

1 **Towards a Taxonomical Consensus: Diversity and Richness**

2 **Inference from Large Scale rRNA gene Analysis**

3

4

5 Dimitris Papamichail<sup>1,2</sup>, Celine C. Lesaulnier<sup>1,3</sup>, Steven Skiena<sup>2</sup>, Sean R. McCorkle<sup>1</sup>,

6 Bernard Ollivier<sup>3</sup>, Daniel van der Lelie<sup>1\*</sup>

7

8

9 <sup>1</sup>Brookhaven National Laboratory, Biology Department, Building 463, Upton,  
10 NY11973-5000, USA

11 <sup>2</sup>Computer Science Department, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, New York,  
12 11794, USA

13 <sup>3</sup>IRD, UMR180, IFR-BAIM, Université de Provence, ESIL, F-13288, Marseille  
14 Cedex 09, FRANCE

15

16 **Key words:** classification, phylogeny, 16S rRNA, richness estimation, diversity,  
17 microbial communities

18

19 \* Corresponding author: Daniel van der Lelie

20 Phone: +1 (631) 344 5349

21 Fax: +1 (631) 344 3407

22 Email: [vdlelied@bnl.gov](mailto:vdlelied@bnl.gov)

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 Population analysis is persistently challenging but important, leading to the  
25 determination of diversity and function prediction of microbial community members.  
26 Here we detail our bioinformatics methods for analyzing population distribution and  
27 diversity in large microbial communities. This was achieved via (i) a homology based  
28 method for robust phylotype determination, equaling the classification accuracy of the  
29 Ribosomal Database Project (RDP) classifier, but providing improved associations of  
30 closely related sequences; (ii) a comparison of different clustering methods for  
31 achieving more accurate richness estimations.  
32 Our methodology, which we developed using the RDP vetted 16S rRNA gene  
33 sequence set, was validated by testing it on a large 16S rRNA gene dataset of  
34 approximately 2300 sequences, which we obtained from a soil microbial community  
35 study. We concluded that the best approach to obtain accurate phylogenetics profile of  
36 large microbial communities, based on 16S rRNA gene sequence information, is to  
37 apply an optimized blast classifier. This approach is complemented by the grouping of  
38 closely related sequences, using complete linkage clustering, in order to calculate  
39 richness and evenness indices for the communities.

40 **INTRODUCTION**

41 Metagenome shotgun sequencing and analysis is revolutionizing the field of  
42 molecular ecology, revealing a more complete vision of the biodiversity and functions  
43 within ecosystems (2-6, 12, 29-31). Preliminary to constructing and sequencing  
44 metagenome libraries, it is necessary to estimate the complexity and richness of the  
45 microbial community to be examined. This can be adequately done by constructing  
46 and sequencing ribosomal RNA (rRNA) gene libraries (8). Thus, the means to  
47 accurately identify and classify large datasets of rRNA genes and to determine  
48 community richness is an essential step in metagenome sequencing projects. The  
49 increasing library sizes to cover the metagenomes of complex microbial communities  
50 and the subsequent amount of screening and analysis needed necessitates the  
51 development and application of adequate and robust bioinformatics tools for  
52 community composition analysis that can handle large rRNA gene data sets.

53

54 The following tools are available for analyzing microbial community composition:

55 **Phylogenetic trees** are useful in determining novel groups of organisms, but are  
56 limited in their reliability for large datasets. Bootstrap values become expensive to  
57 calculate and tree topologies become unreliable as tree size increases (20).

58 **Oligonucleotide (k-mer) based classifiers** provide fast and reliable techniques,  
59 which exploit the fact that closely related sequences share common small  
60 subsequences and that organisms and regions have their own distinct signatures, a  
61 term to describe distributions of oligonucleotides (10, 14, 22, 23). A disadvantage is  
62 the lack of positional information of oligonucleotides, which becomes more  
63 problematic with decreasing k, in which case the probability of finding oligos by  
64 chance increases exponentially. Adding location information to oligonucleotides

65 would lead to computation time increases, while limiting its generality. In addition,  
66 altering a single base in a sequence results in  $k$  different  $k$ -mers, and random  
67 mutations can therefore have devastating results on the oligonucleotide distribution.  
68 Correcting this problem by approximate matching for  $k$ -mers leads to exponential  
69 time increases relative to the number of errors allowed.

70 At present, the most widely used tool for species identification based on ribosomal  
71 RNA gene sequences is the ribosomal database project (RDP) Naïve Bayesian  
72 classifier (9). This tool uses 8-mers to cluster and classify 16S rRNA sequences based  
73 upon vetted sequences with well assigned taxonomy  
74 (<http://rdp.cme.msu.edu/index.jsp>, James Cole, private communication) (11).

75 **Sequence alignment classifiers** extract differences and calculate distances between  
76 DNA sequences. They can be used to identify the closest match of a sequence to a  
77 vetted reference data set. The computation time required for aligning sequences  
78 increases quadratically to the length of the sequences, which significantly delays the  
79 analysis of large datasets, e.g. rRNA gene sequences representing a complex  
80 microbial community.

