in the Black Sea. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
15 *United States of America* 104, 7104-7109.
- 16 Leininger, S., Urich, T., Schloter, M., Schwark, L., Qi, J., Nicol, G. W., Prosser, J. I., Schuster,
17 S. C., Schleper, C. 2006. Archaea predominate among ammonia-oxidizing prokaryotes in
18 soils. *Nature* 442, 806-809.
- 19 MacGregor, B. J., Moser, D. P., Alm, E. W., Nealson, K. H., Stahl, D. A. 1997. Crenarchaeota in
20 Lake Michigan. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 63, 1178-1181.
- 21 Martens-Habbena, W., Berube, P. M., Urakawa, H., de la Torre, J. R., Stahl, D. A. 2009.
22 Ammonia oxidation kinetics determine niche separation of nitrifying Archaea and
23 Bacteria. *Nature* 461, 976-981.
- 24 Mendelssohn, I. A., McKee, K. L., Patrick, W. H., Jr. 1981. Oxygen deficiency in *Spartina*
25 *alterniflora* roots: metabolic adaptation to anoxia. *Science* 214, 439-441.
- 26 Mincer, T. J., Church, M. J., Taylor, L. T., Preston, C., Karl, D. M., DeLong, E. F. 2007.
27 Quantitative distribution of presumptive archaeal and bacterial nitrifiers in Monterey Bay
28 and the North Pacific Subtropical Gyre. *Environmental Microbiology* 9, 1162-1175.
- 29 Moin, N. S., Nelson, K. A., Bush, A., Bernhard, A. E. 2009. Distribution and diversity of
30 archaeal and bacterial ammonia oxidizers in salt marsh sediments. *Applied and*
31 *Environmental Microbiology* 75, 7461-7468.
- 32 Mosier, A. C., Francis, C. A. 2008. Relative abundance and diversity of ammonia-oxidizing
33 archaea and bacteria in the San Francisco Bay estuary. *Environmental Microbiology* 10,
34 3002-3016.
- 35 Nicol, G. W., Leininger, S., Schleper, C., Prosser, J. I. 2008. The influence of soil pH on the
36 diversity, abundance and transcriptional activity of ammonia oxidizing archaea and
37 bacteria. *Environmental Microbiology* 10, 2966-2978.
- 38 Nold, S. C., Zhou, J., Devol, A. H., Tiedje, J. M. 2000. Pacific Northwest marine sediments
39 contain ammonia-oxidizing bacteria in the β subdivision of the *Proteobacteria*. *Applied*
40 *and Environmental Microbiology* 66, 4532-4535.
- 41 O'Mullan, G. D., Ward, B. B. 2005. Relationship of temporal and spatial variabilities of
42 ammonia-oxidizing bacteria to nitrification rates in Monterey Bay, California. *Applied*
43 *and Environmental Microbiology* 71, 697-705.
- 44 Ouverney, C. C., Fuhrman, J. A. 2000. Marine planktonic Archaea take up amino acids. *Applied*
45 *and Environmental Microbiology* 66, 4829-4833.

