Small-Scale Variability in Bacterial Community Structure in Different Soil Types

Mylène Hugoni[1] · Naoise Nunan[2,3] · Jean Thioulouse[4] · Audrey Dubost[1] · Danis Abrouk[1] · Jean M.F. Martins[5] · Deborah Goffner[6] · Claire Prigent-Combaret[1] · Geneviève Grundmann[1]

Abstract

Microbial spatial distribution has mostly been studied at field to global scales (i.e., ecosystem scales). However, the spatial organization at small scales (i.e., centimeter to millimeter scales), which can help improve our understanding of the impacts of spatial communities structure on microbial functioning, has received comparatively little attention. Previous work has shown that small-scale spatial structure exists in soil microbial communities, but these studies have not compared soils from geographically distant locations, nor have they utilized community ecology approaches, such as the core and satellite hypothesis and/or abundance-occupancy relationships, often used in macro-ecology, to improve the description of the spatial organization of communities. In the present work, we focused on bacterial diversity (i.e., 16S rRNA gene sequencing) occurring in micro-samples from a variety of locations with different pedo-climatic histories (i.e., from semi-arid, alpine, and temperate climates) and physicochemical properties. The forms of ecological spatial relationships in bacterial communities (i.e., occupancy-frequency and abundance-occupancy) and taxa distributions (i.e., habitat generalists and specialists) were investigated. The results showed that bacterial composition differed in the four soils at the small scale. Moreover, one soil presented a satellite mode distribution, whereas the three others presented bimodal distributions. Interestingly, numerous core taxa were present in the four soils among which 8 OTUs were common to the four sites. These results confirm that analyses of the small-scale spatial distribution are necessary to understand consequent functional processes taking place in soils, affecting thus ecosystem functioning.

Keywords Bacterial diversity · Community structure · Soil · Spatial scale · Ecological strategies

✉ Mylène Hugoni
mylene.hugoni@univ-lyon1.fr

1 Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, INRAE, VetAgro Sup, UMR Ecologie Microbienne, INRA, UMR1418, 69220, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France

2 Institute of Ecology and Environmental Sciences – Paris, CNRS – Sorbonne Université, 4 place Jussieu, 75005 Paris, France

3 Department of Soil and Environment, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, 75007 Uppsala, Sweden

4 Université de Lyon, Université Lyon 1, CNRS, Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Evolutive UMR 5558, F-69622 Villeurbanne, France

5 Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, IRD, IGE UMR 5001, 38000 Grenoble, France

6 Unité Mixte Internationale CNRS 3189 « Environment, Health and Societies », Faculté de Médecine, 51 Bd Pierre Dramard, 13344 Marseille, France

Introduction

Microbial diversity is central to soil ecosystem functioning and the ecosystem services soils deliver, as microbial communities are involved in many biogeochemical processes, and their various interactions may affect these activities [1–3]. Despite this fundamental role, we still do not have a full understanding of the processes underpinning the emergence and maintenance of soil microbial diversity. Hubbell (2001) defined biodiversity as being synonymous with species richness and relative species abundance in space and time, where relative species abundance refers to the commonness or rarity of a species in relation to others, in a given community. The question of what makes a species common or rare has long been of empirical and theoretical interest in community ecology [4]. Despite a growing number of surveys interested in rare and core microbial communities, only a few recent studies have targeted bacterial spatial distributions, in a range of different ecosystems, such as water, guts, soil, or even the surface of

stones [5–9]. These studies have highlighted the fact that the "rare biosphere" is constituted of a myriad of species. The rare communities are of interest as they may be of functional significance. It has been shown that rare taxa are a resource pool for responding to environmental changes [10], maintaining species diversity [11], and promoting functional redundancy [12]. Other studies conducted on aquatic ecosystems at a global scale have shown the presence of a rich and diverse rare biosphere among Archaea and Bacteria [13, 14]. Hugoni et al. (2013) reported that the rare archaeal biosphere in the ocean should not solely be characterized as a seed bank of dormant cells; rather, it is a complex association of indigenous and itinerant cell types of different origins and with different fates that might contribute to microbial interaction networks and metabolic processes in the environment.

Although these have yielded a host of information at larger scales, microbial distribution patterns and their consequences for ecosystem functioning are far less documented at small scales [15–17], especially in soils. However, it is clear that cell-to-cell, cell-substrate, and cell-substratum interactions that all take place at small scales are likely to have significant effects on overall processes [18, 19]. Previous studies have attempted to study bacterial communities and soil properties at sub-millimeter scales, in different contexts as different soil aggregate size classes, aggregate surfaces vs interiors, various soil fractions, or different soil pore distributions [20–25]. These studies, using several methods such as fingerprinting [21], clone libraries [24], pyrosequencing [20, 22, 25], or particulate organic matter characterization (POM) [23], suggested that microaggregates represent micro-environments that select specific bacterial lineages [26]. In order to evaluate the regulatory role of such interactions, the problem of spatial patterns and scale needs to be addressed, and models derived from the community ecology of macro-organisms might give the tools to understand small-scale microbial biodiversity.

The analysis of how biodiversity is distributed across space has employed various spatial approaches in community ecology, based on habitat generalists and specialists [27, 28] and on the core-satellite hypothesis [29, 30]. Classifying species into habitat generalists and specialists is the first step toward examining the underlying biological and ecological factors leading to the differential distribution of species among habitats [31]. Habitat generalists are defined as broadly distributed microbial taxa, whereas specialists are rare taxa that can be locally abundant [28, 32]. The "core-satellite hypothesis" (or "Hanski's hypothesis") proposes that species fall into one of two categories: "core" species, which are widespread and locally abundant, and "satellite" species consisting mostly of rare species that are present in a limited number of sites and at low abundances [29, 30]. Core and satellite taxa are classically identified to predict communities' occupancy-frequency distributions (with occupancy defined as the percentage of samples in which a taxon is present and frequency defined

as the percentage of taxa found for each occupancy). This characterization of communities' ecology in terms of spatial distribution has often shown a bimodal distribution (i.e., most species are present in either most patches or only a small number of patches). In contrast, generalists and specialists refer to the ability of a taxon to tolerate a range of habitats by considering the spatial distribution of taxa. Previous work focusing on soil bacteria at the small scale showed that an occupancy-frequency relationship was detectable at this small scale, following Hanski's core-satellite hypothesis [8]. This work was done using microarray and 454 pyrosequencing data, using samples of a few milligrams taken along a 22-cm-long transect at 1-cm intervals. Here, we extend this study to include a range of soils and use Illumina sequencing in order to derive a more in-depth analysis of the distribution of individual taxa. We chose to include a number of soils with different abiotic properties because it is known that these properties influence the composition and distribution of microbial communities.