81 The program BLAST (1) performs approximate sequence alignments, finding locally  
82 very similar pieces as opposed to globally calculating the best way to convert one  
83 sequence to the other. BLAST can be calibrated to achieve a desired speed/sensitivity  
84 ratio. Local alignment provides flexibility in handling sequencing errors, incorrectly  
85 inserted or omitted prefixes, suffixes and subsequences, as well as ambiguous  
86 characters. A further advantage of BLAST is the ability to compare sequences, one at  
87 a time, against a database of vetted sequences. Classification using alignment is  
88 highly parallelizable, with great promise over multi-processor and future multi-core  
89 systems.

90

91 Two important factors that describe a microbial community are *richness*, meaning the  
92 number of species present, and *diversity*, which is their relative abundance (21). The  
93 latter can be estimated from the classification efforts and/or phylogenetic analysis of  
94 community samples. Richness estimation requires information on the number of  
95 distinct subpopulations present in the community, according to a threshold set to  
96 determine them (e.g. genus level), as well as the evenness information, meaning how  
97 different the sizes of the subpopulations in the community are. Several richness  
98 estimator methodologies have been developed including extrapolation from  
99 accumulation curves, parametric estimators and non-parametric estimators, the latter  
100 being the most promising for microbial studies (13). Among this last class of  
101 estimators, Chao1 (7) seems to be the most suited method for estimating phylotype  
102 richness from prokaryotic 16S rRNA libraries (16).

103

104 In this manuscript we describe the use of local alignment classification as a more  
105 robust tool in grouping closely related sequences, while maintaining equivalent or  
106 slightly increased classification accuracy as compared to the RDP naïve Bayesian  
107 classifier. In addition, we argue against the single linkage clustering methodology for  
108 richness estimation calculations in favor of the equally computationally-attractive  
109 complete linkage method.

110

## 111 MATERIALS AND METHODS

112

### 113 Computation

114

115 All computational experiments were performed on either a hyper threaded Pentium 4  
116 at 3.2GHz desktop with 2GB of memory or dual Xeon at 2.8GHz server with 4GB of  
117 memory. Since most classification computations are parallelizable, a cluster of 4-10  
118 desktops was used for reducing computational time. All time references referring to  
119 computation will assume use of one CPU desktop with at least 2GB of memory.

120

121 All programs/scripts performing computations and statistical evaluations were written  
122 in Perl, except the edit distance calculations, which were written in C in order to  
123 decrease computational time. The program R (28) was used for the clustering  
124 analysis. Computation times for the single, average and complete methods differ  
125 insignificantly and have a quadratic time dependence to the number of sequences (or  
126 linear to the number of pair-wise sequence distances). Evaluation of the average and  
127 maximum in-group distances of a clustering were performed using the height and  
128 order arrays provided by R, in conjunction with the calculated pair-wise edit distances  
129 of the vetted sequences.

129

### 130 16S rRNA Sequence Classification

131

132 Classification accuracy was measured by performing leave-one-out tests of the 5574  
133 vetted sequences against themselves. A subset of vetted sequences is created,  
134 excluding the singletons, which are sequences that belong to a phylogenetic group  
135 with only one member. Each sequence of this new dataset is then separated from the  
dataset and classified against it. The number of correctly classified sequences is then

136 divided by the total number of sequences present in this subset (5246 - with singletons  
137 being excluded) to produce the final accuracy percentages.

138

139 Classification with the RDP naïve Bayesian classifier takes approximately 1.5  
140 minutes, when submitted through the web, to produce a complete 1000 sequence  
141 assignment with confidence estimates, as calculated by bootstrap trials.

142 The *blastn* classifier requires, for the same number of sequences and against the same  
143 database of vetted sequences, approximately 35 minutes.

144 Using *bl2seq*, for performing pair wise comparisons, requires significantly more time,  
145 in the range of days.

146 Increasing the accuracy of BLAST by lowering the values of the word size  $W$  and the  
147  $X$  drop-off parameters results in a significant increase in computation, while  
148 increasing the classification accuracy at the genus level by no more than 0.1%.

149

150 The naïve Bayesian classifier principles are described in (23). The RDP classifier uses  
151 oligonucleotides of size 8 and randomizes the selection of oligonucleotides to be used  
152 for the confidence calculation. In each of the 100 bootstrap trials, 1/8 of all possible 8-  
153 mers of a sequence are selected randomly.

154

155 The BLAST parameters adjusted for *bl2seq* and *blastn* in order to minimize  
156 misclassifications were:

1571. *match*: The reward for a matched character, common to both sequences  
158 compared.

1592. *mismatch*: The penalty for a character substitution

1603. *gap\_start*: The penalty for initiating a gap.

1614.           *gap\_extend*: The penalty for extending an initiated gap by one character.  
162    These values can be scaled proportionately without affecting the alignment, but only  
163    the score, although the relative scores under the same parameter set remain  
164    proportional.  
165  
166    The score for each BLAST alignment, used to determine confidence values, was  
167    calculated by summing up the individual scores of the locally aligned pieces, which is  
168    already normalized against the length of the sequences being compared. The two tests  
169    to measure misclassifications and calibrate local alignment parameter space were (i)  
170    the number of rRNA sequences that score better against a sequence from another  
171    genus than against all of the sequences in their genus and (ii) the number of ribosomal  
172    sequences that score better against a sequence from another genus than at least one  
173    sequence from their own genus. The first test was used predominantly, since the final  
174    classification decision is based on the top scoring vetted sequence and can lead to a  
175    misclassification only if the test sequence aligns with a higher score against a foreign-  
176    genus vetted sequence.  
177    For scoring an alignment, we used the sum of scores of individual local aligned  
178    pieces, which are not overlapping. A query sequence is assigned the phylogenetic  
179    lineage of the highest matching score.