- 1 Oved, T., Shaviv, A., Goldrath, T., Mandelbaum, R. T., Minz, D. 2001. Influence of effluent
2 irrigation on community composition and function of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria in soil.
3 Applied and Environmental Microbiology 67, 3426-3433.
- 4 Pace, N. R., Stahl, D. A., Lane, D. J., Olsen, G. J. 1986. The analysis of natural microbial
5 populations by ribosomal RNA sequences. Advances in Microbial Ecology 9, 1-55.
- 6 Park, S. J., Park, B. J., Rhee, S. K. 2008. Comparative analysis of archaeal 16S rRNA and *amoA*
7 genes to estimate the abundance and diversity of ammonia-oxidizing archaea in marine
8 sediments. Extremophiles, 1-11.
- 9 Pearson, A., McNichol, A. P., Benitez-Nelson, B. C., Hayes, J. M., Eglinton, T. I. 2001. Origins
10 of lipid biomarkers in Santa Monica Basin surface sediments: a case study using
11 compound-specific ¹⁴C analysis. Geochimica Cosmochimica Acta 65, 3123-3137.
- 12 Prosser, J. I. 1989. Autotrophic nitrification in bacteria. Advances in Microbial Physiology 30,
13 125-181.
- 14 Prosser, J. I., Nicol, G. W. 2008. Relative contributions of archaea and bacteria to aerobic
15 ammonia oxidation in the environment. Environmental Microbiology 10, 2931-2941.
- 16 Purkhold, U., Pommerening-Roser, A., Juretschko, S., Schmid, M. C., Koops, H. P., Wagner, M.
17 2000. Phylogeny of all recognized species of ammonia oxidizers based on comparative
18 16S rRNA and *amoA* sequence analysis: Implications for molecular diversity surveys.
19 Applied and Environmental Microbiology 66, 5368-5382.
- 20 Risgaard-Petersen, N., Nicolaisen, M. H., Revsbech, N. P., Lomstein, B. A. 2004. Competition
21 between ammonia-oxidizing bacteria and benthic microalgae. Applied and
22 Environmental Microbiology 70, 5528-5537.
- 23 Rothauwe, J. H., Witzel, K. P., Liesack, W. 1997. The ammonia monooxygenase structural gene
24 *amoA* as a functional marker: Molecular fine-scale analysis of natural ammonia-
25 oxidizing populations. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 63, 4704-4712.
- 26 Rysgaard, S., Thastum, P., Dalsgaard, T., Christensen, P. B., Sloth, N. P. 1999. Effects of salinity
27 on NH₄⁺ adsorption capacity, nitrification, and denitrification in Danish estuarine
28 sediments. Estuaries 22, 21-30.
- 29 Sahan, E., Muyzer, G. 2008. Diversity and spatio-temporal distribution of ammonia-oxidizing
30 Archaea and Bacteria in sediments of the Westerschelde estuary. FEMS Microbiology
31 Ecology 64, 175-186.
- 32 Santoro, A. E., Francis, C. A., De Sieyes, N. R., Boehm, A. B. 2008. Shifts in the relative
33 abundance of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria and archaea across physicochemical gradients
34 in a subterranean estuary. Environmental Microbiology 10, 1068-1079.
- 35 Schauss, K., Focks, A., Leininger, S., Kotzerke, A., Heuer, H., Thiele-Bruhn, S., Sharma, S.,
36 Wilke, B.-M., Matthies, M., Smalla, K., Munch, J. C., Amelung, W., Kaupenjohann, M.,
37 Schloter, M., Schleper, C. 2009. Dynamics and functional relevance of ammonia-
38 oxidizing archaea in two agricultural soils. Environmental Microbiology 11, 446-456.
- 39 Schramm, A., De Beer, D., Gieseke, A., Amann, R. 2000. Microenvironments and distribution of
40 nitrifying bacteria in a membrane-bound biofilm. Environmental Microbiology 2, 680-
41 686.
- 42 Sebiló, M., Billen, G., Mayer, B., Billiou, D., Grably, M., Garnier, J., Mariotti, A. 2006.
43 Assessing nitrification and denitrification in the Seine River and estuary using chemical
44 and isotopic techniques. Ecosystems 9, 564-577.
- 45 Seitzinger, S. P. 1988. Denitrification in fresh-water and coastal marine ecosystems - ecological
46 and geochemical significance. Limnology & Oceanography 33, 702-724.