Other works have attempted to identify which environmental variables shape microbial diversity. Indeed, previous work reported relationships between microbial distributions and abiotic variables [33–35] and aimed to determine the main spatial community driver at a larger scale.

The objective of this study was to investigate in different soils, at the small scale (from 1-cm to 1-m intervals and about 100 to 500 mg weight) whether (1) soil bacterial communities exhibit spatial structures and, if so, whether (2) these structures varied among soils from different environments. We used Hanski's hypothesis (the core and satellite hypothesis) to structure the analysis. The four soils that were used in the study were from four pedo-climatic situations and from three different regions: two Alpine polygonal soils (one from the centers and the other from the sides of polygons), a soil from the Rhône area, and a Sahel soil. Bacterial diversity analyses, evaluated using a 16S rRNA gene metabarcoding approach, were carried out. Community ecology approaches were used to assess the spatial structures using occupancy-frequency distribution patterns (i.e., core or satellite mode distributions) and abundance-occupancy relationships (abundance being calculated as the average percent presence of a taxon in samples). An in-depth analysis of bacterial OTU spatial distribution patterns was conducted by studying core taxa (defined as OTUs present in 100% of the micro-samples for a considered soil) and satellite taxa (defined as present in only 1 micro-sample for a considered soil, these satellite taxa were therefore spatially rare taxa). Moreover, in order to gain a better understanding of the ecological strategies employed by the taxa with regard to their habitat, we classified them according to their distribution across micro-samples (generalist taxa defined as broadly distributed bacterial taxa and specialists taxa were satellite taxa with more than 0.1% of sequences per micro-sample).

Materials and Methods

Soil Sampling

Soils were sampled in regions presenting four pedo-climatic combinations in three geographic locations: La Vanoise (Van), a loamy polygonal soil under alpine climate, sampled in the center of polygons (Van_PC) and from the sides of polygons (Van_PS) (polygons being typical structures retrieved in soil that experience freezing and thawing alternately); La Dombes (LD), a silty loam soil under temperate climate; and Grande Muraille Verte (GMV), a sandy soil in a semi-arid climate.

Thirty nine micro-samples were collected at La Vanoise (col de la Laysse, La Vanoise, France, 2200 m altitude, N 45° 27′ 19.56″, L 6° 51′ 54.12″), characterized by an average temperature in the summer of 5.3 °C and an annual rainfall of 637 mm. Seventeen micro-samples were collected in Van_PC, and 22 micro-samples were collected in Van_PS in September 2013 and September 2014 to take into account the soil convection movements typical of this type of soil with polygons (Supplementary Table 1 [36]). Twenty-two LD soil micro-samples were collected in an undisturbed agricultural soil in September 2013 (Saint André de Corcy, Ain, France, 45° 51′ 04.7″ N 4° 57′ 30.5″) characterized by an average annual min-max temperatures of 8.1–16.9 °C and annual rain of 832 mm. Finally, twenty soil micro-samples were collected in September 2014 in a Savanna soil (Widou, Grande Muraille Verte, Senegal, 15° 58.549′ N 15°17.221′ W″). Maximum and minimum temperatures are 36.9 °C and 20.5 °C, respectively, and the annual rainfall is 300 mm.

The sampling procedure for the Van_PC, Van_PS, and LD soils proceeded as follows: soil cores, 1-cm diameter and 2-cm depth, were taken with a corer along a longitudinal transect, with 1-cm to 10-m lags and 0.2- to 10-m long (Supplementary Table 2). The top 1 mm of the cores (sample depth named *a*) and a 1-mm thick slice underneath (sample depth named *b*) were cut with a scalpel blade. The soil water content allowed the sample to remain intact. Samples were freeze-dried and stored at − 80 °C for DNA extraction. Two-centimeter depth core was an intermediary size to sample in the field and to bring it back to the lab and subsample the final sample (i.e., the micro-sample) with spatial coordinate. Slice *a* was analyzed systematically, and slice *b* was taken in case there was a need to verify data.

In La Vanoise, micro-samples were collected along two 10-m transects with lags from 1 cm to 1 m, to ensure that the sampling covered several polygons, from the centers (Van_PC, yellow colored) and sides of polygons (Van_PS, brown colored), respectively (Supplementary Table 2). Micro-sample weights were 119 mg on average (from 70 to 288 mg) for Van_PS and 129 mg on average (from 120 to 150 mg) for Van_PC.

In LD, the micro-samples were collected along a 2-m transect with 1-cm lags, from an area at the edge of a maize field that had not been ploughed for at least 10 years. Micro-sample weights were 100 mg on average (77 to 144 mg).

For the GMV soil, the sampling procedure of 1-m lags along to a 20-m transect is needed to be adapted as it is a sandy soil, and we could not proceed with cores. As the soil was very sandy, 10 g of soil were sampled every meter at 20 spots in the field and then subsampled in the laboratory (250 to 500 mg), lyophilized, and stored at − 80 °C for DNA extraction.

Soil physicochemical characteristics (texture, pH, organic carbon, organic matter, C/N, assimilable P, K, Ca, Mg) were measured by CESAR (Centre Scientifique Agricole Regional, Ceyzeriat, France, http://www.labo-cesar.com) on pooled micro-samples from Van_PC, Van_PS, GMV, and LD to get average characteristics of the site (Supplementary Table 1) using standard methods that followed the AFNOR French standard (AFNOR, 2004).

DNA Extraction

DNA extraction from micro-samples was performed following Michelland et al. (2016). Briefly, soil micro-samples were suspended (1 g mL^{-1}) in PBS (pH = 8) and centrifuged at 5700 g for 1 min. The pellet was suspended in a 1-mL washing solution (50 mmol L^{-1} Tris-HCl pH = 7.7, 25 mmol L^{-1} EDTA, 0.1 % SDS, 0.1 % PVP, H$_2$O) and centrifuged at 5700 g for 1 min. The pellet was then suspended in a 35-μL lysis solution (50 mmol L^{-1} Tris-HCl, pH = 8, 25 mmol L^{-1} EDTA, 3% SDS, 1.2% PVP) and microwaved at 600–700 W for 45 s (Orsini and Romano-Spica, 2001). Four hundred microliters of extraction solution (10 mmol L^{-1} Tris HCl, pH = 8, 1 mmol L^{-1} EDTA, 0.3 mol L^{-1} sodium acetate, 1.2% PVP), pre-heated (75 °C), were then added before extraction with one volume phenol-chloroform-isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1) and centrifuged for 10 min at 13,000 rpm. One volume of chloroform was then added, the solution centrifuged for 5 min at 13,000 rpm, and the aqueous phase was retained. Ten percent of the total volume of sodium acetate 3 M (pH 5) and 2 volumes of cold absolute ethanol were added, and after cooling on ice for 20 min, the micro-samples were centrifuged for 30 min at 13,000 rpm and 4 °C. The supernatant was then discarded, and the DNA pellets were washed with EtOH 70% and resuspended in 20 μL water.