180

### 181    **Levenshtein edit distances**

182    The Levenshtein edit distance (17) between two sequences is defined as the number  
183    of edit operations – insertions, deletions and substitutions – required to transform one  
184    sequence to the other, where each edit operation has a cost of 1.

185

## 186 **RESULTS**

### 187 **RDP naïve Bayesian classification and initial drawbacks**

188 We initially tried to use the Ribosomal Database Project (RDP) Naïve Bayesian  
189 classifier to analyze the 2774 16S rRNA gene sequence data from a large scale  
190 sequencing project, which aimed at determining changes in the soil microbial  
191 community composition of trembling aspen when three were exposed to ambient (360  
192 ppm) or elevated (560 ppm) atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. Upon initially analyzing 2774 16S  
193 rRNA gene sequences it became apparent that a large number of them, which were  
194 classified in the same genus, had edit distances accounting for >20% of the total  
195 sequence length, and sometimes up to 50%. Many of these occurred between  
196 sequences classified with low confidence estimates (<50%), creating uncertainty for a  
197 large number of classification groupings. This provided the first clue that many of the  
198 sequences we were trying to classify were distant from all the vetted sequences  
199 available, possibly representing new phylogenetic groups. We also noticed that some  
200 sequences with >99% edit distance similarity were found classified in different taxa,  
201 with a couple of occurrences even at the phylum level. These findings bring to light  
202 the fact that a perfect classification of rRNA gene sequences can currently not be  
203 achieved, and that errors will be found even when classifying unknown sequences to  
204 closely related characterized ones. These results prompted us to explore sequence  
205 identification methods alternative to the RDP Naïve Bayesian classifier.

206

### 207 **Refinement of Vetted Sequence Classification using BLAST**

208 The BLAST utility bl2seq (27), which performs pair wise sequence alignment, was  
209 used as an alternative to maximize 16S rRNA gene classification accuracy. Several  
210 key parameters (match, mismatch, gap\_start, gap\_extend) were adjusted to minimize

211 misclassifications. To do so, a genus level leave-one-out test for each of the 5574  
212 vetted sequences (RDP data set) was performed to determine the parameter set that  
213 optimally separates the scores of closely related species from distant ones. After  
214 examining the different parameter sets we determined the optimal set of key  
215 parameters (*match* = 1, *mismatch* = 5, *gap\_open* = 3, and *gap\_extend* = 2.5), where  
216 the *match* is positive and considered a reward, and *mismatch*, *gap\_open* and  
217 *gap\_extend* are negative and are considered penalties. Compared to the default bl2seq  
218 parameter values, this set of parameters reduced the number of misclassified vetted  
219 sequences from 284 to 268 out of a total of 5246 (328 sequences are unique in their  
220 genus in the vetted set).

221

## 222 **Classifier confidence levels**

223 We created a confidence estimate for each bl2seq alignment score using the value of  
224 the highest scoring pair-wise alignment for each sequence, setting the Boolean value  
225 for correct (1) or incorrect (0) classification at the genus, family, order, class or  
226 phylum level. This gives us the ability to assign a confidence estimate to each specific  
227 score value, according to the number of times an alignment with such a value resulted  
228 in the correct phylogenetic classification. A rating for this score was then based on  
229 these results. Fourth degree polynomial regression curves were used to determine the  
230 relation between classification scores and confidence estimate values for the different  
231 phylogenetic levels. These curves (Figures 1a-e) were, smoothed by the addition of  
232 extra points, representing high confidence estimates at very high scores and zero  
233 confidence estimates at very low scores. The confidence estimate of each score is  
234 calculated from the value of the polynomial for this specific score. From this analysis  
235 we can conclude that confidence estimates decrease when classifying the species at

236 lower phylogenetic levels (from phylum to genus). Figure 1f demonstrates that we  
237 still obtain a 94% classification accuracy at the genus level, when using the optimal  
238 parameter set and the *bl2seq* utility, and increasing accuracies for higher phylogenetic  
239 levels.

240

#### 241 **Exploring the alignment parameter set**

242 We subsequently constructed a vetted sequences database in BLAST format and used  
243 the *blastn* utility, as previously done for *bl2seq*, in a leave-one-out test on this  
244 database. The faster *blastn* processing of sequences, compared to *bl2seq*, was used to  
245 explore all possible combinations of key parameters. In order to identify the best set  
246 of parameters, we performed a full coverage scan at value increments of 5, fixing the  
247 reward value of match to 10, and allowing for all possible combinations of the three  
248 other parameters (*mismatch*, *gap\_open* and *gap\_extend*). Restrictions in the *blastn*  
249 utility did not allow ratios of mismatch/match lower than 1 (except the ratio 8/10) and  
250 higher than 5. Also the mismatch/match ratio of 9/2 was not permitted. We observed  
251 that when using *blastn*, the values for *gap\_start* and *gap\_extend* did not alter our  
252 results, this in contrast to their influence on scores using the *bl2seq* utility. At the end,  
253 the (*match* = 10, *mismatch* = 50) assignment gave the best classification accuracy,  
254 with percentages for the different phylogenetic levels shown in Table 1, together with  
255 the published accuracy results of the RDP naïve Bayesian classifier (32).