- 1 Stehr, G., Bottcher, B., Dittberner, P., Rath, G., Koops, H.-P. 1995. The ammonia-oxidizing
2 nitrifying population of the River Elbe estuary. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology* 17, 177-
3 186.
- 4 Suwa, Y., Sumino, T., Noto, K. 1997. Phylogenetic relationships of activated sludge isolates of
5 ammonia oxidizers with different sensitivities to ammonium sulfate. *Journal of General*
6 *and Applied Microbiology* 43, 373-379.
- 7 Suzuki, M. T., Rappe, M. S., Giovannoni, S. J. 1998. Kinetic bias in estimates of coastal
8 picoplankton community structure obtained by measurements of small subunit rRNA
9 gene PCR amplicon length heterogeneity. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 64,
10 4522-4529.
- 11 Teira, E., van Aken, H., Veth, C., Herndl, G. J. 2006. Archaeal uptake of enantiomeric amino
12 acids in the meso- and bathypelagic waters of the North Atlantic. *Limnology &*
13 *Oceanography* 51, 60-69.
- 14 Thompson, S. P., Paerl, H. W., Go, M. C. 1995. Seasonal patterns of nitrification and
15 denitrification in a natural and a restored salt marsh. *Estuaries* 18, 399-408.
- 16 Tobias, C. R., Anderson, I. C., Canuel, E. A., Macko, S. A. 2001. Nitrogen cycling through a
17 fringing marsh-aquifer ecotone. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 210, 25-39.
- 18 Treusch, A. H., Leininger, S., Kietzin, A., Schuster, S. C., Klenk, H. P., Schleper, C. 2005.
19 Novel genes for nitrite reductase and Amo-related proteins indicate a role of uncultivated
20 mesophilic crenarchaeota in nitrogen cycling. *Environmental Microbiology* 7, 1985-
21 1995.
- 22 Urakawa, H., Kurata, S., Fujiwara, T., Kuroiwa, D., Maki, H., Kawabata, S., Hiwatari, T., Ando,
23 H., Kawai, T., Watanabe, M., Kohata, K. 2006. Characterization and quantification of
24 ammonia-oxidizing bacteria in eutrophic coastal marine sediments using polyphasic
25 molecular approaches and immunofluorescence staining. *Environmental Microbiology* 8,
26 787-803.
- 27 Urakawa, H., Tajima, Y., Numata, Y., Tsuneda, S. 2008. Low temperature decreases the
28 phylogenetic diversity of ammonia-oxidizing archaea and bacteria in aquarium
29 biofiltration systems. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 74, 894-900.
- 30 Utaker, J. B., Nes, I. F. 1998. A qualitative evaluation of the published oligonucleotides specific
31 for the 16S rRNA gene sequences of the ammonia-oxidizing bacteria. *Systematic and*
32 *Applied Microbiology* 21, 72-88.
- 33 Venter, J. C., Remington, K., Heidelberg, J. F., Halpern, A. L., Rusch, D., Eisen, J. A., Wu, D.,
34 Paulsen, I., Nelson, K. E., Nelson, W., Fouts, D. E., Levy, S., Knap, A. H., Lomas, M.
35 W., Nealson, K., White, O., Peterson, J., Hoffman, J., Parsons, R., Baden-Tillson, H.,
36 Pfannkoch, C., Rogers, Y.-H., Smith, H. O. 2004. Environmental genome shotgun
37 sequencing of the Sargasso Sea. *Science* 304, 66-74.
- 38 Ward, B. B., Eveillard, D., Kirshstein, J. D., Nelson, J. D., Voytek, M. A., Jackson, G. A. 2007.
39 Ammonia-oxidizing bacterial community composition in estuarine and oceanic
40 environments assessed using a functional gene microarray. *Environmental Microbiology*
41 9, 2522-2538.
- 42 Watson, S. W. 1965. Characteristics of a marine nitrifying bacterium, *Nitrosocystis oceanus* sp.
43 N. *Limnology & Oceanography* 10, supplement, 274-289.
- 44 Weidler, G. W., Dornmayr-Pfaffenhuemer, M., Gerbl, F. W., Heinen, W., Stan-Lotter, H. 2007.
45 Communities of Archaea and Bacteria in a subsurface radioactive thermal spring in the

1 Austrian central alps, and evidence of ammonia-oxidizing Crenarchaeota. *Applied and*
2 *Environmental Microbiology* 73, 259-270.

3 Woese, C. R., Weisburg, W. G., Hahn, C. M. 1985. The purple bacteria: The gamma subdivision.
4 *Systematic and Applied Microbiology* 6, 25-33.

5 Woese, C. R., Weisburg, W. G., Paster, B. J. 1984. The purple bacteria: The beta subdivision.
6 *Systematic and Applied Microbiology* 5, 327-336.