Illumina Sequencing and Sequence Processing

Amplification of the bacterial V4 region of the 16S rRNA genes was performed using the universal primers 515F/806R. High-throughput sequencing was carried out after a multiplexing step using a MiSeq 2 × 300bp PE technology (MR DNA lab, www.mrdnalab.com, Shallowater, TX, USA).

According to the MR DNA analysis pipeline (MR DNA, Shallowater, TX, USA), paired-end sequences were merged, and denoising procedures that consisted in discarding reads containing ambiguous bases (N) or reads that were outside the range of expected length (i.e., < 150 bp) were carried out using Uchime [37]. The remaining sequences were clustered at a 97% similarity threshold [38] with Usearch [39]. Chimeras were detected using Uchime [37] and removed from the dataset. Final OTUs were taxonomically affiliated using BLASTn against a cured database derived from Greengenes, RDPII, and NCBI (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov, http://rdp.cme.msu.edu) [40].

Singletons were removed from the dataset. In order to compare micro-samples and to retain the largest possible number of micro-samples, a random resampling normalization step at a depth of 5474 sequences per sample was carried out. It should be noted that this procedure resulted in the exclusion of 1 sample from the Van_PC and 3 samples from the GMV soils as they did not contain 5474 sequences (Table 1).

The sequencing data of the LD soil have been published in Michelland et al. (2016), and the dataset is available under the accession number PRJEB14534 in the SRA database. Data for other soils have been deposited under the following accession number ERP016178 at EBI.

Statistical Analyses

The soil parameters (Supplementary Table 1, parameters in column) were analyzed by a standardized PCA. Standardization was needed because of the differences in parameter units. The data table was transformed into row percentages (row sums = 1) before doing the PCA, to reduce the impact of the high sequence count variability among OTUs in the soil micro-samples.

The table of diversity data (OTUs in columns) was analyzed by a PCoA on the Jaccard distance matrix.

Computations were performed with the ade4 package [41] for the R Statistical Software [42].

Results

Physico-chemical Characteristics and Bacterial Diversity

Rarefaction curves indicated that the sequencing effort was sufficient to describe bacterial diversity in Van_PC and GMV soils while in Van_PS and LD, some samples do not appear to have reached an asymptote (Supplementary Figure 1). Moreover, it showed that bacterial richness in the Van_PC micro-samples was more variable than in the other soils (Supplementary Figure 1). There were 418 OTUs common

Table 1 Sequence analyses for Van_PC, Van_PS, LD, and GMV soils: sample number, raw sequence number, and normalization threshold.

	Number of samples	Raw sequence number	Normalization threshold (sequence number)	Number of samples after resampling		OTUs number	Sequences number (%)	Frequency (%)	Average OTUs abundance (%)	Specific core OTUs among core (%)	Specific satellite OTUs among satellite (%)	Core OTUs among common taxa (%)	Satellite OTUs among common taxa (%)	Specialist *** OTU number
Van_PC	17	49643	5474	16	Core*	11	21.72	1.00	1.9744	0		2.39		53
					Satellite**	403	2.97	36.80	0.0074		20.26		11.24	
					Total	1095								
Van_PS	22	1511664	5474	22	Core	105	80.96	7.65	0.7710	9.22		24.16		2
					Satellite	348	0.36	25.34	0.0010		17.62		3.83	
					Total	1373								
GMV	20	442119	5474	17	Core	86	78.80	9.11	0.9163	9.52		15.55		9
					Satellite	266	0.54	28.18	0.0020		13.98		18.90	
					Total	944								
LD	22	1412301	5474	22	Core	155	82.78	12.86	0.5341	23.24		28.71		1
					Satellite	271	0.27	22.49	0.0010		14.44		8.37	
					Total	1205								

*Core defined as OTUs present in 100% of micro-samples

**Satellite defined as present in only 1 micro-sample

***Specialist defined as satellite OTUs presenting > 0.1% of sequences

Detailed analyses of core and satellite taxa: OTUs number, sequences percentage, frequency, average abundance. Detailed analyses of ecological strategies: specific core OTUs percentage, percentage of core OTUs found in common taxa, and number of specialist OTUs

to the four soils, equivalent to 16.54% of the total richness (Fig. 1a).

The PCA ordination, based on the physical and chemical properties of the soils (texture, pH, organic carbon, organic matter, C/N, assimilable P, K, Ca, Mg; Supplementary Table 1), is shown in Fig. 2a. The percentage variability explained by axes 1 and 2 was 59% and 27%, respectively. There was a clear separation among the soils, the LD soil being related to coarse silt (Csi), K, and assimilable P; the GMV soil related to coarse sand; the Van_PC soil to high C/N ratios; and the Van_PS soil to clay and total nitrogen. Both La Vanoise soils (i.e., Van_PC and Van_PS soils) were associated with high fine silt, OM, Mg, and Ca contents. The pH of the La Vanoise soils was close to or above 8 (Supplementary Table **1**).

The PCoA ordination graph of bacterial diversity data is shown in Fig. 2b. The first two axes account for 11% and 9% of the total variability. This analysis highlighted that GMV and LD soils exhibited lower intra-diversity compared to Van_PC and Van_PS soils. On the first axis, GMV and LD soils were distinguished from the Van_PC and Van_PS soils, while on the second axis, GMV and LD soils were distinguished.