256

#### 257 **Improved grouping of closely related sequences using the *blastn* classifier**

258 Although the accuracy results presented in Table 1 do not differ significantly for the  
259 different methods tested, our *blastn* classifier groups closely related sequences with  
260 increased accuracy. To demonstrate this, Levenshtein pair wise edit distances (17)

261 were calculated for a set of 2774 16S rRNA gene sequences representing the  
262 microbial communities associated with trembling aspen under conditions of ambient  
263 and elevated CO<sub>2</sub> (C. Lesaulnier, D. Papamichail, S. McCorkle, B. Ollivier, S.  
264 Skiena, S. Taghavi, D. Zak, D. van der Lelie. (2007). Elevated CO<sub>2</sub> Affects Soil  
265 Microbial Diversity Associated with Trembling Aspen. Environ. Microbiol., under  
266 review). Using the complete linkage method these were subsequently clustered into  
267 groups, in which the percentage difference among sequences is below a cut-off value.  
268 Taking as an example a 1% cut-off sequence difference (this percentage is calculated  
269 proportional to the sequence length, which for the 16S bacterial rRNA gene is  
270 approximately 15), we would expect all group members to belong to the same  
271 phylogenetic group, ranging from genus to phylum, since at the 1% dissimilarity level  
272 even species are expected to cluster together. Considering the high identification  
273 percentages for both the RDP classifier and the *blastn* classifier, we counted the  
274 number of groups that were heterologous at a given phylogenetic level (e.g. contained  
275 members of more than one phylotype). A few indicative results are the following: (i)  
276 For the ambient CO<sub>2</sub> community 16S rRNA sequence set, which comprised of 132  
277 groups with more than one element, 23 groups had elements classified in different  
278 genera by the RDP classifier, breaking them into 52 subgroups. The *blastn* classifier  
279 divided only 15 groups into 30 subgroups. In 14 out of the 15 groups this was due to  
280 the presence of a single misclassified sequence. The biggest group of 32 elements was  
281 identified as 32 *Desulfotomaculum* by our classifier, where the RDP broke it into 6  
282 distinct groups, partitioned as: 4 *Thermodesulfovibrio*, 1 *Succiniclasticum*, 15 *Gelria*,  
283 1 *Propionispora*, 3 *Thermovenabulum* and 8 *Pelotomaculum*. (ii) For the elevated  
284 CO<sub>2</sub> community 16S rRNA sequence set, 28 groups out of a total of 87 groups were  
285 divided into 67 subgroups by the RDP classifier, where the *blastn* classifier only

286 divided 10 groups into 20 subgroups. These examples show that the blastn classifier  
287 reduces classification ambiguities compared to the RDP classifier. The complete  
288 results for all phylogenetic levels and with dissimilarity percentages ranging from  
289 1%-5% can be found in the supplemental online material.

290

### 291 **Clustering methodology for richness estimation**

292 To further deconvolute community composition it is necessary to calculate the  
293 richness of a microbial population, meaning the number of phylotypes present. This  
294 requires partitioning the sampled sequences into sets according to their similarity.  
295 This can theoretically be achieved by using the output of our classifier, where  
296 information is known for the identification of all sequences at different phylogenetic  
297 levels. However, this would require that all sequences are identified with the same  
298 confidence level. This is not the case. In addition, highly dissimilar sequences can  
299 sometimes be classified in the same phylogenetic group when they have the same  
300 vetted sequence as their closest neighbor.

301 We examined three traditionally used clustering methods, the single linkage, average  
302 linkage and complete linkage methods, all which fall under the agglomerative  
303 hierarchical (bottom-up) approach and produce clustering trees (15). We compared  
304 the three methods using the set of 5574 vetted sequences, for which phylogenetic  
305 information for all phylotypes is well assigned. Before applying the clustering  
306 methods, we used the known phylogenetic partitioning of the vetted sequences to  
307 calculate statistics about the number of groups they form at each phylogenetic level,  
308 as well as the minimum, average and maximum Levenshtein edit distances (17)  
309 between sequences in these phylogenetic groups. The means of all these values are

310 shown in Table 2. All vetted sequence statistics, including details about all groups,  
311 can be found in the supplemental on-line materials.