7 Wuchter, C., Abbas, B., Coolen, M. J. L., Herfort, L., Van Bleijswijk, J., Timmers, P., Strous,
8 M., Teira, E., Herndl, G. J., Middelburg, J. J., Schouten, S., Sinninghe Damsté, J. S.
9 2006. Archaeal nitrification in the ocean. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
10 *Sciences of the United States of America* 103, 12317-12322.

11 Wuchter, C., Schouten, S., Boschker, H. T. S., Sinninghe Damsté, J. S. 2003. Bicarbonate uptake
12 by marine Crenarchaeota. *FEMS Microbiology Letters* 219, 203-207.

13

14

15

1 Table 1. Distribution of archaeal *amoA* (AOA) sequences and number of archaeal and
 2 betaproteobacterial *amoA* (β -AOB) operational taxonomic units (OTU), using a 95% nucleotide
 3 identity cutoff, recovered from different estuaries. Total number of sequences in each study are
 4 indicated parenthetically.

5

Estuary	% of clones in cluster		No. of OTUs (no. of clones sequence)		Reference
	Water column/ sediment	soils/ sediment	AOA	β -AOB	
Bahi'a del To'bari, Mexico	83	17	42 (282)	9 (61)	Beman and Francis 2006
San Francisco Bay, CA	85	15	67 (415)	41 (378)	Mosier and Francis 2008
Barn Island salt marsh, CT	55	45	21 (120)	7 (83)	Moin et al. 2009
Westerschelde estuary, The Netherlands	60	40	10 (10)	4 (9)	Sahan and Muyzer 2008
Huntington Beach, CA	100	0	52 (338)	2 (200)	Santoro et al. 2008
Changjiang estuary, China	72	28	31 (47)	NA	Dang et al. 2008
Plum Island Sound estuary, MA	94	6	33 (451)	13 (55)	Bernhard et al. 2010; Bernhard et al. 2005
Average	74	26	37	10	

6

Figure captions.

Figure 1. Phylogenetic relationships among ammonia oxidizing bacterial 16S ribosomal RNA genes and some methane oxidizing bacteria (MOB) for reference. The unrooted neighbor-joining tree was inferred from an alignment of sequences with 1144 nucleotide positions. Bootstrap values (≥ 50) are indicated above the nodes. The gray boxes indicate representative sequences from uncultured AOB affiliated with the *Nitrosospira*-like cluster 1 and *Nitrosomonas*-like cluster 5 as designated by Stephen et al. (1996) that are currently unrepresented in the culture collection.

Figure 2. Phylogenetic relationships among archaeal 16S ribosomal RNA genes. The unrooted neighbor-joining tree was inferred from an alignment of sequences with 1204 nucleotide positions. Bootstrap values (≥ 50) are indicated above the nodes. Asterisks indicate *Archaea* known to have an ammonia monooxygenase gene.

Figure 3. Phylogenetic relationships among betaproteobacterial *amoA* nucleotide sequences. The unrooted neighbor-joining tree was inferred from an alignment of sequences with 329 nucleotide positions. Bootstrap values (≥ 50) are indicated above the nodes. Only sequences from estuarine studies and cultivated representative β -AOB are included in the tree. Numbers inside each polygon indicate the number of sequences in the cluster.

Figure 4. Phylogenetic relationships among deduced archaeal AmoA protein sequences recovered from the three sites. The unrooted neighbor-joining tree was inferred from an alignment of protein sequences with 181 amino acid residues. Bootstrap support (≥ 50) is indicated above the nodes. Only sequences from estuaries and representative *Archaea* known to have *amoA* genes are included in the tree. Colored circles by each cluster indicate the locations where the sequences in that cluster were recovered. Numbers inside each polygon indicate the number of sequences in the cluster.

Figure 5. Relationship between AOA to β -AOB ratios (\log_{10}) and salinity from four different estuaries: Plum Island Sound (Bernhard et al., 2007; Bernhard et al., 2010), Barn Island salt marsh (Moin et al., 2009), San Francisco Bay (Mosier and Francis, 2008), and a subterranean estuary in Huntington Beach, CA (Santoro et al., 2008).

Figure 1





Figure 2






Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5