Abundance-Occupancy and Occupancy-Frequency Relationships

The abundance-occupancy diagrams for each soil showed a positive relationship between the OTU average relative abundances in micro-samples and the proportion of micro-samples in which they were found (Fig. 3). The patterns in the occupancy-frequency diagrams were different however (Fig. 4). The distribution in Van_PC was unimodal with a satellite mode (a large proportion of taxa occupied only one micro-sample), as highlighted by the ratio of OTUs number$_{core}$ over OTUs number$_{satellite}$ equal to 0.027. Van_PS, GMV and LD presented bimodal distributions with number$_{core\ OTUs}$: number$_{satellite\ OTUs}$ ratios of 0.301, 0.323 and 0.571, respectively. Interestingly, compared to Van_PC, Van_PS, and

GMV, a smaller proportion of the taxa that were limited to a small number of micro-samples associated with a larger proportion of taxa and were present in all micro-samples is characteristic of the LD soil (i.e., ratio of OTUs number$_{core}$ over OTUs number$_{satellite}$ of 0.571). Van_PS, GMV, and LD core taxa number are always important, 105, 86, and 155, respectively, but they were less numerous than the satellite taxa. The average abundances (i.e., % of sequences) of satellite OTUs in micro-samples were higher in Van_PC soil than in Van_PS, GMV, and LD soils (Table 1), whereas the average abundances of core OTUs in Van_PC soil (i.e., 21.72%) were much lower compared to other soils (80.96%, 78.80%, and 82.78% for Van_PS, GMV, and LD soils, respectively; Table 1). Core OTUs in Van_PC soil exhibited the lowest frequency compared to the other soils (7.65, 9.11, and 12.86% for Van_PS, GMV, and LD soils, respectively; Table 1), while satellite OTUs' frequency in Van_PC soil was the highest (i.e., 36.80%) compared to the other soils (25.34, 28.18, and 22.49% for Van_PS, GMV, and LD soils, respectively; Table 1).

The PCoA ordination based on OTU patterns, which explained 11 and 9% of total variability on the first and second axes, respectively, separated soils with positive coordinates for LD and Van_PS soils and negative coordinates for GMV and Van_PC. Moreover, on the second axis (Fig. 2b), it separated LD and GMV. Moreover, the PCoA ordination based on OTU patterns separated the four soils as the PCA ordination of the physico-chemical properties did (Fig. 2). Thus, the spatial distribution type, which separates Van_PC (satellite mode) from Van_PS, GMV, and LD (bimodal), presents a typology that is different from the typology of soil physico-chemical characteristics and to the typology based on diversity. The first axis of soil PCA (which explains 59% total variability, Fig. 2a) separates GMV and LD soils from Van_PS and Van_PC. This corresponds to the opposition between semi-arid sandy soil of GMV and organic matter rich soils from La Vanoise, while LD is "positioned" by coarse silt. The second axis (27% explained variability) separates LD and Van_PS from Van_PC and GMV. The community spatial

Fig. 1 Venn diagrams presenting the shared and specific OTUs **a** detected in the four soils, **b** among core OTUs, and **c** among satellite OTUs

Fig. 2 PCA map of soils characteristics (**a**) and PCoA map of bacterial diversity (**b**) for LD, GMV, Van_PC, and Van_PS soils. On (**a**), arrows correspond to the four soil samples and labels to the soil physico-chemical parameters. On (**b**), the position of ellipse centers are given by the means of the coordinates of micro-samples on the two axes of the

factor map for each soil sample origins (LD, GMV, Van_PC, and Van_PS). The width and height of ellipses are given by the variance of the coordinates of the micro-samples on the two axes, and the ellipse slope is equal to their covariance

distribution type may thus be driven by a combination of factors different from the ones driving diversity, thus bringing more information about the soil function.

Composition of Core and Satellite Bacterial Communities

Taxonomic investigations, at the phylum_class level (representing > 2% of sequence abundance) on satellite and core OTUs, revealed that some classes, such as Actinobacteria, Alphaproteobacteria, and Betaproteobacteria, were ubiquitous (Fig. 5). Actinobacteria were more abundant among GMV and LD core OTUs than among satellite OTUs, and Deltaproteobacteria were less abundant among core taxa in GMV and LD than among satellite taxa. Globally, Bacilli and Clostridia represented, on average, 10.2 and 0.7% of all sequences, respectively, in the satellite taxa of the four soils, but only 4.1 and 2.8 %, on average in the core taxa (to be noted that Bacilli were enriched in GMV core OTUs representing 13.9% of sequences).

Core and satellite taxa in bacterial families that accounted for > 2% of the sequences were also analyzed (Table 2). Among those 52 families, 28 were specific to core taxa, while 14 families were specific of satellite taxa (Table 2). The core specific families represented 65.9, 43.3, 44.3, and 33.4% of core taxa sequences in Van_PC, Van_PS, GMV, and LD, respectively, while the satellite-specific families represented

40.2, 14.2, 19.3, and 7.5% of satellite taxa sequences in Van_PC, Van_PS, GMV, and LD, respectively.

Among the core taxa of the four soils (357 OTUs in total), only 2.2% (i.e., 8 OTUs) were common to all of them (Fig. 1b): *Acidimicrobiales* spp. (affiliated with Actinobacteria), *Azospira* spp. (affiliated with Betaproteobacteria, Rhodocyclales order), *Flexibacter* spp. (affiliated with Bacteroidetes, Cytophagales order), *Gemmatimonas* spp. (affiliated with Gemmatimonadetes), *Nitrosococcus* spp. (affiliated with Gammaproteobacteria, Chromatiales order), *Rubrobacter* spp. (affiliated with Actinobacteria, Rubrobacterales order), *Sphaerobacter thermophilus* (affiliated with Chloroflexi, Sphaerobacterales order), and *Sphingomonas* spp. (affiliated with Alphaproteobacteria, Sphingomonadales order). Moreover, Van_PS, GMV, and LD soils had 9.2%, 9.5%, and 23.2% specific core taxa, respectively, whereas Van_PC presented no specific core taxa (Table 1, Fig. 1b). Relatively to common taxa retrieved in the four soils (i.e., 418 OTUs, Fig. 1a), core OTUs in Van_PC which is satellite mode, represented 2.4% of OTUs, and in bimodal soils, Van_PS , GMV, and LD soil, it represented 24.1, 15.6, and 28.7% of OTUs, respectively (Table 1).

In the same way, among the 1288 OTUs constituting the satellite taxa retrieved in the four soils (Fig. 1c), only 2 OTUs were common to the four soils (i.e., 0.16% of OTUs): *Ancalomicrobium adetum* (affiliated with Alphaproteobacteria, Rhizobiales order) and *Nonomuraea terrinata*

Fig. 3 Relationship between relative abundance (average percentage taxa presence in micro-samples) and occupancy (percentage of micro-samples in which each taxa is present) in Van_PC, Van_PS, LD, and GMV soils

(affiliated with Actinobacteria, Actinomycetales order). Moreover, Van_PC, Van_PS, GMV, and LD soils had 20.3%, 17.6, 13.9, and 14.4% specific satellite taxa, respectively (Table 1, Fig. 1c). Relatively to common taxa retrieved in the four soils (i.e., 418 OTUs, Fig. 1a), satellite OTUs in Van_PC, Van_PS, GMV, and LD represented 11.2, 3.8, 18.9, and 8.4% of OTUs, respectively (Table 1).