312 According to the number of groups in each phylotype (see Table 2), we determined  
313 the necessary cut off edit distance value, which, when applied to the inferred  
314 clustering tree, would produce the same number of phylogenetic groups. This is  
315 demonstrated in Figure 2 on a random subset of 100 vetted 16S rRNA sequences. In  
316 this figure, for example, we can observe that a cut-off edit distance value of 300 will  
317 result in the formation of 23 groups for the given 100 sequences. Inversely, if we want  
318 to acquire 15 groups, a cutoff edit distance of 380 is required. Knowing the number of  
319 distinct groups for all taxa for our vetted sequence set allows us to determine cutoff  
320 levels that will generate the same number of groups, when clustering these sequences  
321 with our three hierarchical clustering methods. This allows the evaluation of the  
322 clustering methods independently of the error in the cut-off estimation, which is  
323 actually a separate problem for all clustering and partitioning methods, and usually is  
324 calculated based on observations (13).

325 Correct cutoff values, as shown in Figure 2, cannot be calculated directly from vetted  
326 sequence statistics. To illustrate this point, one would expect that for the complete  
327 linkage clustering method, the correct threshold could be determined by calculating  
328 the maximum in-group distance, when the number of groups formed is the same as in  
329 the vetted sequence set at some phylogenetic level. It happens though that, even at the  
330 genus level, a group exists (Clostridia) in the vetted sequence set with a maximum in-  
331 group distance of 626, which indicates approximately 43% sequence dissimilarity.

332 More appropriate thresholds can be determined by considering the mean of the  
333 average distances inside the groups at every merging step of the average linkage  
334 clustering hierarchical algorithm, and then comparing this value to the known mean

335 for the corresponding groups of the vetted sequences. These values are quite similar,  
336 as can be seen in Table 3. The same effect is observed for the complete linkage  
337 clustering method (Table 3), where the threshold value for partitioning is determined  
338 based on the maximum distance inside each group. Single linkage clustering does not  
339 offer such a measure for estimating a cut-off, since there is no averaging process in  
340 the algorithm.

341 By sorting the groups, formed at the different phylogenetic levels by using the  
342 different clustering methods, according to their cardinality, and by comparing this to  
343 the known phylogeny, we created graphs showing the trends in group sizes. The  
344 known phylogeny group cardinalities were the best approximated by the complete,  
345 followed by the average clustering method. This is shown in Figure 3 for the 75  
346 groups at the order level. Similar figures for all taxonomic levels can be found in the  
347 supplemental on-line materials.

348 To quantify the better performance of the complete clustering method, as observed in  
349 Figure 3, we calculated the Pearson correlation (difference in variance) and square  
350 difference (distance of each individual group of the same index, according to the  
351 corresponding sorted position). The results are presented in Table 4 and confirm that  
352 the complete linkage clustering method provides a better correlation to the known  
353 classification at all five phylogenetic levels. As a case study for the richness  
354 estimation based on different clustering methods, we calculated the Chao1 index at  
355 different phylogenetic levels. Since the Chao1 estimate is based on the ratio of  
356 singletons and doubletons of a sequence grouping, it can vary significantly with  
357 changes to these small integers. For that reason, we tested the Chao1 richness  
358 estimations on 1000 random selected sequences from the vetted sequence set,  
359 repeating the test a total of 1000 times. In Table 5 we present the average richness

360 estimations of these experiments. As seen in Table 5, richness estimations based on  
361 groups clustered with the complete linkage method are the most accurate. In  
362 conjunction with the consistently better correlation of the group size histograms,  
363 complete linkage clustering is preferable for use in richness estimation analysis.

364

365

366 **DISCUSSION**

367

368 The 16S rRNA gene sequence enables the association of phylogeny (18, 26) and  
369 remains the most reliable method to determine completely new or divergent  
370 organisms. Aside from the availability of a curated dataset (i.e. the vetted sequences),  
371 the analysis of 16S rRNA gene sequences serves as a choice model, as it also permits  
372 a direct comparison of the composition of different communities.

373 Although recent tree manipulation and visualization utilities like *arb* (19), which use  
374 multiple alignment to construct phylogenetic trees, have the capability of handling  
375 large datasets, editing their input becomes a laborious and tedious task. Therefore, the  
376 need exists to develop classification tools to overcome both the computational  
377 limitations in accurately identifying taxonomical relationships, and reconstructing  
378 phylogenetic trees for the purpose of better extrapolating ecological roles. We  
379 developed a *blastn* classifier with optimal key parameter set that performs better than  
380 the RDP II classifier for 16S rRNA based identification, especially when it comes to  
381 grouping of related sequences, thus reducing classification ambiguities. However,  
382 every classifier has a closed architecture and will assign every sequence to one in its  
383 dataset. The view of the biodiversity contained within a sample is therefore subject to  
384 the biases incurred by the limited number of sequences contained within the vetted  
385 sequence database, against which we classify.

386 Because of its simplicity and efficiency, single linkage clustering has often been used  
387 for clustering sequences (25). Other tools, such as DOTUR (24), give the user the  
388 option to select different clustering methods, but no information is provided on which  
389 method actually performs better or what dissimilarity cutoff should be used to  
390 differentiate groups at a given phylogenetic level. We demonstrate that the complete  
391 linkage clustering method seems to be the preferential approach to create clusters of

392 closely related sequences, taking into account that it is less computational intense than  
393 full phylogenetic tree analysis. The output of this clustering method can subsequently  
394 be used for richness estimation of the microbial community, using e.g. the Chao1  
395 index, as we did for the different microbial communities associated with trembling  
396 aspen under conditions of ambient and elevated CO<sub>2</sub>.

397 In conclusion, our *blastn* classifier with optimal key parameter set has been proven to  
398 provide consistent and robust analysis. Further improvements could be realized in  
399 both accuracy and speed, especially through the contributions of advances in parallel  
400 and core architectures. These developments should enhance significantly the utility of  
401 database search and taxonomic annotation methods to the molecular biologist.

402

#### 403 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

404 This research was funded by the US Department of Energy's Office of Science (BER)  
405 project number DE-AC02-98CH10886, entitled "Composition of Microbial  
406 Communities for In Situ Radionuclide Immobilization Projects", and by Laboratory  
407 Directed Research and Development funds at the Brookhaven National Laboratory  
408 under contract with the U.S. Department of Energy. We would like to thank Dr James  
409 Cole from RDP for providing us with the vetted sequence data.

410

411 **References**

- 412 1. **Altschul, S. F., W. Gish, W. Miller, E. W. Myers, and D. J. Lipman.** 1990.  
413 Basic local alignment search tool. *J Mol Biol* **215**:403-10.
- 414 2. **Beja, O., M. T. Suzuki, E. V. Koonin, L. Aravind, A. Hadd, L. P. Nguyen,**  
415 **R. Villacorta, M. Amjadi, C. Garrigues, S. B. Jovanovich, R. A. Feldman,**  
416 **and E. F. DeLong.** 2000. Construction and analysis of bacterial artificial  
417 chromosome libraries from a marine microbial assemblage. *Environ Microbiol*  
418 **2**:516-29.
- 419 3. **Breitbart, M., B. Felts, S. Kelley, J. M. Mahaffy, J. Nulton, P. Salamon,**  
420 **and F. Rohwer.** 2004. Diversity and population structure of a near-shore  
421 marine-sediment viral community. *Proc Biol Sci* **271**:565-74.
- 422 4. **Breitbart, M., I. Hewson, B. Felts, J. M. Mahaffy, J. Nulton, P. Salamon,**  
423 **and F. Rohwer.** 2003. Metagenomic analyses of an uncultured viral  
424 community from human feces. *J Bacteriol* **185**:6220-3.
- 425 5. **Breitbart, M., P. Salamon, B. Andresen, J. M. Mahaffy, A. M. Segall, D.**  
426 **Mead, F. Azam, and F. Rohwer.** 2002. Genomic analysis of uncultured  
427 marine viral communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **99**:14250-5.
- 428 6. **Cann, A. J., S. E. Fandrich, and S. Heaphy.** 2005. Analysis of the virus  
429 population present in equine faeces indicates the presence of hundreds of  
430 uncharacterized virus genomes. *Virus Genes* **30**:151-6.
- 431 7. **Chao, A.** 1984. Nonparametric Estimation of the Number of Classes in a  
432 Population. *Scand. J. Stat.* **11**.
- 433 8. **Chen, K., and L. Pachter.** 2005. Bioinformatics for whole-genome shotgun  
434 sequencing of microbial communities. *PLoS Comput Biol* **1**:106-12.

- 435 9. **Cole, J. R., B. Chai, T. L. Marsh, R. J. Farris, Q. Wang, S. A. Kulam, S.**  
436 **Chandra, D. M. McGarrell, T. M. Schmidt, G. M. Garrity, and J. M.**  
437 **Tiedje.** 2003. The Ribosomal Database Project (RDP-II): previewing a new  
438 autoaligner that allows regular updates and the new prokaryotic taxonomy.  
439 *Nucleic Acids Res* **31**:442-3.
- 440 10. **Deschavanne, P. J., A. Giron, J. Vilain, G. Fagot, and B. Fertil.** 1999.  
441 Genomic signature: characterization and classification of species assessed by  
442 chaos game representation of sequences. *Mol Biol Evol* **16**:1391-9.
- 443 11. **Garrity, G. M., M. Winters, K. A. W., and D. B. Searles.** 2002. Taxonomic  
444 Outline of the Prokaryotes, *Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology*, 2nd  
445 ed. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- 446 12. **Hallam, S. J., N. Putnam, C. M. Preston, J. C. Detter, D. Rokhsar, P. M.**  
447 **Richardson, and E. F. DeLong.** 2004. Reverse methanogenesis: testing the  
448 hypothesis with environmental genomics. *Science* **305**:1457-62.
- 449 13. **Hughes, J. B., J. J. Hellmann, T. H. Ricketts, and B. J. Bohannan.** 2001.  
450 Counting the uncountable: statistical approaches to estimating microbial  
451 diversity. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **67**:4399-406.
- 452 14. **Karlin, S.** 1998. Global dinucleotide signatures and analysis of genomic  
453 heterogeneity. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **1**:598-610.
- 454 15. **Kaufman, L., and P. J. Rousseeuw.** 1990. Finding groups in data : an  
455 introduction to cluster analysis. Wiley, New York.
- 456 16. **Kemp, P. F., and J. Y. Aller.** 2004. Estimating prokaryotic diversity: When  
457 are 16S rDNA libraries large enough? *Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods* **2**:114-125.
- 458 17. **Levenshtein, V. I.** 1965. Binary codes capable of correcting deletions,  
459 insertions and reversals. *Doklady Akademii Nauk* **163**:845-848.