Bacterial Ecological Strategy at the Small-Scale: Habitat Generalists and Specialists

Concerning generalists, among core taxa retrieved in the four studied soils (i.e., 229 OTUs), 34.7% were common to at least two soils, 20.2% common to at least 3 soils, and only 3.5% common to the four soils (Fig. 1b).

Fifty-three specialist OTUs were found in Van_PC, representing 4.8% of the total richness in Van_PC (Table 1). To be noted that in Van_PC, 45.3% of specialist taxa belonged to Proteobacteria and 15.1% belonged to Actinobacteria. In GMV, 9 OTUs were considered specialist, while there were 2 in Van_PS and only 1 in LD (Table 1). Interestingly, specialist OTUs in LD and GMV are specific to

these soils, while one specialist OTU was common to Van_PC and Van_PS soils.

Discussion

We use a community ecology approach, drawn from the study of macro-organisms that was used to investigate bacterial community spatial distributions at the micro-scale across four different soils. The micro-sampling (few hundred milligrams: from 100 to 500 mg) was carried out on undisturbed soil so as to take the spatial distribution of taxa in the micro-samples into account (within and between micro-samples). The analysis of bacterial diversity data combined with soil micro-sampling suggested that bacteria can be classified in each soil as core or satellite taxa, depending on their distribution at the small scale.

Spatial Distribution Patterns

The separation of the soils on the two PCA and PCoA ordinations suggests that satellite mode distribution, retrieved in

Fig. 4 Occupancy-frequency relationship for Van_PC, Van_PS, LD, and GMV soils. Frequency is expressed as the percent taxa found for each possible occupancy

Van_PC, is related to coarse sand, high C/N, and pH. Unfortunately, we could not directly correlate bacterial taxa with environmental variables as micro-samples were too small to perform physico-chemical analyses. To date, quantifying environmental variables in micro-samples remains a big technical issue which needed to be resolved in further decades to gain insight into relationships between microbial communities and fine soil physico-chemical properties. Moreover, other complementary variables could be drivers of community spatial structure such as bulk density, soil structural heterogeneity, pore size distributions, and connectivity and organic features (i.e., root architecture or soil invertebrate activity).

While the existence of a rare microbial biosphere, across different ecosystems, is now accepted [43, 44], there is no widely accepted definition of rare taxa in the literature. Indeed, arbitrary relative abundance cut-offs, depending on the study, range from 0.1% to 0.01% [45]. In the present work, conducted at the small scale, we used a spatial definition of rare taxa based on micro-sample occupancy, where taxa found in only one micro-sample were considered spatially rare, or satellite taxa [32]. This corresponds to an average relative abundance of 0.027% of the total sequences, when including all micro-samples in this study. Compared to the definition of Lynch and Neufeld (2015), our percentage of rare taxa identified is quite conservative. Because rare taxa are substantial contributors to bacterial community ecology [43, 45], their spatial distribution may be an important factor impacting ecological processes and thus soil functioning. Studies focusing on spatial ecology of soil bacteria [46] concluded that the relative importance of the underlying processes contributing to the establishment of bacterial distributions can change with soil characteristics. More generally, Lindh et al. (2017) suggested that analyses of occupancy-frequency patterns can be a highly valuable approach allowing the definition of microbial biomes across environmental gradients [7].

Although a positive small-scale abundance-occupancy relationship has already been identified in the LD soil [8], this study confirmed this relationship and extended it to three other soils, suggesting a certain prevalence of the relationship in soil microbial communities. This is hardly surprising as it is one of the most fundamental patterns in ecology [2]. Moreover, the bacterial community spatial distributions also conformed to Hanski's core and satellite hypothesis [29]. However, the present work was conducted in four soils for which samples

Fig. 5 Distribution of bacterial classes representing more than 2% of total taxa in core and satellite taxa, in Van_PC, Van_PS, LD, and GMV soils

Table 2 Distribution of bacterial families representing more than 2% of sequences in at least one of the condition (core or satellite of each site)

Phylum	Class	Order	Family	Core Van_PC	Core Van_PS	Core GMV	Core LD	Sat Van_PC	Sat Van_PS	Sat GMV	Sat LD
Acidobacteria	Acidobacteria	Candidatus Chloracidobacterium Candidatus Solibacter	Candidatus Chloracidobacterium Candidatus Solibacter	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Acidobacteria	Acidobacteria	Candidatus Solibacter	Candidatus Solibacter	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Acidobacteria	Acidobacteriia	Acidobacteriales	Acidobacteriaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Acidimicrobiales	Acidimicrobiales	3.3	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Actinomycetales	Acidothermaceae	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Actinomycetales	Actinomycetaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Actinomycetales	Dietziaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Actinomycetales	Frankiaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Actinomycetales	Micrococcaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Actinomycetales	Micromonosporaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Rubrobacterales	Rubrobacteraceae	19.4	4.4	7.9	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Solirubrobacterales	Solirubrobacteraceae	0.0	3.5	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Solirubrobacterales	Conexibacteraceae	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actinobacteria	Actinobacteria	Solirubrobacterales	Patulibacteraceae	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cyanobacteria	Cyanophyceae	Chroococcales	Chroococcales	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0
Bacteroidetes	Cytophagia	Cytophagales	Cytophagaceae	19.1	7.6	2.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	1.8	0.0
Bacteroidetes	Sphingobacteria	Sphingobacteriales	Sphingobacteriaceae	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bacteroidetes	Sphingobacteriia	Sphingobacteriales	Sphingobacteriales	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chloroflexi	Thermomicrobia	Sphaerobacterales	Sphaerobacteraceae	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chloroflexi	Chloroflexia	Chloroflexales	Roseiflexaceae	0.0	0.0	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chloroflexi	Thermomicrobia	Thermomicrobiales	Thermomicrobiaceae	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Firmicutes	Bacilli	Bacillales	Bacillaceae	0.0	0.0	8.1	0.0	6.9	3.5	0.0	0.0
Firmicutes	Bacilli	Bacillales	Paenibacillaceae	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.4
Firmicutes	Bacilli	Turicibacterales	Turicibacteraceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Clostridiaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Lachnospiraceae	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Thermoanaerobacterales	Thermoanaerobacteraceae	0.0	0.0	3.6	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Firmicutes	Clostridia	Clostridiales	Eubacteriaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.7	0.0
Firmicutes	Erysipelotrichia	Erysipelotrichales	Erysipelotrichaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gemmatimonadetes	Gemmatimonadetes	Gemmatimonadales	Gemmatimonadaceae	4.5	0.0	2.1	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Planctomycetes	Planctomycea	Gemmatales	Isosphaeraceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Planctomycetes	Planctomycetia	Planctomycetales	Planctomycetaceae	0.0	7.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Caulobacterales	Caulobacteraceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Rhizobiales	Hyphomicrobiaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0