- 460 18. **Ludwig, W., and K. H. Schleifer.** 1994. Bacterial phylogeny based on 16S  
461 and 23S rRNA sequence analysis. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **15**:155-73.
- 462 19. **Ludwig, W., O. Strunk, R. Westram, L. Richter, H. Meier, Yadhukumar,**  
463 **A. Buchner, T. Lai, S. Steppi, G. Jobb, W. Forster, I. Brettske, S. Gerber,**  
464 **A. W. Ginhart, O. Gross, S. Grumann, S. Hermann, R. Jost, A. Konig, T.**  
465 **Liss, R. Lussmann, M. May, B. Nonhoff, B. Reichel, R. Strehlow, A.**  
466 **Stamatakis, N. Stuckmann, A. Vilbig, M. Lenke, T. Ludwig, A. Bode, and**  
467 **K. H. Schleifer.** 2004. ARB: a software environment for sequence data.  
468 *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**:1363-71.
- 469 20. **Nei, M., and S. Kumar.** 2000. Molecular evolution and phylogenetics.  
470 Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- 471 21. **Ovreas, L.** 2000. Population and community level approaches for analysing  
472 microbial diversity in natural environments, p. 236-251, vol. 3.
- 473 22. **Papamichail, D., D. van der Lelie, S. R. S. R. McCorkle, and S. S.** 2005.  
474 Presented at the Asian Pacific Bioinformatics Conference (APBC).
- 475 23. **Sandberg, R., G. Winberg, C. I. Branden, A. Kaske, I. Ernberg, and J.**  
476 **Coster.** 2001. Capturing whole-genome characteristics in short sequences  
477 using a naive Bayesian classifier. *Genome Res* **11**:1404-9.
- 478 24. **Schloss, P. D., and J. Handelsman.** 2005. Introducing DOTUR, a computer  
479 program for defining operational taxonomic units and estimating species  
480 richness. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **71**:1501-6.
- 481 25. **Seguritan, V., and F. Rohwer.** 2001. FastGroup: a program to dereplicate  
482 libraries of 16S rDNA sequences. *BMC Bioinformatics* **2**:9.
- 483 26. **Stackebrandt, E., W. Frederiksen, G. M. Garrity, P. A. Grimont, P.**  
484 **Kampfer, M. C. Maiden, X. Nesme, R. Rossello-Mora, J. Swings, H. G.**

- 485 **Truper, L. Vauterin, A. C. Ward, and W. B. Whitman.** 2002. Report of the  
486 ad hoc committee for the re-evaluation of the species definition in  
487 bacteriology. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **52**:1043-7.
- 488 27. **Tatusova, T. A., and T. L. Madden.** 1999. BLAST 2 Sequences, a new tool  
489 for comparing protein and nucleotide sequences. *FEMS Microbiol Lett*  
490 **174**:247-50.
- 491 28. **Team, R. D. C.** 2006. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical  
492 Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 493 29. **Tringe, S. G., C. von Mering, A. Kobayashi, A. A. Salamov, K. Chen, H.**  
494 **W. Chang, M. Podar, J. M. Short, E. J. Mathur, J. C. Detter, P. Bork, P.**  
495 **Hugenholtz, and E. M. Rubin.** 2005. Comparative metagenomics of  
496 microbial communities. *Science* **308**:554-7.
- 497 30. **Tyson, G. W., J. Chapman, P. Hugenholtz, E. E. Allen, R. J. Ram, P. M.**  
498 **Richardson, V. V. Solovyev, E. M. Rubin, D. S. Rokhsar, and J. F.**  
499 **Banfield.** 2004. Community structure and metabolism through reconstruction  
500 of microbial genomes from the environment. *Nature* **428**:37-43.
- 501 31. **Venter, J. C., K. Remington, J. F. Heidelberg, A. L. Halpern, D. Rusch, J.**  
502 **A. Eisen, D. Wu, I. Paulsen, K. E. Nelson, W. Nelson, D. E. Fouts, S. Levy,**  
503 **A. H. Knap, M. W. Lomas, K. Neelson, O. White, J. Peterson, J. Hoffman,**  
504 **R. Parsons, H. Baden-Tillson, C. Pfannkoch, Y. H. Rogers, and H. O.**  
505 **Smith.** 2004. Environmental genome shotgun sequencing of the Sargasso Sea.  
506 *Science* **304**:66-74.
- 507 32. **Wang, Q., B. Chai, R. J. Farris, S. Kulam, D. M. McGarrell, G. M.**  
508 **Garrity, J. M. Tiedje, and J. R. Cole.** 2004. The RDP-II (Ribosomal

509 Database Project): The RDP Sequence Classifier., American Society for  
510 Microbiology (ASM) 104th General Meeting.  
511  
512

513 **Table 1:** Classification accuracy of RDP, blastn and bl2seq classifiers for different  
 514 phylogenetic levels.

<b>Method</b>	<b>Phylum</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Genus</b>
RDP naïve Bayesian classifier	99.9	99.9	99.3	97.1	94.3
blastn classifier	99.9	99.7	99.4	97.1	94.9
bl2seq classifier	99.9	99.7	99.4	96.9	94.7

515 The numbers represent percentages of sequences correctly classified in their known  
 516 phylogenetic levels in leave-one-out tests.

517

518

519 **Table 2:** Phylogenetic partitioning of the vetted sequences in groups and their  
 520 statistics.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Total number of groups</b>	<b>Mean minimum in group distance</b>	<b>Mean maximum in group distance</b>	<b>Mean average in group distance</b>
Phylum	30	36	399	233
Class	39	26	310	234
Order	75	15	336	187
Family	192	25	265	153
Genus	769	39	143	93

521 The known phylogenetic partitioning of 5574 vetted sequences was used to calculate statistics  
 522 about the number of groups they form at each phylogenetic level, as well as the minimum,  
 523 average and maximum Levenshtein edit distances between sequences in these phylogenetic  
 524 groups.

525 **Table 3:** Estimated cut-off values based on the vetted sequence statistics and actual  
 526 cut-off values for different phylogenetic levels determined using the average and  
 527 complete linkage clustering methods.

<b>Cut-offs / Phylogenetic level</b>	<b>Phylum</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Genus</b>
<b>Average linkage clustering</b>					
mean value:	233/231	234/223	187/208	153/158	93/95
Estimated/Actual					
Approximate sequence					
dissimilarity cutoff for	15.9 %	15.4 %	14.3 %	10.9 %	6.6 %
average linkage clustering					
<b>Complete linkage clustering</b>					
mean value:	399/414	310/377	336/339	265/258	143/139
Estimated/Actual					
Approximate sequence					
dissimilarity cutoff for	28.6 %	26.0 %	23.4 %	17.8%	9.6 %
complete linkage clustering					

528 The estimated cut-off values are the means of the vetted sequence statistics for in-  
 529 group average and maximum sequence distances (See Table 2). Sequence  
 530 dissimilarity cutoffs are presented as edit distance over average 16S sequence length  
 531 percentages.

532 **Table 4:** Pearson correlation and square differences of the sorted cardinality lists of  
 533 partition groups, created by the three clustering methods, against the original  
 534 partitions of the vetted sequences

	<b>Correlation</b>			<b>Square distance</b>		
	Single	Average	Complete	Single	Average	Complete
Phylum	0.8018	0.8041	0.9423	3159	2877	1148
Class	0.6431	0.8689	0.9809	3973	1813	364
Order	0.7939	0.9413	0.9809	3612	937	323
Family	0.7841	0.8497	0.9606	1618	1087	284
Genus	0.8085	0.9769	0.9883	816	169	109

535 The Pearson correlation and square differences were calculated for different  
 536 phylogenetic levels.

537 **Table 5:** Average Chao1 richness estimation index calculated for random 1000  
 538 sequence subsets from the RDP vetted sequence dataset and for the groupings from  
 539 different clustering methods.

	<b>Deviation of Clustering Methods richness estimation</b>				
	Average of existing groups	Chao1 index on actual data	Single linkage	Average linkage	Complete linkage
Phylum	21.7	25.1	38.7 %	13.7 %	11.8 %
Class	29.8	33.4	44.3 %	11.5 %	8.9 %
Order	63.5	56.6	51.5 %	19.0 %	7.3 %
Family	192	247.9	63.8 %	26.2 %	6.7 %
Genus	769	1281.3	36.3 %	9.36 %	11.1 %

540  
 541 The first two columns present the average number of phylotypes in the 1000  
 542 randomly selected sequences and the estimated Chao1 richness for each phylogenetic  
 543 level, based on the known taxonomical grouping. The last three columns present the  
 544 average deviation of the Chao1 richness estimate, based on the groupings acquired  
 545 from different clustering methods, as a percentage of the Chao1 richness estimate of  
 546 the known taxonomy. Here complete linkage clustering is outperforming the other  
 547 clustering methods in all but one level (genus).

548 **Figure legends**

549

550

551 **Figure 1(a-e):** Fourth degree smoothed polynomial regression curves and classification score  
552 confidence estimates for different phylogenetic levels (phylum, class, order, family, genus).  
553 The confidence estimate of each score is calculated from the value of the polynomial for this  
554 specific score.


555 **Figure 1(f):** Classification accuracy at different phylogenetic levels when using the optimal  
556 parameter set (*match* = 1, *mismatch* = 5, *gap\_open* = 3, and *gap\_extend* = 2.5) and the  
557 BLAST bl2seq utility.

558


559 **Figure 2:** Complete linkage clustering of a subset of 100 vetted 16S rRNA sequences  
560 (for demonstration purposes). For two different cut off edit distance values of 300 and  
561 380, the set is partitioned into 23 and 15 groups, respectively.

562


563 **Figure 3:** Cardinalities of the 75 groups formed by the single, average and complete  
564 clustering methods, compared to the original 75-group partitioning of all 16S vetted  
565 sequences, at the order level. The logarithmic values of the group sizes are presented  
566 in reverse sorted order. The two rightmost “steps” of each curve show the number of  
567 the doubletons and singletons, representing groups with two and one members,  
568 respectively.




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)




(e)



(f)


571 Figure 2:  
572



573

574 Figure 3:

575



576

577

578