Table 2 (continued)

Phylum	Class	Order	Family	Core Van_PC	Core Van_PS	Core GMV	Core LD	Sat Van_PC	Sat Van_PS	Sat GMV	Sat LD
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Sphingomonadales	Sphingomonadaceae	*6.3*	*6.8*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Rhizobiales	Hyphomicrobiaceae	0.0	*2.3*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Rhodobacterales	Rhodobacteraceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*1.9*	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Rhodospirillales	Acetobacteraceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	*4.4*	0.0	0.0	*1.8*	0.0
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Rhodospirillales	Rhodospirillaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*2.3*	*3.0*	0.0
Proteobacteria	Alphaproteobacteria	Sphingomonadales	Sphingomonadaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	*6.6*	0.0	0.0	*4.3*	0.0
Proteobacteria	Betaproteobacteria	Burkholderiales	Alcaligenaceae	0.0	*2.7*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Betaproteobacteria	Burkholderiales	Burkholderiaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	*2.6*	*7.3*	0.0	*1.8*	0.0
Proteobacteria	Betaproteobacteria	Burkholderiales	Comamonadaceae	0.0	0.0	*2.3*	0.0	0.0	*2.8*	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Betaproteobacteria	Rhodocyclales	Rhodocyclaceae	*15.0*	*4.5*	*4.2*	0.0	0.0	0.0	*2.4*	0.0
Proteobacteria	Deltaproteobacteria	Desulfobacterales	Desulfobulbaceae	0.0	*2.2*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Gammaproteobacteria	Chromatiales	Chromatiaceae	*12.1*	*4.3*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Gammaproteobacteria	Enterobacteriales	Enterobacteriaceae	*10.1*	*5.5*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proteobacteria	Gammaproteobacteria	Pseudomonadales	Pseudomonadaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*3.3*	0.0	*3.4*
Proteobacteria	Gammaproteobacteria	Xanthomonadales	Xanthomonadaceae	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*2.3*	*2.1*	*7.3*	0.0
Spam (candidate division)	Spam (candidate division)	Spam (candidate division)	Spam (candidate division)	0.0	*2.0*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verrucomicrobia	Spartobacteria	Chthoniobacterales	Xiphinematobacteraceae	0.0	*2.5*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verrucomicrobia	Spartobacteria	Spartobacteria	Spartobacteria	0.0	*2.0*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The ten most abundant families per conditions italicized

differed a bit in the size and/or mass collected as there was a loamy, a silty loam, and a sandy soil that do not allow the strictly same sampling procedure. Soil heterogeneity and, thus, the requirement for different experimental procedures may have an impact on the results.

Gleason (1929) showed that quadrats of the most serviceable size should be chosen to measure frequency distributions of plants and that the information is obscured or lost if the quadrats are either too large or too small [47]. The fact that different ecological strategies were identifiable here suggests that the sample size used was appropriate for the study of bacterial spatial distributions in soils [16]. Compared to other studies, the present work showed the relevance of the small-scale approach in spite of the very low organism's size to sample size ratio [48]. Previous studies investigating the type of occupancy-frequency patterns have suggested that unimodal distributions that are characterized by an excess of rare, endemic species occur more frequently than bimodal distributions [49, 50]. Even when bimodal distributions are detected, the magnitude of the core mode, representing cosmopolitan species, is generally smaller than that of the rare species [50]. The three bimodal distributions that we observed indicate that it may be a common community spatial distribution of soil bacteria at the small scale. This suggested that OTUs are either adapted to the majority of micro-habitats in this soil or that these OTUs have high dispersal capabilities favoring the colonization of empty ecological niches. Indeed, core species are believed to owe their regional commonness to the rescue effect (i.e., reduction in local extinction probability [51]), while satellite species are maintained by the habitat heterogeneity [52]. Cadotte and Lovett-Douste (2007) suggested that via the rescue effect, widespread and abundant species should have reduced risk of local extinction. In their work conducted on trees, different community spatial structures were observed [53]. Indeed, trees in degraded environments showed a satellite mode distribution, contrary to the other studied environments. In the Van_PC soil, the satellite mode distribution might represent a functional mode (i.e., corresponding to a stressful state) as in Cadotte and Lovett-Douste (2007).

Bacterial Ecological Strategies

For some authors, identifying core taxa is the first step in defining a "healthy" community and predicting community responses to perturbation [54]. Interestingly, it has been suggested that due to the great microbial diversity among ecosystems, the possibility of any species being present at high abundance in a large range of samples is low, and it is possible that the focus should instead be on higher taxonomic levels or on functional genes [55]. The results presented here are in accordance with this theory as only a few core OTUs are common to the four soils. However, when considering the commonness

in only two or three soils, their richness increases, suggesting a patchy distribution rather than a ubiquitous one.

Conclusions

There is an increasing recognition that interactions within bacterial communities can have an impact on community functioning [56, 57]. In this contribution, we have shown that the types of small-scale distributions of bacterial communities vary across soils with different physico-chemical features. This suggests that the type and range of interactions that might be expected to occur within microbial communities are likely to vary depending on the pedo-climatic context. We have shown that one soil presented a satellite mode, and the three others presented bimodal distributions. We also identify among bacterial richness retrieved in those four soils microsamples that up to 13% can be classified as core taxa that could be responsible for the stability of soil bacterial communities. Thus, the consideration of microbial spatial distribution that could play a major ecological role should further improve predictions and modelling on diversity modification risks on soil bio-conservation and epidemiology.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Delgado-Baquerizo M, Maestre FT, Reich PB, Jeffries TC, Gaitan JJ, Encinar D, Berdugo M, Campbell CD, Singh BK (2016) Microbial diversity drives multifunctionality in terrestrial ecosystems. Nat Commun 7:10541. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10541

2. Gaston KJ, Blackburn TM, Greenwood JJD, Gregory RD, Quinn RM, Lawton JH (2000) Abundance–occupancy relationships. J Appl Ecol 37:39–59. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2000.00485.x

3. Graham EB, Knelman JE, Schindlbacher A, Siciliano S, Breulmann M, Yannarell A, Beman JM, Abell G, Philippot L, Prosser J, Foulquier A, Yuste JC, Glanville HC, Jones DL, Angel R, Salminen J, Newton RJ, Bürgmann H, Ingram LJ, Hamer U,

Siljanen HMP, Peltoniemi K, Potthast K, Bañeras L, Hartmann M, Banerjee S, Yu RQ, Nogaro G, Richter A, Koranda M, Castle SC, Goberna M, Song B, Chatterjee A, Nunes OC, Lopes AR, Cao Y, Kaisermann A, Hallin S, Strickland MS, Garcia-Pausas J, Barba J, Kang H, Isobe K, Papaspyrou S, Pastorelli R, Lagomarsino A, Lindström ES, Basiliko N, Nemergut DR (2016) Microbes as engines of ecosystem function: when does community structure enhance predictions of ecosystem processes? Front Microbiol 7:214. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.00214

4. Hubbell SP (2001) The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography (MPB-32). Princet Univ Press, Princeton

5. Cariveau DP, Elijah Powell J, Koch H, Winfree R, Moran NA (2014) Variation in gut microbial communities and its association with pathogen infection in wild bumble bees (Bombus). ISME J 8:2369–2379. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2014.68

6. Hugoni M, Escalas A, Bernard C, Nicolas S, Jézéquel D, Vazzoler F, Sarazin G, Leboulanger C, Bouvy M, Got P, Ader M, Troussellier M, Agogué H (2018) Spatiotemporal variations in microbial diversity across the three domains of life in a tropical thalassohaline lake (Dziani Dzaha, Mayotte Island). Mol Ecol 27:4775–4786

7. Lindh MV, Sjöstedt J, Ekstam B, Casini M, Lundin D, Hugerth LW, Hu YOO, Andersson AF, Andersson A, Legrand C, Pinhassi J (2017) Metapopulation theory identifies biogeographical patterns among core and satellite marine bacteria scaling from tens to thousands of kilometers. Environ Microbiol 19:1222–1236. https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.13650

8. Michelland R, Thioulouse J, Kyselková M, Grundmann GL (2016) Bacterial community structure at the microscale in two different soils. Microb Ecol 72:717–724. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-016-0810-0

9. Cutler NA, Chaput DL, Oliver AE, Viles HA (2015) The spatial organization and microbial community structure of an epilithic biofilm. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 91:fiu027. https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiu027

10. Jones SE, Lennon JT (2010) Dormancy contributes to the maintenance of microbial diversity. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 107:5881–5886. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0912765107

11. Dohrmann AB, Küting M, Jünemann S, Jaenicke S, Schlüter A, Tebbe CC (2013) Importance of rare taxa for bacterial diversity in the rhizosphere of Bt- and conventional maize varieties. ISME J 7:37–49. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2012.77

12. Louca S, Polz MF, Mazel F, Albright MBN, Huber JA, O'Connor MI, Ackermann M, Hahn AS, Srivastava DS, Crowe SA, Doebeli M, Parfrey LW (2018) Function and functional redundancy in microbial systems. Nat Ecol Evol 2:936–943. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0519-1

13. Galand PE, Casamayor EO, Kirchman DL, Lovejoy C (2009) Ecology of the rare microbial biosphere of the Arctic Ocean. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 106:22427–22432. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0908284106

14. Hugoni M, Taib N, Debroas D, Domaizon I, Jouan Dufournel I, Bronner G, Salter I, Agogue H, Mary I, Galand PE (2013) Structure of the rare archaeal biosphere and seasonal dynamics of active ecotypes in surface coastal waters. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110:6004–6009. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1216863110

15. Franklin RB, Mills AL (2003) Multi-scale variation in spatial heterogeneity for microbial community structure in an eastern Virginia agricultural field. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 44:335–346. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-6496(03)00074-6

16. Grundmann GL (2004) Spatial scales of soil bacterial diversity–the size of a clone. FEMS Microbiol Ecol 48:119–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsec.2004.01.010

17. Morris SJ, Boerner REJ (1999) Spatial distribution of fungal and bacterial biomass in southern Ohio hardwood forest soils: scale dependency and landscape patterns. Soil Biol Biochem 31:887–902. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(99)00002-4

18. Wilpiszeski RL, Aufrecht JA, Retterer ST, Sullivan MB, Graham DE, Pierce EM, Zablocki OD, Palumbo AV, Elias DA (2019) Soil aggregate microbial communities: towards understanding microbiome interactions at biologically relevant scales. Appl Environ Microbiol 85:e00324. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00324-19

19. Nunan N, Schmidt H, Raynaud X (2020) The ecology of heterogeneity: soil bacterial communities and C dynamics. Philos Trans R Soc Lond Ser B Biol Sci 375:20190249. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0249

20. Bailey VL, McCue LA, Fansler SJ et al (2013) Micrometer-scale physical structure and microbial composition of soil macroaggregates. Soil Biol Biochem 65:60–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.02.005

21. Blaud A, Chevallier T, Virto I, Pablo AL, Chenu C, Brauman A (2014) Bacterial community structure in soil microaggregates and on particulate organic matter fractions located outside or inside soil macroaggregates. Pedobiologia 57:191–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedobi.2014.03.005

22. Davinic M, Fultz LM, Acosta-Martinez V, Calderón FJ, Cox SB, Dowd SE, Allen VG, Zak JC, Moore-Kucera J (2012) Pyrosequencing and mid-infrared spectroscopy reveal distinct aggregate stratification of soil bacterial communities and organic matter composition. Soil Biol Biochem 46:63–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.11.012

23. Kravchenko AN, Negassa W, Guber AK, Schmidt S (2014) New approach to measure soil particulate organic matter in intact samples using X-ray computed microtomography. Soil Sci Soc Am J 78:1177–1185. https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2014.01.0039

24. Mummey D, Holben W, Six J, Stahl P (2006) Spatial stratification of soil bacterial populations in aggregates of diverse soils. Microb Ecol 51:404–411. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-006-9020-5

25. Negassa WC, Guber AK, Kravchenko AN, Marsh TL, Hildebrandt B, Rivers ML (2015) Properties of soil pore space regulate pathways of plant residue decomposition and community structure of associated bacteria. PLoS One 10:e0123999. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0123999

26. Rillig MC, Muller LA, Lehmann A (2017) Soil aggregates as massively concurrent evolutionary incubators. ISME J 11:1943–1948. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2017.56

27. Barberán A, Bates ST, Casamayor EO, Fierer N (2012) Using network analysis to explore co-occurrence patterns in soil microbial communities. ISME J 6:343–351. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2011.119

28. Pandit SN, Kolasa J, Cottenie K (2009) Contrasts between habitat generalists and specialists: an empirical extension to the basic metacommunity framework. Ecology 90:2253–2262. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-0851.1

29. Hanski I (1982) Dynamics of regional distribution: the core and satellite species hypothesis. Oikos 38:210–221. https://doi.org/10.2307/3544021

30. Ulrich W, Zalewski M (2006) Abundance and co-occurrence patterns of core and satellite species of ground beetles on small lake islands. Oikos 114:338–348. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2006.0030-1299.14773.x

31. Chazdon RL, Chao A, Colwell RK, Lin SY, Norden N, Letcher SG, Clark DB, Finegan B, Arroyo JP (2011) A novel statistical method for classifying habitat generalists and specialists. Ecology 92:1332–1343. https://doi.org/10.1890/10-1345.1

32. Monard C, Gantner S, Bertilsson S, Hallin S, Stenlid J (2016) Habitat generalists and specialists in microbial communities across a terrestrial-freshwater gradient. Sci Rep 6:37719. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep37719

33. Bahram M, Hildebrand F, Forslund SK, Anderson JL, Soudzilovskaia NA, Bodegom PM, Bengtsson-Palme J, Anslan S, Coelho LP, Harend H, Huerta-Cepas J, Medema MH, Maltz MR, Mundra S, Olsson PA, Pent M, Põlme S, Sunagawa S, Ryberg M, Tedersoo L, Bork P (2018) Structure and function of the global topsoil microbiome. Nature 560:233–237. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0386-6

34. Wang C, Michalet R, Liu Z, Jiang X, Wang X, Zhang G, An L, Chen S, Xiao S (2020) Disentangling large- and small-scale abiotic and biotic factors shaping soil microbial communities in an alpine cushion plant system. Front Microbiol 11:925. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.00925

35. Martínez-Olivas MA, Jiménez-Bueno NG, Hernández-García JA, Fusaro C, Luna-Guido M, Navarro-Noya YE, Dendooven L (2019) Bacterial and archaeal spatial distribution and its environmental drivers in an extremely haloalkaline soil at the landscape scale. PeerJ 7:e6127. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.6127

36. Taş N, Prestat E, Wang S, Wu Y, Ulrich C, Kneafsey T, Tringe SG, Torn MS, Hubbard SS, Jansson JK (2018) Landscape topography structures the soil microbiome in arctic polygonal tundra. Nat Commun 9:777. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03089-z

37. Edgar RC, Haas BJ, Clemente JC, Quince C, Knight R (2011) UCHIME improves sensitivity and speed of chimera detection. Bioinformatics 27:2194–2200. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr381

38. Kim M, Morrison M, Yu Z (2011) Evaluation of different partial 16S rRNA gene sequence regions for phylogenetic analysis of microbiomes. J Microbiol Methods 84:81–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2010.10.020

39. Edgar RC (2010) Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST. Bioinformatics 26:2460 btq461. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btq461

40. DeSantis TZ, Hugenholtz P, Larsen N et al (2006) Greengenes, a chimera-checked 16S rRNA gene database and workbench compatible with ARB. Appl Environ Microbiol 72:5069–5072. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.03006-05

41. Thioulouse J, Dray S, Dufour A-B, Siberchicot A, Jombart T, Pavoine S (2018) Multivariate analysis of ecological data with ade4. Springer-Verlag, New York

42. Core Team R (2016) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna

43. Pedrós-Alió C (2012) The rare bacterial biosphere. Annu Rev Mar Sci 4:449–466. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-marine-120710-100948

44. Sogin ML, Morrison HG, Huber JA, Welch DM, Huse SM, Neal PR, Arrieta JM, Herndl GJ (2006) Microbial diversity in the deep sea and the underexplored "rare biosphere". Proc Natl Acad Sci 103:12115–12120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0605127103

45. Lynch MDJ, Neufeld JD (2015) Ecology and exploration of the rare biosphere. Nat Rev Microbiol 13:217–229. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3400

46. Raynaud X, Nunan N (2014) Spatial ecology of bacteria at the microscale in soil. PLoS One 9:e87217. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0087217

47. Gleason HA (1929) The significance of Raunkiaer's law of frequency. Ecology 10:406–408. https://doi.org/10.2307/1931149

48. Fierer N, Lennon JT (2011) The generation and maintenance of diversity in microbial communities. Am J Bot 98:439–448. https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.1000498

49. Levin SA (1974) Dispersion and population interactions. Am Nat 108:207–228. https://doi.org/10.1086/282900

50. Tokeshi M (1992) Dynamics of distribution in animal communities: theory and analysis. Res Popul Ecol 34:249–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02514796

51. Eriksson A, Elías-Wolff F, Mehlig B, Manica A (2014) The emergence of the rescue effect from explicit within- and between-patch dynamics in a metapopulation. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 281:20133127. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.3127

52. Czaran T (1998) Spatiotemporal models of population and community dynamics. Springer, New York

53. Cadotte MW, Lovett-Doust J (2007) Core and satellite species in degraded habitats: an analysis using alagasy tree communities. Biodivers Conserv 16:2515–2529. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-006-9027-8

54. Shade A, Handelsman J (2012) Beyond the Venn diagram: the hunt for a core microbiome. Environ Microbiol 14:4–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2011.02585.x

55. Hamady M, Knight R (2009) Microbial community profiling for human microbiome projects: tools, techniques, and challenges. Genome Res 19:1141–1152. https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.085464.108

56. Pande S, Kost C (2017) Bacterial unculturability and the formation of intercellular metabolic networks. Trends Microbiol 25:349–361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2017.02.015

57. Pascual-García A, Bonhoeffer S, Bell T (2020) Metabolically cohesive microbial consortia and ecosystem functioning. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 375:20190245. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0245

Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH ("Springer Nature").

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users ("Users"), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use ("Terms"). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;

2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;

3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval , sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;

4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages

5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or

6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

onlineservice@springernature.com